

10-25-2012

# Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Oct. 25, 2012

Arts & Sciences Faculty  
*Rollins College*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac)



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Oct. 25, 2012" (2012). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 8.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac/8](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/8)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

# **MINUTES**

## **Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting**

### **Thursday, October 25, 2012**

#### **12:30 – 1:50 pm**

In attendance: Joshua Almond, Mark Anderson, Pedro Bernal, William Boles, Wendy Brandon, Carol Bresnahan, Sharon Carnahan, Julian Chambliss, David Charles, Daniel Chong, Gloria Cook, Daniel Crozier, Denise Cummings, Alice Davidson, Donald Davison, Joan Davison, Nancy Decker, Kimberly Dennis, Lewis Duncan, Hoyt Edge, Larry Eng-Wilmot, Julia Foster, Theodore Gournelos, Yudit Greenberg, Dana Hargrove, Paul Harris, Jill Jones, Erik Kenyon, S. Ashley Kistler, Stephen Klemann, Susan Lackman, Carol Lauer, Luis Martinez, Nick Marx, Jana Mathews, Dorothy Mays, Margaret McLaren, Ruth Mesavage, Jonathan Miller, Jennifer-Scott Mobley, Robert Moore, Anne Murdaugh, Steve Neilson, Rachel Newcomb, David Noe, Alan Nordstrom, Derrick Paladino, Twila Papay, Kenneth Pestka, Paul Reich, Kasandra Riley, Dawn Roe, Emily Russell, Samuel Sanabria, Rachel Simmons, John Sinclair, Joseph Siry, Robert Smither, Michelle Stecker, R. Bruce Stephenson, Claire Strom, Kathryn Sutherland, Eren Tatari, Jennifer Toohey, Robert Vander Poppen, Richard Vitray, Susan Walsh, Yusheng Yao, Jay Yellen, Wenxian Zhang.

- I. The meeting is called to order at 12:36pm.
  
- II. Approved the Amended Minutes from A & S Meetings on September 20. Katie Sutherland was left off the attendance list on the distributed minutes and would like them amended to include her as present. A motion to approve the amended minutes is made and seconded. The minutes are approved as amended.
  
- III. Committee Reports
  - a. Academic Affairs. Claire Strom reports that AAC approved new MENA minor, three new study abroad programs, changes to majors and minors, and approved academic calendars for next two academic years. They are working closely with Gen-Ed implementation committee and are considering the move to 128 credits.
  
  - b. Professional Standards. Joan Davison reports that PSC is in the process of approving sabbatical grants. They will be meeting with Dean Richards to discuss Lecturers in Holt that would be seated in A&S Academic Departments

and teach 4/4 loads. This discussion will be limited to professional issues like grant competition and hiring practices, not financial issues. Future agendas include consideration of the 5+1 option and two issues within the teaching evaluation system. The first is faculty comparison groups (A&S only or PSC and A&S aggregated), and the second is the ability to separate out course evaluation and teaching evaluation. PSC also is working on a bylaw change that would limit the number of tenure applications to once during a tenure-track career.

- c. Student Life. Daniel Crozier reports that SLC has been working on the student travel policy. They are developing a pilot program for distributing a pool of funds for Scholarships for High Impact Practices (SHIP). The application will be at VP of Student Affairs website. Paul Harris asks who is eligible and Dan states that the funds are only for CPS and A&S students because Holt did not contribute funds. Claire Strom asks for the limit for a single student request. Dan says the upper limit is \$1500. Rachel Simmons asks whether costs associated with Rollins Study abroad programs could be covered. Dan says yes, but like all faculty funding requests students are asked to list all sources of funding they have on an application.
- d. Finance and Services. Bob Moore reports that F&S has been working on Merit Pay for this year. The merit pay committee now has members (divisional and at large) and should be meeting soon to determine merit. Merit pay raises should become available in December paycheck including back pay for September, October, and November. F&S has also been looking at faculty travel costs. The current standards (\$1200 domestic and \$1500 international) were set up in 1992 and are probably not feasible for two funded trips at today's travel costs. They are discussing an increase to \$2000 for domestic travel and \$2500 for international travel. F&S is also looking at gender equity in pay with Provost's office.
- e. Jill Jones reports that she met with David Lord and Susan Whealler Johnston, and Clay Singleton to discuss issue of faculty representation on board. Don Rogers was scheduled to attend but had a last minute conflict. Rollins board member Susan Whealler Johnston (also Executive Vice President of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges) will chair a trustee sub-committee looking at whether or not board should have non-voting faculty representation in the form of the presidents of the various faculties. Board members did not seem particularly hostile to the idea.

