

3-31-2011

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 31, 2011

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, March 31, 2011" (2011). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 40.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/40

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.

**Approved Minutes
Executive Committee
March 31, 2011**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Claire Strom, Barry Levis, Sue Easton, Joan Davison, Deb Wellman

Guests: Jill Jones, Dexter Boniface

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:45 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—The Executive Committee approved the minutes of March 17, 2011 as amended.
- III. Old Business – Posthumous Degree Policy (SLC) – Boles reminds EC that Toni Holbrook was asked to research the issue of typical institutional posthumous policies and found 14-16 schools with policies. Boles crafted a policy based upon these examples which he first asked Hater, Holbrook and Levis to review and then took to SLC. Boles elaborates SLC disagreed with his suggested policy which necessitated senior status, 100 semester hours, GPA of 2.0, in good academic standing and death could not occur during a crime. Students and other committee members objected based upon possibility of being one or two credit hours short as well as the fact this is a death and Rollins should not be caught in details given the personal situation, but rather convey a good will gesture. SLC then redrafted the policy. (See Attachment 1.) Foglesong states two decisions seem to exist in this policy, one by the department and the other by the Dean and Provost. Davison asks about specific guidelines and the possibility of departments applying different standards. Boles explains SLC views quantification as problematic because of the desirability of empathy and the need for exceptions. Easton argues for a demonstration of concern for the family, an empathetic relationship with the family, and who Rollins is. Levis states he is torn; he sympathizes with Davison’s concerns and the desire to maintain some standards, but also understands the preference for a general policy. Foglesong asks whether EC should send the policy to the faculty, amend the policy and send it to the faculty, or send the policy back to SLC. Davison suggests irrespective of the decision there is need for ultimate approval of the Board of Trustees. Foglesong concurs and moves to change and add “upon approval of the Dean of the Faculty *and Provost, the Board of Trustees will be asked for final approval.*” This amendment passes. Strom then moves and Easton seconds to send the resolution to the faculty. The motion passes.
- IV. New Business
 - A. Proposed Attendance Policy (SLC) – Levis states this is a joint AAC and SLC proposal. (See Attachment 2.) Boles explains SLC developed the policy and

then incorporated AAC suggestions. Davison expresses in exceptional cases an extraordinary number of absences might make it impossible to fulfill the competencies of the course. She proposes an amendment to read “A student will not fail a course because the number of religious observances and/or college business absences exceed the number of absences allowed *except if excessive absences make it impossible to fulfill the competencies of the course.* Levis seconds and the amendment passes. Davison suggests a friendly amendment to change “by the end of the official add/drop period” to “*before* the end of the official add/drop period.” Wellman asks about tournaments. Boles answers these exceptions are covered in the document. Davison asks about the concept of college business and whether on campus meetings constitute college business. A discussion ensues regarding how to address this legitimate concern until Foglesong emphasizes that written evidence is necessary. Levis moves the resolution, Boles seconds and the motion passes.

- B. Proposed Blackboard Policy (AAC) – Levis begins with a report on actions taken which AAC believes do not require faculty actions including changing the name of a Holt major and minor changes to biology, marine biology, and CMC majors. Levis also reports that AAC rescinded its approval of changes to the INB major because given differences between INB and Economics the new major would either require 19 courses or no longer be interdisciplinary in character. Levis elaborates that AAC was concerned the major meet accreditation standards, retain its interdisciplinary nature and not necessitate hiring new faculty. Levis states INB could not bring changes that met these concerns. Levis then introduces the policy sent to AAC from IT. He notes AAC is forwarding it to EC without recommendation as AAC is uncertain about the committee’s role in the policy. Levis explains the IT policy calls for IT’s deletion of old courses from blackboard and requires faculty members to save the material which they wish to retain. (See Attachment 3.) Levis expresses concerns about the policy adding to faculty workload, but says IT claims the process of saving takes seconds. Davison emphasizes the policy also gives intellectual property control to faculty members rather than the institution. Boles suggests this is an appropriate policy for a report. Boles recommends Levis reports the new policy to the faculty. Strom seconds and the motion passes.
- C. Proposed Annual Academic Report (AAC) – Levis states that like the previous policy, AAC is uncertain what its responsibility is with this report. (See Attachment 4.) Foglesong asks if the report comes from the Dean of the Faculty and Wellman answers “yes and no.” Wellman explains that SACS wants reviews completed annually rather than once every five years. Wellman also suggests that in the long run it will require less work of faculty if the reports are written each year. Davison notes this explains the annual review but does not address the seven year external review. Foglesong inquires about the Soviet language “academic unit.” (Laughter.) Wellman suggests the language might need to be changed. Easton asks for in depth clarification from Wellman on the different reviews. Wellman explains once a year the department chair writes a report and the department considers appropriate

