

2-2-2012

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 2, 2012

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec

Recommended Citation

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 2, 2012" (2012). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 30.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/30

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

Minutes
Executive Committee Meeting
Feb 2, 2012

In attendance: Jill Jones, Alexandria Mozzicato, Joan Davison, Jenny Queen, Dexter Boniface, Gloria Cook, Joe Siry, Bob Smither, and Carol Bresnahan.

I. Call to Order. The meeting is called to order at 12:32pm.

II. Approve the Minutes from the last Executive Committee meeting. The minutes are approved.

III. Committee Reports

1. PSC: Joan Davison reports that the main thing to report is Lisa Tillmann's request that PSC look at grant budgets for the last ten years. She states that she does not know if this is something PSC actually must do, or if Bob Smither simply can provide PSC with the information; or if Jill and Joe have access to this line item through the budget committee, or if their work on Budget and Planning does not break items down to that level. Bob Smither responds that Karla Knight might be able to provide this information. The second issue, Joan continues, is the TPJ visiting scholar fund. Carol Bresnahan states that there has been some concern about low turnouts at TPJ events. Joan raises the problem that TPJs are often scheduled on top of other events. Carol states that she was surprised by the sheer number of TPJ events (around thirty for the year or roughly one per week). Joan notes that we also have Winter Park Institute on top of the TPJ visitors. Carol asks if it would make more sense to change the way TPJ is allocated; for example, the funds could be allocated at the department level. The executive committee decides that the issue of what to do about TPJ funds should not be handled by PSC. Bob states, tangentially, that another often poorly attended event is the celebration of faculty authors. Jenny Queen suggests that maybe it should be an annual, as opposed to bi-annual event. She also suggests it might be better promoted by departments. Jill asks Joan about a separate point, namely the issue of whether or not CPS should have a vote on PSC. Joan states that doing so would violate the A&S

- bylaws. Carol states that the important thing is that we maintain trust between the two colleges.
2. AAC: Gloria Cook reports that AAC held the first of three open meetings on general education requirements on Tuesday, Jan 31st. About forty people turned out. There were many excellent suggestions and comments. She states that many people desire a change in the current system. However, she is uncertain whether or not the faculty are ready to adopt the new RP system given that it would be a significant change. Furthermore, if the faculty did want to adopt the RP program, there are some glitches that need to be worked out. For example, there is a question as to whether or not the team-taught model is sustainable and/or desirable. Gloria states that she would like to form a general education sub-committee to look into this issue and carry it forward. The charge of the sub-committee would be to bring forward a modified RP proposal to the floor of the faculty by fall 2012. She emphasizes that this is an urgent issue that cannot be put off for another year. Regarding the subcommittee, Joan asks what the role of the existing RP committee would be. Gloria states that the RP committee, as currently composed, is made up only of science faculty and that there is a need for a new committee with broader representation. Jill states that she actually likes the current system of general education requirements. She adds that the subcommittee would need a strong chair or advocate to win faculty over to a new system. Joan suggests Bruce Stephenson as a possibility. Allie Mozzicato notes that many students also like the current system and have concerns about adopting a new one. Allie asks how students can have input; for example, students in the current RP pilot program. Joan notes that one concern from the science faculty is that they maintain demand for science classes. AAC, Gloria concludes, will again conduct another open meeting next Tuesday at the common hour at Keene. The focus of this next meeting will be areas of improvement and the timeline if AAC were going to recommend adoption of a revised RP.
 3. F&S. Joe reports insurance premiums are going up six percent with an increase of \$250 in the deductible for each member of the plan, a point he inadvertently forgot to mention at the last faculty meeting. He reports, furthermore, that the F&S committee is considering the responses to an A&S faculty-wide survey on merit (approximately 184 members received the survey). On the issue of merit pay, Jill notes that at the last A&S faculty meeting a resolution was passed

