Rollins College
Rollins Scholarship Online

Executive Committee Minutes | College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports

11-5-2015

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, November 5, 2015

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, November 5, 2015" (2015). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 159.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/159

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 rwalton@rollins.edu.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
November 5, 2015
Agenda

12:30 in CSS 167
Lunch will be served

I. **Call to order**
Dexter Boniface

II. **Approval of Minutes from 10-8-15**
Dexter Boniface

III. **New Business**
a. Set the agenda for the A&S Faculty Meeting on November 19th
b. Discussion of Board of Trustees Join Committee (and debriefing)
(Attachments #1-2)
c. Discussion of Faculty Compensation Protocol (how should we proceed?)
(Attachment #3)
d. Discussion of Policy K1 1003 on creation of academic programs (time permitting)
(Attachment #4)

IV. **Committee Reports**
a. Any committee business that requires deliberation by EC
-- F&S – Faculty Resolution on Divestment
(Attachment #5)
b. Reports: SLC, AAC, F&S, PSC, SGA (time permitting)
(Attachments #6-10)

V. **Adjournment**

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
November 5, 2015
Approved Minutes

PRESENT

Dexter Boniface, Emily Russell, Ashley Kistler, CJ Dunn, Craig McAllaster, Derrick Paladino, Anca Voicu, Grant Cornwell, Eric Smaw, and Karla Knight (for Jennifer Cavenaugh)

CALL TO ORDER

Dexter Boniface called the meeting to order at 12:32 PM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM 10/1/15

EC unanimously approved the minutes from the 10/8/15 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Set agenda for the A&S Faculty Meeting on November 19th
Dexter Boniface

EC will present a walkthrough of the multiple governance models on the table and allow time for discussion. The CPS faculty serving on the EC+ Committee will be invited to attend the meeting.

Kistler said the divestment issue may end up on the faculty meeting agenda whether we add it or not. The group wants EC to endorse the resolution, but plan to bring it to the faculty even without an endorsement from EC.

Discussion of Board of Trustees Faculty Joint Committee (and debriefing)
Dexter Boniface
(Attachments #1-2)

The President's idea of an ad hoc joint BOT and faculty committee has been implemented. The Board has asked us to deliberate about the nature of this committee and whether or not it needs refinement. Is meeting three times a year enough? Boniface believes what we have in place now is good. One drawback is that Russell is not a member since she is not on the Executive Council. Paladino asked if we will lack continuity since, with the exception of the faculty president, EC membership changes each year. Russell suggests we keep the current composition for now.

Discussion of Faculty Compensation Protocol

Dexter Boniface
(Attachment #3)

Two faculty have developed a document that details the timeline of everything that has happened in regards to compensation/merit pay. They have asked EC to identify facilitators to lead a discussion about merit pay and market increases and the possibility of decoupling the two. Boniface proposes we detail the issues and investigate how to handle them.

Boniface stated that prior to 2008 we had a very transparent and predictable compensation model. Today there is confusion about our model because each year since faculty adopted the merit pay model it's been implemented in a different manner. He notes that 2009 was the only year merit pay was processed in accordance with the procedures adopted by faculty. EC discussed next steps and Cornwell expressed concern at moving to develop a compensation model before we sort out our governance structure. Boniface said EC has a responsibility to respond to faculty who are calling for the issue to be deliberated. There was a suggestion to pass a resolution that says we will not conduct merit reviews when the salary pool for increases is less than 3-4%. As an intermediate step until we have an elected governance group, Russell suggested we reaffirm the merit pay resolution faculty originally adopted and define a minimum trigger amount. EC decided merit pay will be addressed once we are in a place where we can deal with the issue across both schools.

Discussion of Policy K1 1003 on creation of academic programs
Dexter Boniface
(Attachment #4)

This issue was tabled until the December EC meeting.

REPORTS

SGA
CJ Dunn

Dunn reported that the legislative body of SGA passed the divestment bill but not without dissent. Kistler said that F&S voted to not vote on the bill and instead bring it to EC. More discussion and information is needed. Smaw said he will work with Dunn to put together a campus debate or discussion on the issue. A motion was made that EC declares the faculty resolution on divestment should be postponed pending review. Motion passed unanimously.

SLC
Derrick Paladino

SLC discussed with the Dean of Students' Office the possibility of combining the social and honor codes into a single document. Violations of the codes would still be adjudicated separately and remain where they are currently housed. The goal is to unify the honor system. SLC is exploring how this is handled at other ACS schools.

AAC

Anca Voicu

Questions remain about the role of Explorations Coaches in academic advising. AAC passed a resolution that will come to EC that states all Explorations coaches receive training from Tiffany Griffin and a designee from Explorations will report to AAC. Voicu will circulate the document to EC and the Committee will decide at the next meeting whether or not to endorse the resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Dexter Boniface

Boniface adjourned the meeting at 1:47 PM.

ATTACHMENT 1

Dexter Boniface

From:	Lorrie Kyle
Sent:	Wednesday, October 14, 2015 10:01 AM
To:	Dexter Boniface; Mary Conway Dato-on; Ashley Kistler; Derrick Paladino; Don Rogers; Eric Smaw; Anca Voicu; Orlando Evora; Susan Whealler Johnston (sjohnston@agb.org); keen@keewin.net; Tom Kuntz; eric.spiegel@siemens.com; ewallace@learningcaregroup.com
Cc:	Henrique Correa; David Lord
Subject:	Message from David Lord re Rollins Faculty and Trustee Joint Committee Meeting
Attachments:	Joint Committee Draft.docx
Importance:	High

The following message is sent on behalf of David Lord, board chairman.

I am looking forward to our joint meeting on Thursday morning. I welcome receiving any topics anyone would like to suggest for our agenda.

Grant will join us for the first portion of the meeting as we introduce ourselves and have some discussion about this ad hoc committee during its first year. He has kindly shared with me some information on the charge that the similar committee had at Wooster. I have used this to draft some ideas for how we might operate during 2015-16, which we can review and discuss Thursday. The idea is for this year to be a trial, and in 2016-17, to decide if the committee should be formalized in College and faculty bylaws.

During the latter portion of the meeting, Grant will depart. He is especially interested in our visiting on how things are going in the first two months of his transition into the presidency and any issues that call for his and the board's focus during this transition year.

I am pleased that, between the Joint Committee and faculty attending trustee committee meetings, we have the opportunity to work together on making Rollins stronger and to better to know each other.

Agenda ideas can be sent to me, and I will also ask for ideas at the beginning of the meeting.

David Lord
dlord@griffisgroup.com
97 W Boulder Street
Colorado Springs, Co 80903
719-661-0589

Board of Trustees and Faculty Joint Committee (Ad Hoc Committee for 2015-16)

Draft Charter for 2015-16: For Discussion at October 15, 2015, Meeting

General Responsibilities

The Trustee-Faculty Joint Committee will act as a liaison and avenue of direct communications between the all-College Faculty and the Board of Trustees. The Committee will normally meet during each Board of Trustees meeting cycle. The Committee will convey the issues and concerns of the Faculty to the College president, the Education Committee of the board, and other relevant board committees as appropriate. The trustees will use the meeting as an opportunity to discuss issues where they are seeking faculty input.

An overview of the Board of Trustees meeting agenda will be shared in advance of the Joint Committee meeting to provide an opportunity for faculty to share input on any relevant topics that will be discussed during trustee committee and full board meetings.

The trustees on the Joint Committee will report to the board at each regular meeting regarding the insights and findings gained from the Joint Committee. The trustees will inform the College president of faculty concerns or issues expressed by the Committee.

Composition of the Committee

The Faculty representatives on the Committee are the seven members of the all-College Faculty Executive Committee; the seven trustees are nominated by the board chair and approved by the full board. The trustee board chair will serve as co-chair of the Joint Committee, and the faculty will designate their co-chair.

Specific Tasks

1. Strategic Direction and Objective Setting
    1. Review the strategies and objectives that provide long-term directions for continued well-being of continued excellence and well-being of the faculty.
    2. Identify those strategies or objectives that require coordination with board committees, particularly the Education Committee.
    3. Provide a forum for the College president, board, or faculty to share ideas around strategic planning that require board and faculty collaboration and coordination.
2. College Shared Governance
    1. Identify issues around effective shared governance that require coordination between the faculty, College president, and board of trustees.
    2. Maintain an understanding of current best practices for effective shared governance in higher education.
    3. Review any changes being proposed by the faculty or trustees to College and faculty bylaws.
3. Best Practices and Benchmarking
    1. Provide information and understanding of the current best practices in higher education for faculty development, compensation, and benefits.
4. Committee and Charter Assessment
    1. By the May 2016 Board of Trustees meeting, the Committee will review the structure and scope of work of the Committee and send any recommendations for change to the College president, board chair, and Committee on Trustees chair.

Special Meetings

1. The two co-chairs can convene a meeting by conference call between trustee meetings if a need arises.

ATTACHMENT 2

Invitation for Faculty Representation at Board of Trustees Committee Meetings

The Board of Trustees and President Cornwell are working to build communications with the faculty and involve them more in trustee meetings. A Joint Faculty and Trustee Committee has been formed and will meet during each board meeting cycle. We also would like to extend an invitation for faculty representatives to attend the Finance, Student Life, Education, and Development and Alumni Relations Committee meetings on Thursday, October 15. The board's Executive Committee only meets between board meetings, by phone.

Although the Arts and Sciences faculty in spring 2015 made a specific request to the board for representation at future board meetings, the trustees feel the representation should reflect the all-College faculty. In its work, the board has to be thinking about "one Rollins," and our discussions are around all the schools. I thus am reaching out to the presidents of the three faculties with this invitation.

Last year, the presidents of Crummer, Arts and Sciences, and the College of Professional Studies or their representatives attended the Education Committee meetings, and the board appreciated having faculty viewpoint for these meetings. I understand that other members of the A&S faculty Executive Committee include the chairs of the A&S Student Life and Finance and Services committees; these would be good representatives to attend the two parallel board committees. I also think it would be helpful to have a faculty representative attend the Development and Alumni Relations Committee meeting.

You will find attached to this note a further description of the four major committees of the board and the schedule of their meetings. Please coordinate with Lorrie Kyle regarding which faculty will attend the meetings. She will advise the vice president who works with each committee and will share copies of materials provided to the trustees for each meeting.

President Cornwell is working to have faculty participate in some meals during the board meeting as another way for trustees and faculty to better know each other and build relationships.

If there are questions, don't hesitate to call me 719-661-0589 or email dlord@griffisresidential.com

Cordially

David Lord
Board Chair

Finance Committee

The Board of Trustees exercises its responsibility for the business and financial affairs of the College through its Finance Committee. The Vice President for Business and Finance and Treasurer informs the Committee of changing conditions that affect the financial welfare of the College. The Finance Committee:

- reviews and recommends the annual operating budget;
- monitors budget performance during the fiscal year;
- reviews and recommends tuition and fee rates as a part of the annual budget;
- oversees the physical plant; reviews the appointment of architects, engineers, and other related professionals; and reviews plans, specifications, and budgets for construction and renovation;
- reviews and recommends acquisition or disposal of plant assets;
- reviews the financial impact of new or changed academic programs;
- oversees the conduct of business and financial activities to assure that performance is consistent with generally accepted standards.

Education Committee

The Board of Trustees exercises its responsibility to assure that the educational program is consistent with the charter of the College and that high academic standards are maintained through its Education Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs informs the Committee of educational issues which affect the character and quality of the academic programs at Rollins. The Education Committee:

- reviews and recommends to the board new degree programs and the elimination of degree programs;
- review and recommends to the board candidates for tenure and for promotion to full professor;
- reviews and recommends to the Board candidates for emeritus rank;
- meets periodically with faculty, students, overseers, and outside experts to inform itself of educational developments at the College;
- arranges for programs and activities that will inform trustees of educational developments at the College;
- assures and protects academic freedom.

Student Life Committee.

The Student Life Committee oversees the College's goal of providing a safe and healthy campus environment that promotes students' well-being and academic success through its Student Life Committee. The Vice President for Student Affairs informs the Committee of issues that affect the character and quality of student life at Rollins. The Student Life Committee:

- educates and advises the Board of Trustees on emerging issues in student life;
- offers guidance on policies and practices in, but not limited to, the following areas:
  - enrollment, retention, and financial aid;
  - housing, dining, and social facilities;
  - co-curricular activities;
  - athletics;
  - fraternity and sorority life;
  - campus safety and security;
  - career services;
  - health and counseling services.

Development and Alumni Relations Committee.

The Board of Trustees exercises responsibility for the oversight of private financial support of the College through its Development and Alumni Relations Committee. The Committee operates in three areas: annual gifts for current operations, capital gifts, and deferred gifts and bequests. The Development and Alumni Relations Committee:

- reviews regularly the financial needs of the College;
- reviews and recommends to the board plans and programs for raising the funds necessary to meet these needs;
- reviews and recommends to the board the annual fund-raising goals;
- reviews and recommends to the board the annual goal for trustee giving, and participates in their solicitation;
- reviews regularly prospects for giving and participates in their cultivation;
- fosters an atmosphere of awareness and concern among the constituencies of the College and the general public.

ATTACHMENT 3

ROLLINS
POLICY

Title:	Creation and Revision of Academic, Non-Credit, and Collaborative Programs	Type:	Key Institutional
No: KI 1003		Approval Date: Rev. 1 11-X-2015; May 15, 2014	
Responsible Office: VPAA/Provost		Approved By: Rev. 1 appvd by A&S and CPS Exec Committees. Fac Exec Cncl; P&BC; Pres Staff, President	
Next Review: ~~2019~~2020		Revision No: 1	

I. Purpose/Introduction/Rationale

This policy provides guidelines for the review and approval of new academic, non-credit, dual, or joint collaborative programs, or substantive program modifications to any of the above.

The creation of academic degree, major, minor, or certificate programs (credit or non-credit); substantive changes to existing programs;[1] the establishment of joint, dual-degree, or cooperative degree programs with other institutions; or the initiation of community or public service programs must align with the College's mission, institutional plans and priorities, available resources, and the needs of students. Faculty of the Arts & Sciences (A&S), the College of Professional Studies (CPS), and the Crummer Graduate School of Business (CRU), respectively, have primary responsibility for curricular content, quality, and effectiveness of credit-bearing programs and courses at Rollins College that culminate in the awarding of academic degrees, diplomas, or certificates. Non-credit programs of study that culminate in certification document are reviewed administratively in consultation with the appropriate faculty governance entities.

New degree, major, minor, or certificate program; substantive changes to an existing program; or the establishment of joint, dual, or cooperative degree programs *may not* be advertised or implemented until final approval is granted from the appropriate College entities outlined in this policy, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), and other appropriate external accrediting organizations of the College, if required. Non-credit programs require only the approval of appropriate College entities prior to advertisement and implementation.

II. Definitions

Baccalaureate degrees are defined as those programs requiring a minimum of 140 semester hours beyond the high school diploma, a minimum of 30 semester hours of which shall be comprised of general education coursework. In the residential undergraduate programs of A&S/CPS, at least 50% of the semester hours required for undergraduate degrees shall be earned through coursework completed at Rollins. In part-time evening undergraduate programs of the Hamilton Holt School at least 25% of the semester hours required for the degree shall be earned through coursework completed at Rollins.

Master's degrees are defined as those programs requiring a minimum of 30 semester hours beyond the baccalaureate degree. At least 33% of the semester hours required for master's degrees shall be earned through instruction at Rollins.

Doctoral degrees are defined as those programs requiring a minimum of 50 graduate semester credit hours beyond the baccalaureate degree with at least 30 graduate semester hours beyond the master's degree, including a maximum of 12 hours of dissertation hours and a maximum of 23 dissertation preparation hours.

Undergraduate majors are defined as coherent programs of study in an academic discipline leading to a baccalaureate degree in the given academic area of specialty.

Undergraduate and graduate minors, concentrations, or certificates are defined as coherent clusters of academic courses comprising a distinct curricular pattern in a single discipline. Minor, concentration, and certificate programs normally require a minimum of 15-18 semester credit hours of prescribed coursework.

Credit certificate programs are defined as coherent clusters of credit coursework culminating in a certificate or other credential offered by one of the College's schools.

Non-credit certificate programs are defined as coherent clusters of non-credit coursework culminating in a certificate or other credential offered by one of the College's schools. When appropriate and available, certificate programs of the College are typically recognized by relevant professional organizations.

Dual academic degree programs are defined as those between Rollins and one (or more) institutions in which "students study at two or more institutions and each institution grants a separate academic award bearing only its name, seal, and signature."

Joint academic degree programs are those between Rollins and one (or more) institutions in which "students study at two or more institutions and the institutions grant a single academic award bearing the names, seals, and signatures of each of the participating institutions."[2]

Dual and joint academic degree programs are typically governed by Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) between the College and other participating institutions. These MOUs articulate agreed-upon academic completion requirements and the awarding of degrees, diplomas, or certificates.

III. Procedure or Application

A. General Guidelines

As delegated by the College's Board of Trustees,[3] development and oversight of credit-bearing programs culminating in the awarding of academic diplomas or certificates from Rollins College are governed by appropriate Faculty Bylaws. Once formally approved by appropriate faculty governance entities, new degree, major, minor, certificate programs; substantive changes to an existing program; or the establishment of joint, dual, or cooperative degree programs are implemented by the College's administration in consultation with those faculty. Non-credit programs may be initiated by faculty or administrators of the College and the recommendations of the faculty are reviewed in consultation with the appropriate faculty governance entity or entities.

In the case of new degree programs or program revisions with resource implications, administrative review is also required by the College's Planning and Budget Committee (P&BC), President's Cabinet, President, and, in the case of new degree programs, the Board of Trustees. Proposals for all new programs must include justification and rationale based on the College's mission, institutional plan, available resources, and the needs of students. Faculty governance review and approval processes follow the steps noted in Part B. (below).

No new academic degree, major, minor, certificate program, or substantive change to any existing credit-bearing program, may be advertised or implemented until final approval is granted from the appropriate College entities outlined in this policy, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), and other appropriate external accrediting organizations of the College as required. Non-credit certificate programs require only the approval of appropriate College entities outlined in this policy prior to advertisement and implementation.

B. Review and Approval Process

Departments, programs, faculty, staff, or administrators considering new credit-bearing academic programs (or revision of existing programs) ~~are strongly encouraged to~~are required to meet with the appropriate ~~faculty governance body (if required),~~ Dean(s) and ~~,~~ the Faculty Executive Council, including the ~~and~~ Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (VPAA/Provost) and President, ~~as early as possible in the development process~~prior to developing full program proposals for approval to discuss program changes, resource needs, and substantive change documentation, as required.

1. Approval Process for Credit Programs (including Credit Certificate programs)

A. Sponsoring department, program, and/or faculty committees develop prepare a *Cover Sheet for New Program Proposal or Substantive Change of an Existing Program*. This summary concept document is reviewed with the appropriate Dean(s) and the Faculty Executive Council, including the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (VPAA/Provost) and President. The VPAA/Provost shares the results of this review with the program proposers and the Education Committee of the Board of Trustees. See the *Academic Approval Process Pathway* document included with this policy for additional information.

B. Once preliminary concepts are reviewed and approved, the ~~S~~sponsoring department, program, and/or faculty committees revise the Cover Sheet and develop a full program proposal describing:

- rationale and need for new program or modification of an existing program,
- intended student learning outcomes,
- budget and resource requirements,
- a curricular plan (Catalog copy) articulating program requirements, and
- a Demonstration of Learning (DoL, assessment of student learning outcomes) plan.

~~B~~C. Full ~~P~~proposals bearing appropriate approvals from department, program, or committee chairs are then passed back to the appropriate Dean(s), VPAA/Provost and are then forwarded to either the Academic Affairs Committee of A&S (A&S-AAC), Curriculum Review Committee of CPS (CPS-CRC), or the Faculty of the

Crummer Graduate School of Business, respectively, for review and approval.[4, 5, 6] Proposals for programs in the Hamilton Holt School are first approved by the Hamilton Holt School Dean and then follow the same curricular approval processes described above for A&S or CPS, depending on the academic discipline involved.[*]

~~C~~D. Once approved by faculty governance, ~~meeting minutes recording approval are forwarded to the appropriate Dean(s) and VPAA/Provost for either~~ administrative review, recommendation, or approval, as applicable, by the Planning and Budget Committee, President's Staff, President, and Trustees, if required, ~~or implementation in consultation with the appropriate faculty~~is completed by the VPAA/Provost. Once all internal reviews are complete, an appropriate proposal, if required, for substantive change is prepared by the sponsoring program and Dean(s) and submitted to Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACSCOC) or other external accrediting organizations.

No new academic degree, major, minor, certificate program, or substantive change to any existing credit-bearing program, may be advertised or implemented until final approval is granted from the appropriate College entities outlined in this policy, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), and other appropriate external accrediting organizations of the College as required.

2. Non-Credit Programs

A. Crummer Graduate School of Business
Non-credit programs of the Crummer School's Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership Center and Management and Executive Education programs are approved by program directors in consultation with the Dean of Crummer, or designate of the Dean. Program effectiveness and participant outcomes are assessed by each unit and is reported annually through the College's Administrative Effectiveness System (AES).

B. Hamilton Holt School
Non-credit programs of the Holt School or its Center for Lifelong Learning follow the process below.

1. Sponsoring department, program, committee, staff member, or administrator develops a proposal describing:
    - rationale and need for new program or modification of an existing program,
    - intended participant outcomes, and
    - budget and resource requirements,
    - a curricular plan articulating program requirements, and
    - an AES plan for evaluating participant outcomes and program effectiveness.

[*]All significant actions of the A&S-AAC are subsequently reported to and approved by the Executive Committee of the A&S faculty and if changes or new programs are considered to be of great significance, such cases are taken to the full A&S faculty at a monthly meeting for review and approval.

2. The proposal is forwarded by the developer to the Dean of the Hamilton Holt School. The Dean then notifies the appropriate faculty leadership of the proposal and provides a copy of the proposal for review. The proposal is then submitted to the VPAA/Provost, along with comments from the faculty leadership, for approval. The VPAA/Provost will consider alignment to mission and budgetary implications, and may consult with other constituencies, if needed. Approval is communicated to the developer by the VPAA/Provost.

IV. Related Policies or Applicable Publications

[1] Rollins College. (2013). *Key Institutional (KI) 1002 Substantive Change Policy*.

[2] Southern Association of College and Schools Commission on College (SACSCOC). *Agreements involving joint and dual academic awards: Policy and procedures*. http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/AgreementsInvolvingDualandJointAwards.pdfSubstantive Change Policy.

[3] Rollins College. (2002, amended). *Bylaws of Rollins College, Article IV, Faculty, Section 1. Appointment, Powers and Duties*.

[4] Rollins College. (2014.) *Faculty Handbook, Faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences, Section IV Policies and Procedures; Section V Bylaws, Article V Governance Structure, Section 1; Article VI, Section 1-2; and Article VII, Section 1*.

[5] Rollins College. (2014.) *Bylaws of the College of Professional Studies, Article IV Standing Committees, Sections 1 and 3 and Article V, Meetings of the Faculty, Section 1.*

[6] Rollins College. (2014.) *Bylaws of the Faculty of the Crummer Graduate School of Business, Section VI Bylaws, Article III, Faculty Responsibilities, Rights and Duties, Part 1 Academic Programs.*

V. Appendices/Supplemental Materials

Academic Approval Process Pathway
Cover Sheet for New Program Proposal or Substantive Change of an Existing Program
~~Demonstration of Learning Template Link~~
~~Administrative Effectiveness Template Link~~

VI. Rationale for Revision

[*Not applicable.*]

DRAFT

ROLLINS

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS & PROVOST

Academic Program Approval Process Pathway

The academic program approval process, for both credit and non-credit programs, provides a prescribed series of steps designed to assure that all new programs are aligned with strategic priorities of the College, support the mission of both the institution and sponsoring academic unit, and that necessary resources are available to sustain programs. While the process is based on and built around the steps required to develop and offer a new degree program, there are many other types of academic changes included in this process. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA)/Provost is responsible for administration of this process at Rollins College.

As detailed in College policies KI 1003 *Creation and Revision of Academic, Non-Credit, and Collaborative Programs* and KI 1002 *Substantive Change*, some academic changes may not require approvals at all levels, or may be advanced through some levels of the process as information items. The general approval sequences, for new credit, non-credit, and collaborative programs with other institutions, or significant changes to existing programs appear below. To identify proposals with promise and eliminate those with concerns before time is invested in proposal development, for new credit programs the process entails two steps – pre-proposal review and full proposal approval.

Credit Programs *(including credit certificate programs and joint, dual, or collaborative programs with other institutions)*	**Non-Credit Programs**	
	Holt	**Crummer**
PRE–PROPOSAL REVIEW		
Sponsoring department, program, and/or faculty committee(s)		
Appropriate Dean		
Faculty Executive Council, including President and Provost		
Board of Trustees Notification (Provost's Report to Education Committee)		
FULL PROPOSAL APPROVAL		
Appropriate Dean	Sponsoring department, program, committee, staff member, or administrator	Program Director
VPAA/Provost	Holt Dean	Crummer Dean or Designee
Appropriate Faculty Governance Committee	Faculty Governance (notification and comment)	
Planning and Budget Committee (P&BC)	VPAA/Provost	
President's Cabinet		
President		
Board of Trustees (new degree programs)		
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) or other external accrediting organizations		

DRAFT

New degree, major, minor, or certificate program; substantive changes to an existing program; or the establishment of joint, dual, or cooperative degree programs may not be advertised or implemented until final approval is granted from the appropriate College entities, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), and other external accrediting organizations of the College, if required. Non-credit programs require only the approval of appropriate College entities prior to advertisement and implementation.

Overview of the Approval Process

As a basic overview, listed below are types of proposals considered in the academic program approval process, as well as general approval process details. Campus administrators should consult College Policy KI 1002 *Substantive Change* for a complete list of changes requiring notification, review, or approval by SACSCOC.

Types of Changes in Academic Programs and Structures

- New campus branches or extension centers
- New schools or name changes of schools
- New departments, including name changes and transfers to other divisions
- New centers or institutes, including name changes
- New joint, dual, or collaborative programs with other institutions
- All new academic credentials, including:
  - Certificates
  - Degrees
  - Majors/tracks/concentrations
  - Minors
  - Name changes
  - Terminations/program closures

Steps in Proposal Development, Review, and Approval: New Academic Programs

Pre-Proposal Review

1) Review College Policies for Required Approval Process (including VPAA/Provost *Cover Sheet for New Program Proposal or Substantive Change of an Existing Program*).
2) Prepare preliminary VPAA/Provost *Cover Sheet*, including estimated enrollments, projected revenue, and costs.
3) Review proposed program plans with Dean for preliminary approval.
4) If approved, Dean forwards VPAA/Provost *Cover Sheet* to Provost for review by Faculty Executive Council (including President and Provost).
5) VPAA/Provost informs sponsoring department and Education Committee of Board of Trustees of Executive Council outcome and/or concerns.

Full Proposal Approval

1) Prepare full proposal and update VPAA/Provost *Cover Sheet* (as needed)
2) Review and approval of appropriate Dean
3) Review and approval by VPAA/Provost
4) Review and approval of appropriate faculty governance committee, including approval by the appropriate full faculty, if required
5) Review and recommendation by Planning and Budget Committee (P&BC)
6) Review and recommendation by President's Cabinet
7) Review and approval by President

8) Review and approval by Board of Trustees (for new degree programs only)
9) Submission to Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACSCOC) or other external accrediting organizations, as required

Approval Process Details for New Degree Programs

New academic degrees comprise those for which a new degree credential, e.g., Executive Doctorate in Business Administration (E.D.B.A.), not previously offered or awarded by the College is proposed. Appropriate departments, deans, and faculty governance committees first consider all proposals for new academic degree programs. No outside notifications or advertising of proposed changes can be made until approved through the full process. The sponsoring dean assures that proposals are appropriately formatted and complete. The purpose of this review is to assure conformity with College policy and quality standards, as well as presentation of approved programs in a manner that will ease passage through subsequent governance bodies, the Board of Trustees, and accrediting agencies.

Once approved by appropriate faculty governance bodies, proposals for new degree programs are forwarded by the VPAA/Provost to the Planning and Budget Committee (P&BC) for review and recommendation. Academic administrators from the VPAA/Provost's Office then forward most proposals to the VPAA, President's Cabinet, and the President for review, changes, and/or approval. If approved by the President, the VPAA/Provost forwards new degree program proposals to the chair of the Education Committee of the College's Board of Trustees for inclusion on its agenda and subsequent presentation, review, and approval by the full Board or inclusion on the Administrative Action Report, as appropriate.

> ***NOTE***: Academic changes not requiring Trustee action may be implemented with appropriate internal approvals from the VPAA/Provost and/or President, with the Education Committee of the Board of Trustees being updated on all changes not requiring acceptance by the full Board (as either an action or report item).

Following Trustee approval, the appropriate Deans, program directors/department chairs, and Assistant Provost, and Provost prepare required accrediting agency notifications or substantive change proposals, if required, for transmission by the College President.

Once the appropriate accrediting agencies make approval decisions, program proposers may move forward with implementing and advertising the new program.

DRAFT

ROLLINS

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Cover Sheet for New Program Proposal or Substantive Change of an Existing Program

Program Name	
College	
Department or Program	
Contact(s), E-mail, Phone	
Type of Program	Degree, Major, Minor, Certificate, Dual or Joint Degree Program
Level	Undergraduate, past-baccalaureate, graduate, doctoral, professional.
Credit or Non-Credit	
Total Credit Hours	
Effective Date	
Program Need and Fit to Mission	
Intended Audience	
Projected Enrollment	
Location(s) of Instruction	Physical location of instruction (e.g. Main Campus, new location, etc.) and means of delivery (e.g. traditional face-to-face, on-line, blended, etc.). Indicate plans or potential plans for expansion to additional physical locations or additional means of delivery.
Admission Requirements	
Faculty Required and Credentials	If existing faculty will staff the program, please explain how teaching in the new program will affect offerings of the department, e.g., existing majors, minors, general education, etc.
Coursework Required	
Student Learning Outcomes	What will students or participants know or be able to do upon completion of the program?
Evaluation & Assessment	How will student learning outcomes be assessed and how will program efficacy be evaluated?
Resource Requirements & Project Budget	Will the program require additional resources, from any source, such as faculty, courses, library materials, equipment, and/or facilities? If such resources are required, indicate the source of funding to support needs.
PRE-PROPOSAL REVIEW	
Sponsoring Department	Signature and Date
Appropriate Dean	Signature and Date
Faculty Executive Council	Signature and Date
Trustee Notification	(Date; *Completed by Office of the VPAA/Provost)*
FULL PROPOSAL APPROVAL	
Appropriate Dean	Signature and Date
VPAA/Provost	Signature and Date
Faculty Governance	Required only for credit-bearing programs. Note all governance bodies and approval signature(s).
P&BC Approval	(If required; Date; *Completed by Office of the VPAA/Provost*)
President's Cabinet	(If required; Date; *Completed by Office of the VPAA/Provost*)
President	(If required; Date; *Completed by Office of the VPAA/Provost*)
Board of Trustees	(If required; Date; *Completed by Office of the VPAA/Provost*)

Dexter Boniface

From:	Rollins College Provost
Sent:	Friday, October 30, 2015 11:10 AM
To:	Dexter Boniface; Debra Wellman; Tom McEvoy
Cc:	Jennifer Cavenaugh; David C.S. Richard; Craig McAllaster
Subject:	Emailing - KI 1003 Creation-Revision of Academic, Non-Credit, Collaborative Programs 10-2015 rev.pdf
Attachments:	KI 1003 Creation-Revision of Academic, Non-Credit, Collaborative Programs 10-2015 rev.pdf

Dear Dexter, Debra, and Tom,

As you know, our office has been working to develop a clearer approval process pathway for new academic programs (or substantive changes to existing programs).

The process pathway was reviewed by the Education Committee of the Trustees earlier this month and Craig asks that it now be presented to you for review and comment by faculty governance executive committees.

The process pathway is incorporated into College Policy KI 1003 Creation and Revision of Academic, Non-Credit, and Collaborative Programs as revisions. Additions and deletions are shown in light blue/green, respectively, in the document. Please note that this policy was originally approved in May 2014 by the Faculty Executive Council, Planning and Budget Committee (P&BC), President's Staff, and President.

In short, the new pathway creates a two-step process:

- first, review/approval of new program (or substantive change) concepts by the Faculty Executive Council, deans, provost, and president, with notification to the Board of Trustees, before a full proposal is developed, and
- second, preparation of full proposals and formal/review by deans, provost, governance committees/faculty, as well as the Planning and Budget Committee (P&BC), president's cabinet, Trustees, and SACSCOC (as required).

Thank you in advance and please contact Craig or myself if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Toni Strollo Holbrook, M.B.A., Ed.D.
Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness
Courtesy Assistant Professor of Education
Office of the Vice President for
Academic Affairs & Provost

ROLLINS

... If one advances confidently in the direction of her dreams, and endeavors to live the life which she has imagined, she will meet with a success unexpected in her common hour. -Henry David Thoreau

The information transmitted herein is intended solely for the individual or entity addressed and may contain confidential or priviedged material.
Review, retransmission, dissemination, other use of, or action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than intended recipients is prohibited.
f you received this message in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

Pay Cycle Begin	COLA (Base)?	Merit (Base)?	COLA (Stipend)?	Merit (Stipend)?	Follows Protocol's "Grounding Assumptions"?
2008 (Oct.): Faculty Approves "Strategic Faculty Compensation Implementation Protocol"					
2009 (Sept.)	Yes	Yes	n/a	n/a	Yes
2010	No	Yes	n/a	n/a	No (no COLA)
2011	Yes ($1k)	Yes (<$1k)	n/a	n/a	No (differential is not meaningful)
2012	No	Yes	n/a	n/a	No (no COLA)
2013	No	No	Yes ($600)	Yes (2%)	No (not Base)
2014	No	No	Yes (2%)	No	Yes?
2015	Yes	No	No	No	Yes

ATTACHMENT 4

Merit Pay and Market Disparities Research
Compiled by Lisa Tillmann

Data supplied by HR:

*Indicates years in which the administration did not abide by minimum standards set by the (A&S, then inclusive of CPS) faculty, who "passed" merit pay/market disparities under duress.

Reasons for Revisiting:

- On the market disparities side: we do not have equal pay for equal work.
- We identify as a liberal arts college. We tell students it doesn't—or shouldn't—matter in what they major. Yet we pay their professors radically different salaries depending on *their* majors.
- On the market disparities side, our practices do not even make sense from a market perspective. In the corporate world, a person is typically paid according to successful performance of duties. If two salespeople have the same level of education, same years of experience, and same performance, the one who majored in business is not paid tens of thousands more than the one who majored in philosophy.
- We never had a real dialogue or debate about either merit pay or market disparities. We didn't know the collective will of our colleagues in 2007, and we don't know it now.
- Many faculty—even those who consistently have been awarded the highest level of merit pay--have found merit pay and market disparities divisive, dispiriting, and contrary to Rollins' values of equity and fairness.
- For many, merit pay and market disparities have undermined faculty solidarity and morale.
- For many, the message of "adopt merit pay or never receive a raise again" violated shared governance.
- Research on merit pay suggests that it only should be adopted when: 1) an institution is flush with resources (Rollins adopted amid a tanking economy), 2) there are significant differences in performance (no faculty consensus was sought that this was/is true), 3) such differences are measurable (highly debatable), 4) evidence suggests that affected parties *want* to be evaluated this way (never established).
- The administration and Board have never answered the question: "What is the 'problem' the 'solution' of merit pay is meant to solve?"
- There has been no evaluation of the *impact* (on, e.g., faculty perceptions of fairness, equity, community, or morale) of merit pay or market disparities.
- There has been no evaluation of the *effectiveness* of merit pay or market disparities. What "problem(s)," if any, have been solved? What new problems may have been created? Have the benefits outweighed the costs?

Timeline:

11/15/07 A&S faculty meeting minutes:

- A&S faculty learns from President Duncan that the Board has set aside for salary increases a pool of 4% plus $470,000 for market disparities, later referred to by President Duncan as for "merit." This marks the beginning of those two changes getting conflated. The pool and future increases are contingent on the faculty's agreement to allow "market disparities" and to institute merit pay. The faculty votes to study.

Board's "take it or never receive another increase" proposal passes 77 to 23.

10/14/08 A&S faculty meeting minutes:

- A&S faculty approve Strategic Faculty Compensation Implementation Protocol (62-12).
    - "The FSC [Faculty Salary Council] will recommend to the Dean that the merit process not be initiated if the merit salary pool does not meet or exceed the minimal amount determined by the A & S Faculty Executive Committee. In addition, **the Executive Committee and FSC will guarantee the merit pay system exists in addition to (not as a substitute for) the current system of promotion salary adjustments, annual across the board percentage increases to base pay, and equity adjustments**."

2/9/12 A&S faculty meeting minutes: Zoomerang survey (92 respondents): "The question, 'Do you support merit in any form?' Resulted in an even split, 42 in favor, 42 opposed, several offering no opinion."

3/15/12 Executive Committee [EC] minutes: "Carol Bresnahan states that she believes that the Board of Trustees is not open to a non-merit salary system. She states that her perception of the Board is that **they see the merit system as a way to change the culture at Rollins College to one which is more aligned with work incentives**."

4/5/12 EC minutes:

- "When the faculty originally created a process to implement the distribution of merit pay, it was **based on the premise that merit would be in addition to cost of living adjustments**."
- **"[T]he Rollins Board of Trustees has declared that any forthcoming pay raises for Rollins faculty will be distributed on the basis of merit."**
- "After a two-year period affected faculty will review this process and revise as needed."

5/13 F&S End of Year Report: "Procedures to make merit pay available to eligible faculty were put in place, including distribution of the one-page application forms (attached) to Arts and Sciences Faculty and the establishment of a Merit Pay Committee as a subcommittee of the Finance and Services Committee. The five-member elected committee represents tenured faculty from each division of the Arts and Sciences and one at large member."

9/10/13 Professional Standards Committee minutes: "Periodic review supposed (Faculty Salary Council) to be taking place, but it is not clear if this is taking place. **Original ideas of merit pay in faculty handbook (2010 rev) not consistent with the current system**."

Faculty Handbook (2014):

- "The amount of money to be distributed as merit pay in any given year will be determined by the Planning and Budget Committee and the method of distribution will be determined by each college."
- "Each fall, the FSC will convene a meeting of the Merit Pay subcommittee to review FSARs and the Merit Pay application forms. Faculty who meet expectations in two of the three categories (teaching, professional work, and service) will be awarded merit pay. Faculty having been awarded tenure and/or promotion within the past year will not be reevaluated but will automatically receive a designation of merit for that academic year. There will be only two classifications, Deserving of Merit or Not Deserving of Merit."

ATTACHMENT 5

Faculty Resolution
Presented by Lisa Tillmann and Barry Allen

Whereas education at Rollins centers on "global citizenship" and "responsible leadership";

whereas Rollins is dedicated to "social responsibility" and "environmental stewardship";

whereas the Rollins Coalition for Sustainable Investment has been spearheaded and organized by students who have embodied Rollins' values of global citizenship, responsible leadership, and social responsibility;

and whereas with bill 1516.26 the Student Government Association seeks to address environmental stewardship at an institutional level:

be it resolved that the Arts and Sciences faculty support the Student Government Association-approved resolution Divestment from Fossil Fuels.

Student Government Association Divestment Resolution

Approved: 10/14/15

Legislation 1516.26
Resolution: Student Support of Divestment from Fossil Fuels
SPONSOR: Julianna Dubendorff and Filipa Bento

Whereas: The Rollins endowment is partially invested in fossil fuel companies

Whereas: Rollins has the duty to uphold its own mission of "global citizenship and responsible leadership" and "environmental stewardship"

Whereas: Rollins has historically been a leader in environmental sustainability and should strive to continue to be at the forefront of such a movement

Be it Hereby Resolved, The Student Government Association of Rollins College will:

1) Ratify the Student Divestment Resolution, which reads:

Dear Rollins College Board of Trustees,

Rollins College has invested part of its $300+ million endowment in harmful fossil fuel companies. Because climate change caused by the burning of fossil fuels has become one of the most pressing issues of our time, we believe that Rollins must take leadership on this incredibly urgent, global problem. Thus, we must seriously consider fossil fuel divestment for both moral and economic reasons.

In order to keep warming below 2°C, a target that the United States and nearly every other country on Earth has agreed to, the International Energy Agency calculates that the fossil fuel industry will need to leave approximately 80% of their reserves of coal, oil, and gas unburned. Those reserves may be below ground physically, but they're already above ground economically and factored into the share price of every fossil fuel company. Globally, the value of those reserves is around $20 trillion, money that will have to be written off when governments finally decide to regulate carbon dioxide as a pollutant. According to the investment bank HSBC, the industry could face a potential devaluation of up to 60% in light of such government actions.

Given this situation, continued investment in fossil fuels would increase our endowment's risk to the carbon bubble's devaluation, a devaluation that must happen if we are to stop climate change from worsening. Refusing to divest would also signal that we, as an institution, believe the fossil fuel industry is a legitimate long-term investment. As an academic institution that has "global citizenship," "responsible leadership," "social responsibility," and "environmental stewardship" as part of our mission, we cannot afford to send such a message.

Therefore, as public pressure to confront climate change builds, we ask that you:

1. Freeze any new investment in fossil fuel companies immediately.

2. Divest within 2 to 5 years from direct ownership and from any commingled funds that include fossil fuel public equities and corporate bonds.

3. Direct at least 1% of previous fossil fuels investments into renewable energy and other socially sustainable funds.

We believe that such actions on behalf of our college will not only be a sound decision for our institution's financial portfolio, but also for the wellbeing of its current and future graduating classes. As students who plan to live on this planet for decades to come, we deserve the opportunity to graduate with a future not defined by climate chaos.

ATTACHMENT 6

November 5, 2015

Academic Affairs Committee Report

Dear colleagues,

This report covers the period October 6th through November 3rd, 2015.
The following agenda items have been discussed and unanimously approved by the AAC.

1. **Changes to the Political Science Minor.**
   A mistake was made removing the old Political Science Minor due to its international component. The Political Science Department proposed to retain the old minor in addition to the newly approved minor because of this international component. On the minor map, language has changed in description to reflect the new minor. Another change is to change Civic Engagement Minor in requirement of the internship, Political Science would like to institute that for this minor, an internship is not required, but require a Community Engagement (CE) course (changes in red on document).

2. **Change to the rFla new course application**.

   The New Course Subcommittee discovered numerous issues with proposals for new courses considering that many of these new courses are for the new rFLA curriculum and will need to reside within the new rFLA matrix. The New Course Subcommittee is proposing changes to the rFLA new course proposal form (see attached old version and proposed new version). The proposed changes have been vetted and approved by the New Course Subcomittee, Robin Mateo, and Claire Strom (director the General Education Program). The proposed rFLA new course form include (but not limited to) information on what is being assessed in each rFLA course level, URLs to important information, and revisions of language to streamline the process and to make the rFLA new course proposal form similar to the standard new course proposal form. The new rFLA coure proposal form will give the New Course Subcommittee more information to assess each course before approval.

3. **Change to the Sustainable Development minor.**

   Proposed changes to the Sustainable Development minor were brought to AAC by Barry Allen and are as follows (also see attached document): remove INB200 and INB225 from the list of core courses. Replace these courses with POL130 and POL333.

Rationale for these changes: Both INB200 and INB225 have not been offered on a regular basis. Current Sustainable Development minors have rarely taken all the core courses on the minor map, and instead they have substituted other approved courses in their place. They have notified INB of the proposed changes to the Sustainable Development Minor and INB is OK with the change. Likewise, they have spoken with the Political Science Department about adding their courses to this minor, and they agreed to the new proposed change in the minor. Both POL130 and POL333 are current courses and taught regularly.

4. **Proposal on closing the CR-No Credit loophole.**

Due to the wording of the current policy on students designating a course as CR/NR, a loophole exists where students can elect to CR/NC a course, and then intentionally fail the course (grade of a D+ or lower) and not have this course count against their major GPA (See attached documents concerning language in the policy that allows for this loophole). Accordingly, students have used this loophole to protect their GPA, notable examples include Alfond Scholars and students attempting to get into medical school. Susan Walsh brought this to the attention of AAC to propose closing this loophole.

Three different options were proposed to the AAC:

1. Use this option, but repeat the course for a letter grade

1a. Change the highlighted wording to read, "**Courses taken under this option may be repeated for letter grades**." In this way, students can retake a course for which they receive a CR for a higher grade without having to fail the course. If the course is required for the major, the student may still repeat the course for a letter grade. The CR will not impact their GPA. Since they are repeating a class, they will not receive credit for retaking the class, and students and their advisors must be clear about this before using this option, as a student may have to take up to 6 additional credits to make it up to 140 (or 128). Students who are on Bright Futures scholarships run out of money at 140 credits.

1b. Change the highlighted wording to read, "**Courses taken under this option may be repeated for letter grades**, **but the new grade will be averaged with the previous grade.**" Since the instructor of the course has to enter an actual letter grade that is then converted into CR or NC by Student Records, the original grade still exists in the system. If a student chooses to retake the course after using this option (because it is required by their major, for example), they will be unable to fully replace their grade with the new grade and take the average instead. This compromise will encourage them to do well the first time they take the course, lower the incentive to repeat it, and reduce the probability that CR/NC is an ideal option to buffer a grade they don't want on their transcript.

2. Count CR as fulfillment of a required general education, major, or minor course

Remove this statement, **"Courses taken under this option may not be used to fulfill general education, major, minor, or concentration requirements".** In this way, as long as students receive CR, they can continue to move forward in the major without affecting their GPA. This may allow students who are not doing

well in the major to continue moving forward. It may also negatively impact their transcripts if graduate and professional schools see that students took a class as CR/NC instead of earning a grade in it.

3. Cannot retake courses if they use this option

Change the wording to read, "**Courses for which students receive either a NC or CR grade may not be repeated**." Here, it is in a student's best interest to decide whether to continue to invest in the course (and major) or to abandon it. However, the inability to repeat the course means that a student must complete the coursework and have their major or minor GPA affected if this course is in their major or minor. If this is the only course that fulfills a particular major requirement, a student must complete the course to the best of their ability, only repeating the course if they do, in fact, fail it. For general education requirements, students can find an alternative course.

Of these three options the AAC recognized options 1a and 3 as valid options and approved them unanimously. A. Voicu will take the recommendation of the proposed language change for the CR/NC policy to EC.

5. **Proposed changes to the Biochemistry Molecular Biology (BMB) major** (K. Riley): BMB is proposing the following changes concerning 300-level elective courses in the major. Changes include: striking the word "Intermediate" from CHM301 Intermediate Inorganic Chemistry (see document) as this word was never intended for this course, the addition of CHM460 to the list of approved electives, CHM460 Advanced Topics in Chemistry is a 2 credit courses in overload chunks by Chemistry Faculty where students would take CHM460 twice for a total of 4 credit hours in advanced topics, and a change to the major map indicating that at least one elective for the BMB major must be a course with a lab – rationale is to make certain that student has at least 1 lab associated with a lab intensive major.

The AAC has unanimously approved the proposed changes.

The topics currently under discussion are the following:

1. **Should students be formally permitted to declare a major before beginning to take classes at Rollins?**

This discussion concerns major declaration policies and procedures for incoming first year students. Apparently incoming students declare majors but no policy could be found that would require them to declare a major, and any such policy would fall under AAC.

The AAC will be working with Holly Polig, Robin Mateo and associate dean Gabriel Barreneche to gather information concerning admissions forms, language, and policies.

2. **Exploration coaches and the question of academic advising.**

The question remains as to the role of Explorations Coaches (formerly Student Success) play in academic advising. This issue has arisen that Exploration

Coaches are performing tasks that fall under academic advising and therefore fall under AAC purview. The question for discussion is to whether AAC should make a recommendation to Student Affairs that Explorations coaches report to the faculty.

We as AAC recommend the following:

1. Explorations coaches receive training from Tiffany Griffin.
2. A designee of Explorations report to an academic office within the scope of the faculty (AAC) concerning these items which are tied to academic advising:
    a. Brainstorming about course planning, developing multiple options for course scheduling, and developing questions for faculty advising appointments
    b. Assistance in considering options with add/drop during registration prior to faculty advising
    c. Reviewing and exploring major map and minor maps

    A Voicu will take this to the EC.

3. **Should the Faculty Advisory Committee to International Programs (FACIP) be a subcommittee of AAC?**

    A. Voicu sent out the A&S bylaws for review of the role of AAC and what items AAC has purview over. After reviewing the role of AAC and if IP falls under AAC purview, we should review and discuss so we can articulate what issues AAC might have with IP – before we make any recommendations to EC.

    Giselda Beaudin's office has purview over all 3 schools. So why should this office report to AAC of A&S?

    Members of AAC have expressed that Giselda is very thorough and is bringing new programs through AAC, even though she doesn't necessarily report to AAC. The AAC has decided to report this issue of "which office reports where?" to the administration as to receive some clarification. Discussion will be continued once additional information has been received from the administration.

    The "reporting lines" issue has been resolved following the Provost's decision according to which the FACIP will report to the Provost.

    Your colleague,

    Anca Voicu

ATTACHMENT 7

SGA Committee Report

- Dave's Boathouse will open Thursday November 12th to the student body. There will be an event held there that night sponsored by the Student Government Association. This event will have a live band and trivia. The event is open to the campus and anyone is invited.
- The senate of the student government association passed the legislation supporting divestment from fossil fuels. The legislation calls for the school to take several actions in the short term and long term that will effect the schools overall investment strategy. The legislation is attached as a separate file.
- Student Government in partnership with the Inter Fraternity Council, PanHellenic Association, Sports Athletic Administration Council and Off Campus Student Association are partnering to develop an It's On Us Campaign Video. The goal of the video is to bring awareness to the reality of sexual assault on college campuses and encourage the act of bystander intervention amongst the campus. Filming will begin Friday for this project with the expected completion date of next week.
- The Safe Campus Act was brought up in the SGA meeting this past week. The senate determined they needed more information on the legislation before deciding whether to vote in favor or against it. There was a forum held on the safe campus act during the executive committee meeting to educate the campus on the law.

ATTACHMENT 8

Report to the Executive Committee from the Student Life Committee
November 5, 2015

Below are some highlights of our meetings and work

1. **Joining the Honor and Social codes in one document**
    a. After discussions with the Dean of students' office the SLC is beginning to explore how we might combine the social and honor codes into one home in the spirit of 1-Rollins. The idea is that honor is honor. The SLC is looking to create a guiding statement and/or principles that covers all honor that will cover both academic and social expectations. Nothing will change regarding where violations of the code are adjudicated, but both codes will be housed in one document. The SLC is currently exploring the associated colleges of the south to see what other institutions are doing in this area.

2. **Our meetings will be held on Tuesdays from 12:30-1:45 throughout this next academic year.**
    - 11/17- Warden Dining Room
    - 12/1- Warden Dining Room
    - 12/8 (only if needed) - Warden Dining Room

3. **SLC Members**

Derrick Paladino (chair), Nathan Arrowsmith (Staff), Missy Barnes (A&S), Hannah Ewing (A&S), Alexa Gordon (Staff), Andrew Luchner (A&S), Matthew Nichter (A&S), Ellane Park (A&S), & Adriana Talbot (SGA Representative), Mackenzie Cooper (SGA Representative), Davin Laskin (SGA Representative), Filipa-Alidreia Belito (SGA Representative), Stephanie Chewning (SGA Representative)

ATTACHMENT 9

Minutes for the October 27th, 2015 meeting of PSC

Meeting of Professional Standards Committee
12:30 -1:45 P.M. in Bush 123

Committee Members Terms and Affiliation

Rosanna Diaz, 2014 – 2016, Humanities Rep
Fiona Harper, 2014 – 2016 Science Rep
Anne Murdaugh, 2014-2016, at Large Rep
Eren Tatari, 2014-2016, at Large Rep
Anne Stone, 2014 – 2016 CPS
Susan Montgomery, 2015 – 2017, Expressive Arts Rep
Eric Smaw, 2015 – 2017, at Large Rep
Stacey Dunn 2015-2017 at Large Rep
Nathan Juhos 2015-2016, SGA Rep

Committee Members in Attendance

Rosanna Diaz, 2014 – 2016, Humanities Rep
Fiona Harper, 2014 – 2016 Science Rep
Anne Murdaugh, 2014-2016, at Large Rep
Eren Tatari, 2014-2016, at Large Rep
Susan Montgomery, 2015 – 2017, Expressive Arts Rep
Eric Smaw, 2015 – 2017, at Large Rep
Stacey Dunn 2015-2017 at Large Rep
Nathan Juhos 2015-2016, SGA Rep

I. **Call to order: 12.33pm**

II. **Approval of Minutes:**
   a. Minutes from October 20th, 2016 approved.

III. **Old Business:**

   a. Grants were approved and Karla will be sending out letters.

IV. New Business:

a. Dan Chong, Internationalization Committee: Current chair of Internationalization Committee (IC). Program started approximately 10 years ago under President Duncan. The Provost has asked the IC to revise its mission so that the outcomes of faculty/staff travel are more/clearly beneficial to Rollins. Last year, the IC revised the guidelines; and discussed the overlap between the Individual and Course Development Grants and the RIG Grants and whether PSC should have oversight on this process. Dr. Chong concurs that PSC has purview over the internationalization grants since they are internal grants. Last year budget was cut to $100,000 per year. Currently, the President and Provost put the Cuba trip on hold to review the internationalization grants (then they approved the Cuba trip for this year). Individual grants are on hold (exceptions may be granted). The guidelines and the budget going for IC are still being decided.

- **i.** Fiona Harper voiced that faculty need to be aware of this 'hold' so they don't waste their time preparing for trip proposals.
- **ii.** Dan Chong said he is pushing for a decision on this, hoping for a December decision but eventually IC is an advisory committee with the final decision resting with the Provost and the President.
- iii. Eric Smaw: transparency and review of the decision making, and an official appeal process are issues for IC currently. PSC should be involved (as is its purview per the By Laws) in the IC's RIG grant process. PSC has received reports/complaints from faculty about how the grant process was handled in the past.
- iv. Fiona Harper: as per the By Laws, all grants fall within the purview of PSC. There has to be some connection between PSC and any grant giving advisory committee (like the IC).
- v. Dean or Associate Dean being present in standing committee meetings would be beneficial (as was the practice in the past).

vi. Dan Chong: the other issue to be resolved with the administrators is the overlap between RIG and other grants (Critchfield...etc.).
vii. Fiona Harper: the new RIG guidelines are too narrow that it is not clear how the RIG grants are different from other grants.
viii. Dan Chong: there is a danger that the budget may be cut, which is a problem.
ix. Eric Smaw will join IC's meeting with the President.

b. Second Round of Ashcrofts, Critchfield, and Development Grants: PSC may have a larger pool of money for grants in the spring round.

c. Eric will ask Karla about reports submitted after completing a research project using a Rollins internal grant. Last year when PSC switched to anonymous proposals, reports were no longer attached. PSC discussed the pros and cons of reviewing reports. Eric Smaw will follow up with Karla regarding the status of reports.

d. FYRST grants: PSC discussed if the FYRST applications should be online. PSC decided to discuss the revision of the guidelines since the current guidelines are too vague.

i. From where does the money for the FYRST grants come? Eric Smaw will find out.

V. Adjourned: 1:15pm

ATTACHMENT 10

Finance and Services Committee Report
Executive Committee Report
11/5/15

At the October 6 meeting of the Finance and Services committee, we discussed the following issues. I have also included below issues that were discussed during Board of Trustees' Finance subcommittee meeting, which I attended on October 15.

Old Business

1. **Faculty Salary Study:** Udeth Lugo gave us a brief update on this, saying that HR, the two deans, the Provost, and a few others were working on gathering benchmarking data. It is hard to do this type of study, however, without first developing a philosophy of compensation.
2. **Divest Rollins:** Update from Scott Novak, Lisa Tillman, and Barry Allen. No meeting has been set for Scott and the Coalition advisors to meet with the Investment Committee yet. Jeff Eisenbarth is working on scheduling a meeting. The Coalition would like F&S to endorse the resolution passed by SGA on Divestment. However, Jeff Eisenbarth indicated to me during a phone conversation and in several emails that we should put a hold on doing so for now. He feels the committee is interested and willing to take this on and that a faculty directive could be counterproductive. The committee did not reach a consensus but asked me to bring the resolution to EC for discussion.
3. **Sabbatical Policy:** Considered a policy proposal presented by Zhaocheng Peng to move to a full-year, fully-paid sabbatical system. The proposal was quite complicated and the committee expressed many concerns. The issue was tabled so that some committee members could do additional research on this subject

New Business

1. **Parking**: We met with Ken Miller to discuss concerns about parking on campus. The number of available parking spots on campus is steadily declining but there is nothing that can be done about it in the short term.
2. **Merit/Market Pay:** Lisa Tillman and Kathryn Norsworthy attended the meeting and presented a document that outlined concerns about the current merit pay/market pay system. The document included a timeline of when we moved from an egalitarian salary structure to our current system. They would like us to identify skilled facilitators that can lead the campus in discussing these two issues and in, perhaps, working towards developing a philosophy of compensation. They would like us to ask President Cornwell to start this process of identifying facilitators and revisiting these issues.