changes in light of the report. Then an in depth and external review is conducted once every seven year. Levis expresses concern about the cost of such reviews. Davison suggests other methods exist for external review and indeed political science sends its materials for external review each year. Foglesong asks whether this issue must be addressed this year. Wellman responds the issue can wait until next year. EC agrees to postpone action on the RAAR given concerns, costs and the arrival of new provost. EC also agrees to send this decision to Sharon Carnahan. Levis moves the decision as a resolution, Davison seconds and it passes.

- D. PSC Issues – Strom reports PSC needs advice regarding faculty feedback to administrators. She explains she is working with Hater on a response to faculty given its feedback, but Duncan has not responded to Strom’s request for a report. Foglesong encourages Strom to make an appointment with Duncan. Strom then asks, how should PSC respond to the “recommit to committee” motions from our last faculty meeting. Strom emphasizes the motions require significant changes in the bylaws and amendments and the work might not be possible this year. Strom elaborates PSC currently is trying to sort out nonbase pay compensation to provide advice to the dean. Foglesong suggests two courses of action: one, we can roll over to next year the bylaw changes or, two we to come back to the faculty and announce EC and PSC does not want to change the proposed bylaws. Faculty then can vote for or against each bylaw. Strom notes that the proposal to add the FEC recommendation to the bylaw was tabled although this is practice. Foglesong asks whether the sentence can be tweaked or clarified so that it is clear not all recommendations stop the process. Strom comments she is uncertain which McLaren motion passed. Foglesong asks Davison for clarification and she states it was the motion to table and return to committee. Jones suggests a case to the faculty must be strong to change the process. Easton comments part of the problem is the size of the document and the fact people are not reading the whole document but a section. Levis concurs faculty members are not reading the bylaws. Strom emphasizes PSC was very thoughtful in the development of these changes. Foglesong expresses appreciation for Strom’s and PSC’s work but says faculty jealously want to protect their rights. Strom concludes by noting that most of PSC disagrees with Rubarth’s revisions. Davison comments that perhaps the changes which Rubarth suggests should come from the faculty based upon the petition provision. Strom agrees to discuss again with PSC the various options discussed with EC.

V. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 2:01pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary

Attachment 1

Bestowing of a Posthumous Degree

In the case of the event of a student dying before finishing coursework at the college, a posthumous degree will be awarded if the student had completed a substantial amount of the coursework required for the major and degree.

Procedure:

A posthumous degree can be requested by either the student's family or the department in which the student was a major. The request must first be approved by the major department and then forwarded to the Dean of the Faculty. Upon approval of the Dean of the Faculty, the Provost would then give final approval.

If the request for the posthumous degree comes from the student's major, the Provost will first confer with the student's family to see if the request is acceptable before the approval process begins.

Upon approval, the degree will either be mailed to the family or presented to them in a private ceremony. The student's name will be included in the Commencement list of graduates.

The degree will be posted on the student's permanent record as follows (example):

Degree Awarded Artium Baccalaureus 8-MAY-2011

Primary Degree

Major: English

Minor: Writing

ATTACHMENT 2

CURRENT POLICY CONCERNING ATTENDANCE

CLASS ATTENDANCE

It is the responsibility of the faculty to publish attendance policies for their courses in the course syllabus. If a distinction is made between "excused" absences and "unexcused" absences, it must be conveyed in the attendance policy. At the instructor's discretion, a student's grade may be lowered for failure to comply with the attendance policy. If the student feels s/he must be absent from class for any reason, it is the student's responsibility to confer with the faculty member to determine whether the absence is to be considered "excused" or "unexcused" as defined by the attendance policies. The Office of the Dean of Student Affairs will communicate when students must be absent from campus for hospitalization, family emergencies, or similar contingencies. Students will be responsible for all work missed.

Proposed Policy (All new material in bold)

CLASS ATTENDANCE

It is the responsibility of the faculty to publish attendance policies for their courses in the course syllabus. If a distinction is made between "excused" absences and "unexcused" absences, it must be conveyed in the attendance policy. At the instructor's discretion, a student's grade may be lowered for failure to comply with the attendance policy.

