

4-21-2005

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 21, 2005

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 21, 2005" (2005). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 118.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/118

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Executive Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

Minutes of the Meeting
Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences
April 21, 2005

Members attending: L. Duncan, P. Lancaster, H. Edge, Y. Greenberg, S. Lackman, D. Griffin, S. Klemann, P Neinken. Guest: Paul Harris

I. Call to Order: Yehudit Greenberg called the meeting to order at 12:30.

II. Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the meeting of April 7, 2005, were approved as amended.

III. Announcements: Greenberg thanked Pierce for his service on the Committee. Greenberg is looking for someone to serve as Vice-President for next year; Rick Bommelje is willing to serve, but is able to serve for only one year. There does not seem to be a prohibition in the By-Laws.

International Review Board (Lancaster): A committee headed by Jim Eck has put together a proposal. It is ready for PSC review.

Faculty Salary Task Force (Griffin): The Task Force has met for the second time, and will meet again on May 4. Next year's F&S Committee will have to continue the discussion to make a proposal.

III. Honor Code (Greenberg): Greenberg proposed to the Executive Committee that, using the first three pages of the Honor Code, we present to the faculty a set of principles about the meaning, philosophy of the Code. We do not need a new document. The set of principles are articulated within the first three pages. *Proposal:* Present to the faculty a motion with three different parts: (a) First two paragraphs "Philosophy of the Academic Honor System"; this is ready to go; (b) "Academic Honor Code Violations" – define the exact violations; (c) "Honor Pledge" – second half of the first page. These three sections are the core of the Honor Code. Greenberg would like to present this to the faculty and have each section approved. Griffin: What is the next step? Edge: I believe Roger would be committed to using the Faculty Retreat to talk about implementation. Lancaster: What is not accomplished about having the faculty views on certain principles? For example there is not a statement about self-identification and accusation; as well as the question about the accused knowing the identity of the accuser. Bernal added that he had also prepared a series of essential questions about the Honor Code; there are questions about what the fundamental principles are, and what is procedure? There are questions about what this code is for: an instrument of moral education, or a procedure for dealing with violations? The Committee reviewed the principles of the Honor Code, section by section. The first and second sections were straightforward. Neinken is concerned about "nor witness" in the pledge. Bernal said the reaffirmation of the pledge includes "nor witness." Duncan: It appears we are backsliding. A few weeks ago it was a principle of the code that it was a violation if one witnessed an incident, but did not report it. It appears that this is a principle, but not a procedure. Bernal: Then this means mandatory requirement. Griffin: We could get this document through the faculty if we defined this *only* as a principle and not a requirement. Edge: You could say that mandatory reporting is separate from the procedural issues. Neinken believes that the confidentiality clause is important to keep in, and that "nor

witness” must be removed to satisfy the students. Lancaster: Some faculty does not consider it mandatory to report. Griffin: The faculty did believe that faculty reporting was mandatory. Neinken: It sounds like this is an honor code for the students, but I thought it applied to the whole institution. Greenberg: The faculty are imbedded within this document. Duncan: For the interests of fairness, this applies to the faculty as well as the students. Griffin: I think we have to approve something that says we have to have mandatory reporting on the part of everyone in this community. We need to stand up strongly for that principle. There was general discussion that #9 should be kept in. Duncan: We have to make it clear that we are agreeing to the principle of the Honor Code and not the procedures. Lancaster: Any reasonable system should have a principle to allow the accuser to know the witness, but there should be procedures in place to guard the identity of the accuser and receive some protection. Klemann: The identity of the accuser will be known to the Committee and the Dean. Griffin: There is great concern among the students that there be anonymity. Duncan: Here is a type of compromise: a student could alert the committee that a violation has occurred and the committee will determine whether the violation has occurred; if there has been, at that times. If there is a time where the identity of the accuser is mandatory, then there may be discussion. There would be an option to remain anonymous.

V. Professional Standards Committee (Harris): The PSC has been working on a combination qualitative and quantitative faculty evaluation form. A majority of the faculty is in approval, but there is a vocal minority that is concerned what the numbers will mean, and how they will be used. PSC is suggesting that there be an on-line form in use for the next academic year, keeping the numbers confidential from everyone else except the specific individual faculty members. After a full year the PSC will be able to revisit the issue and do an analysis of the scores. The procedure would be handled through a computer evaluation. There are concerns that students might not fill out the forms; Duncan pointed out that if faculty emphasize the need for filling out the form there is a great level of participation. Griffin: There is concern that there is a reduction in narrative with the addition of the quantitative form. Harris: The question list is large: about 32; there are two narrative questions. One of the problems with the pilot was that responses were heavily weighted to the Sciences. The pilot data did not reveal a correlation between the quantitative numbers and the grades in the course.

VI. AAC (Klemann): AAC has received R&T infusion forms from all except one department. The Executive Committee needs to endorse the documents through the Dean of Faculty Website/General Education/R&T Infusion. The AAC has worked with the Departments to make the language more specific. At the next faculty meeting Klemann will indicate this information to the faculty. The descriptions have been put in a relatively common format.

A second item of business is approval of new minor of Latin American and Caribbean Studies. In the context of the R&T, there were some courses that needed to be changed, and there is an addition of one mathematics course, which means a modification of the curriculum by addition of a Senior Capstone requirement; a student cannot take the seminar without having taken another 400-level course. The major requires two courses at the 400-level. The Department offers two or three 400-level courses per year. And for information: the Health and Wellness Task Force had its colloquium on April 7; for this to move further there needs to be a serious

conversation that involves consideration of the faculty as a whole. This conversation has been scheduled at the end of the Reading Day Faculty Meeting, May 4.

VII. Core Competencies (Edge): As part of the SACS evaluation the College was advised to revise its core competencies as things that may be measured and certified. Numbers 4 and 5 on the original list have been eliminated. A grade in a course is not sufficient to measure that the student is competent.

VIII. Agenda for the Final Faculty Meeting: Recognition of retiring faculty meeting; course evaluation form. Perhaps some of the other topics can be slipped in between the voting of the meeting of April 28.

IX. Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Cohn Lackman, Ph.D., M.B.A.
Vice-President/Secretary