

3-27-2012

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, March 27, 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, March 27, 2012" (2012). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 25.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/25

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

Meeting Minutes
March 27, 2011

Opening:

The regular meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee was called to order at 12:36 pm on March 27, 2011 in the Chapel-Room Classroom #1 by Gloria Cook.

Present:

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

Visitors:

Julie Carrington, Associate Professor of Computer Science
Jennifer Cavanaugh, Associate Dean of the Arts & Sciences
Robin Mateo, Director of Student Records
Lisa Tillman, Associate Professor, Critical Media and Cultural Studies

A. Approval of Minutes

Minutes for the last several sessions have been disseminated and approval will be tabled until last week.

B. Review of Agenda

- (Item 1) CMC – CMC Lab Credit
- (Item 2) CMS – Separate Lab from Lecture
- (Item 3) CAPE – Clarification for College Credit
- (Item 4) Maymester – Student Appeal Process
- (Item 5) Deadlines for Submission of New Course Proposals

Gloria Cook opened the meeting by letting the committee know that Carol Bresnahan shared that the Board of Trustees were very interested in the plan Implementation Committee of the Rollins Plan. Jonathan Miller wants to add a librarian to Committee. Think of names for the new committee. Fiona Harper wanted to nominate Judy Schmalstig. Jana Mathews added that it was important to have a couple of students on the Committee. Gloria said that the EC would come up with names for consideration. We will want to make sure to have divisional representation. Gloria or Mark will consult with EC for more names.

(Item 1) CMC – CMC Lab Credit

Julie Carrington, Associate Professor of Computer Science represented this issue for the Computer Science Department. She explained that CMS 167 is a five credit hour course beginning-programming course with a lab. This year we separated the course into two sections and three labs. It was confusing. We would like to uncouple them and to separate out the one credit for the lab and four credits for the course.

There are two reasons for the request for this change. First, scheduling is something of a nightmare, especially if, like this past year, we have more than the usual two sections of a lab and, even worse, if we also have more than one section of course. With two course sections and three labs, we have to list six course/lab combinations. It would be much simpler to list as two separate courses allowing for scheduling flexibility.

We have a new faculty member joining our department this year. Which leads to my second reason for this request. With one course section and three labs, the faculty member is teaching the equivalent of two and half regular four credit courses and only getting paid for a single extra credit. Would like for the instructor to be fully credited and compensated for two and a half regular four credit courses.

Fiona Harper asked if a student could be registered for the lab without the lecture? She felt the reasons articulated are good reasons, but they are not curriculum driven reasons. Jennifer Cavanaugh asked why couldn't they be handled as co-requisites? Fiona also asked what if students drop the lab? Mark Anderson asked how this was dealt with this in the Biology Department. Fiona sketched out a sample curriculum with labs on the adjacent whiteboard. She pointed out that for every section of lecture, we have three to four labs. The options are within here she indicated to the chart. She continued that it would be worthwhile having a divisional discussion about this. We see this as problematic when a student is liable for two "W's". This is the rhetoric set up for scheduling.

Mark asked if Robin Mateo had any thought on this? Robin replied that with regards to Chemistry, classes and labs are completely separate. Biology classes and labs are not separated, but the students have options. Julie nodded, and said yes now with more students it becomes really difficult. Fiona said it was the same thing that they encountered. Julie reminded her that they didn't have as many faculty though. Fiona urged that they should all talk about it at a divisional level and bring it back to the AAC. Julie suggested concurrent registration. Mark clarified that she was asking to divide the course into two co-requisites. Julie agreed that this was what she was asking for.

Gloria moved to a vote on CMS 167 separating out one credit for the lab and four credits for the course. Motion was approved.

