

12-2-2008

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Student Life Committee Meeting, Tuesday, December 2, 2008

Arts & Sciences Student Life Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Student Life Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Student Life Committee Meeting, Tuesday, December 2, 2008" (2008). *Student Life Committee Minutes*. Paper 60.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_sl/60

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 Student Life Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

Student Life Committee for the Arts and Sciences
Agenda for December 2, 2008
Bush Science Center #257
12:30 – 1:45pm

Membership: Faculty Reps: Paul Harris (Chair), Denise Cummings, Creston Davis, Derrick Paladino, Jennifer Queen, Katie Sutherland
Staff Reps: Ken Miller
SGA Reps: Nick Horsmon, Alex Brown, Taylor Finkelson

Guests: Karen Hater, Interim Dean of Student Affairs

I. Approval of last Student Life Committee Minutes

II. Announcements (none)

III. Old Business

A. SGA Update on

1. Student Social Honor Code to complement the academic honor code

N. Horsmon reported that SGA is working with student affairs to examine the judicial process. They were concerned with the productivity of the Community Judicial Hearing Council. The current committee of 5 students meets 1 a week to deal with 2-3 cases each time. This means that there is little to no student involvement in the majority of disciplinary cases. SGA believes that if students heard a greater number of cases then students might feel more accountable to one another. SGA recognizes that this would involve a change in procedure and require either a greater number of councils or a greater workload for the council. K. Miller asked what other schools they were looking at as models for this. N. Horsmon reported they were relying mostly on UVA & Elon as student run models. C. Davis stated that Honor is a big part of the student culture at UVA. Student are accountable to one another and decisions about dorm rooms and privileges are based on things like grades and community service. Several people on SLC agreed that Rollins students do not do a good job of holding one another accountable for their behavior and that this was a needed cultural change on campus.

2. Student representation on the Board of Trustees

N. Horsmon & P. Harris reported that both faculty and students are in a holding pattern on Board representation.

3. Purpose of the SLC

N. Horsmon reported that the SGA reps for SLC met since the last meeting and discussed possible purposes for the SLC committee. They suggest a mission statement more clearly defining the goals of SLC and a reporting of SLC agendas to faculty committees. P. Harris reported that the Faculty Executive Committee does get regular reports of what SLC is doing and that rest of faculty have access to minutes if they desire. He also reported that in some sense we do not have a mission statement only a directive in the bylaws and that perhaps a mission statement would be useful. It was suggested that we revisit this document in early Spring with that in mind.

There was also an involved discussion on some confusion regarding new alcohol policies in the dorms. Specifically at issue was the idea that individuals 21 and over who were drinking could not interact with underage individuals. K. Hater stated that the actual policy is that Ward and Rex Beach are dry dorms and that in other residence halls if everyone in the room is underage then the room becomes a dry room. K. Miller made the point that there is a difference between an underage individual in a room with four legal drinkers and one legal drinker supplying alcohol for a room full of individuals who are underage. He gave an example of one legal drinker in a room full of people with 15 solo cups, 2 cases of beer and a couple of handles of vodka. Common sense tells an observer that that the one person over 21 isn't the only one consuming in the room. It was pointed out that several people put through the judicial process because of the violation ended up with a finding of not responsible. This was considered a positive step because it meant that everyone suspected of violation was being treated similarly (i.e. forced to go through the judicial process) rather than having one or two individuals at the scene (be they R.A.'s, Campus Security, whoever) trying to sort out responsibility.

B. Presentation/Discussion of Faculty Involvement in the Co-Curriculum Survey Results

J. Queen and K. Sutherland presented a report outlining the results of a faculty survey regarding advising of student organizations. (see Appendix A). Upon hearing that the faculty overwhelmingly do not believe there should be a connection between the activities of student organizations and the curriculum, K. Hater asked if faculty had ever been asked about how they would like to best connect with students? No one thought they had. Several people thought this might be an important question to ask faculty in light of current discussions going on in Student Affairs and in the curriculum reform plans where co-curricular activities seem to be playing such a central role. T. Finkelson also mentioned that it might be informative to ask students how they would best like to connect with faculty. It was decided that the final spot on this report (the follow-up) would be tabled until our first meeting in January when we would create an action plan.

IV. New Business (none)

V. Adjournment

Appendix A

Student Life Committee Results from the Survey on Faculty Involvement in the Co-Curriculum Spring 2008

Purpose & Method:

In the 2007-2008 academic year, the Student Life Committee, joining forces with Cara Meixner from the Office of Student Involvement and Leadership, discussed faculty involvement in the co-curriculum specifically with regards to serving as advisors to student organizations. Statistics indicate that an organization's advisor is more likely to be a member of the staff (especially student affairs staff) than a faculty member, especially if that organization is a fraternity or sorority. In an effort to determine the perception of the current and ideal levels of involvement in student organizations several focus groups of students, faculty, and staff were held. From these focus groups a survey was created and sent to all full-time faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences via the Web. The survey asked several demographic questions and open-ended questions on what motivates/discourages faculty from organization advising, potential incentives to participate, and the role of these organizations in the curriculum. We were especially interested in differences between Greek and non-Greek organizations.

