

9-12-2013

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 12, 2013

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

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



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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 12, 2013" (2013). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 5.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/5

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

Executive Committee Sept. 11, 2013

Present: Carol Lauer, Claire Strom, Julian Chambliss, Hoyt Edge, Yusheng Yao, Carol Bresnahan, Robert Salmeron, Bob Smither, David Richard, Bob Sherry, Sharon Carnahan, Toni Holbrook, Mamta Accapadi

The meeting was called to order at 12:30 pm

The minutes from May 2, 2013 were discussed; we will redact information that might identify a specific faculty member during a discussion of policy. We rewrote a phrase, and the minutes were approved.

Bylaws – Bob Sherry said that the changes to article VIII of the A&S by laws aim at 3 purposes: 1) discourage conflicts of interest, 2) define duties of liaison, and 3) streamline relation to Dean's office. Sharon Carnahan noted that a large group of younger faculty are coming up for tenure and promotion, and there are departments where the chairs are untenured or not full professors. Also, there seems to be an increased number of CECs that didn't understand process.

Claire Strom asked if there was a check on whether CECs are put together on time. First, it was pointed out that Dean has veto power over the CEC composition. Smither also said that if no report is submitted on time, it is up to Dean to ask about it, but that it has taken care of itself in the past. He would be surprised if there are CECs not in place now, but he will ask everyone all Chairs.

Edge noted that the foot note defining is ex officio says that they are voting, but in fact the document says that they are non-voting. We need to specify that they are non-voting. The FEC will clarify this. Carol Lauer expressed concerned about non-voting/non-tenured members being present for the vote on tenure or promotion. A discussion followed. Bob Sherry wants to state the issue as positive, so he suggested "only voting members shall be present for the vote." That was accepted.

A discussion followed on Confidentiality. Everyone understood the intent but worried about aspects of how it was stated. Lauer pointed out that letters from FEC or the Dean may cover things covered by confidentiality. What if the committee generates a letter revealing their discussion about the candidate (and we assume they will), could not that letter breach the clause? So, the bylaw might say "exclusive of official documents." Dave Richard pointed out that you need to communicate information to the candidate, but worries if the proposed by law changes eliminate feedback. Bob will discuss these issues with the FEC again. Claire Strom asked if the bylaw shouldn't go through PSC; Carol Lauer responded that these kinds of changes hadn't previously before since FEC is a standing committee and the changes are to merely to clarify policy, not change it.

Mission Statement

Carol Bresnahan said that the presentation was to offer information now. President Duncan wants to meet with the Executive Council every 4-6 weeks. This Council will take up the Mission Statement. When she arrived at Rollins, Carol made suggestions to the Mission

Statement adding the newly created CPS, but A & S did not agree to the specific changes because of several issues, one being the phrase “nationally ranked.” Provost Bresnahan offered 3 proposed ways of expressing the Mission that are to be brought to Executive Council. SACS will require us to bring in CPS (or take out specific mention of any school). Some people suggested leaving out the enumeration of the different schools. Also, the word “selected” should be “selective.” The first part of the Statement seems to express a mission, but then it begins a discussion that is descriptive and not mission-oriented. Further, a mission should be what unites us and not how we are different.

Other Business

Carol Lauer stated that she had talked with Udeth Lugo, who is quite willing to create charts dealing with faculty salaries and issues of compression and gender equity. These are issues that Finance and Service is dealing with.

Reports

Robert Salmeron, President of SGA, reported that first meeting of SGA took place yesterday, and he offered a sign-up sheet for volunteers to serve on faculty governance committees. Since they have large senate, more volunteers signed up for committees than there are official slots. He asked if other students can attend meetings. This was affirmed, but there are no official alternates. Also, there will be forum for the campus to talk about campus climate (working with Mamta Accapadi). It will be open to entire campus on Oct. 19. The SGA wants to improve cohesiveness on campus, they hope good things come out of the discussion rather than just complaints. Toni Holbrook expressed interest in seeing the notes from the forum to include in the SACS document.

Yusheng Yao. Student Affairs will discuss High Impact Practices scholarship; someone will come to explain the scholarship to the committee for the sake of new members. They are also discussing the non-smoking policy and implementation.

Claire Strom reported on Academic Affairs. They have scheduled to the Oct. 2 meeting already; they meet weekly. The new blended learning policy passed. They also approved moving the PE requirement into Competencies as Predictive Health Competency (there will now be 4 competencies); she said that it makes sense to bring it in. PE will come and present the idea to the EC on 10/10.

