

9-20-2012

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Sept. 20, 2012

Arts & Sciences Faculty
Rollins College

Follow this and additional works at: 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, Sept. 20, 2012" (2012). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 7.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/7

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.

MINUTES

Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting

Thursday, September 20, 2012

12:30 – 1:50 pm

In attendance: Joshua Almond, Mark Anderson, Pedro Bernal, Gay Biery-Hamilton, William Boles, Dexter Boniface, Wendy Brandon, Carol Bresnahan, Sharon Carnahan, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Martha Cheng, Daniel Chong, Gloria Cook, Daniel Crozier, Denise Cummings, Mario D'Amato, Alice Davidson, Donald Davison, Joan Davison, Nancy Decker, Kimberly Dennis, Hoyt Edge, Larry Eng-Wilmot, Julia Foster, Carol Frost, Christopher Fuse, Theodore Gournelos, Yudit Greenberg, Dana Hargrove, Jonathan Harwell, John Houston, Elizabeth Hunt, Jill Jones, Erik Kenyon, S. Ashley Kistler, Stephen Klemann, Harry Kypraios, Susan Lackman, Carol Lauer, Luis Martinez, Julia Maskivker, Jana Mathews, Ruth Mesavage, Jonathan Miller, Jennifer Mobley, Susan Montgomery, Robert Moore, Thomas Moore, Anne Murdaugh, Ryan Musgrave, Rachel Newcomb, David Noe, Jim Norris, Maurice O'Sullivan, Twila Papay, Kenneth Pestka, Jennifer Queen, James Ray, Paul Reich, Kasandra Riley, Joni Roos, Edward Royce, Marie Ruiz, Emily Russell, Samuel Sanabria, Rachel Simmons, Joseph Siry, Eric Smaw, Cynthia Snyder, Michelle Stecker, Paul Stephenson, Kathryn Sutherland, Eren Tatari, Zeynep Teymuroglu, Jennifer Toohey, Matthew Vad Nichter, Robert Vander Poppen, Richard Vitray, Susan Walsh, Jonathan Walz, Yusheng Yao, Wenxian Zhang, Eric Zivot. Guests: Ena Heller, Patrick Powers.

- I. Call to Order. The meeting is called to order at 12:35pm.

- II. Approve the Minutes from A & S Meetings on April 26 and May 2. A motion to approve the minutes is made and seconded. The minutes are approved.

- III. New Business
 - A. Shall we approve the attached Minor in Middle Eastern and North African Studies? (The Document has been endorsed by AAC and EC.) See Attachment 1. Rachel Newcomb addresses the faculty. She states that the time is right for Rollins to adopt this new minor. There is great interest in the Middle East but also ignorance about the region. Furthermore, this minor reflects our mission. Rollins also has study abroad opportunities in the region. This gives students a competitive edge as they graduate. In designing the minor, Rachel states that she and the other participants reviewed other minors at Rollins, as well as other

Middle East studies minors around the country. In terms of staffing needs, the minor is based on courses that Rollins already offers. At present, language is not a required component. Rick Vitray asks about the language requirement. Rachel states that you can only use two language courses toward the minor. Bill Boles asks if you can complete the minor with too many lower-level courses. Rachel suggests that this could be accepted as a friendly amendment. Bill's friendly amendment – that at least one elective class must be at the 300-level or above – is accepted. Carol Lauer asks if there is a specific requirement that minors have a certain number of 300-level courses. Jonathan Miller, on a separate point, makes a plea to faculty to please consult the library when proposing new programs such as these to be sure the library can support such initiatives. The motion is called to question. The minor is approved unanimously.