#### IV. New Business

- a. A motion for establishing the relationship of General Education and AAC is made and seconded. (Attachment 1) Claire Strom reminds faculty that she talked at retreat about relationship between A&S faculty & General Education

Implementation Committee. She (as chair of AAC) and Mark Anderson (as the Director of General Education) are proposing that anything that is policy related needs to come to AAC who can then decide what come before the executive committee and then the full A&S faculty. The motion is unanimously approved by voice vote.

- b. A motion for the approval of the four neighborhood themes proposed by the Director of the General Education Curriculum is made and seconded. (Attachment 2) Mark Anderson states that two weeks ago faculty voted for top three themes (see table in the attachment for results). Four themes seem to win out and Mark asks for approval to move forward with these themes. Bill Boles asks if these four themes are actually sustainable give the small number of responses. Mark says yes. The original survey had higher return rate and these four had high approval rates on that survey as well. Additionally that survey asked about ability to teach in the areas (i.e. do you have one or multiple courses that would work) and asked for divisional information. Those results indicated that faculty from all four divisions had multiple courses. The second survey was more of a vote and had a lower return rate, but still had support for those themes. Joe Siry asks about student opinion. Mark states that the focus groups from the summer were excited about these and that some theme names came from student ideas. Mark also reports having shown these to a number of students who are disappointed they do not get to do it. Jenny Cavanaugh clarifies that the committee did take this list to different focus groups, and that three of the top four choices of faculty were also student top choices while the fourth option had moderate support. Paul Harris comments that the categories are so broad it is hard to believe we would not have enough classes and then clarifies that this is not a criticism. Sharon Carnahan asks about the response rate. Mark estimates that the electronic ballot was sent to 192 faculty and 68 responded. Sharon asks for clarification that the student body as a group have never been surveyed. Mark says this is correct. Sharon states that one of the concerns with the old RP program was that we never got a broad vote from students on what they were interested in. She asks if we are locking ourselves in, shouldn't we ask faculty and students more broadly. Jill Jones states that today is the day to ask faculty. We have quorum and we are being asked for approval. Emily Russell wonders how this will work. Are there a set number of students in each general education theme? If there is a theme that doesn't "make," will it close down? Mark Anderson says that we will phase themes in and out slowly over time. Emily states that she is thinking of comparison between RCCs and Majors. Each RCC gets 15 students and students may not get their first choice, whereas majors are a choice and we have popular majors and less popular majors. Mark says that we learned from pilot that a theme cannot run with only 40 students, but there is no expectation that each theme will have 25% of the students. Jonathan Miller states that the committee is proposing these 4 themes and asking full A&S faculty for approval. What is the procedure for changing them going forward? Mark states that is where AAC