Julian Chambliss reported on Profession Standards. They will first take up the old business from last year. So, they will take up the discussion of CIEs from last year. They have invited Paul Harris and James Zimmerman to attend a meeting, and they will have colloquium for all faculty. Also, they are looking at the “family leave” policy; there seems to be inconsistency. Also, the deadline for grants is coming up.

Hoyt Edge spoke about the issues Finance and Service is dealing with. He discussed some recent develops in the question of parking on campus; he has had good communication with Jeff Eisenbarth and Ken Miller. There are a couple of other issues that need discussing, and information will be given to the faculty. Carol Lauer asked about the difficulties for Evening students parking. David Richard said he will ask to see if there are student complaints. F& S is

also revisiting the upgrade in faculty travel money last year; we are to evaluate the financial implications of that change this year. The committee will be investigating salary issues this year, particularly issues of compression and gender equity.

Hoyt Edge and Carol Lauer reported on the decision from the Planning and Budget Committee about salary increases for this year. There is a \$2 million shortfall projected in the budget this year; however, the trustees said that this was not a year not to give faculty and staff increases, so options were discussed in the P&BC.; The P&BC recommended that the best option was to give a salary pool of 2%, using the money as a stipend; this means it would be a one-time stipend (given in October or November), and it would not be added to the base salary nor would retirement contributions be made. However, an attempt would be made by the P&BC, administration, (and faculty chairs) to find cost reductions enabling the increases to be added to base salaries.

Mamta Accapadi said that she just wanted to say hello to the group and to be open for questions. She said that one of her strengths is thick skin and encourages options and even criticisms from faculty. She pointed out that she has “never belonged” anywhere academically. She does not fit classically into Student Affairs or Academic Affairs only, but she has had experience in both so she can be thoughtful about the whole community, which is her focus. Mamta said that we are doing so much right at Rollins. It is OK to have tensions if the discussion is about how to create student success and creating life-long learners. She wants to serve everyone and is not a turf person. Part of her background is multi-cultural affairs. She finished by saying that critiques make compliments more solemn.

SACS

Carol Bresnahan and Toni Holbrook discussed several issues. Bresnahan pointed out that 128 credit hours is more the industry standard than 140. Bresnahan said that Lauer felt more comfortable populating SACS committees by working through the EC. In consultation with Holbrook, membership for a suggested implementation committee was developed as follows: Chair of AAC or designee; chair of CPS Curriculum Committee or designee; representatives from dean’s office (2-Cavanaugh and Huebner; student success representative suggested by Harte Weyant; A&S/CPS student records representative (Mateo or designee); Holt student records representative (Lusk or designee); SGA presidents from A&S/CPS and Holt. The committee would be about 10 people. Suggestions for others to be in core or to be represented at appropriate times were: Athletics (Parker or designee), Finance (Short or designee). It was asked if 3-2 programs should be represented.

Strom asked how and when we might change to 128 credits; Bresnahan responded that it would probably be when we go to the new GER. Strom then asked whether, when A&S passed 128, it was linked to 5+ program; it is coupled? Bresnahan answered that it is; otherwise we can’t pay for the 5+. Strom asked if we could envision an earlier start to the 5+ program since we’re staffing GER, and it is starting early. Bresnahan answered that we can if we are committed to the GER implementation. We can start the GER changes in fall 2015, but 5+ could start a semester before (spring 2015). It was asked whether or not we will grandfather in the 128 requirement? Bresnahan responded that having two systems seems difficult, so it looks like everyone would be converted, but there will be more discussion. Lauer asked if it matters for

SACS if majors have 68 credits. Holbrook responded that she did not believe so; the GERs must be at least 30 semester hours, bachelor's degrees must be at least 120 semester hours, and 25% of the classes in major program must be taught by Ph.D.s or faculty with other terminal degrees. Otherwise, we make our own policy and then must abide by those policies.