Results & Analysis:

Demographics: The 58 responses to the survey created a response rate of approximately 30% of those asked to complete it. The break down of 60% tenured, 28% tenure-track, and 10% non-tenure track indicates that our sample is representative of the general faculty population (1 person did not indicate rank). Of the respondents, 38% were currently advising a non-Greek student organization, 66% had advised in the past and 24% had been asked to advise and refused. There was less participation in advising Greek organizations. Only 5% were currently advising a fraternity or sorority, 17% had advised in the past, and 17% had been asked and refused. This seems to indicate that it is not the case that faculty are refusing to advise Greek organizations at a greater rate, but that we are being asked to advise these organizations less often.

Motivation: When asked what motivates faculty to advise student organizations, the faculty perception was that faculty that choose to advise (1) are seeking to help and connect with students, (2) had an existing relationship with the student who asked them to advise, and (3) see it as a way to serve the college. These responses were prevalent regardless of the type of organization. Faculty responses also indicated a perception that an interest in the organization's mission itself motivated faculty if the organization was non-Greek, while past membership was considered a motivating factor in advising Greek organizations.

Reluctance: When asked what might make faculty reluctant to serve as an advisor, lack of time and lack of recognition as service during the tenure and promotion process were the two most prevalent answers regardless of organization type. For non-Greek organizations, lack of interest was also a potential reason to not serve. A different pattern emerged for reluctance in advising fraternities and sororities. Faculty mentioned the negative perception of Greek life on campus and a lack of desire to place themselves in precarious legal/ethical situations. Additionally, faculty mentioned the stigma from other faculty associated with advising such an organization. This stigma seems to be

real given the number of sarcastic comments about wanting to relive one's youth that appeared under what might motivate someone to advise such an organization.

Incentives: Faculty were asked to think about what kinds of things might increase their willingness to advise student organizations. Recognition as service to the college during the tenure and promotion process was the most prevalent answer followed by monetary and time incentives (like course release). Improving the negative reputations (with regards to drinking and partying) was often mentioned specifically for Greek organizations. Several respondents did not believe that any type of incentive was appropriate for advising student organizations.

Curriculum connections: Given the current discussion of curriculum reform on campus, faculty were asked about ideas on how to integrate the co-curricular activities of student organizations into the Rollins curriculum. The most overwhelming response, especially for Greek organizations, was that there should not be a connection. For the individuals who did want to see connections, they were different for Greek and non-Greek organizations. The recommendation for non-Greek organizations was to strengthen their connections to specific classes and departments. Recommendations for Greek organizations included highlighting or increasing their service to the campus and community at large.

Followup:

LEFT BLANK FOR SLC TO DECIDE WHAT'S NEXT

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN THE CO-CURRICULUM SURVEY

This year Student Life Committee is examining potential connections between the curriculum and the co-curriculum. To facilitate these connections, faculty must have some level of involvement in student organizations. This survey is intended to assess faculty opinions about student organizations and solicit ideas about linking the curriculum more closely to the co-curriculum. You will be asked a set of questions first about fraternities and sororities, and then about “non-Greek” student organizations.

This survey has been reviewed and approved by the Rollins College Institutional Review Board (IRB). Your responses to this questionnaire are voluntary and anonymous. When you click on the submit button at the bottom of the survey, your responses will be e-mailed to Paul Harris (Chair of Student Life Committee) without any identifying information attached.

A summary report from this survey will be sent to the entire faculty when the research is complete.

If you have any questions, contact Paul Harris pharris@rollins.edu or extension 6316.

The following questions concern fraternities or sororities:

1. Do you currently advise a fraternity or a sorority? Yes No

If Yes, approximately how many hours per semester does your role as advisor require?

2. Have you advised a fraternity or sorority at Rollins in the past? Yes No

If Yes, approximately how many years combined have you spent advising these organizations?

3. Have you ever declined a request to advise a fraternity or sorority? Yes No
4. In your opinion, what motivates faculty members to advise fraternities or sororities?
5. In your opinion, what factors make faculty members reluctant to advise fraternities or sororities?
6. Can you think of anything (e.g., practices, policies, procedures, incentives) that might increase faculty willingness to advise fraternities or sororities?
7. Do you have any ideas about how the co-curricular practices of fraternities and sororities could be better integrated into the curriculum at Rollins?

The following questions concern “non-Greek” student organizations (i.e., organizations that are not fraternities or sororities):

8. Do you currently advise a non-Greek student organization? Yes No

If Yes, approximately how many hours per semester does your role as advisor require?

9. Have you advised non-Greek student organizations at Rollins in the past? Yes No

If Yes, approximately how many years combined have you spent advising these organizations?

10. Have you ever declined a request to advise a non-Greek student organization? Yes No

11. In your opinion, what motivates faculty members to advise non-Greek student organizations?
12. In your opinion, what factors make faculty members reluctant to advise non-Greek student organizations?
13. Can you think of anything (e.g., practices, policies, procedures, incentives) that might increase faculty willingness to advise non-Greek student organizations?
14. Do you have any ideas about how the co-curricular practices of non-Greek student organizations could be better integrated into the curriculum at Rollins?

Information about you:

15. Gender? Female Male
16. Tenure status? 1 Tenured
 2 Working Towards Tenure (Tenure Track)
 3 Non-Tenure Track Position
17. Rank? 1 Instructor 2 Assistant Professor 3 Associate Professor 4 Professor

**Thank you for completing our survey.
Please click the submit button to send your responses to us.
Your responses will be anonymous when we receive them.**