

2-7-2012

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, February 7, 2012

Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, February 7, 2012" (2012). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 20.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/20

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



Academic Affairs Committee

Open AAC Colloquia on The Rollins Plan
February 7, 2012

Opening:

The open meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee was called to order at 12:33 pm on February 7, 2012 in the Choral Room #119 – Tiedtke Hall by Gloria Cook.

Present:

Mark Anderson, Sara Bishop, Gloria Cook, Nancy Decker, Fiona Harper, Sebastian Novak, Maria Ruiz, Samuel Sanabria, Wenxian Zhang

Visitors:

Chris Fuse, Laurel Goj, Mila Martine (Student), Jonathan Miller, Thom Moore, Alexandra Pierson (Student), John Sinclair, Joe Siry, Robert Smither, Bruce Stephenson, Rachel Simmons

A. Continuing Discussion

~ January 31st colloquia we discussed the strengths of The Rollins Plan.

During AAC open meeting last Tuesday, Jan 31st, the strengths of the Rollins Plan were identified. These include 1) the developmental nature of the plan in that upper-level students in the Plan would be taking courses with other upper-level students, not with first-year students 2) An intentional integration of ideas across disciplines and across divisions.

It was pointed out that in order for the Rollins Plan to work in the future, the school would need to invest in faculty development. We would need to train faculty to teach integration, and to give faculty incentives to meet with other faculty in their program and to develop courses appropriate for the program. There was some concern that faculty might not be willing to invest the time and work necessary to make the transition to a new general education program.

AAC student representatives raised concerns that future students would feel trapped by the programs and not feel able to move from one to another. They were also concerned that many of the good courses now being offered might be lost in the transition.

Other concerns include recruitment and that some departments currently use the alphabet soup to help them fill courses for their majors. These courses might not have large enough enrollments to be offered as electives in the future.

~ This week's colloquia the topic is the weaknesses of The Rollins Plan and the recommendations from the Rollins Plan Steering Committee.

I'd like to start by reading you two e-mails that I received. "I believe that our current system is better and more cutting edge than the proposed Rollins Plan changes. We ought to quit calling it the "alphabet soup" model and call it "more choices." With the choice program right now as it currently stands, Biology students can take my Monsters in Film & Literature class for the "L". I think that is a plus. What I learned from the RP pilot is that I prefer a wider range of choices and so do the students. This is one of the e-mails I just downloaded.

May I say something about that? I like that she or he said about the alphabet soup. I wanted to make a comment early on today about the idea of what is in a name? I really that it is unfortunate that we have either chosen or by default accepted the name "alphabet soup" for what we currently have. Because it is an implicit rejection or at least criticism of what we have. That's been labeled without consensus that that is what the name should be. And while there are many people that I have talked to that are interested in the RP, there are at least an equal number that I have talked to that like the current program. One suggestion I have is to second that e-mail and quit call it alphabet soup and give it a proper name. It is going be hard to argue for alphabet soup. It is important what is in a name.

My issue is what is the economic impact of The Rollins Plan on college operations? You look at if from the pilot and there are just a few students. How will affect the college operations? Will it be sustainable?

I'm sure the Dean would tell us that it going to be rather painful. Especially in the transition period. Am I correct? We have to fund Faculty Development. At some point we will have to have our current system (let's not call it alphabet soup anymore) and the Rollin Plan going at the same time. There will be a mass confusion for a while. Anything new is always going to be painful for a while. Can we sustain both programs at the same time?

This feels like it is huge. In terms of if we are going to some type of workshops. We need to take a very serious study of the Faculty load to make sure we have enough classes, enough professors and if there are different things that the professors need to be doing. Seems to me that the implications of this are quite large.

Well I did some research on other schools. And they do not call it Gen Ed; they call them the core classes. That is what the University of Chicago calls it. They call it "the core" and there was a whole thing about it online. And also, last week I don't know if anyone remembers this, but Professor Davison and Stephenson said all the ivy league schools are doing this. None are doing this. So I don't know where they got their information from.

I know from my own experience that my son at Duke it is called a focus group. You have to be invited in order to join. It is exactly set up the same.