Exceptions exist for absences owing to religious observances and college business. If a student misses a class because of either situation, then the student must confer with his/her professor as to how and when the make-up work will be done, which includes the possibility of turning work in early. Absences will be addressed by the faculty member in accordance with his or her attendance policy. A student will not fail a course because the number of religious observances and/or college business absences exceed the number of absences allowed. The student's class participation grade in the course, though, may be affected.

--In regard to absences due to religious observances, students must communicate any attendance conflicts to their professor by the end of the official add/drop period.

--In regard to absences due to college business, students must present to their professor written evidence of an upcoming absence as soon as they are aware of the conflict.

It is the student's responsibility to discuss with his/her professor how and when make-up work should be completed before missing class.

If the student feels s/he must be absent from class for any other reason, it is the student's responsibility to confer with the faculty member to determine whether the absence is to be considered "excused" or "unexcused" as defined by the attendance policies. The Office of the Dean of Student Affairs will communicate when students must be absent from campus for hospitalization, family emergencies, or similar contingencies. Students will be responsible for all work missed.

Deletion of Courses from Blackboard

Purpose:

The purpose of this policy is to provide an academic schedule regarding course life in Blackboard. By doing so faculty will be better able to manage content in each of their courses. This will provide better access and more flexibility of the faculty's intellectual property by allowing them to control what is saved and when to save. If requested, IT will assist any faculty who need help managing their content. With this policy IT will be better able to manage space on the server, free up resources for new courses, and reduce the number of courses for all faculty and students.

Policy Statement:

Academic course sites that are one year old will be removed from the Blackboard production server unless the instructor requests that sites be retained. The age of an academic course will be defined by the course term code ending in the course year and term. Term codes are the last six digits located at the end of the Course ID. The first four digits are the current year and the last two digits are the term.

The term codes for A&S are: 01 = spring, 06 = summer, and 09 = fall.

Term codes for Crummer are: 11 & 21 = spring, 14 & 26 = summer, and 19 & 28 = fall.

Scope:

Only academic course sites in the Rollins Blackboard system are subject to this policy. Non-academic sites are not affected.

Parameters:

- Academic course sites that are older than one year will automatically be **removed** through a process managed by IT approximately 4 weeks after the start of each term. **Removed** is defined as deleting the course site in its entirety from the production server.
- IT **will not** maintain an archive of any academic courses.
- If the instructor does nothing, academic course sites older than one year will be **removed**.
- Academic course sites that are unavailable 4 weeks into the current term will be identified as unused and **removed**.
- Academic course sites with no instructors 4 weeks into the current term will be **removed**.
- A general reminder will be sent to all instructors notifying them that these courses need to be archived before they are **removed**.

Procedure:

- Instructors can archive as many courses as they wish and at any time.
- Instructors will be responsible for storing their archived courses for future use.
- If more than one instructor teaches the course, the recommendation is that each course instructor archive a copy for his or her future use.
- The removal process will be scheduled appropriately to limit the load on the system.
- Academic course sites that fall within the parameters will be **completely and permanently deleted** from the production server.
- This process **cannot** be undone once completed.

Exemption Process:

Faculty can request that their courses be exempt if they meet any of the following:

- The course is continuing through the next semester with the same enrollment.
- There is an academic appeal pending.
- Other exceptions can be reviewed case-by-case.

PROPOSALS TO THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 22, 2011



Proposal 1: Rollins Annual Academic Report (RAAR)

Each Academic Unit will submit an annual review to the Dean of Faculty by June 15 of each year. (The format in use in 2011 is attached.)

Proposal 2: Each Academic Unit will undergo an in-depth internal and external review, to be completed by the end of each 7th academic year, on a schedule which rotates all of the academic units at the College. The initial schedule will be determined by the Dean of Faculty in consultation with Department Chairs.

Academic units which are externally accredited by a national organization shall undergo in-house in-depth administrative review every 10 years.

Procedure for review. Over the course of one semester, the Academic Unit must complete an in-house review of its of its mission, alignment with standards of best practice in education and its own field, achievement of student learning outcomes, and overall fitness. The Chair or Director will coordinate the completion of a self-assessment report.

After the completion of this self-study, the academic unit must participate in a process of voluntary review by experts outside the college. Experts will be chosen by the Department and approved by the Dean of Faculty, who will meet with the academic unit after the external review and assist in