

3-2-2017

Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, March 2, 2017

College of Liberal Arts 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

College of Liberal Arts Faculty, Rollins College, "Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, March 2, 2017" (2017).
The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes. 122.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/122

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



ROLLINS

College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting

March 2, 2017

Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes
- III. Announcements
- IV. New Business
- a. Proposal: Structural Changes in rFLA (c/o CC, EC)
- V. Committee Reports
- a. Executive Committee (Dexter Boniface)
- b. Curriculum Committee (Mario D'Amato)
 - i. Reporting item: Proposals for the Faculty (c/o Task Force on the Undergraduate Curriculum)
 - ii. Colloquies to gather feedback: Friday, March 3 @ 4pm in Bush 176 and Wed., March 8 @ 4pm in Bush 176
- c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Eric Smaw)



ROLLINS
Meeting Minutes
March 2, 2017

Present

Agee, Sharon; Allen, Barry; Almond, Joshua; Anderson, Mark; Armenia, Amy; Barnes, Melissa; Barreneche, Gabriel; Bernal, Pedro; Biery-Hamilton, Gay; Boguslawski, Alexander; Boles, Bill; Bommelje, Rick; Boniface, Dexter; Boulanger, Michele; Brown, Shan-Estelle; Carnahan, Sharon; Cavanaugh, Jennifer; Chambliss, Julian; Charles, David; Cheng, Martha; Coyle, Whitney; D'Amato, Mario; Davidson, Alice; Davison, Joan; Decker, Nancy; Dennis, Kimberly; DiQuattro, Marianne; Dunn, Stacey; Ewing, Hannah; Fetscherin, Marc; Fokidis, Bobby; Forsythe, Matthew; Freeman, Sarah; French, Todd; Fuse, Christopher; Garcia, Mattea; Gilmore, Zackary; Gunter, Mike; Habgood, Laurel; Hammonds, Joshua; Harper, Fiona; Harris, Paul; Harper, Jonathan; Hotchkiss, Renee; Jackson, Karen; Kenyon, Erik; Kistler, Ashley; Kline, Nolan; Kodzi, Emmanuel; Kodzi, Ivy; Lackman, Susan; Libby, Susan; Lines, Lee; McClure, Amy; Mesavage, Matilde; Miller, Jonathan; Moore, Thomas; Mourino, Edwin; Myers, Daniel; Nichter, Matthew; Niles, Nancy; Nodine, Emily; O'Sullivan, Maurice; Ouellette, Thomas; Painter, David; Park, Ellane; Patrone, James; Peng, Zhaochang; Pett, Timothy; Pieczynski, Jay; Reich, Paul; Riley, Kasandra; Roe, Dawn; Rogers, Donald; Russell, Emily; Ryan, MacKenzie Moon; Sardy, Marc; Schoen, Steven; Sharek, Julie; Simmons, Rachel; Smaw, Eric; St. John, Steven; Stephenson, Paul; Stone, Anne; Strom, Claire; Summet, Valerie; Sutherland, Katie; Svitavsky, Bill; Tillmann, Lisa; Vander Poppen, Robert; Vitray, Rick; Walsh, Susan; Walton, Rachel; Winet, Kristin; Witmer, Sunni; Yao, Yusheng; Zhang, Wenxian

Call to Order

Faculty President Dexter Boniface called the meeting to order at 12:35 pm.

Approval of the Minutes

Approval of the CLA faculty meeting minutes from December 2, 2016.
Minutes approved by voice vote.

Announcements

Boniface: On behalf of Jonathan Miller, There will be an open forum for faculty 3-4pm on Wednesday March 8th in the Olin Library Meeting Room. This is one of a number of open forums to come out of the strategic planning process. This one concerns proposals coming out of the Retention & Graduation Rates (led by Susan, Faye, and Mamta) and the Post-Graduate Direction & Success (led by Jenny Queen and Lisa Johnson) taskforces. The forum will be an opportunity to learn more about and discuss proposals that have implications for advising, opportunities to integrate career and life planning into the curriculum, and the idea of a single hub of student services located in a central location on campus, probably in Olin Library.

If you are interested in any of these ideas, please read the reports of the two taskforces available on Blackboard, and come along to the forum – 3-4pm, Wednesday, March 3rd, Library Meeting Room. There will be cookies.

Sharon Carnahan: We are pleased to tell you that the Rollins College Research Center has moved into Hume House. The president, development office, and department of psychology are excited to host an Open House on Monday. If you are unable to make the open house but have questions or desire to visit the new facility our new e-mail address is hume@rollins.edu.

Boniface: Overview of upcoming election cycle in faculty governance:

Divisions	Executive Committee	Curriculum Committee	Faculty Affairs Committee
Business	<i>Marc Fetscherin</i>	<i>Nick Houndonougbo</i>	<i>Michele Boulanger</i>
Expressive Arts	<i>Robert Vander Poppen</i>	VACANCY	<i>Marianne DiQuattro</i>
Humanities	VACANCY	VACANCY	VACANCY
Science and Mathematics	VACANCY	VACANCY	VACANCY
Social Sciences	VACANCY	VACANCY	VACANCY
Social Sciences-Applied	<i>Jim McLaughlin</i>	<i>Mattea Garcia</i>	<i>Joshua Hammonds</i>

At-Large Representatives	Executive Committee	Curriculum Committee	Faculty Affairs Committee
#1	VACANCY (President)	VACANCY	VACANCY (two-year)
#2	n/a	<i>Jonathan Harwell</i>	VACANCY (two-year)
#3	n/a	<i>Nancy Niles</i>	VACANCY (one-year)
#4	n/a	<i>Zhaochang Peng</i>	n/a

Election Calendar:

Divisional Cycle:

March 2: Call for divisional nominations for vacancies on standing committees

March 9-10: Close and distribute nominations

March 20-22: Elections for divisional representatives

At-large and Advisory Cycle

March 23: Call for at-large nominations to EC (i.e., President), CC, FAC, and any and all vacancies on College Advisory Committees including Diversity Council, FACIP, Internationalization, and Student Life); also: ratification of FEC, Appeals Committee slates (anticipated)

March 30: Close and distribute nominations

April 6: Elections for at-large representatives to EC (President), CC, FAC,, and All Vacancies of Advisory committee (nominations will be accepted from the floor)

Rick Vitray: as far as I recollect, we've never done this electronically. We've always done it at divisional meetings.

Fiona Harper: We've done it both ways.

Boniface: Perhaps I am overgeneralizing from my own experience in my division, but I can say that we did conduct these elections this way last year.

Vitray: Can we vote in our meeting next week?

Boniface: I'll be transparent here. There's desire from some divisions to have the ability to conduct voting in an anonymous fashion. A division could certainly meet and discuss,

Vitray: You haven't answered my question.

Boniface: I'm not prepared to unilaterally make a procedural or bylaws decision at this moment. I would want to consult with my colleagues on EC, including Rick Vitray, about this question.

We encourage each of you to consider volunteering for these important service opportunities.

New Business

Proposal: Structural Changes in rFLA (c/o CC, EC) [Attachment #1]

Claire Strom: We are planning, as we have always been planning, to have a holistic analysis of the curriculum, which will start in Spring 2017. This is not in place of that at all. This fall will be the first time that the full curriculum has been running. We have always said there would be places that we discovered that weren't running smoothly and we need to tinker to address those issues.

These first proposed changes to course numbering and concurrent enrollment allow for that tinkering to address problems, particularly of students concern over lack of choice and ease of advising.

Kim Dennis: Can you address how this will impact assessment?

Strom: That's the next point.

After teaching a few rounds of 300s, we've determined that we're assessing too much at once. The more we dig into the rubrics we discover concerns. The integrative learning rubric, for instance, is incomprehensible. Although we need to be teaching ethical reasoning, the way the rubric is written, it's basically written for philosophers to teach, which is difficult for other disciplines. We will still be pursuing the double touch idea: for example, Written Communication is addressed in the WCMP/ENG 140 and the rFLA 300 level. The information literacy assessment is going well; we have good partnerships with the librarians.

These changes will make it easier for the faculty and the assessors in the summer; it will cost less because we will be paying fewer assessors; and we will be able to keep the work we've done so far since we are dropping some assessment, but not moving it to other levels.

I move that we approve the proposed structural changes to rFLA.

Lisa Tillmann seconded.

Nancy Decker: If this passes can we make this available already in the spring?

Strom: If we're not going to assess ethical reasoning going forward, there's no reason to assess it now. It's comments like that from faculty that make it clear that these are changes we should make.

Laurel Habgood: if this passes, how do I advise my students who need a 150 vs a 200?

Strom: I will work with Karla to change the language in the catalogue. If they still need a 150, they take a 200. If they have taken a 150, they can count it as a 200.

Boniface: Seeing the end of debate, I would move on to the vote.

Motion: Do you support the proposed structural changes to the rFLA curriculum? Motion passes by 92%.

Committee Reports

Executive Committee, Dexter Boniface

Boniface: Martha Cheng was elected to fill a vacancy on the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Curriculum Committee, Mario D'Amato (chair)

Proposals for the Faculty (c/o Task Force on the Undergraduate Curriculum)

[Attachment #2]

D'Amato: Much of this material should be familiar to you, the task force received a charge from the president, held colloquia to discuss related questions and ideas, and have returned to the faculty with a more specific proposal. We'll present the proposals today, answer questions for clarification, then host two colloquies tomorrow and next Wednesday.

Strom: At this point we're looking for questions of clarity, then we can have discussions at the colloquies. The first proposal allows for a deferred, deliberative declaration of major. Students will come in as "exploring" or "exploring—x" and then have an opportunity to declare a major once they've taken courses in that department.

Amy Armenia: The second and third proposals are linked by an underlying principle that local knowledge within departments makes them best able to assess the needs of their students.

Strom: The fourth measure goes back to the first measure. When Mark, Jenny, and I were first imagining the implementation of the curriculum, we were trying to figure out a way to exempt a student from taking a course in the division of their major. But a student could be declared in a major, but never take a course in it. With a deferred declaration of major, we now have a mechanism to do this. Students would not have to do this, but particularly in the sciences and the arts—where major students are sometimes bored in the more general courses—this would help both students'

experience of the curriculum and staffing concerns.

Robert Vander Poppen: two points of clarification: Do we anticipate there being any problems with departments that offer scholarships based on declaration of major?

Strom: No. Mario has worked very closely with the involved departments, the development office, and admissions to make sure that those scholarships won't be in jeopardy.

Vander Poppen: In the system we're considering moving to, you say two courses in divisions beside the ones they are considering for the major. Should that include the RCC?

Strom: We're waiting to hold the colloquia to see how people feel about that.

Socky O'Sullivan: Having worked on planning committees, I appreciate the work here and know how difficult it can be. I also know we have a tendency at Rollins to "precompromise." I see some missing proposals in this document. First: we need to consider the relationship between the co-curriculum and the curriculum. Questions have been raised about fraternity life, but the answer seemed to be that it was off the table. If our students and demographics have changed since the 1950s, why hasn't our social culture also changed? What is the appropriate relationship of the curriculum and the co-curriculum. Second question—and I know it's sensitive—in the recent dark ages of Duncan, many things happened that did not involve broad discussions. One of the things that should be on the table is the appropriate number of courses for majors. Historically that has always been a matter for dialogue. That's a very important thing for all of us to be talking about. We also need to consider our strange mission statement, which calls us a "comprehensive liberal arts college." That's not smart. We can be "comprehensive" or "liberal arts," but there's no such thing as both. Finally, I want to offer an advertisement of Thomas Ouellette's production of *Love's Labors Lost* at the Orlando Shakespeare theater.

Strom: I think the co-curriculum is beyond the scope of our discussion today.

Armenia: Our guiding approach was to take a light touch and emphasize departmental autonomy. Looking at the number of courses is certainly a measure that departments have taken successfully to ease staffing requirements.

Carnahan: This question arose because of the large number of business majors. I don't really see that addressed here. I see this tangentially, gently touching on those issues without directly addressing them. I am also disturbed by general education requirements reduced to as few as four classes. Four neighborhood classes appears to be a reduction in strength for the student.

D'amato: The charge that came from Grant wasn't specific about a major. But when you look at the 6 largest majors, 2 of them are the business majors. Those facts are unavoidable. We weren't going to come up with an ad hoc proposal that tried to take down a single major. Because that would be unprincipled.

Carnahan: I find your rephrasing of my question to be somewhat of concern. You rephrased my question as though I was seeking "to take down a major in an ad hoc way." You talked about great disparities in numbers of students in majors and while some of these measures might achieve that slowly over time, they won't have any immediate, significant impact.

Strom: To address your second question about the neighborhoods, in the past if you

took a gen ed course in your major, you got credit for both the general education course and the major curriculum.

David Charles: I see two ramifications of not taking a gen ed course within your division. As a student, you might not find that major within your division. An art historian may not discover they have a passion for music. At Rollins, internal recruitment is essential. I worry about students lost to this process if they attempt to find a streamlined path through the curriculum. Second, pedagogically, the students within the division are often the risk takers and the modelers for the other students in the class. We sometimes talk about these classes as teaching an oil painting because of the loss of conversancy that students have in the field. I worry that this proposal will water down the material further and further because there's no student in the class to serve in that modeling role.

Strom: We should talk about that more tomorrow or next week

Jennifer Cavanaugh: The proposal encourages departments to look at current staffing and make decisions about their major. Is that working on the assumption that they won't be getting additional positions? Are we seeing those questions as a zero sum game?

Armenia: If you've set your criteria for the appropriate size, taken autonomous measures and they haven't worked, then that becomes part of the case made in future staffing requests.

D'Amato: After the bylaws revision of the spring and fall, requests for lines fall into a three step process: CC feedback, EC ranking, Dean and Provost decision. Bylaws are asking these committees and departments to make considerations based on resource and institutional mission.

Decker: In this written language there is a designation of "permanent lecturer" and I'm not certain what the committee has thought that meant.

D'Amato: we were using language for what counts as a faculty position for voting purposes.

Decker: Jenny has been doing some careful consideration on what the term lecturer means and I encourage us to stay in dialog on that question.

D'Amato: We'll see you all tomorrow.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Eric Smaw (chair)

Smaw: We have received a report from Chris Fuse on Student Faculty Collaborative Scholarship; those decisions will be made soon. A series of bylaws changes have been sent to EC and we plan to retreat over those proposed changes. The Compensation Task Force has been meeting with Grant and Susan about our findings. We anticipate showing you our findings at the faculty meeting on March 23. Right after that meeting we'll have colloquia set up for whatever you would like to express and you'll hear from Toni Holbrook about the scheduling for those meetings. You'll also get a faculty survey, for those faculty who would prefer a written feedback process. A team from the task force will organize that feedback to inform our proposal that will ultimately go to Grant. Before we send that proposal, we'll come back to you.

Lisa Tillmann: A group of us has been asking since the 2nd of September for a series of meetings that would not take place in a room like this where we have our backs to each other and that would be expertly facilitated by one of the many experts in group dialog we have on this campus. We have asked for this over and over again. We feel like we

have been completely disregarded and blown off. We did not need data to come together to talk about our history and how we've gotten to our current salary structures. We do not need data to talk about our values. I want to express my continued frustration with process. We've been after our new administrators about transparency and openness. I expect the same thing from my colleagues and I don't feel like we're getting that with respect to this question.

Joan Davison: Why isn't the work of this committee public? Other committees make their work transparent. We've had problems in the past when there hasn't been broad participation in the process, then we've rejected the outcome in the end. I don't understand why we couldn't talk about the broad philosophical principles of a salary policy without having data about what our benchmark schools are doing.

Smaw: We're talking about faculty salaries at a private school that has a policy that faculty salaries aren't to be disclosed. That's what has been told to me over and over. To the question of why we aren't working in full disclosure, it's because we have to balance privacy and transparency.

Tillmann: None of us is asking to see particular faculty member's salaries. You know that is not what we're seeking.

Smaw: One dimension is the balance between privacy and transparency. Another dimension is that some of the is done by the staff, it's not all done by us. That's coming from Udeth Lugo and Matt Hawks. If you want to ask them, I don't know what they'll say. With respect to the comment and question about small group discussions and philosophy. The colloquies will be set up for opportunities for people to exchange in smaller rooms. As to the question of whether or not we plan to talk at you or talk to you, I intend to present the information, take a seat, take out a notepad and record your comments and questions. I have no intention of talking at you; I am quite interested in what the faculty will have to say. As I said at first, I was not the administrator who set salaries, I am not the administrator who established our current salary policy.