- B. Shall we request a non-voting A & S representative to sit on appropriate meetings of the Board of Trustees? See Attachment 2. Dan Crozier moves that we request to the Board that the A&S faculty have non-voting Board representation. Rick Vitray asks who this resolution is addressed to. Jill responds it would be forwarded to the Chair of the Board. Kim Dennis asks if we asked for this before and what the results were. Jill states that mostly recently we asked for a voting member and that this was turned down. However, this resolution is different since we are not asking for voting rights. Furthermore, Jill states, the national climate has changed in ways that make this resolution more favorable. Socky O'Sullivan states that the larger issue here is providing information to the Board of Trustees. For instance, during the vote for a new college of Professional Studies, Socky states that Board members were misinformed about the faculty's position. Jill Jones agrees that the goal of the resolution is to promote genuine faculty consultation. Claire Strom asks if the Board will resist adding new members who will not be major financial contributors to the College. Twila Papay asks how this faculty representative will be chosen. She suggests that the person should be elected. Joan Davison suggests that the President of the A&S faculty should be this representative (or someone designated by the President). This is offered as a friendly amendment and accepted. The motion passes unanimously.
- C. Institutional Planning Priorities/Strategic Planning Initiatives.¹ Carol Bresnahan addresses the faculty. She prefaces her remarks by saying that Toni Holbrook has assisted in this effort and can also answer questions. She states that the Budget and Planning committee has been trying to identify institutional priorities. The discussions of this committee led to the creation of four committees (academic excellence, student success, sustainable business model, and areas of distinction). These committees worked in the spring semester under the supervision of Laurie Joyner. After Laurie left her position at Rollins, Carol and Toni identified certain overlap in the ideas of the four committees' recommendations and consolidated these into three groups. Furthermore, Carol continues, the planning document should be thought of as an Institutional Plan. She states that many of the recommendations are tactical rather than strategic. In other words, these items are

¹ The relevant documents are available at: <http://www.rollins.edu/provost/planning/>.

not yet clearly linked to our mission and core values. Therefore she will seek to draft an umbrella statement that will fill this gap. Joe Siry and Bob Moore are assisting her in this effort. She emphasizes that this document is a draft. Yes, she states, it will be presented to the Board during their upcoming retreat (October 18-19). She will seek an endorsement by the Board of the general process as opposed to the specific proposals contained in the draft document. She adds that she asked President Duncan to convene the Executive Council in order to discuss mechanisms to gain feedback from the various campus constituencies since institutional planning issues transcend each individual college at Rollins. She is happy to take questions or receive feedback by email. Toni Holbrook adds that there is a website that contains all the original reports of the working groups, their membership and other materials. There is also a feedback mechanism built into the webpage. Don Davison states that he likes the idea that we should distinguish between tactics and goals. Furthermore, he states that he would like to see general education emphasized as an area of distinction. Carol states that general education is already emphasized in this way in the document under Academic Excellence. Claire Strom notes that the document calls for a transition to 128 hours starting in the fall of 2013 but notes that this proposal has not been approved by the faculty. Carol states that this is correct and that it would need to be approved by the faculty. Emily Russell asks who the point person is to relay concerns. Carol states that there is not a specific person who has been identified for this. Joan Davison states she does not feel like electronic responses from the webpage are sufficient. She states that the draft documents contain some significant changes; for example, changes to the criteria of promotion and tenure. She states that the document as a whole seems to treat academics as a secondary or tertiary concern whereas Student Affairs appears to be the primary focus. She states that, furthermore, the notion of an area of distinction in Digital Liberal Arts does not seem to reflect current strengths at Rollins in the same way as, say, global citizenship or community engagement. She notes that these are important issues that need to be discussed collectively. Jenny Queen states that the phrases Joan is referring to are not in the documents that the faculty received. Carol explains that there are two separate sets of the documents and underscores that the documents that the faculty as a whole received are the same ones that the Board will review. R. Matilde Mésavage asks about the proposal for summer teaching. Who would teach in the summer? She expresses a concern that this could encumber the faculty's ability to do research. Carol states that faculty already teach in the summer; the change would be in the timeframe of summer classes. Carol Lauer concurs with Joan that these issues need to be addressed collectively. For example, some faculty have historical knowledge about past strategic initiatives, such as proposals aimed at increasing student enrollment and creating a summer school. Many of these proposals have been proposed and studied before. In fact, a previous study under President Bornstein determined that it would not be possible to expand enrollment without a major outlay of building costs, thus nullifying the added revenues that would be generated. She states, furthermore, that this document reflects the particular people that were on the committee and, therefore, does not really reflect the broader community. Joe Siry states that the rise in student enrollment has been

driven by economic conditions more than anything else. Emily Russell asks at what stage we go from proposal to actual budget lines and implementation plans. Carol states that we do not have the money to do all of the things in the document so we will first need to prioritize which are the most important.