Well Duke and University of St. Louis do it. No other schools in the top 20 do it. I do not know where they got their information from.

What do they do? Just out of curiosity. Oh you mean requirements for cognitive, affective, etc.

What we do. Almost exactly. If not more Gen Eds than we have. So I thought that was misleading.

What we do now is, would be a distribution sort of requirements. It is not a core. A core is where you have you have particular classes that everybody takes.

No, it's the same, but they call it a core.
In terms of classifying general education requirements...one extreme is a core requirement where everyone takes the same courses. So the core courses in the major are the courses that everyone takes. Some of the common Gen Ed program that most schools do is some sort of a distribution requirement, you take so many courses from these, so many from these and so many from these. I would say ours is that sort of thing. So what we are doing is the norm. Most schools have been doing this for the past 30 years and I predict in 10 years, they won't be doing it anymore.
Right. But I just didn't like that they said that all top academic institutions are doing this. When only Washington, University of St. Louis, Duke and Brown are doing it. And Amherst. They need to get their facts straight.
I agree and understand what you are saying.
That is what two teachers said. They need to get their facts straight. That is misleading and I don't like that.
Mark can you explain why you think in 10 years what we currently have will be gone?
What we have is based on from research that was done prior to the 1980's. And I think that the best research we have is based on AACUB. When the Rollins Plan was built was based on AACUB. You have had this group of educators from across the country meeting regularly for some time now on what education ought to look like. They don't suggest a particular way of delivering Gen Eds. But I think the Rollins Plan was based on that current research, not based on the pre-1980's research. As we see, changing Gen Education is costly and painful and it will take schools a while to do it, and not all schools change. The Rollins Plan is in that direction. The Rollins Plan is not the only way to do it. It is a way to do it, to move in that direction. Whether it is a good way or not, I don't know.
I just have a question from a student prospective. When does the Rollins Plan start for students? How will it affect scheduling conflicts with the RCC, Honors Program and 3/2 programs?
We are not up to that point yet. We are not implementing anything just yet. We are just looking at it. We are evaluating the pilot. It is experimental, that is why we call it a pilot. At this point, we want to know if it is even feasible for this college to adopt this plan or a modified version. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the program? Today we focus on some of the problems arising from this Rollins Plan.
Is there a way we can incorporate some of the core changes without changing entire nature or structure of General Education requirements?
I'm going to tag off of that for a second. It occurs to me that one of the core goals is to address the AACUB Leap Learning Outcomes. I am just looking at the list we were provided last week. Is it not then possible as an alternative that we have Gen Eds, not alphabets soup choice, what have you, that are developmental? So you have a lower level and an upper-level rather than a core to keep it simple. Then we take our own Gen Eds and identify which of these leap outcomes that we think our individual courses meet. I can identify a lot of the skills in my courses and build in other skills that are lacking, i.e. personal or social responsibilities. Is that an easier step than building a whole new course? With these as a basis.
I think our current system, now as I quote Toni. "We can attest that we taught have taught values, ethics and culture with all the "V's" and "C's" but we can't really access it." So at some point we are going to have to adopt a new system

that will allow us to access our Gen Ed program. The Leap learning outcomes is a wonderful way and approach to doing that. I don't know how far we want to take it. Another point, right now I need to remind our members that we are evaluating the Rollins Plan. I don't think we are in a position to propose a whole new program. I would like to somehow adopt what we have here and make some changes. I don't know this is totally up to the Faculty and up to the students.

Reading of second e-mail she received: "Although I think that the Rollins Plan's aspirations were admirable, it turned out to be for me far too bureaucratic and over-managed. Instead of the linked Faculty getting together to talk about common intellectual issues or holding group activities for all students. My group was regularly called together to do administrative and assessment stuff. So that was one of the problems from a Faculty member within the program.