(Item 2) CMS – Separate Lab from Lecture

Lisa Tillman, Associate Professor represented the Critical Media and Cultural Studies Department in their quest to seek good judgment and advice on awarding appropriate level of credit for core and elective courses. Within their department, the faculty has different skill-levels and participant levels with regards to digital media technology in the labs attached to their courses. Lisa is team-teaching a digital media course with Carrie Schultz, and Ted Gournelos has a very high competency and is teaching on his own.

Two of the core courses, CMC 100 and 400, have a 4-credit course component and a 1-hour digital media lab component. The department would like to be able to offer students a choice in how much digital media training they receive. Some versions of 100 and 400 would stay at 5 total credits but other versions would receive up to 6 credits for the lecture and extended lab. The course number offers some indication of how in-depth the course is and if the lab is one or two credits depending on who is teaching. CMC 310 is an elective course with which the department would like to have this proposed flexibility. One version of 310 would be the regular four hour course then a second version would add a one-hour lab, a third version would add a two-hour lab. One-credit lab is 9 contact hours and a two-credit lab is 18 contact hours. Do we create different course numbers for each instance? Can we maintain course flexibility with regards to who is teaching? We would like to retain these same course numbers but allow for flexibility each semester to indicated if the particular section would be worth 4-, 5- or 6-credits?

Fiona asked if the appropriateness of the IFT lab hours were congruent to everything else on campus. Jennifer said there are precedents for courses that have variable credit. Maybe we look at separating lab from lecture. Lisa said that she was urged by Toni Holbrook not to do this. Jennifer asked what the transcripts reflect? Lisa asked Robin if we could manage the credit audit?

Jana Mathews asked if these were core courses that all CMC majors must take? Just seems with the evolving set of faculty. Lisa replied that this allows the department to be more flexible than they are now. Sarah Bishop wanted to clarify that CMS 400 counts for 4-credits some semesters and 6-credits other semesters depending on the faculty. Lisa replied that the 6-credit course offers an advanced lab that is available for students on a producer track. Students would get to choose from multiple sections of the capstone course. Jennifer Cavanaugh brought up that there is a precedent from History 120 because some faculty teach the course as a “C” or a “D” with differentiation by professor. Mark Anderson proposed that maybe there is bigger conversation to be had of how much credit faculty and students receive. Lisa agreed the credit hours and contact hours awarded are not standardized. Gloria added even during extended course or lab time, only one course load is given. Jana added that 36 contact hours equal a 2-credit course. Gloria agreed that Jennifer’s solution is a good one.

Lisa admitted that this was her first time dealing with labs. Doesn’t see an equitable solution for students or faculty. Jennifer said we should attach faculty to course with an explanation. Jana noted the conceptual structural idea about this. Different students will gravitate to professors based on syllabi and teaching style. Lisa didn’t realize the larger-equity issue. Wanted students and faculty to get more credit. Wenxian Zhang feels that if you have different levels of classes, it will be easier for students to choose. Lisa remarked they just switched to embedded labs a year ago. To make sure that the students have the skills, they

want them to pass the class in isolation and the lab in isolation. Gloria asked if Ted's course could be renamed? Lisa supposed she could. Mark asked if they could just put a letter after it? Jana wanted the committee to consider getting away from counting hours for credits. Courses have all sorts of extra hours stated in the syllabi. Sarah suggested maybe looking at classroom hours vs. contact hours. Nancy Decker said that would be an accounting nightmare. Sarah concluded if you want Advanced Media you go to Ted Gournelos, if you want a more basic course, you go with another professor. Lisa pondered if 9 hours are not a standard. Fiona shared that it was very standard for Science. She would be very happy to report what they do; for example, Laurel Goj has 12 hours of class and 17 contact hours. Lisa stressed that she wanted to make sure they were being fair in their department and campus-wide. There is a larger context of inequality. Lisa wanted to withdraw her request in lieu of the larger issue.

Mark agreed that we would expect to have this be resolved. This is a really sticky issue, not a simple solution, unlikely to come to a decision. Do not hold off on what you need to do until this larger issue is resolved. Lisa said, Ted's class is a 5-credit class, students and faculty should get credit for the work they do. Everyone at the table agreed. At this point, Lisa decided to withdraw her proposal so she can discuss this uneven distribution of lab hour with her CMC faculty further.