- D. Discussion of the new General Education curriculum. Mark Anderson addresses the faculty in his new capacity as Director of General Education. Students entering Rollins in the fall will have a new general education system. Thus, there is a lot of work to be done between now and then. New course proposals will be soon be solicited. Mark reviews the history of the 17-member Gen Ed Implementation Committee which has been in operation since the beginning of the summer. The committee received 38 theme proposals which they combined to form 12 themes. They also involved student focus groups and conducted a faculty survey via *zoomerang*. Mark states that the data has been placed on Blackboard and all faculty should have access to it. Those that do not have access can email Mark, and he will make sure they get it. The committee is planning to hold a colloquium to discuss the results of the survey. Although the survey was imperfect, it did reveal some important patterns. For example, “When Cultures Collide” was among the most popular across a broad spectrum of respondents. After the colloquium, the committee will ask the faculty to identify their three favorites themes (using a weighted vote). Carol Lauer asks what the results were of the student focus groups. She states that the themes need to have student buy-in. Harry Kypraios suggests that it is important to identify themes that faculty are willing to teach in; therefore he suggests that the question being asked on the next survey needs to be more specific, i.e. will you teach in this neighborhood? Eric Zivot concurs that this should be an additional question on the survey. Sharon Carnahan emphasizes that the choice of theme is an important one because faculty will be teaching in these areas. Harry Kypraios asks if it is the intention that the courses for the themes be all new courses. Mark states that many of the courses will be new courses but others might be developed on the basis of existing courses. Ed Royce asks what the mechanism will be to determine whether courses are approved for a given Neighborhood. Mark states that AAC will make the ultimate decision just as it does now. Socky asks if it will be practically feasible for AAC to process so many proposals. Susan Lackman asks about students who are “grandfathered” into the system. Mark states that it is only the incoming students who will be subjected to the new system. Gloria Cook states that the demands on AAC will not be so great because the system will begin with only one year of classes for entering freshman. So the change will not come ‘all at once.’ Susan Lackman asks if one course could fulfill a requirement in the old system *and* the new system. Mark states that, no, this is not the intention. It is a developmental program and it is not desirable to have seniors taking 100-level courses.

IV. Announcements.

- A. Joan Davison (PSC) wishes to remind all faculty members scheduled for sabbatical in 2013-2014, that is next year, that the deadline for applications for FYRSTs and research and development grants is Friday, September 28, 2012, 5pm. Please submit the grants applications on the approved forms to Karla Knight. This is a hard deadline and the Professional Standards committee will not accept late proposals.
 - B. Bob Moore (F&S) states that representatives are needed for the merit pay committee (one from each division); this is important so that we can get our raises!
 - C. Hoyt Edge announces that he will soon be sending out a call for nominations for the Cornell Distinguished Faculty awards. This is a significant award and he encourages thoughtful nominations.
 - D. Dan Chong invites faculty to participate in a “think tank” style working group on High Impact Practices. All faculty are invited to participate.
 - E. Jill Jones announces that the Fall faculty party is October 20.
 - F. Rick Vitray moves that future committee reports be limited to those items that urgently require faculty attention. The motion was postponed to a future date.
- V. Adjourn. A motion to adjourn is made and seconded. The meeting adjourns
- VI. Addendum: Committee Reports (sent by email)
- a. Academic Affairs. Claire Strom reports that AAC approved the following: MENA minor, new travel abroad programs to Tel Aviv and Munich, new temporary travel abroad program to Rome, and renumbering of Environmental Studies classes for Holt. Furthermore, AAC appointed Bill Boles as the rep to the CPS curriculum committee. Finally, AAC created two new subcommittees—one to advise Giselda, one to advise Robin Mateo.
 - b. Finance and Services. Bob Moore reports that at the September 12 Planning and Budget Committee meeting Jonathan Miller reported that Olin Library has reorganized its budgeting procedures in such a way as to mitigate the impact of inflation rates that consistently exceed the Consumer Price Index (CPI) on periodicals, databases, and software. Dave Richards discussed future plans for the Holt School. Most significantly he suggested that Holt, which has been paying in about 6.3 million/year to the general College fund, be allowed to cap that amount and adjust it only with reference to the CPI. Then, he proposed new programs in Holt, a Health-related program and an INB program, which he estimated would bring in large numbers of new students