SACS policies. SACS gives us a template indicating those core, comprehensive, and Federal standards where institutional policies are required. There are approximately 100 standards with which the College must comply for reaffirmation of accreditation—a plethora—, of those, 20 require written policies. Holbrook completed an audit of policies during the summer that indicated about 12 policies needing to be written or rewritten to accommodate SACS. They are in different categories and are located in multiple locations, from the Faculty Handbook to the HR website to the Student Code of Rights and Responsibilities to Catalogs. The first policy that has been written is a “Policy on the Creation and Publication of Policies.” A draft will be given to the EC for informational purposes and for affirmation of the academic policy approval processes it articulates (taken from Faculty Bylaws); they will then go to P&BC for further review, prior to President's Cabinet, and President's final approval. We looked at the Policy on Policies and a second SACS-required elaboration of the existing Academic Credit Hours and Levels of Courses policy. Suggestions were made to make issues clearer and consistent with practice and with blended learning in the credit hour policy. Holbrook will forward to Lauer an electronic copy of the proposed Policy on Policies, and a revised version of the Credit Hour Policy for additional review.

Lauer announced that Lauer and Ouellette are meeting with a group of Trustees tomorrow for breakfast.

The meeting concluded at 2:05

FEC
Proposed By Laws Change -- Comparative Version

Section 1.

Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

+++++

◆ Proposed

◆ Current

While the composition and structure of a Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) varies among departments, normally the *minimum* membership is three individuals and the Department Chair or a senior departmental faculty member serves as the CEC Chair.

The Department Chair in which the candidate holds appointment (or Chairs for joint appointments), in consultation with departmental members, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) in conformity the requirements set forth below (sec.1-5), on or before May 15 prior to the academic year in which the candidate's evaluation takes place. In selecting a candidate's CEC, the Department Chair may wish to consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences, since the Dean retains authority to *disapprove* the CEC's composition.

The Chair of the department to which the candidate has been appointed, in consultation with members of that department, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee by May 15 prior to the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as CEC chair.

1. Voting Membersshp For Tenure and Promotion Evaluations:

A candidate's *voting* CEC shall normally consist of the Department Chair (unless the Chair is being evaluated) and a *minimum* of two additional tenured members of the department who are selected by a majority of all full-time members of the department, without excluding qualified tenured members who wish to serve. Only tenured associate professors and full professors may vote on the promotion of assistant professors. Only full professors are eligible to vote on the promotions of associate professors. If the chair is untenured or does not hold the rank for which the candidate is making application, the *voting* CEC, in consultation with the Dean, shall select an appropriate CEC and CEC Chair.

The CEC normally consists of the Chair of the department (unless the Chair is being evaluated) and a minimum of two additional tenured members of the department who are selected by a majority of all full-time members of the department, without excluding tenured members who wish to serve. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as CEC chair.

For candidates with an appointment in more than one department or program, the CEC, with the advice of the candidate, will add to the CEC one more tenured faculty member, or non-tenured faculty member, if a tenured faculty member is unavailable. This faculty member should have greater familiarity with the work of the candidate outside the department to which the candidate was appointed. If such a faculty member is unavailable, the Chair of the Professional Standards Committee will select a tenured faculty member to serve on the CEC.

2. Special Circumstances:

Where three qualified (per sec. 1 above) tenured members of the department are unavailable, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, in consultation with the Department Chair, candidate and the department, shall select tenured faculty members from outside the department (or in very rare instances from outside the College), to serve as *voting* or *non-voting* CEC members.

If two additional tenured members of the department are unavailable, nontenured members may be appointed. If non-tenured members are unavailable, the department Chair, with the advice of the candidate and the approval of the CEC, will select tenured members from outside the department to serve on the CEC.

3. Non-Voting CEC Membership:

Departments are encouraged to include tenure-track (for tenure evaluations) and tenured associate professors (for promotion evaluations) faculty as *ex officio*¹ (*non-voting*) CEC members, so that those faculty members may confidentially review material submitted, provide information, and gain knowledge about Rollins evaluative standards, policies, and practices.

4. FEC Liaison:

A member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (the FEC Liaison) serves on each tenure or promotion committee as an *ex officio*² (*non-voting*) member. The FEC liaison's primary functions are to provide procedural information and support to the CEC/candidate, promote compliance with departmental criteria, and insure institutional uniformity.

In addition, a member of the FEC serves as an ex officio (non-voting) member when the candidate is being evaluated for tenure or promotion.

5. Confidentiality:

A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment and promotion matter is considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics. In this regard, the entirety of a candidate's tenure and promotion proceeding shall be held in strict confidence by all participants. The opinions expressed by the Rollins administration, faculty, or by internal or external referees shall not be discussed with the candidate or with other parties. The Department Chair or his/her designee (including but not limited to the CEC Chair) shall convey whatever information needs to be transmitted to the candidate in a timely fashion.