unanimously which asks for a consultation with senior administrators to explain why the original proposal for a merit system (as developed by the faculty taskforce) is not currently being followed. Joan states that the President's answer will be that the Board of Trustees mandated this. Jenny Queen agrees with Joan; she states that this resolution will not really provide any new information. Joan adds that meetings of the Board of Trustees are confidential and the President may not be able to provide any information on their deliberations. Jenny states that she is frustrated that the faculty are raising questions that have already been answered. Jill states that even though President Duncan presented the faculty with a new salary system and explained its rationale, the President never explained why the faculty proposal was jettisoned. She states that Laurie Joyner was a real advocate for the system we created and might have a different opinion than the President. She therefore sees some merit in the resolution. Joan states that when Rick Foglesong was faculty president he pressed President Duncan on this issue. The result was that President Duncan made a public presentation to the faculty and announced the across-the-board 'merit' raise. Jill Jones states that her problem with this process is that we never told about what happened to the system the faculty originally created. Bob states that it might be worthwhile to consider more broadly whether or not the faculty is being well-served by a merit-based system. Joan states that another and even greater concern is the merit system as applied to the staff. She states that there are serious concerns about how merit is distributed to staff, particularly low-income staff. She states that she has heard disturbing stories of 'merit' allocations that were made on the basis of personal rather than performance criteria. Joe Siry, continuing his report, asks what F&S should do about the issue of possibly moving Rollins to a three-two teaching load. Carol Bresnahan suggests that we would need to change our graduation requirements, and make other changes, to make this happen, though it might indeed be possible to do so. Bob Smither states that his strategic planning committee can look into this. Dexter Boniface points out that it is already part of the charge of that committee already (at least in the draft) to look into issues of faculty load, so this would seem to make good sense. The committee, Joe concludes, will host a discussion of benefits and salaries on 2-14-12 in the Galloway Room during the common hour. He notes that because F&S has been asked to advise the dean with respect to future

- disbursements, the committee would like to see the data on previous merit awards.
4. SLC. Jenny Queen delivers a report on SLC activities. They are awaiting results from the community commitments reviews and will be hearing from RCC & Residential Life about the Living Learning Communities at the next meeting. The other piece of business, Jenny continues, concerns the policy on High Impact Practices (“HIPA”). As written, it only applies to pooled funds from the four Deans (A&S, CPS, Holt, and the College), the Provost, and the President to be allocated for student scholarships for high-impact practices for which there is not already a source of funding. She states that if we could get a new student travel policy to pass, we might be able to have some logic to other policies; for example, the issue of student travel in the student-faculty collaborative research program. Joe asked if there was faculty representation on the HIPA committee. Jenny notes SLC asked HIPA to allow a committee member to serve and they agreed. Daniel Chong is currently co-chairing the HIPA committee as a representative of the student life committee; however, his term on SLC will expire this year. SLC needs to be mindful to make sure it has a representative on the committee next year.
 5. SGA. Allie Mozzicato reports that Ken Miller came to SGA last week to discuss current and future parking issues as well as crime. She notes that cameras are going to go up in the parking lot and in select building entrances (specifically, McKean and Sutton). She states that this is not a monitoring system; it will only be used in the event of a crime. The plan is that tapes will only be stored for thirty days; however, she notes, this could be a problem over winter break. She reports that with the ongoing building renovation on campus, some parking spots will be converted to student parking and staff parking. Jenny Queen inquires what parking spaces are being converted. Allie responds that the parking spaces next to Casa Iberia were among the spaces mentioned. Jenny notes that these are faculty parking spots and that the new student parking appears to be coming at the expense of faculty parking spaces. She states that she is concerned that Ken Miller has not brought these changes to the faculty. Allie continues her report, noting that the discussion about what to place in the ‘Tar Plaza’ continues. A local artist presented a few ideas including a statue of a Tar standing on the state of Florida. Others expressed a preference for some sort of fountain. Carol Bresnahan states that she was at the meeting and feels strongly that a

statue of a giant male sailor is not a representative symbol for a student body that is more than 50% female. Jenny asks what happened to the veteran's memorial that was near the flag in front of the main administration building. Carol states that she believes there is a plan in place to eventually return it to campus. Allie furthermore reports that two consultants asked students about campus media (e.g., newspaper, radio) and how to improve it; the students gave an honest assessment. She states that individuals involved in the student newspaper (*Sandspur*) are concerned about the implications of the consultant's deliberations. They presented a resolution but it did not pass. She states that *Sandspur* is supported by SGA and she did not feel that there was need for grave concern about the future of the student newspaper.