that would benefit Holt and the general fund (at an 80/20 ratio in disbursements to Holt and A&S) and would allow Holt to play a role as a center of innovation for the campus. Pennie Parker reported that added funding would be needed to finance travel for sports teams since increasing costs have made it difficult for athletic teams to participate in away games. At the September 4 Finance and Services Committee meeting, it was noted that the plan for evaluating faculty for merit pay that was passed by a vote of the faculty last spring includes the following stipulation: "A five-member elected committee representing tenured faculty from each division of the Arts and Sciences and one at large member reports to the Dean of Arts and Sciences their recommendations regarding who will receive merit raises. The Dean and the Committee, which is chaired by a faculty member, meets to reconcile any disagreements regarding who shall receive merit pay." The Committee determined that this committee should be established as soon as possible in order that merit raises be appropriately distributed in a timely manner. The also put on its agenda for the year a consideration of faculty travel funds and of faculty salaries so as to determine whether or not gender inequities or other issues may be so revealed. Implications of the anticipated transition to a 128-hour requirement for graduation were discussed. Although the strategic plans outline significant cost savings, due to the complexity of variables involved, total savings will be difficult to determine until the plan is put in place. It was suggested that the voice of staff be strengthened in college affairs. As a first step toward this, the Committee recommends that a presentation by the president and vice presidents be made to an all-staff gathering once per semester. Such a meeting should provide both an opportunity for staff to stay in the information loop on important college matters and to include their voice in the decision-making processes. In general staff morale appears to be good, but there are issues in which staff interests are overlooked and in which their voice would offer a constructive complement to campus conversations. The Committee will send a request to the president's office suggesting that these presentations to the staff be implemented. It was suggested that a training procedure be put in place for students who are designated to sit on faculty governance committees. As far as current student representatives are concerned, Leon Hayner will check with Brent Turner about this year's assignments.

- c. Professional Standards. PSC believes it might be valuable to reexamine the existing course evaluation system with three sets of potential changes in mind. First, the existing evaluation would be separated into two parts, dividing the questions which focus upon the instructor from the questions about the course. For example, is the professor organized, or knowledgeable, or on time, would be the instructor evaluation; questions such as how long did you study and did you participate in class would be a course evaluation. The division of the questions into two parts would facilitate the second change under consideration. The second change would compare A&S instructors' evaluations only with other A&S instructors, so that the aggregate scores on

