

1-15-2004

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, January 15, 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, January 15, 2004" (2004). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 127.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/127

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
January 15, 2004

Members attending: R. Bornstein, Y. Greenberg, P. Bernal, L. Eng-Wilmot, S. Klemann, S. Lackman, T. Holbrook (for Casey), P. Lancaster, S. Ledbetter: Guests: C. Lauer, S. Carrier.

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

II. Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the meeting of December 9, 2003, were approved as presented.

III. Continued discussion on PSC proposal for evaluation of tenured faculty (Schmalstig):

A. Changes, in keeping with spirit of Article VIII: Seven years (instead of 5); developmental; tied in with Sabbatical.

B. Letter sent from Department to Dean in spring of fifth year. Would not interfere with tenure and promotion duties, since review by Dean would take place in summer.

C. Would it be possible or appropriate to add (to last line of Section 2), "and Sabbaticals"? The most direct implication would be grants that would take place during Sabbatical year. There are also FYRST grants that are available, and post-tenure review would affect those. The issue is that nothing is positive or punitive about this evaluation. Tying this evaluation into the Sabbatical may be implied as development. Proposal (friendly amendment): Ask PSC to include in Section 1 that the self-evaluation include a proposal by the faculty member for Sabbatical. Perhaps postpone tying evaluation into Sabbatical; and tying this into developmental process; make it clear that evaluation is not tied into *getting* Sabbatical.

D. If this is passed in the Spring, it would go into effect with faculty coming up for Sabbatical in 2006-7.

E. There is no place in the guidelines where teaching and research are integrated: there is no place where research comes into classroom, or collaborative research with students. Request that these suggestions for questions a faculty member may wish to address be embedded somewhere (faculty handbook, et al).

F. With modifications, the proposal can be presented to faculty at next meeting.

IV. Finance and Service (Eng-Wilmot): Discussion of memo from Les Lloyd about developing an IT Master plan. Create and develop a committee that has wide constituency. F&S will address the issue at their next meeting. I.T. now reports to VP-Finance, instead of Provost.

V. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) (Lancaster, Carrier, Lauer):

A. Overview: Plan is due in January 2005. This is a planning document that can be no longer than 100 page, with no more than 75 pages of narrative. The QEP is an opportunity to pick out something we'd like to do anyway and demonstrate to SACS that we will focus on student learning. There are many topics we would like to address together. QEP will be evaluated by On-Site Review Committee with specific backgrounds and qualifications. The college's Accreditation Leadership Team is now evaluating all the information that is being submitted now. The QEP will have institution-wide focus: some aspect of the college that will be found in all areas of the college; something that will impact all the students, but not in the same way. This becomes an

action plan. The process gives Rollins a lot of leeway to do what is important to us: must be a unified theme focused on student learning outcomes.

B. Key elements of QEP:

- Brief descriptive title: maximum of 75 pages and 25 pages of appendices.
- Persuasive rationale/justification for the QEP and its importance
- Statement of student learning appropriate to the QEP
- Review of “Good practices” related to the QEP
- Support among campus constituency groups and evidence of such support
- Specific, well-defined goals that focus on improving student learning
- Implementation framework including timelines and necessary resources
- Evidence that the institution has sufficient resources to implement, sustain, and complete the QEP
- Comprehensive evaluation plan clearly linked to the QEP goals
- Demonstration that institution has the means for assessing the QEP

Potential topic areas can be:

- Academic excellence
- Responsible Citizenship and Ethical Leadership
- Internationalization

Focus: Something that can be completed in a finite amount of time; should be pragmatic and doable.

Does this diffuse the singleness of the vision?

Continued conversation about the community, and that may be a topic. Leads to pragmatic things we can do to change the culture and enhance academic excellence. (Should be subsumed into academic excellence?) Community may be stratagem to develop academic excellence. The focus could on be building an academic excellent community, and can we engage students in learning. We need to figure out how to measure student learning outcomes.

C. The next step is to pick a topic: suggested timeline presented. We have an opportunity on January 29 to address the issue at the all-college meeting preceding the A&S Faculty Meeting.

D. Discussion of ways to modify and refine suggestions to distribute to faculty. State goals and rationale. This is a charge to a committee to develop a plan. (Idea: Academic Excellence: Building and Intellectual Community) And just because something isn’t in the list doesn’t mean we are going to stop doing it. There is a concern about the moral ecology of the campus; the process of building community and the process of changing the ecology are synonymous.

E. Summary Motion: Will refine topics, and document will be sent to the general faculty as addendum to agenda of All-College Faculty Meeting. Discussion may move to a later colloquium. But there will be an agreement to limit discussion to all-college meeting for 30 minutes.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Cohn Lackman, Ph.D., Secretary