will come in. Claire Strom asserts that that is what we just passed a few minutes earlier. Mark clarifies that some things AAC will decide and some will be brought by AAC to the full faculty. Presumably, AAC will bring new themes to full faculty. Carol Bresnahan notes that we got paragraphs with those names, and asks if by approving these are we also approving the paragraph explanation? Mark states that the committee does not intend to change them substantially. Carol follows up asking that language be made appropriate for high school students. Mark agrees. Steve Klemann asks if freshman would choose their theme around this time in the semester and Mark says yes. Students will be acculturated in RCC and choose around now. Carol Lauer acknowledges that we vote today, but students vote with their feet. She asks if we can assume that if a theme has fewer than 60 students then it will be dropped. Mark says the committee has not discussed a number. Carol suggests having a theme in waiting. Rachel Newcomb wonders if there is a problem with students “locking in” so early. Mark says that presumably students will be able to switch and successfully complete a different theme. Hopefully students would not switch after completing four of their five classes. Paul Harris asks how the committee decided upon four themes as the correct number. Mark notes that at a previous meeting faculty approved between three and five themes, and that four seemed to fit those requirements. Additionally, there was a clear break in data that there were four themes popular with faculty. Bill Boles asks, using next year’s numbers, if all four offered, what is the plan if only three are popular. Mark says again this is not something the committee has discussed. David Charles asks if it would be helpful to use this year’s RCCs as a sample group and ask them to decide. David states that he understands that the committee ran focus groups, but suggests getting real data by assuming that these freshmen are like next years. Then faculty will not invest resources in creating classes that will not happen. Bruce Stephenson reminds us that one of the ideas from last year’s committee was if there was one that was under-enrolled, the committee could just expand course offerings in the biggest one. Wendy Brandon wonders if students will be signing up for the larger idea or for a specific course. Mark says that like RP courses, theme courses will be listed together in course schedule. Joan Davison acknowledges that there are all kinds of unanswered questions and probably decisions will be made that she won’t like. But based on her experiences as an advisor, our current system is not perfect. Students do not choose using optimal strategies. She also reminds us that none of the issues brought up here are new and suggests we focus on big issues. The motion to call the question passes unanimously. The voice vote indicates the motion passes unanimously. Mark reminds us that while we still need letters for next year, new RCC’s do not need “letters.” He suggests more 100-level courses that could help students explore majors. In the near future, he will be visiting department chairs looking for eight courses from each division (two courses per theme per division).

- c. A motion to approve the AAC proposal to add a GPA requirement to minors was made and seconded. (Attachment 3) Claire Strom notes that this is probably just an oversight, but while we have a 2.0 requirement graduation for Majors we do not have one for Minors. Carol Bresnahan asks why the last sentence of minor paragraph is not there for the major paragraph. Claire indicates that that is beyond the scope of this motion and agrees to take that issue back to AAC. The voice vote on the motion passes unanimously.
  
- d. A motion is made and seconded to change the wording of A&S bylaw Article VIII, Section 1 as indicated in Attachment 4. Joan Davison explains that the change makes the wording positive. Rather than asking the Dean to ensure that no more than half of the department disapproves, the new wording requires assent from a majority of the department. Nancy Decker asks about departments with an even number of members. Joan says the wording requires that assent must come from MORE than ½. Emily Russell wonders if the more substantive change is dropping of “program” from the language. Joan explains that this is dropped because based on changes made last year, faculty cannot be appointed to a program only to a department. Jonathan Miller asks if the language means the vote requires a simple majority of department or of those present. Joan says the intention is that the Dean needs to consult everyone in the department. But then clarifies that like we do with faculty meeting, you are not required to consult people on sabbatical. Jonathan asks what to do if he does not get a response? Claire Strom asks if you can say in your “notification” that silence is assent. Jonathan thinks that is not true given the wording. David Charles asks if this is referring to traditional searches AND non-traditional searches. Joan clarifies that it is intended for all appointments as we are trying to get rid of irregular searches. David worries that a traditional search could not go forward without approval of potentially uninformed colleagues. Jonathan Miller asks about a competitive search (i.e. we are competing against another institution to hire someone) where are we trying to get a response fast. Paul Harris suggests wording of a majority of tenure/tenure-track “not on sabbatical” or “on campus.” Joan Davison suggests amending it to read “tenured/tenure track members not on leave.” The voice vote on amendment passed. The question is called and passes by a unanimous voice vote. Voice vote on the amended bylaw is changed to hand vote. Lots of “yes” hands (no official count). Six “no” votes are registered. The motion passes by majority.