the new instructor evaluation would only be based upon A&S. This seems desirable because CPS, as a College of Professional Studies, now has a different purpose than A&S. Further, FEC only evaluates A&S faculty members. The concern is that materials which FEC uses to evaluate A&S members not be confounded by scores from CPS faculty members who are not subject to a full FEC evaluation, and who sometimes teach different types of courses. Yet, the second part of the evaluation – the questions actually focused upon course evaluation – would be compared to all courses (both A&S and CPS) as we wish to have information regarding student perceptions of learning across the undergrad body, particularly as a shared general education curriculum continues. The third change would be to review specific questions with an eye to changing and eliminating confusing and redundant questions. PSC would seek clarification from PSC's student membership and SGA regarding how students understand certain questions. Do the students understand questions as CECs and FEC does? Also, the current evaluation instrument sometimes seeks the same type of information with multiple questions. Students grow tired as they often feel as if they answer the same questions, yet the College does not perform any ongoing tests for consistency. Given the lack of such evaluation of the instrument, it seems that the number of questions might be shortened. PSC is willing to undertake this large project, but only if it receives the initial endorsement from the A&S body. We do not want to undertake the project if the faculty membership oppose the project. Are there questions or concerns about PSC's suggestion to undertake the changes in evaluations? Finally, to keep EC informed, PSC passed a resolution for a bylaw change at today's meeting. Unfortunately I will not be at the next scheduled EC meeting (10/4) because I will be at an out of town presentation. Yet, EC should endorse the bylaw change on 10/4 so it can be brought to the A&S faculty at its 10/25 meeting. A potential problem is that I took the bylaw change to PSC as a policy issue, and thankfully PSC members did not ask any questions regarding the particular of cases. I individually met with department chairs involved, but believe it is preferable to keep the issue at the policy level. Bob Smither did raise one interesting question: whether a provost or president can appoint someone to a department. In fact, the President makes the appointment, and I am uncertain whether we can change that power, but the President is to make appointments with the advice of the Dean. PSC's resolution and rationale follow: *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. Further 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.

- d. Student Life, Daniel Crozier, chair. The committee has met twice this semester so far, on September 4 and September 18. On September 4 we updated members regarding usual committee duties, including annual Community Commitment Review Panels for residential organizations on campus, and chose members to sit on several college committees where SLC members traditionally serve: Food Services Committee: Judith Wolbert; High Impact Practices Advisory Committee: Susan Montgomery; Campus Center Construction Committee: Jenny Queen; Student Employment Advisory Committee: Dan Crozier. We began to discuss our major agenda item of this year: the development of a policy for funding of student travel as recommended to us by the High Impact Practices Advisory Committee last year. We reviewed the policy as they recommended it and began to plan possible ways to implement it. The HIP board recommended that we pilot the program when it is ready. A subcommittee was formed to design the application form for this consisting of Susan Montgomery, Gabe Anderson, and Raquel Ells. We recognized that there is infrastructure not yet in place that is required before the plan can be implemented. This involves the administration of the funds for the travel grants and the maintenance of a website. After the September 4 meeting, Daniel Crozier contacted Vice President Nielson about how best to get this in place. He will work with the Vice President and with Dean Karen Hater on this aspect in anticipation of our October meeting. On September 18, Susan Montgomery presented the

committee with a draft of the application that students would complete who are seeking funding for travel. Approximately half of that meeting was spent fine-tuning the document. Gabe Anderson will work on creating an online version of the document. The remainder of the meeting consisted of a report from Campus Safety director Ken Miller followed by questions from the committee. Ken discussed the structure and daily workings of his office and presented several new initiatives that the office is currently undertaking. A majority of the discussion centered around student perceptions of Campus Safety with several of our student members relating their own experiences with the office, both positive and negative. Ken Miller stressed the fact that while his office tries to do its best with public relations, the primary goal is to maintain a safe environment at Rollins. He offered statistics that demonstrate a great deal of success in this area, particularly when compared to other institutions, and said that he is always available for further discussion with our committee.

ATTACHMENT #1

Proposal for Minor in Middle Eastern and North African Studies

Presented by: Rachel Newcomb, Associate Professor & Chair, Department of Anthropology

Faculty Members Scheduled to Regularly Teach in Minor: Rachel Newcomb, Yudit Greenberg, Eren Tatari

Departments/Department Chairs Supporting This Major: Anthropology, Political Science, Philosophy & Religion, Modern Languages

Rationale:

Nationwide, there has been an increased interest in the Middle East and North Africa, a region not well understood by most Americans. The enclosed proposal for a minor in Middle Eastern and North African (MENA) Studies draws on this interest, as well as the expertise of several tenured or tenure-track faculty who regularly teach courses focusing on this region. As a hallmark of a globally focused liberal arts education, a minor in Middle East and North African (MENA) Studies not only fits in well with Rollins' mission to educate for global citizenship but also will give our students a competitive edge in their future careers. The proposed minor thoroughly covers the cultures, politics, and religions of the region throughout history, with a strong focus on the contemporary period. All proposed courses except one are currently being taught.