Kim Dennis: With regard to the issue of transparency, there's an important difference between seeking information about specific salaries and what we're seeking, which is transparency of process. You're saying that you want to be transparent, but the frustration you're hearing is because we've been told there would be opportunities to hear from faculty and now we're being told those will come in April. Nowhere in the entire strategic planning report on compensation does the word gender occur. We've been promised forums and they're now happening in April. There's a contradiction between saying you're being transparent and this process.

Smaw: I'll talk about gender. On the question of gender, gender is one of the serious questions on the faculty salary study and review. You say the word gender appears nowhere in the strategic planning documents, that may be true, but we are diving deeply into that question. In terms of concern over opportunities: they are happening, but they are not happening early. We have difficult and serious work to do and we're trying to operate in a slow and methodical way. Everyone on this committee understands that if this is not done well and not done right, then the faculty will suffer. If I have to take criticism for moving too slowly, I will take it because if we do this poorly there will be negative consequences. We have to get the president something that he can take to the Board of Trustees and we have to establish our care and credibility in that process.

Dennis: No one is critiquing a careful and methodical process. We don't know what is happening behind closed doors. We have been asking for the opportunity to provide input since September.

Smaw: Joan was asking about the order of operations. When we determined our list of benchmarks, we discovered that the lists we had been using in the past were quite different than our actual list of schools. We believe we have needed to be on the same page. There's an expression: You have to know where you are before you know where you're going. I want to emphasize, though, there's no objective, single way to do this.

Libby: Are you saying that the task force is comparing our salaries to other institutions?

Smaw: We're doing both external analysis and internal analysis.

Libby: There really is quite a lot of data that show consistently year after year, that Rollins salaries are lower than what appear to be our peer institutions. Why can't that be discussed? We're talking about data that are already out there. It seems clear that we're paid less than other institutions.

Smaw: We will have that discussion on March 23. I have started this process with the principle that I will allow the data to tell me where faculty salaries are rather than moving forward with assumptions. Some is AAUP data, some is CUPA data, some is internal data. The more you scratch the surface, each data set has virtues and can tell you some things, at other points they fail. We will discuss those complexities

O'Sullivan: As a point of information, before the past administration, it was fairly common for us to get graphs that plotted specific data without revealing specific salaries. Anyone can go online to find AAUP or CUPA data. It's critical for us to have a policy, but I would hate to have a debate about process to interfere with salary adjustments in the coming year. We need a significant adjustment bonus. Don't give the trustees the excuse that they're waiting on a full policy.

Mike Gunter: In 2014 we bumped up the promotion rates, but that was the first time in a quarter century that we've done that. As part of this process, will we put a step in where we include a review process for those adjustments so we don't have to wait 25 years?

Smaw: that's a good idea and exactly the kind of thing we hope come out of faculty discussions.

Boniface: To Mike's point, I brought this very point up with members of the board that there hasn't been increases to faculty support that have been in line with the growth of the faculty. For what it's worth, I would second what Eric said at the end, as frustrating as it is that it has taken so long to get here, we can feel optimistic that at least for the time being we have an administration that is willing to engage with us on these questions in a deep and substantive way. I have some hope that we will see traction on those issues.

Adjournment

Dexter Boniface adjourned the meeting at 1:44 pm.

Structural Changes in rFLA

1. Change rFLA neighborhood student requirements to:

- One 100-level course, taken in the spring, alone
- Three 200-level courses that can be taken in conjunction with each other
- One 300-level course that must be taken once the writing and math competencies and other neighborhood classes are completed. It can be taken in conjunction with the 200-level language class
- The PEA and BPE requirements do not need to be completed before the 300-level rFLA course is taken

Rationale:

This will make the neighborhood system easier for students—they will have more choice, and they will not be stuck in their final semester, if they have not completed their language requirement.

2. Change rFLA assessment to:

- 100 level Information Literacy
- 200 level Critical Thinking
- 300 level Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking

Written communication is also being assessed in the ENG 140 classes.