## V. Announcements.

- a. President Duncan’s Report on the Board of Trustees October Retreat. President Duncan reports that there will be an open forum on the trustees visit, but this is a preview of the forum. The EC of the board met over the summer and approved exploration of opportunities at Lake Nona. Dean Richards and President Duncan went yesterday to a meeting at Lake Nona. Google just

named Lake Nona a 21<sup>st</sup> century health village. The Board approved budget parameters. Tuition cannot increase more than 4% with compensation increases of 2-2½%. The 4% increase is not sustainable. The Board says we need to find ways other than tuition increases to support raises. The audit committee reported that the outside auditor report came back clean. There was some concern about the IT security review. The Education committee approved three new degrees for Crummer. There is a trustee committee working to develop a stand-alone trustee committee on Student Life (used to be under Education). Trustees charged the administration to increase diversity of the Board (with approval to expand Board numbers if necessary). The retreat began with President Duncan giving general higher education overview and then a Rollins update. In the Rollins update, it was noted that US News & World Report ranked Rollins number one in the South and Crummer had good rankings too; the National Collegiate Scouting Association (NCSA) ranked Rollins 15<sup>th</sup> for our combination of quality academics and athletics; and we are in the Chronicle of Higher Education's list of top colleges to work for. Many of the Board's three days of sessions centered on strategic planning priorities. The board met with Holt students. They also had a joint teleconference meeting with trustees from Hendrix. They also used the meeting to announce three \$1,000,000 gifts (one which endows the head basketball coach position, the Alford challenge grant, and a spendable account to partner with Boys & Girls Clubs members to attend Rollins). The science building is on budget and schedule. The Campaign committee reported that we are leaving the silent phase and going into the quiet phase. The public phase starts when we hit the 50% mark. The trustees strongly supported the 5+1 proposal, thought that the 128 credit hour curriculum was a no-brainer, thought the new General-Education plan was good, and liked the idea of e-portfolios as an additional means of assessing students. The only idea they did not support was the 12-month calendar. They do not want the college to launch a significant summer semester plan. The report ended with a short film created by development office for campaign launch.

V. No motion to adjourn because we lost quorum. Ended at 2:04pm.

**ATTACHMENT #1**

Motion for establishing relationship of General Education and AAC

**WHEREAS:** The A&S bylaws state that the “Academic Affairs Committee shall have primary authority in all policy matters concerning the curriculum, including general education

**WHEREAS:** The General Education Implementation Committee is a subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

All documents generated regarding policy matters concerning General Education should be submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee for review.

## ATTACHMENT #2

Four Themes Proposed by the Director of General Education Curriculum

### **Innovation and Creativity**

Companies and organizations are competing in a world of economic and technological change that is moving faster than ever. The Internet. Microloans. Stem Cell research. The pill. The impact of creative thinking is prominent and ever changing. The global marketplace needs more people who are creative, innovative, and flexible. Some contend that colleges and universities aren't doing enough to foster these characteristics in their graduates. This neighborhood will do precisely the opposite. It will be structured to explore and enhance each student's creative process. Rollins students will learn about important creative leaps and the people who made them; recognize the possibilities for change in the 21st century; and develop the skills to be change makers themselves. Students who choose this neighborhood will be challenged to experiment with their world testing its boundaries and discovering new ideas in the process.

### **Mysteries: Into The Unknown**

Mona Lisa's smile. Antimatter. The shroud of Turin. An ideal democracy. The Bermuda triangle. Breaking the speed of light. Sherlock Holmes. Mysteries capture our imagination, and beckon us across the boundaries of settled knowledge into the unknown, the unseen. Though we may feel reassured by all we think we know, we get more excited about what we DON'T know. This neighborhood invites students to examine how what we don't know drives inquiry, knowledge, and intelligence. Courses in this neighborhood explore how mysteries—our blind spots, mistakes, wrong turns are fertile ground for producing new knowledge and new truths across disciplines.

### **Self and Community in a Diverse World**

Today, we live in an increasingly multi-cultural and multi-lingual world. Our identities—from our DNA to our religion to our fingerprints—shape ways that we think about, feel, and engage with this world. This neighborhood will explore how individuals and cultures define their ethnic, gendered, religious, physical, and linguistic identities and senses of self. Students will consider identity as the way that we establish differences or similarities with others, bridge divisions, and make connections in our diverse world. Examining identities in this critical way will prepare students to understand themselves chemically, biologically, culturally, socially, and personally and how to interact with people of distinct backgrounds, a requirement for life in the 21st century. This neighborhood will help students to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to become true global citizens.

