

10-7-2004

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 7, 2004

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, October 7, 2004" (2004).
Executive Committee Minutes. Paper 121.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/121

This Minutes 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
October 7, 2004

Members attending: P. Lancaster, D. Griffin, P. Bernal, S. Klemann, N. Decker, Y. Greenberg, S. Lackman, P. Neinken, Hoyt Edge

I. Call to Order: Yudit Greenberg called the meeting to order at 12:35.

II. Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the meeting of September 21, 2004, were approved as amended.

III. Request for faculty discussion on Fall Break. E. Gregory wishes a resolution that there be no less than two days for Fall Break. There is discussion about having a calendar for Fall 2005 that will allow Fall Break as well as provision for making up hurricane days. Another consideration is the break before Thanksgiving. Klemann is in favor of revisiting the idea of more than a one-day Fall Break. This committee requests review of the fall term calendar for 2005. Griffin: I think we should make it clear that classes are not to be cancelled *ad hoc* before holidays or hurricanes. Klemann: I believe that the Executive Committee should discuss this with the Dean of Faculty. Edge concurred. Gregory will be informed that the Executive Committee will revisit the issue, and the committee will ask Roger to present a model calendar at the next Executive Committee meeting.

IV. Endorsement of Hoyt Edge for reappointment as Associate Dean of the Faculty (Lancaster per Casey): "I am going to the Executive Committee to seek the endorsement of Hoyt Edge for another three years as Associate Dean of the Faculty. This endorsement comes with the support of the Provost and President. Hoyt has been doing an outstanding job, particularly in the areas of the first-year experience, post-tenure review, and faculty evaluation. He is committed to continuing his career as an administrator for at least this period of time. I request your endorsement." There appears not to have a faculty approval process. There appears to be nothing in the Archives, either. The position is recruited from the faculty, and is recruited and selected by the Dean. Griffin: This does not need to require a Faculty selection. Greenberg: A faculty member asked if this position had other terms: does it rotate? How long is the term? Should there be an evaluation process at the end of the three years? Griffin: The person who evaluates the Associate Dean is the Dean of the Faculty. Decker: Then, the evaluation of the Dean also includes an Associate Dean evaluation, too. Lancaster: All these administrative appointments serve at the pleasure of the President. Griffin: Hoyt serves at the pleasure of the Dean of the Faculty. Perhaps at the next meeting of the Exec Committee, the Dean could give us his perspective on the position. Greenberg: Does the Committee need any more documentation? Decker: Implicit in this issue is administrative accountability. It is clear that the position of the Associate Dean is the choice of the Dean. If the end of a 3-year term is not the time to be faculty input on how things are working administratively, there will be faculty concern on when the position may be evaluated. Lancaster: There is an on-going commitment to evaluation. If there are complaints, you may let the Dean know, because he will be evaluating the Associate Dean. Motion: The Executive Committee endorsed the plan unanimously. The Committee requested

the procedure be formalized for the Exec Comm to approve the appointment, and that a job description be created.

V. Committee Reports:

Administrative Affairs Committee (Klemann): Distributed at last meeting a proposal for the Internship Program, revised at the request of Casey. The first proposal is a reduction of the number of hours the student is working on site; the reflects the increase in formal requirements (readings, papers, et al) associated with the internships. The second proposal is a reduction of the summer internship program from 10 weeks to 9 weeks; this is a response to staffing considerations (note, not all students are doing a 10-week internship in all cases). Third proposal is the extension of the time to register for summer internships; this will allow students who leave for the campus to arrange for a summer internship (there will be late fees associate with that, and will allow greater flexibility). The AAC has endorsed all these changes. These are probably alternations to the plan, and do not require voting by the whole faculty. Alterations in the guidelines will be distributed to the faculty by Sharon Fischer.

VI. QEP Proposal (Lancaster) – Proposal distributed in response to most recent faculty colloquium and comment. There is a new and more tightly focused revision. There is a list of six outcomes, and we will need to come up with measurement and evaluation processes. Griffin: We need to come up with measurement first so we can track change. Greenberg: Do we prioritize the timing for the initiatives over the five years? Lancaster: You do some of each every year. Also, comments are welcome, and should be sent to Tom Lairson, who is working on this draft. Griffin: Suggest that all drafts should be posted on the website so people may see how the drafts are developing. Neinken: There is a student colloquium on the QEP Thursday, October 14, at 12:30 p.m. The next step is to have something for the Accreditation Leadership Team to read. A document will be brought to the faculty at the November faculty meeting. Lancaster: It might be better for the faculty to endorse a document of missions, goals, etc., instead of the whole 100-page document. Griffin: Does the faculty have to vote on this? Greenberg: The faculty does have to endorse the proposal. Lancaster: It is not explicit in the requirements of SACS that the faculty have to vote on the QEP. Klemann: We need to do the best we can to make sure people buy into this. Griffin: Then you have to think out what will happen. Edge: Let's not forget that this matches what the faculty voted on; the faculty voted on something similar, and the QEP plan moved away, but this document has moved back. Klemann: Take this to the Nov. 19 meeting, in case there are any questions; it can be brought back at the December 2 meeting. Decker: Is there a budget behind this, and how large is it? Has money already been set aside to realize these goal? Is it possible to bring this number to the faculty to say what that money is? Lancaster: There is a very rough preliminary budget of \$150,000 for the first 12-18 months. [There was further discussion.] There is some money in the budget set aside already for next year, and there will be other sources. Greenberg: Requested QEP bring to the Exec Committee a document for endorsement by the Exec Committee. Lancaster: We now have to look to the ALT, because they have assigned the QEP to be drafted. ALT will be bringing forward the plan.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 1:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Cohn Lackman, Secretary