The CEC Chair shall send notice of the CEC's composition to the FEC, Dean, and candidate by June 1.

The chair of the CEC will notify the FEC, the Dean, and the candidate of the members of the CEC by June 1.

¹"Ex officio" is a Latin term meaning "by virtue of office or position." Ex-officio members of boards and committees, therefore, are persons who are members by virtue of some other office or position that they hold. For example, if the bylaws of an organization provide for a Committee on Finance consisting of the treasurer and three other members appointed by the president, the treasurer is said to be an ex-officio member of the finance committee, since he or she is automatically a member of that committee by virtue of the fact that he or she holds the office of treasurer.

Without exception, ex-officio members of boards and committees have exactly the same rights and privileges as do all other members, including, of course, the right to vote. Source: The Official Roberts Rules of Order Website - <http://www.robertsrules.com/>

² See *id.*

FEC
Proposed By Laws Change
New Version

Section 1.

Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

While the composition and structure of a Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) varies among departments, normally the *minimum* membership is three individuals and the Department Chair or a senior departmental faculty member serves as the CEC Chair.

The Department Chair in which the candidate holds appointment (or Chairs for joint appointments), in consultation with departmental members, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) in conformity the requirements set forth below (sec.1-5), on or before May 15 prior to the academic year in which the candidate's evaluation takes place. In selecting a candidate's CEC, the Department Chair may wish to consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences (Dean), as the Dean retains authority to *disapprove* the CEC's composition.

1. Voting Membership For Tenure and Promotion Evaluations:

A candidate's *voting* CEC shall normally consist of the Chair of the department (unless the Chair is being evaluated) and a *minimum* of two additional tenured members of the department who are selected by a majority of all full-time members of the department, without excluding qualified tenured members who wish to serve. Only tenured associate professors and full professors may vote on the promotion of assistant professors. Only full professors are eligible to vote on the promotions of associate professors. If the chair is untenured or does not hold the rank for which the candidate is making application, the *voting* CEC, in consultation with the Dean of Arts and Sciences, shall select an appropriate CEC and CEC Chair.

2. Special Circumstances:

Where three qualified (per sec. 1 above) tenured members of the department are unavailable, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, in consultation with the Department Chair, candidate and the department, shall select tenured faculty members from outside the department (or in very rare instances from outside the College), to serve as *voting* or *non-voting* CEC members.

3. Non-Voting CEC Membership:

Departments are encouraged to include tenure-track (for tenure evaluations) and tenured associate professors (for promotion evaluations) faculty as *ex officio*¹ (*non-voting*) CEC members, so that those faculty members may confidentially review material submitted, provide information, and gain knowledge about Rollins evaluative standards, policies, and practices.

¹"Ex officio" is a Latin term meaning "by virtue of office or position." Ex-officio members of boards and committees, therefore, are persons who are members by virtue of some other office or position that they hold. For example, if the bylaws of an organization provide for a Committee on Finance consisting of the treasurer and three other members appointed by the president, the treasurer is said to be an ex-officio member of the finance committee, since he or she is automatically a member of that committee by virtue of the fact that he or she holds the office of treasurer. Without exception, ex-officio members of boards and committees have exactly the same rights and privileges as do all other members, including, of course, the right to vote. Source: The Official Roberts Rules of Order Website - <http://www.robertsrules.com/>

4. FEC Liaison:

A member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (the FEC Liaison) serves on each tenure or promotion committee as an *ex officio*² (*non-voting*) member. The FEC liaison's primary functions are to provide procedural information and support to the CEC/candidate, promote compliance with departmental criteria, and insure institutional uniformity.

5. Confidentiality:

A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment and promotion matter is considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics. In this regard, the entirety of a candidate's tenure and promotion proceeding should be held in strict confidence by all participants. The opinions expressed by the Rollins administration, faculty, or by internal or external referees shall not be discussed with the candidate or with other parties. The Department Chair or his/her designee (including but not limited to the CEC Chair) shall convey whatever information needs to be transmitted to the candidate in a timely fashion.

The CEC Chair shall send notice of the CEC's composition to the FEC, Dean, and candidate by June 1.

² See *id.*

Current Mission Statement (<http://www.rollins.edu/provost/documents/All-Faculty-of-RC-Bylaws.pdf>)

Rollins College educates students for global citizenship and responsible leadership, empowering graduates to pursue meaningful lives and productive careers. We are committed to the liberal arts ethos and guided by its values and ideals. Our guiding principles are excellence, innovation, and community.