### **When Cultures Collide**

If it really is "a small world, after all," how do peoples, cultures, and environments change as a result of different worlds encountering one another?

Will every corner of the globe eventually look the same, or will subaltern cultures be able to survive the homogenizing forces of globalization? Inspired by the 1492 Columbian Exchange as well as today's ever-increasing global integration, this neighborhood invites students to examine the biological, artistic, political, cultural, and socioeconomic effects of globalization. Courses in the humanities will examine hybridity, identity, and diversity in literature, religion, and philosophy, as well as in the expressive arts. Social sciences will look at the political and economic consequences of these worlds coming into contact with one another throughout human history. The sciences will explore the effects on genetic, human, animal, and plant development and the complications and unintended consequences that result from the movement of peoples around the world.

<b>Themes</b>	<b>Favorite</b>	<b>Second Favorite</b>	<b>Third Favorite</b>	<b>Total Votes</b>	<b>Weighted Votes</b>
When Cultures Collide	18	12	7	37	85
Mysteries: Into The Unknown	13	8	6	27	61
Innovation and Creativity	10	9	10	29	58
Self and Community in a Diverse World	8	14	5	27	57
Peace and Conflict	5	6	10	21	37
Freedom and Equality	6	4	9	19	35
Technology, Machines, and Systems	2	9	11	22	35
iPlanet	4	2	3	9	19
Laws and Taboos	2	3	5	10	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>66</b>		

## **ATTACHMENT #3**

### AAC Proposal to add GPA Requirements to Minors

#### **Major Requirements**

Students must satisfactorily fulfill the requirements of an established major or the plan of study of a self-designed major. Department Chairs or Program Coordinators must approve course substitutions within the major. In addition, students must earn a minimum grade point average of 2.00 ('C') in the courses approved for the major as accepted on the senior audit.

#### **Minor Requirements**

Students who declare a minor must fulfill satisfactorily the requirements of that minor as specified by the department or program. Minors normally involve twenty-four (24) to thirty-two (32) semester hours of study. In addition, students must earn a minimum grade point average of 2.00 ('C') in the courses approved for the minor as accepted on the senior audit. As with majors, minors are noted on a student's official academic transcript, but not on the diploma.

## ATTACHMENT #4

### PSC Resolution: Faculty Appointments

Resolved, to change the wording of A&S bylaw Article VIII, Section 1, “The Dean shall not recommend the appointment of anyone of whom a majority of the tenured and tenure-track members of the appointee's department or program disapproves. If a new appointment must be made when a majority of the members of the department or program cannot be consulted, the Dean may recommend no more than a one-year visiting appointment.” The new wording of the bylaw will state: **“The Dean shall not recommend the appointment of anyone of whom a majority of the tenured and tenure-track members of the appointee's department does not approve.”**

Rationale: The A&S faculty takes seriously its responsibility to approve new and continuing tenure track and visiting members of its academic departments. Yet although the current intent (as well as other sections of the bylaws which discuss departmental search committees) signals a departmental authority, the administration has overlooked the process at least three times in the past five years with complicating results for the departments and faculty hires (appointees) involved. The change of wording from a “majority ... disapproves” to a “majority...approve” clarifies that an administrator cannot simply appoint a new person to a department and hope the department does not object. Now the administration must seek approval prior to the appointment.

Furthermore, the new language drops reference to appointment to programs. The A&S faculty discussed the question of appointment to programs a few years ago, and the faculty soundly defeated the proposal. Indeed, the A&S bylaws elsewhere specify appointment to a single department.

Finally, the bylaws drop mention of the exception. The exception currently reads: “If a new appointment must be made when a majority of the members of the department or program cannot be consulted, the Dean may recommend no more than a one-year visiting appointment.” It is difficult to conceive of a need for such exceptions, particularly given the current availability of email and other forms of communication. As stated, when such recent “exceptions” occurred, complications developed for the departments and some hires involved. This resolution reiterates the desirability of following the proscribed procedures for appointments to departments with active departmental searches and approval.