We have some students here today and I'd like to hear more about the student experience. But in answer to your question, this is sort of a bureaucratic problem. One reason I suspect there are seniors in juniors in some classes that maybe shouldn't be there and I like your point about developmental. But if I have a class cancels because it doesn't make count, and a senior or junior in that class would have made the difference. We run into a administrative set of regulations that say if I have only 3, 4 or 5 people in the class that I am not going to be teaching it unless I want to do it independently. The other one is that it would be great to say that no seniors can take 100-level or 200-level classes. I'd be all for that, but you are right between the problem of classes make the count or mixing levels within classes. It can be upsetting when you think a junior or senior could have saved the classes.

Yes, plus we need these general education requirements and a lot of those are met at the 100-level and 200-level classes. I understand what you are saying. I personally don't have a problem integrating the classes with freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors as it plays out now we are always a mixed population with some people who are over ambitious or others who are lagging on their Gen Eds. Personally I don't have a problem with it either way.

One of the reasons I like the developmental aspect whether we go with the Rollins Plan or not. I've taught 100-levels where I have senior and freshmen together. In teaching you shortchange no matter how hard you try. You are shortchanging one of those two groups. The senior students write to the level that is far greater than the freshman so therefore you either have to make the assignments difficult enough to challenge the seniors and work to their abilities and leave the freshman behind or you make it more geared to freshman in which case the seniors get a really easy class. Experience tells us that between junior and sophomore mix there is not much difference, I would agree to that. But seniors and freshman split, there is ten and ten and nowhere to go. And at the price tuition you pay, you deserve the best class you can get. Not the easy "A" I have to give you or you earn because it was an inappropriate challenge.

Which just makes scheduling so much harder, if you have to knock out a Gen Ed as a junior or senior.

See you said it yourself right there. You have to "knock out" a Gen Ed. That's my issue with the current system. It's not about I really want to learn about a new culture, or I really want to check out science...its all about knocking out a class. Isn't that unfortunate that you are paying that much tuition and your education is just knocking out classes.

Under the Rollins Plan I feel as if you would have the same thing, it's just tweaked. With different labels. If you just went to college and take what you are

interested in
You still have to knock out the Humanities division of this Rollins plan instead of the V.
If students went to college to take what they were interested or just for their major, then every student would have a totally different schedule right now, I guarantee you. That is just the system at large.
This is something some schools do, which is to not have any general education requirements at all. There are no requirements at some schools.
Amherst!
One of the comments that I have heard in response to this is, that is fine for students at Amherst or students at Grinnell...Rollins students we cannot expect them to challenge themselves by taking the most difficult classes...they need requirements.
No, I understand and I agree, because that is the essence of a liberal art education and we get this well roundedness.
Can I ask under the current proposal for the Rollins plan...the suggested... current plan how many courses are required in the Rollins Plan? Five?
Well the recommendation is four courses plus a capstone. So it's five.
So five versus how many in the current general education?
12 and 2 gym classes.
But then also instead of having just the four or five in the Rollins Plan, you still have other general education requirements like the foreign language requirement would still be there.
So six?
And then the Math competency also.
writing one of the five? Originally it was.
Writing competency is not one of the five.
Eight
Versus thirteen currently?
Versus twelve. Are you abolishing gym with The Rollins Plan? Do we still have to ...So it is 8 classes versus 12.
No...that hasn't been...
Are we getting rid of PE?
We didn't even address that...
I think one of the concerns was that I was teaching RCC at the time that the RP was being implemented. A number of my students immediately recognized that because of the Gen Eds that they were coming in with, it was not to their benefit

<p>to do the RP. So I think one of the concerns that we will have going forward is if we do implement the RP how do we decide to deal with the students coming in with course credit, etc. that they have earned prior to coming to Rollins?</p>
<p>Well right now the registrar has to figure out whether they satisfy a V, C, D or S, etc. and the registrar still has to do that, they will go course by course to see what they have satisfied so far.</p>
<p>We don't give away that many Gen Eds credits coming in...you get the Q if you take AP Statistics, the W ...</p>
<p>Through standard enrollment you can get a Q, L or W are the only ones, or if you take upper-level IB Chem and you score high on the test there is a chance you can get a P. It's really difficult to get Gen Eds.</p>
<p>You can get an S, you can a W.</p>
<p>Right now you can't get an S.</p>
<p>I've had students come in with an S...maybe it was an AP.</p>
<p>Can I take this in a slightly different direction? When I came here five years ago, we had already had a year of the 4 C's committee thinking about this. I've been here five years, so for six years we have been thinking about this. As Mark says this is difficult, it's time-consuming. But I also remember that three years ago there was so much optimism about this program and a huge sense that we were getting somewhere with the Rollins Plan, but we killed it. A dagger in the heart to a pilot program that was overloaded with assessment. If we hadn't piloted it, if we said this is a great idea and lets go with it. All the comparisons of students looking at whether they lose going with the plan or sticking with the old one or not ...we would have been past those by now. All the issues of whether you get a transfer credit for something ...they are not the biggest, biggest issues, neither is what you have earned already... that is a transition issue right? Rather that starting this meeting with what are the problems of the RP...what is the proposal going forward? And what do we think of this proposal going forward? This is too negative at the moment this meeting is too negative.</p>
<p>We did emphasize all the positive aspects last week.</p>
<p>This meeting is too negative. We need to figure out what is the proposal on the table.</p>
<p>That is fair, one of the things Gloria is saying is that we spent an hour and fifteen minutes of substantial discussion on the positive aspects. Now we are looking at the stumbling blocks.</p>
<p>What I don't know at this stage is what is the proposal that I might be able to have some comments about on what are the stumbling blocks as opposed to a pilot that we have done.</p>
<p>We have sent out the Steering Committee recommendations before the holiday and again as well as the evaluation from Peggy Maki. We can start from there and see what the recommendations are. One of the recommendations from the Steering Committee was that we should always adhere to the goals of for example, the interdisciplinary nature. I think everybody can agree from last week's meeting that this was good thing. Now whether it needs to be team-taught, that would create a lot of nightmare for the Administration and for the Dean I don't know. I know it is creating a significant drain on Faculty. I heard that some classes had only 4 or 5 people and they were team-taught. Am I correct?</p>
<p>I was on the committee that submitted the original pilot and I thought the intent</p>

was because team-teaching was so intensive and time-demanding that it would only be the Capstone that would be team-taught rather than all the courses, as this would be more logistically feasible.

Yes it is right there on the first page, 16 or number 15. Courses should be interdisciplinary in nature, however they need not all be all team-taught. I also wanted to say that Maki, which you might have read at some point, but Maki was in agreement in that the most successful programs were implemented without pilots. Because the pilots do create the “what about what we have? That is in her report.

I brought my copy of “Culturally Adrift.” Are a lot of you familiar with this book? New York Times bestseller list. What is wrong with your degree...what we can do for best value...I just want to read what it says here, “*active and collaborative learning is an effective educational practice, because students learn more when they are intensely involved in their education or are asked to think about and apply what they learned in different settings.*” Part of the idea of the RP was that we don’t know if you are doing this right now in your general education or even your major. To solve problems and for you to get hired, this is what these top educators say we need to do to improve the quality of our education. The idea is that it doesn’t have to be team-taught, but it does need to be integrated. The idea of the Biology major solving a Biology problem you need to know more than just Biology. You know like the study you all did about all the sewage is screwing up the reefs, well that’s bad, but how do you get rid of the sewage...you need a different set of knowledge. That’s what we were trying to follow from this report; it says you need to have this integrated experience whether it is in the major or in the Gen Eds. But to have general education program where you knock out a bunch of electives and you may be able to solve an important problem or not...with the RP the idea was once you work through the program, you are able to solve problems and you are educated at an evolved level. This book came out last year; there was a discussion group on campus about this book. Education needs to be integrated. Combining different sets of knowledge to solve an important problem.