Rationale:

- We are assessing too much in the general education
- Both integrative learning and ethical reasoning were proving hard rubrics to understand and to apply effectively across all disciplines
- Assessing five learning outcomes in the 300 level class is hampering faculty in their development of interesting educational interdisciplinary classes.

Note: This does not mean that we are abandoning either integration or ethics. Next year, we will pull together a task force to determine where these outcomes should live in the Rollins' curriculum.

Task Force on the Undergraduate Curriculum College of Liberal Arts Proposals for the Faculty

1. Deferred, deliberative declaration of major

Conceptual underpinnings:

- Students should experience a variety of classes at Rollins College before declaring a major.
- Major declaration should be accompanied by a thoughtful reflection by the student.

Goals:

- Students will choose majors more effectively and change them less frequently.
- A more committed student choice of major will improve the ability to predict faculty needs.
- Students will be more cognizant of the nature and benefits of a liberal arts education.

Plan:

- All students enter Rollins with their major listed as “Exploring.” For those students who express a preference for a major, their major will be listed as “Exploring—x.”
- Students who need to be coded for specific purposes (e.g.: scholarships) will be coded based on preference forms.
- To declare a specific major, students must:
 - Take two classes from the desired major’s major map.
 - Take one class from two other divisions of the college—these courses can include RCC, competencies, and neighborhood classes.
 - Fill out a declaration of major form that requires a reflection on why the major is being chosen.

Motion:

That all students be required to defer the declaration of a major until they have taken two courses from the major map and one course from two other divisions of the college. At that point, they will complete a reflection explaining their choice.

2. Departmental assessment of optimum number of students

Conceptual underpinnings:

- Departments best understand the rhythms of their major and the needs of their students. They also best understand the pressures on their faculty in terms of advising and teaching.
- Therefore, individual departments are best able to determine the ideal number of students to whom they can provide a quality, mission focused, liberal arts education.
- Each department should determine an optimum number range of students in their department based on current tenure and tenure-track faculty (and

permanent lecturers, artists-in-residence, etc.). The department should take into consideration its contribution to interdisciplinary majors.

Goals:

- To realistically engage departments in a conversation about the optimum number range of students in a major in terms of staffing classes and advising.
- To lay the groundwork for a distribution of students across majors that is philosophically, pedagogically, and institutionally reflective of the mission and goals of Rollins College.

Plan:

- Moving forward, the Curriculum Committee will require this information when departments request positions.

Motion:

That all departments determine an optimum number range of students that should be enrolled in their major in order to most effectively staff and advise them given current faculty.

3. Departmental self-regulation of student numbers using autonomous curricular measures

Conceptual underpinnings:

- That several departments have successfully used curricular tools to limit and control the numbers of students in their majors.
- That each department knows best which courses or other curricular tools could reduce student numbers.

Goals:

- That majors where the optimum number is greatly exceeded by the actual number of students implement curricular measures to bring the two numbers into better alignment.

Plan:

- Departments that have considerably more students than they have determined to be ideal will create a plan to rectify this situation using autonomous curricular measures.
- The Curriculum Committee will review and advise on these plans.

Motion:

That a department with substantially more students than it considers desirable for effective instruction and advising will determine autonomous curricular measures to reduce the numbers. The plans will be brought to the Curriculum Committee.

4. Reduction of student neighborhood requirements depending on major declaration

Conceptual underpinnings:

- One aim of the neighborhood system is to expose students to a variety of ways of knowing.
- Students are sufficiently exposed to a divisional perspective by majoring in that division.

Goals:

- To allow students to reduce their neighborhood requirements by not taking a class in the same division as their major.
- To reduce the need for rFLA classes by about 1/5th.

Plan:

- Once students have taken two classes in a department and declared that major, they can be exempted from that division in the rFLA. This exemption would be available only once in a student's undergraduate career.
- Students in the Business division will be required to take all four divisional classes to ensure sufficient exposure to a liberal arts education.
- Students already in the neighborhood system will be allowed to not take a neighborhood class in their declared major's division, with the exception of Business.

Motion:

That, once students have declared their major, they are exempted from the neighborhood class in that division. Business majors will continue to take neighborhood courses from all four academic perspectives.

Mario D'Amato
Claire Strom
February 3, 2017

Endorsed by the Curriculum Committee
February 7, 2017