Rollins is a comprehensive liberal arts college. Rollins is nationally recognized for its distinctive undergraduate Arts & Sciences program. The Crummer Graduate School of Business offers a nationally ranked MBA program. The Hamilton Holt School serves the community through exceptional undergraduate and graduate evening degree and outreach programs. We provide opportunities to explore diverse intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic traditions. We are dedicated to scholarship, academic achievement, creative accomplishment, cultural enrichment, social responsibility, and environmental stewardship. We value excellence in teaching and rigorous, transformative education in a healthy, responsive, and inclusive environment.

(We understand the mission statement as now written to include the College of Professional Studies.)

Proposed Revisions

Rollins College educates students for global citizenship and responsible leadership, empowering graduates to pursue meaningful lives and productive careers. We are committed to the liberal arts ethos and guided by its values and ideals. Our guiding principles are excellence, innovation, and community.

Rollins is a comprehensive liberal arts college. Rollins is nationally recognized for its distinctive undergraduate Arts & Sciences [and Professional Studies](#) programs. The Crummer Graduate School of Business offers nationally [recognized high-quality master's and doctoral](#) programs. The Hamilton Holt School serves the community through exceptional undergraduate and graduate evening degree and outreach programs. We provide opportunities to explore diverse intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic traditions. We are dedicated to scholarship, academic achievement, creative accomplishment, cultural enrichment, social responsibility, and environmental stewardship. We value excellence in teaching and rigorous, transformative education in a healthy, responsive, and inclusive environment.

OR

Rollins is a comprehensive liberal arts college. Rollins is nationally recognized for its distinctive undergraduate [and selected graduate](#) programs. We provide opportunities to explore diverse intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic traditions. We are dedicated to scholarship, academic achievement, creative accomplishment, cultural enrichment, social responsibility, and environmental stewardship. We value excellence in teaching and rigorous, transformative education in a healthy, responsive, and inclusive environment.

OR

Rollins is a comprehensive liberal arts college. Rollins is nationally recognized, [with](#) distinctive undergraduate programs [in liberal arts \[or arts and sciences\] and professional studies](#). The Crummer Graduate School of Business offers nationally [recognized high-quality masters and doctoral](#) programs. The Hamilton Holt School serves the community through exceptional undergraduate and graduate evening degree and outreach programs. We provide opportunities to explore diverse intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic traditions. We are dedicated to scholarship, academic achievement, creative accomplishment, cultural enrichment, social responsibility, and environmental stewardship. We value excellence in teaching and rigorous, transformative education in a healthy, responsive, and inclusive environment.



ROLLINS
Proposed Policy

Title:	Academic Credit Hours and Levels of Courses	Type:	Academic
Approval Date:	Click here to enter a date.	Issued:	Click here to enter a date.
Approved By:		Revised:	Click here to enter a date.
Responsible Office:	VP for Academic Affairs & Provost	Review:	Click here to enter a date.

NOTE: TEXT REVISIONS TO EXISTING POLICY SHOWN IN RED OR BLUE AND REPRESENT ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION REQUIRED BY THE US DEPT OF EDUCATION AND SACS|COC.

I. Purpose/Introduction/Rationale

Academic credit provides a means of measuring and valuing the amount of engaged learning time expected of students enrolled not only in traditional classroom settings, but also in other settings, like laboratories, studios, internships/practica, independent study, thesis or dissertation research and writing, experiential learning, and blended or hybrid learning environments. Academic credit may also help to quantify the level and academic rigor of student learning. The 1906 Carnegie Classification Unit is commonly accepted as the historical standard for determination of academic credit in higher education and informs the Rollins policy for determining and awarding academic credit.¹

II. Definition

In accordance with Federal regulations and for the purposes of this policy, at Rollins the semester hour is used to measure, calculate, record, and interpret the number of credit hours accumulated by students in completing degree requirements. Factors for determining semester hours awarded in the Rollins definition include student time on task, subject competency, and achievement of learning outcomes attained by a typical student engaged in focused study for a designated period of time. Factors contributing to student time on task for purposes of awarding academic credit at Rollins may be comprised of contact time, independent preparation or study time outside of the classroom, and/or the educational experience.