I agree with Bruce. We’d like to have Gen Ed system that is providing something more meaningful for the students so they don’t feel like they are just checking off the list. They should get some skillset or knowledge set or both that gets them to be really practical with their education to apply to some real world problems, I think this was part of the impetus of the design for the RP. Well, we know that this checklist of alphabet soup is really convenient for scheduling purposes, but are we really here in Higher Ed to do things that are convenient? Probably not...it’s a lot of money to spend on convenience. So maybe we should think more directly and purposely about what the education is doing. Regarding team teaching, so I’m team teaching in the RP right now the class is about the diversity of the Home, Place & Space with Julian Chambliss from the History department. It is working out really well. He’s providing a lot of the meaty content of the course. And we are doing a visual journal project about it. Which I’m leading, which is helping them creatively and critically think about the content of the course. I don’t have the knowledge base that he has and he doesn’t know how to make art. You know what I am saying? So we are a good team...right? Very complimentary in this situation. I totally recognize that we are both on-load for this course and it’s a small course. But it’s the kind of synergy, the discussions that we are able to have in this course with the students as professors from different disciplines, you know, that is hard to do on your own. Not everyone is really interdisciplinary in their own field. Some of us are, but not all of us. It is a nice thing to be able to do in a small school. To teach with someone else. I am also learning tons in the course, so that is my part of my professional development as well. Team teaching is hard; it is messy, we certainly haven’t figured out how to compensate anyone for it properly. But when it works really well, it is really worthwhile.

Just to further on that, I have taken numerous team-taught classes at Rollins, I think they are the best classes I have ever taken at Rollins. I don’t think a

<p>professor can bring in something that they are not an expert in? Really enjoy classes that team-taught. Team teaching is necessary. If you have only 5 classes how are you going to getting those 12 Gen Eds that we have currently into those 5 classes when they are not being team-taught? Are we losing 7 things?</p>
<p>Are any of the students here currently in the RP plan? You have probably have heard some of the feedback ad nauseum on the Rollins Plan implementation.</p>
<p>I invited a Rollins Plan student, but they did not show up.</p>
<p>I was an RA during the implementation of the RP, so all of my residents were going through it. I heard a lot of complaining from my residents.</p>
<p>What did you hear?</p>
<p>Students didn't like it. There was not flexibility, they were stuck in it, they didn't end up liking what the subject matter and wanted to get out and then you could get out but it caused problems with the scheduling and so were stuck in it.</p>
<p>So they didn't like it and it was really messy it when they tried to fix it.</p>
<p>I think the main problem is, that when you come into college, everyone thinks about what they want to be and they switch their majors. If you go right into a specialized program, which is only about Revolutions, History of Florida or Elections ... then you are actually a lot less prepared for the real world. I am a double major and I love taking the Gen Eds here. I just went through a lot of interviews recently and in those interviews I was able to incorporate a lot of my Gen Ed education. For instance, I took an Ethics course I had to take for a "V" requirement and that helped me argue with someone about the origin of human rights. If I had taken a Revolutions or History of Florida course, that would have hindered me and limit me with my higher education. When you do a Rollins Plan you specialize it, it's hard to synthesize all of your college education and get a larger perspective with just one set program for four years.</p>
<p>You might think the Rollins Plan is restrictive, in a way that you will never learn Ethics, History or Philosophy but it is not. It opens your world to different views and on top of that, you are only taking four courses and your capstone, you have many electives that are freed up. If you want to enrich yourself with other disciplines you can. There is space in your schedule. Somehow it will intergrate everything together.</p>
<p>I went to Hendrix which is a sister school of ours. They produce 23 Med students each year. How many do we have...about 10 now (per Fiona). They had every Pre-Med student there come up and not discuss their courses that they took in Pre-Med, but they discussed their Gen Eds. A series of courses called the Hendrix Odyssey program in which they produce a product at the end. They have to produce something they are interested in. Students find that it, rather that the faculty. The student is in an Odyssey search for knowledge. That is how they sell medical school</p>
<p>Would not have taken Ethics if it was not required not for the Gen Eds. The wide range of Gens Eds provided unexpected benefits. I was more prepared for interviews. The wide range of Gen Eds, you get a lot out of it.</p>
<p>Students use Gen Eds in real world situations. My Communication class provided help in a social situation. I learned about defined communication styles...students do apply what they learn.</p>
<p>There must be a reason the Gen Eds have been a part of Rollins. We are not saying it is not good; we want to see what is best as we move towards the 21st Century.</p>

My style is Communicator. I learned this in a Community Engagement workshop. In four years, the students who were familiar with the old system will graduate. Or five years. What is left is the faculty members. We have invested ourselves into trying to put Rollins into a new category, which has removed the value for looking at developmental side of pedagogy. In order for faculty member to feel like they have the time, energy, the wherewithal to continue to invest in our own professional development, our lives as scholars and I am wondering with the amount of time you are talking about for people to be successful that it takes for people to be team teachers, not only willing and but talented to be team teachers while continuing to be lead RCC's classes. And if so, we have to create some incentives and what will those be?

I'm looking at this huge administrative task, how do we pull this together. Maybe I have been a Department Chair for far too long. To tag team with Nancy. Different skills than faculty normally have. We build a pyramid with our education; many of us come out of the conservatory with blinders on. We believe in the Liberal Arts and have drunk the poisoned Kool-Aid and we don't want to change. We believe that our Music students are better off if they have taken these courses and we love double majors. How do we pull this off with faculty and staff? Because a lot of us ...our disciplines are rather limited, yet the institution hired us because our disciplines were rather limited, we fulfill a real niche in the institution's role. How do we make specialists into generalists? How do you transition other faculty who may not be so necessary after this transition? Every time someone team-teaches; someone else picks up their remaining load. Can Bob Smither talk about this? You are looking at a bigger faculty. It is a daunting task. Alphabet soup needs revision. Bob can you speak to this.

Not ready to make official comments yet. Understand completely though. Faculty load is a huge question that is impacted by this. The Faculty load even with or without this is a problem. Until there is a proposal on the floor, it is hard to say. I would also add that on the one-hand, team-teaching can be a fabulous experience it doesn't always work. Not everyone can do it.

Can we point out that the Rollins Plan actually does not suggest team-teaching. That is not part of the Rollins Plan. Faculty in the Rollins Plan have chose to team-teach. The Rollins Plan does not have this element of team-teaching as part of the plan. The suggestion is that the Capstone be team-taught, not that it is the norm.

If you want interdisciplinary experiences, you have to have multiple disciplines. When we designed the RP's, we wanted these areas represented, these interdisciplinary experience, we aren't gadget professors that you can just attach other disciplines to.

Some of us are gadget professors. To be fair and say something more positive as Jonathan asked for that we can at least get on record. Bob is absolutely right, there is a faculty load issue. We are putting the cart before the horse. In the EC meeting, Carol Bresnahan gave us a comment. I'm wondering if we are coming at this the wrong way. Let's reduce the number of courses that we need right now, this year for graduation. We have more courses for graduation than any of our peers have. If we start looking at steps to make the RP possible and you include flexibility on one hand and developmental values on another. I think there is a way out of this. Jonathan is right, we are sitting here with a box with too many courses in. We require 35 courses for graduation = 128 hours. Most schools require 32 courses. Students can take a full load, 4 classes each semester and not have enough credits to graduate. That is a problem. There is still a issue with Maymester.

Last year we had a problem with too many students graduating early. A 3-year graduation equals a loss of income. Students were charged extra for super full