Additionally, students have more options than ever before to study abroad in the region. For the past few years, Rollins students have regularly been spending semesters in countries like Morocco, Israel or Jordan. Short-term field studies to Morocco, Israel and Turkey have already taken place and are planned for future semesters. Furthermore, Rollins College is in the process of establishing a formal relationship with Tel Aviv University for a semester/yearlong overseas studies, with an excellent Middle Eastern studies and Arabic curriculum.

There are several reasons for proposing to name this minor Middle East and North African studies (MENA Studies), rather than just "Middle East Studies." The term "Middle East" is generally used by scholars to refer only to the Gulf region, Egypt, and countries such as Jordan, Israel, Lebanon, and Syria, while ignoring the equally strategically important countries of North Africa. North Africa is often left out in narrowly defined area studies programs because it is not usually considered part of African Studies curricula either.

MENA, however, is broader, including the former French colonies of North Africa. It is the preferred diplomatic designation for the region and is also already a program name at many other schools of record, such as UCLA and Oberlin.

Curriculum and Staffing Concerns:

Rollins has tenured or tenure-track faculty currently teaching all of the proposed courses, primarily in the Departments of Anthropology, Political Science, and Religion.

STRUCTURE OF MINOR

This would be a six-course minor with core courses drawn from the Departments of

Anthropology, Politics, and Religion. It would include multiple electives and study abroad opportunities. No more than three courses may be taken from any one department. No more than two language courses may count toward the minor.

Proposed core courses:

ANT 255 – Middle East Culture (Newcomb) - Explores everyday lives of people in the Middle East as they negotiate the challenges of globalization, new media, human rights discourses, religion, and the legacy of colonialism.

POL 304 – Middle East Politics (Tatari) - Explores the politics of the Middle East and various approaches for analyzing its regional and international issues such as U.S. foreign policy in the region.

Electives:

ARA 101 – Arabic 101

ARA 102 – Arabic 102

ARA 201 – Arabic 201

ARA 202 – Arabic 202

ANT 277 – Women & Gender in the Middle East and North Africa

ARH 218 – Archaeology of Egypt and the Near East

HBR 101 – Hebrew 101

HBR 102 – Hebrew 102

HBR 201 – Hebrew 201

PHI 205 – Middle Eastern Humanities

POL 306 – Muslims in Western Politics

POL 307 – Islam and Politics

REL 125 – Hebrew Bible (Old Testament)

REL 217 – Jewish Life and Thought

REL 219 – Islam: Religion and Society

REL 223 – Contemporary Jewish Literature and Film

REL 228 – Women and Religion

REL 304 - Jerusalem

Elective Course Descriptions:

ANT 277: Explores the concept of gender in the Middle East and North Africa from an anthropological perspective. Examines how religion, cultural practices, media, politics, and social class affect men's and women's roles in work, family, and society.

PHI 205 Middle Eastern Humanities: (to be offered starting Fall 2013): The course covers topics such as Middle Eastern religions, philosophy, literature, architecture, visual arts, music, and the effects of modernity on the Middle East.

POL 306 Muslims in Western Politics. Explores the characteristics of Muslim populations and their role in politics in the U.S. and three West European countries from a comparative perspective.

POL 307 Islam and Politics. Introduces Islam and covers Islamic theology, spirituality, jurisprudence, culture, and political ideology.

REL 125 Hebrew Bible (Old Testament): Treats selections as literary, historical, and theological works. Discusses myth, story, and religious interpretation; theological concepts of creation, revelation, and redemption; views of nature, God, and social order; gender roles; and community.

REL 217 Jewish Life and Thought: Features modern historical, literary, and theological masterpieces that explore law, ritual, Zionism, Israel, American Judaism, and changing world of women in contemporary Judaism.

REL 219 - Islam: Religion and Society: Explores religious, cultural, political, and social dimensions of Islam, from beliefs and practices to relationship of Islam to the Judaeo-Christian heritage.

REL 223 Contemporary Jewish Literature and Film: Draws upon short stories, novels, and films that depict modern Jewish experience in Europe, Israel, and the U.S. Considers shtetl, enlightenment, and emancipation in Europe, immigrant Jews in Israel and U.S., Holocaust, establishment of Israel and contemporary Israeli society, and tradition vs. modernity.

REL 228 Women and Religion: Studies the status, experiences, and contributions of women in world religions. Focuses on women in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, and on contemporary feminist ideology and spirituality. Readings include sacred texts, history, theology, and anthropology. Discussions center around topics such as male and female concepts of the divine, gender roles, creation of new rituals, and women's ordination. Prerequisite: one REL or WMS course.

REL 304 Jerusalem: History, Religion, and Politics: Examines the history of Jews, Christians, and Muslims in Jerusalem from the biblical period to the present. Focuses on religious teachings that expound notions of sacred land and the subsequent political dominations of the city, modern nationalist movements, and current debates and dialogues on the future of Jerusalem. Prerequisite: One REL course.

LANGUAGE COURSES -

ARA 101 Elementary Arabic I: Introduces students to the fundamentals of the Arabic language.

ARA 102 Elementary Arabic II: Continues fundamental introduction to Arabic language.
Prerequisite: ARA 101.

ARA 201 Intermediate Arabic I: Reviews and builds on first year grammar and vocabulary.
Prerequisite: ARA 102.

ARA 202 Intermediate Arabic II: Reviews and builds on first year grammar and vocabulary. Presents more intricate grammatical concepts and stresses reading for comprehension, expansion of vocabulary, and improvement of oral and written skills. *Prerequisite: ARA 201.*

HBR 101 - Elementary Hebrew (Gabbai)

HBR 201 - Intermediate Hebrew (Gabbai)

ATTACHMENT #2

Resolution requesting non-voting Arts and Sciences Faculty representation on the Rollins Board of Trustees

WHEREAS: The A & S faculty is an essential stakeholder as well as provider of the teaching, intellectual, and engagement missions and operations of Rollins

WHEREAS: Rollins College proclaims in its All Faculty Bylaws, “a commitment by all members of the institution to democratic and participatory shared governance and to consultation”

WHEREAS: There is currently no formal venue for contact between the academic body of the college (The Faculty) and the corporate board of the college (The Board of Trustees), despite their obvious overlapping concerns

WHEREAS: An A & S Faculty member can provide a perspective to the Board of Trustees on academic issues and issues specific to the cultural and intellectual climate of Rollins that have not historically or currently been part of the Board’s expertise and membership; that a faculty member would expand the diversity and breadth of the Board’s perspective and deliberative effort

WHEREAS: There seems to be a growing national trend towards including faculty on the Boards of quality institutions as part of a more transparent selection process and an emphasis on board members with diverse backgrounds and experiences

WHEREAS: The President of the College has recently become less involved and less directly knowledgeable about the activities of the faculty (no longer attending, for example, Executive Committee meetings of the A & S Faculty) and yet is responsible for communicating the interests of that faculty

WHEREAS: Communication and trust between the A & S Faculty and The Board of Trustees would be a benefit to both parties and the College as a whole

WHEREAS: There is neither prohibition nor conflict of interest for a Faculty member to serve as a Trustee

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The A & S Faculty of Rollins College requests that The Board of Trustees of Rollins College should include, on appropriate committees, a non-voting representative from the A & S faculty on the Board the Trustees.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the A & S Faculty