IV. Old Business

1. Strategic Planning Committees and process. Jill reports that she has advanced nominations to the strategic planning committees with a strong preference for current members of A&S governance committees.
2. Mission Statement. Jill asks whether or not the faculty would likely pass the revisions to the mission statement. Jenny asks what the procedure is for changing the mission statement. Carol states that the current bylaws include the mission statement, whatever it happens to be. She does not believe the mission statement is part of the all-college bylaws in the sense that it is amended in the same fashion as the bylaws themselves. Jenny recalls from AHFAC deliberations that the logic of including the mission statement in the all-college bylaws as part of the AHFAC's suggested recommendations was to eliminate the possibility that the mission statement could be changed without faculty deliberation and support. Joan notes that faculty might not support the change in the bylaws for several reasons. First, there are some faculty who simply reject the creation of CPS. Second, there are some faculty who believe the proper procedure should be the same as amending the all-college bylaws. Finally, faculty might object to the language of the changes. She notes, for instance, that Socky pointed out at the last faculty meeting that the language of the mission statement reflects specific historic circumstances in the life

of Rollins College and may not make any sense for our current realities. Jenny and Joe each raise the question of how a new program (CPS) can be “renowned” when it is so new. They suggest that perhaps the language of the mission statement should be revised more broadly, rather than merely inserting CPS.

3. CPS invitation from PSC. *This point was discussed above under committee reports for PSC.*

V. New Business

1. Would it be appropriate for the Dean of the College/VP of Planning to report to the A & S Faculty once a semester as the Dean of Students does? *This issue was not discussed.*
2. Discuss Resolution passed at the Dec. 7 A & S meeting that asks that the Provost inquire about the possibility of an all-undergraduate-college academic affairs or curriculum committee. Specifically the resolution asks that the Provost clarify directly with AACSB (the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) to ascertain whether or not such an all-undergraduate-college committee structure is an impediment to the International Business (INB) Department’s accreditation at Rollins. Furthermore, the resolution asks the Provost to ascertain whether or not the creation of a separate college (the CPS) was indeed necessary for INB accreditation. Jill reminds the committee of the resolution. Carol Bresnahan responds that she has investigated the issues raised in the resolution and has tried as much as possible to respond to the issues specifically raised in Hoyt’s resolution. Jill suggests that Carol email her answers.
3. Are we the “College of A & S” of Rollins College? Jill notes that some faculty have asked that we clarify what “college” means. For example, if Rollins is composed of several colleges, does that make us a University? Furthermore, if A&S is a college, what exactly does that mean? Joan Davison states that the language of the “College of Arts & Science” is new. Jenny Queen concurs; she states that before the creation of the College of Professional Studies there was no College of A&S; rather, as currently stated in the mission, there were merely “A&S Programs” located within

Rollins College. Similarly, the Dean's position was defined as the Dean of the Faculty, not as it is currently (Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences). Carol Bresnahan states that she believes that the language of a College of A & S at Rollins is older and precedes the creation of the CPS. She believes that a distinct College of A&S is not actually new to Rollins' identity.

4. Merit Pay. The A & S faculty has requested a forum with senior administrators about what decision-making process was used when they departed from the system that the faculty and Laurie Joyner created. (This has been brought up at the last several meetings if you check the minutes, but a resolution was passed at the last meeting.) *This issue was discussed above under committee reports for F&S.*
5. Increased Pay for Adjuncts and Overload. Jill Jones thanks the Provost for her work on this issue. Carol states that credit goes to the PSC committee and others that worked on this issue.
6. The meeting is adjourned at 2:06pm.