load or classes being brought in.
Regarding study abroad internships, the situation is that students can't be gone for an entire semester. The RP by reducing the number of general education requirements, there is a space created so that students are not encouraged but required to travel abroad. Have to get out there. One way to look at this. Part of a larger curriculum change.
High impact practices is one of our buzz words, so I think that is the beauty of having only 5 courses. Students can actually leave campus and immerse in the other cultures with the language.
The flip-side, Carol Crist from the colloquy in mid-2000, we learned that you can have a cultural client in the community based course too. It is important what you have done. You have a project to present.
That is sort of what the Hendrix Odyssey Program does. There is an option to study abroad or do research with a faculty member. It is not their Gen Eds, this is in addition to their Gen Eds....it is incentive for the program. It is great for students to go abroad, but then I also need them to be able to come back and work in my labs.
Hendrix dropped their number of general education requirements to 7, so they could have this experience.
We have finally have City College of Queens available for History majors before it was not possible to study abroad without paying extra and going outside the Rollins portfolio.
The whole study abroad is changing tremendously. Europeans know they have to have English to survive in the world. English is prevalent and entire curriculums abroad are in English. Language is no longer a barrier to going to non-English speaking places. We need to get more Rollins students abroad so that they can compete on the global market. The vast numbers going overseas are just going for a short time. Field study experiences are at a 70% rate.
The Rollins Plan reduces the number of courses to free up the students for an experience abroad.
As I see the transition, if we were to start it this Fall which we won't. The students that are currently here would not join the Rollins Plan; they would finish out the Gen Ed program that they came in on. So the only students who would be in Rollins Plan would be the people who come in after its implementation. In that sense, you do not need buy-in from the current students. Because it has nothing to do with them other than they will be interacting with students in a different general education program. That is what makes the transition hard, for 4 years you will have different general education programs for the upperclassmen and the underclassmen. We would be running two programs at once.
We have a little experience in this as we moved to a Developmental major. It was chaos. Everyone's prospective is their own. Those in the prior system have the perspective that, "thank goodness I don't have to deal with that" and those in the new system will think, "I can't believe they used to have to do that." Everyone likes what they have and doesn't want the other. That's human nature.
Under Peggy's recommendation plan, the incoming freshman students just take one Rollins Plan class in the Spring. So the first couple of years, the transition will be very gradual. The transition might not be as bad as we think.
My quick impression is that we have lots of freshman. Not as many sophomores, fewer juniors and maybe the same...fewer seniors. The problem at Rollins is Freshman and sophomore classes must be served. Correct me Bob if I am

wrong, are there more seniors than sophomores.
I just heard you say second semester of freshman year you start the RP. Would everyone go abroad all at once?
Peggy also suggested in her evaluation that one of the RP courses can be taken from another "big idea" division...another RP. During the end is when the students connect the dots.
Instead of taking courses, that I know why I am taking. Instead I wait for my Senior year it all comes together and makes sense.
You have to build in those connection skills from the very beginning. We talked about this last time. Not a magical process. It is a process that is taught and incremental.
Our hope is that students finishing the RP, they will have projects like at Hendrix. Projects could be displayed on our website. Students see that you are working on something to give to the greater community. In the pilot we could not do that.
As you are thinking about the RP, we tend to lose a lot of students after the after the 2 nd year. Is there a plan for attrition? How does the Rollins Plan help with this?
Our hope is that you are buying into a project that you would be a part of. Idea of opportunity to complete a task and add to your resume as a 21- or 22 year old. You will want to stay at Rollins to complete this project. We did a focus group for our major. Employers are telling us that they want to see projects.
We also get a lot of transfers. How does this transfer part of the work?
There is a table, table #3 under Transfer RCC. Two and two and Capstone.
If they have an AA, it is a nonissue. Transfer student with two years or more is tricky.
Feedback from Student Records solicited.
How many students are we talking about?
75 Transfers.
That is a lot of students. Have you spoken with Admissions about this?
Yes, we have. They loved the idea when we first produced it.
In this economic climate, we need to make ourselves attractive.
Dean of Admissions told him...maybe RCC is inhibiting the Rollins Plan? More flexibility there. We are trying to set an RCC and the Rollins Plan at the same time as well as going abroad.
We haven't sorted the link between RCC and the Rollins Plan. How does it fit and work together? If RCC doesn't help student's transition into college and pick majors then we shouldn't have it.
On page 19 of the Steering Committee Reporthow many course.... looks like

actually less work in the long run. Projection of RP vs. actual course offerings.
Can we expand offerings?
That is the flip side. Link together all programs ... RCC/ RP
As an undecided major, are we getting exposure to everything? Not allowing students to feel around when you aren't sure. Makes me take things I never would have .
Should we force students...?
The Rollins Plan has that built in...you have to take something from each division.
Appreciative advising is also stretching students.
Impacts advising process?
We will need changes in the nature of advising.

Next Meeting

February 21, 2012 Chapel-Room Classroom #1

Adjournment:

Meeting was adjourned at 1:50 pm by Gloria Cook.

Colloquia Notes submitted by: Mark Anderson