III. Procedure or Application

This policy applies to all courses that award academic credit as described in the sections that follow (e.g., any course that appears on an official transcript issued by the College) regardless of the mode of delivery including, but not limited to, traditional lecture-discussion, independent study, hybrid/on-line, seminar, laboratory, or other formats. Academic units and appropriate faculty governance bodies are responsible for ensuring that academic credit is awarded only for work that meets the requirements outlined in this policy.

Undergraduate Course Credit

Undergraduate course credit is typically determined on the basis of classroom contact time and out of class expectations, or equivalent factors as outlined previously. Rollins undergraduate faculty expect

undergraduate students to spend three hours outside of class each week working on course-related activities for every one hour spent in the classroom, an increased expectation from the commonly accepted higher education practice that students spend approximately two hours outside of class for every one hour spent in classroom instruction.

Examples:

For a typical four-semester-hour lecture-discussion undergraduate course, the College schedules three 50-minute sessions of classroom instruction per week in a 15-week semester, a total of 150 minutes per week and 2,250 minutes (37.5 hours) per semester. Course learning outcomes and assignments are designed to require a typical student to spend an additional 540 minutes (9 hours) per week, or 8,100 minutes (135 hours) per semester, in out-of-class preparation. The total engaged learning time for the semester is 10,350 minutes (172.5 hours).

Non-laboratory courses that meet a fourth or a fifth hour a week earn a maximum of five semester hours/credit units. Laboratory courses earn up to five or six credit units/semester hours depending on the length of the laboratories (two or four hours).

Studio and performance courses generally earn two to three credit units/semester hours. Academic Credit units awarded for short-term courses of variable length are awarded is determined proportionally based on the following calculations: each semester hour of unit of academic credit requires a minimum of 8.125 contact hours per term.

Validation of factors contributing to and calculation of academic credit (semester hours) awarded -hours and levels of courses are determined by academic departments or programs. Proposals and are then reviewed and approved by the appropriate faculty governance bodies. Academic Affairs Committee.

Graduate Course Credit

Graduate academic credit is typically determined on the basis of classroom contact time and out of class expectations, or equivalent factors as outlined previously. A typical lecture-discussion graduate course may be valued at three or four hours per course, using the contact time and out-of-class formulas noted below.

Examples:

For a typical three-semester-hour graduate level lecture-discussion course, the College schedules one 150-minute session of classroom instruction per week in a 15-week semester, a total of 2,250 minutes (37.5 hours) per semester. Course learning outcomes and assignments are designed to require a typical student to spend an additional 360 minutes (6 hours) per week, or 5,400 minutes (90 hours) per semester, in out-of-class preparation. The total engaged learning time for the semester is 7,650 minutes (127.5 hours).

For a typical four-semester-hour graduate level lecture-discussion course, the College schedules three 50-minute sessions of classroom instruction per week in a 15-week semester, a total of 150 minutes per week and 2,250 minutes (37.5 hours) per semester. Course learning outcomes and assignments are designed to require a typical student to spend an additional 540 minutes (9 hours) per week, or 8,100 minutes (135 hours) per semester, in out-of-class preparation. The total engaged learning time for the semester is 10,350 minutes (172.5 hours).

Academic credit awarded for short-term courses of variable length at the graduate level is determined proportionally based on the following calculation: each semester hour of academic credit requires a minimum of 8.125 contact hours per term.

Validation of factors contributing to and calculation of academic credit (semester hours) awarded and levels of courses are determined by academic departments. Proposals are then reviewed and approved by the appropriate faculty governance bodies.

IV. Related Policies or Applicable Publications

Current Location of Policy:

Faculty Handbook, Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences, Section IV, Policies and Procedures, Part B. Academic Policies.

Proposed Location of Policy:

Faculty Handbook, **All Faculty of Rollins College, Section II Policies and Procedures**, Policy on Academic Credit Hours and Levels of Courses

V. Appendices/Supplemental Materials

None.

VI. Rationale for Revision

Alignment with 2012 revisions to Federal and regional accreditation requirements.

ⁱThe Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/faqs>) notes, "The unit was developed in 1906 as a measure of the amount of time a student has studied a subject. For example, a total of 120 hours in one subject -- meeting 4 or 5 times a week for 40 to 60 minutes, for 36 to 40 weeks each year -- earns the student one 'unit' of high school credit. Fourteen units were deemed to constitute the minimum amount of preparation that could be interpreted as "four years of academic or high school preparation."