(Item 3) CAPE – Clarification for College Credit

Gloria shared that Robin sent another e-mail out that Rollins would accept scores of 1 and 2 from the CAPE test scores. The 1 and 2 scores from CAPE are equivalent to an AP score of 4 and 5.

(Item 4) Maymester – Student Appeal Process

Gloria reminded everyone that last year the faculty voted on the policy that students are allowed to take only one Maymester class. Students wishing to take two courses need to go through an appeal process and the Academic Appeals committee will decide if they can then register for two Maymester courses. The change we have approved is to let a student who feels they are capable of taking two classes file an appeal. This is in line with the majority of our academic policies which allow students to appeal numerous things such as permission to walk in graduation with less than 8 credits remaining, permission to study abroad if the GPA is below the minimum requirement, permission to substitute courses etc. Robin has communicated to the students the link for the appeals process and the following statement:

If you have already registered for two Maymester courses and you do not file an appeal to remain enrolled in both and/or you are not approved to participate in both, please be aware that your registration in whichever class you registered for last, will be removed after online registration closes on Friday, May 4, 2012.

Jana wanted to bring to everyone's attention that the appeals policy is buried at the bottom of the paper. We should be more transparent. The method of this has struck a raw nerve with some students, parents and faculty. Jennifer asked Robin to send out the e-mail, wanted to make sure those who had applied to two classes had good grades. Jennifer asked Rosa Disla

in Student Records to pull reports on these particular students and the grades were good. Gloria added that students could always apply; some may need the additional credits for financial aid loans

Mark stated that it is an embarrassment to the school if students can finish a semester long class in four weeks. If you add up the regular contact hours of classwork for a semester versus the four weeks... students could not physically take two classes in four weeks. Students cannot learn without doing the work. Jennifer agreed but then countered that there is a possibility of multiple roads to learning. There are some classes that can be delivered in a shorter amount of time. Jana added that students could only be given a certain amount of work. Some students take 12 hours to write an "A" paper and some take 90 minutes. Mark added that we should look carefully at appeals. Gloria agreed saying that we want students to successfully complete these courses.

Nancy added that she is now seriously realizing how very many students themselves must think about contributing to financial cost of college looking at the popularity of 3/2 programs. A Maymester with two courses is half a semester at the cost of \$1600.00. Ideally you could shave off the cost of a year by taking two courses over two Maymasters. Gloria added that students could take a Maymester and a Holt class. They could take courses at Valencia. Jana added that this might be beneficial to athletes. Sarah added that the Communications major is so new. Jennifer confirmed that there are three student appeals as of now. All are seniors who are short of hours.

(Item 5) Deadlines for Submission of New Course Proposals

Gloria let everyone know that deadlines need to be set for submission of new course proposals. Maria Ruiz recalled that historically there were deadlines. Jennifer advised that we could publish deadlines and put them on the forms. We would want to have some flexibility for the new faculty. You could meet once a month. One of the things that is happening is that people are just putting Gen Eds on their courses. Robin has been contacting professors and advising them from the college catalogue as to the requirements. Maria suggested that if a deadline was missed, the proposal goes into consideration in the next semester. Jennifer advises putting the deadline on the form and communicating it at the Department Chair Meetings as well. Mark Anderson suggested linking it with registration.

A motion was made and agreed to that Robin Mateo picks the deadline for each semester for New Course/ Gen Ed Proposals.

April 3, 2012 → Next meeting date

Agenda Topics for Future Meetings

New Business –

- 1). MLS
- 2). CRC 2

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:41 pm by Gloria Cook. The next general meeting will be at 12:30 pm on March 27th in Chapel-Room Classroom #2.

Minutes submitted by:

Mark Anderson

Approved by:
