

3-22-2011

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, March 22, 2011

Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_aa](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, March 22, 2011" (2011). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 36.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_aa/36](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/36)

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](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

AAC Minutes – March 22, 2011

In attendance: Barry Levis (Chair), Rick Bommelje (Secretary), Gloria Cook, Sebastian Novak, Hillary Roviario, Darren Stoub, Kristen Trucco, Martina Vidovic, Deb Wellman

Guests in attendance: Lisa Tillman, Larry Eng-Wilmot, Pat Schoknecht, Sean Phelan, Sharon Carnihan, Don Rogers, Marc Sardy, Sharon Agee

The meeting was called to order at 12:32 PM.

**Minutes.** The minutes of the March 15, 2011 meeting were approved with a correction.

Barry stated that he had sent a memo this week to members requesting that the order of business be reversed this week, beginning with New Business. Members unanimously agreed with this shift in the agenda.

**New Business**

**1. Changes in CMC Major**

Barry introduced Lisa Tillman who is presenting the proposal for changes to the CMC major. Lisa stated the substantive changes include embedding a lab in three of the core courses. Barry asked if the courses are increased from 4 to 5 credit hours and Lisa confirmed. A second change is dropping ENG 211 Visual Rhetoric as a core course because of scheduling considerations in the English department and because of staffing constraints in the CMC department. not being able to develop an alternative core course at this time. Barry queried if the core would be reduced from five to four courses and Lisa confirmed. Lisa stated that students will fulfill the theory requirement both with CMC 300 and with SOC 335 Sociological Theory taught by Ed Royce. The other changes involve wording edit and the description of SOC 335. Gloria asked if the students will be getting the fundamentals as the curriculum is trimmed down. Lisa responded that there is no trimming down occurring. The core courses will be reduced from half of the curriculum to 40% but students will be required to take one area concentration course that will be congruent with their concentration. It does not reduce the number of courses that they are taken, only the size of the required courses. Darren stated that when the CMC Program was passed by the faculty, because the major has ten required courses, it was suggested that students would be encouraged to dual major. He asked how many students are currently dual majoring. Lisa did not have the data available in preparation for the meeting and asked if there is a concern. Darren stated that at the time it was passed, he thought that ten required courses was low for a major. Sebastian reported that there are 7/125 double majoring listed on Foxlink. Barry stated that Roger's preference was ten required courses for a major. Lisa stated that there are a number of transfer students who would not be able to double major. Gloria indicated that this is a wonderful example of an interdisciplinary major, being able to tap into other departments. Gloria asked if

juniors and senior are able to find enough courses to take. Lisa stated that she has found approved courses for students. She expressed concern that members of the CMC department have been teaching primarily core courses. In the four years of operation of the program, this is the first term that she has taught an elective course.

**Gloria made a motion to approve the motion**

**Hillary seconded motion.**

**Motion passes unanimously**

## **2. Changes in Chemistry Major**

Barry introduced Larry Eng- Wilmot who is presenting the proposal for changes to the Chemistry major. Larry stated that several years ago the curriculum for the Chemistry major changed substantially as a result of a study by the accrediting committee of the American Chemical Society. The department is in the second year of implementation of the major and is discovering some issues with pre-requisite and issues with the catalog and major-minor map that has led to some confusion. A large part of the proposal deals with cleaning up the pre-requisite issues and developing clearer language in the catalog and on the major-minor map. The substantive change involves the minor. Instead of requiring 4 required courses and 2 electives, the department is proposing that there be 3 required courses and 3 electives. It is anticipated that most students will take CHM 221, BCH 335, and BCH 435 as their electives. CHM 320 Analytical Chemistry would be dropped as a core course and will be made an elective. The reason is that there is an increase in the number of minors. This has been happening more frequently when students are in their junior year and realize that they can minor in Chemistry. Some of the students are Biology and Biochemistry Molecular Biology majors. This is a way for the students to be able to group a set of electives together to create a mini concentration in the minor. Barry reviewed the specific changes in the proposal (i.e. CHM 335 and CHM 435 were updated to BCH 335 and BCH 435. The prerequisites for BCH 335 were updated to reflect what is already listed in the catalog.) Barry commented that this has nothing to do with pre-medical course requirements and Larry confirmed this.

**Darren made a motion to approve the motion**

**Kirsten seconded motion.**

**Motion passes unanimously**

## **3. Blackboard Archives**

Barry introduced Pat Schoknecht who is presenting the proposal for archiving of Blackboard material. Pat stated that currently Blackboard courses do not disappear. There are 2 issues with this: 1. For the IT department, they build up on the server for no reason and, 2. For the faculty member, there are a number of old courses that appear, causing clutter. The recommendation is that annually the courses will be removed that are one year old. Pat stated that if this begins in Fall 2011, four weeks into the term the IT department would remove the Fall 2010 courses. The Spring 2011 courses would still be active. Pat indicated that faculty members will be asked to take care of their own intellectual property and archive the courses themselves. Barry expressed that the directions about archiving appear to be time consuming and difficult. He also emphasized that his concern is about protecting the faculty and it appears that adding additional responsibilities is a serious problem. Pat's responded that these are the faculty members' courses

and their intellectual property. If she takes responsibility for archiving all of the courses, then they become the College's property. As a faculty member, she does not feel good about that at all since she wants to keep her own intellectual property. She would much prefer to take the 5 minutes to archive her courses and retain her intellectual property. Darren asked if it would be better to archive at the end of the semester rather than 4 weeks into the term. Pat stated that this is not substantially different for us and is happy to accept this as a friendly amendment if it is easier. Gloria asked if the archiving could be done every two years. Barry agreed and stated that there are several courses that are taught every two or three years. Pat stated that the faculty member can send the archive to IT or the import could be done by faculty member themselves which takes only a few minutes. Darren confirmed that it takes a few minutes to execute. Deb asked if there is a length of time for keeping grade books from a legal standpoint. Pat did not know and Deb stated she would follow up with this with the College attorney. Darren stated that present policy is that syllabi are submitted to the Dean of the Faculty's office for record. He indicated that some faculty are moving from a paper syllabus to an electronic version on Blackboard and asked about who has ownership. Pat stated syllabi must be turned in to the Dean of the College for SACS. The College does not currently have an intellectual property policy. Barry asked if the Blackboard archiving proposal is being vetted other than through this committee and Pat stated that this has met with the Crummer faculty. There was conversation about where this should go next. Gloria suggested that Barry take this policy to the EC for discussion. Deb recommended that if this goes through that special training sessions be set up for faculty and Pat concurred.

**Gloria made a motion to endorse the policy with the friendly amendment that archiving will be done at the end of the term rather than four weeks into the term.**

**Martina seconded the motion.**

**Motion passes unanimously**

#### **4. Departmental Assessment**

Barry introduced Sharon Carnihan who is presenting the proposal on departmental assessment that included an annual review and a seven year external review. Sharon stated that SACS calls for annual assessments of academic units. At Rollins, this has been on a sporadic basis over the years. Reports have been requested that deal only with student learning outcomes and some reports have requested that deal only with department needs (i.e. for faculty or additional budget) Rollins is well behind its peer and aspirant institutions in this process. Just about everybody requests an annual reporting of data concerning learning outcomes. When the draft was put together for an annual review by departments, it was put together in 2 forms: 1). The Dean will request an annual review without being specific paragraph by paragraph about what it should contain as long as it reported at the core the student learning outcomes and strengths and weaknesses of the department; and 2). The second version that is the Rollins Academic Report as it exists this year. Most colleges have a program for review or in depth review of departments. The schedule resembles a five year schedule for faculty. The college has an institutional effectiveness committee that has been formed this year. Members include the director of institutional research, the Dean, Provost, Director of Christian A. Johnson Center, Toni Holbrook and Sharon. It is this group's opinion and the Provost's opinion that this is something that the Dean would do and does not need to be part of the By-Laws and did not need committee

approval. However, it made great sense to bring it to AAC to ask for endorsement, support and comments. Sharon distributed a copy of a memo that went to department chairs. One of the open questions to be decided in the future is who needs to report every year. For SACS purposes, the administration decided to go with departments and stand-alone majors in the Holt School. Barry asked how much time will be required to do this. Sharon stated that of the departments on campus, 100% of the departments have completed this year. Of those 70% of the departments will be collecting numerical data about what their students know and do. The other 30% have plans for non-numerical data. She believes that once this is done two years in a row no one will complain about it. We need to know what are students know and what they can do when they graduate. In order to establish a culture of assessment at Rollins, more needs to happen. Barry stated that at one time Jim Eck had developed a system. Sharon stated this system does exist; however, the judgment was to start over again. Barry indicated that at one time there was an in-depth review process established that included a rotation schedule among departments. It was ended because of the expense. He asked if there is administrative commitment to fund this and Deb confirmed. She stated that two assessments have been done this year. Sharon indicated that the current budget would cover only two per year. Darren stated that he has been appalled that we do not have a formalized program review. Sharon indicated that the Dean advised that this come through AAC. If it is endorsed and put in the AAC minutes it would make it easier. Barry stated that the process would be similar to the Blackboard archives proposal whereby AAC would endorse and take it to the EC to find out how they want to handle it. Barry asked if this was presented to the Department Chairs and Deb confirmed. Sharon stated that the reaction of the Department chairs was that there must be funding available for this. She also indicated that the College is 5 to 6 years behind the rest of the county on assessment. Sharon distributed a tool to measure RAR. Hillary stated that from a students' perspective she appreciates that programs will be reviewed and renewed in a manner that is accreditation appropriate.

**Gloria made a motion to endorse the policy on Departmental Assessment and forward it to the EC.**

**Rick seconded motion.**

**Motion passes unanimously**

## **5. INB Major**

Barry reported that after the last meeting, he received two emails, one from Harry Kypraios and one from Benny Balak, complaining that they had not been informed that the INB revised proposal was on the agenda. They also said there was a misrepresentation of the department's view about EC 221, the Statistics course. Barry emphasized to Ben that we had been informed that there had been a statement from the department that they were going to make this change. Ben stated that was not the case and Barry informed Ben that he needs to have a meeting and officially inform AAC that the requirement will be taken off. Ben stated that there is a problem with this is that it does not coincide with the catalog. To take ECO 221 a student needs just ECO 202. It was the INB impression that students needs to take EC 202 and EC 203 and Ben responded that they wanted to make it easier so the students could take EC 203 and EC 221 concurrently. Barry stated that we can only work with what is in the catalog which states that a student must take EC 202 before EC 221. This means that we have approved a 19 course major because EC 202 will be required for all INB students. Barry stated that when he reported this, Darren asked for a

rescinding of the vote. Darren pointed out that it was his understanding that in the meeting between INB and economics, there was the decision to agree to disagree, that there was no willingness. Barry confirmed that this was in the minutes. Darren stated that he talked to Harry Kypraios who indicated that they the economics department had been trying to get INB work with them on the courses. Darren also stated that the article in the Sandspur indicating that the INB was a forgone conclusion pending AAC approval. Both of these items were disturbing to him and he felt he was duped. Since he did not have all of the information available, he felt compelled to make the motion to rescind. Hillary stated that she had the feeling that the economics department was going to come back and say they did not say that, which is what has happened. Deb responded that she had asked if we could do it temporarily, which did not happen. Darren pointed out that he voted for the proposal with the understanding that it would go to the full faculty. Barry confirmed that it was the AAC recommendation that it would go to the full faculty. Gloria indicated that she respects the INB's position that it is their curriculum; however, she queried the interdisciplinary nature of the major. As she reviewed the interdisciplinary major requirements on the website, she believes that INB is not an interdisciplinary major. Gloria asked how do we define the interdisciplinary major. Barry stated all departmental majors are 12 courses; interdisciplinary majors have 16 to 18 courses, with the exception of CMC that has 10. Darren asked if this is a policy. Rick asked if it should be in the minutes of the faculty meeting when the program was approved. Darren stated that if there is no stated policy, INB should not be held to a higher standard. Deb emphasized that she does not believe that we were duped and INB does not want a 19 course major. Hillary asked if passing a 19 course major would change the faculty requirements and Barry stated that it would not. Rick stated that it was his understanding that once the motion was passed by AAC that it would go to the full faculty for debate. Darren concurred that he wanted the proposal to go to the faculty for the ultimate decision. Rick asked Barry if he has reason to believe that the EC would approve the proposal and he stated that he doubted it. Rick read the motion that was passed, which did not include that it was the AAC's understanding that it would go to the faculty. Deb stated that she is in favor of rescinding the vote because this is not what INB wants. Darren stated that the faculty of the institution is responsible for the curriculum. Deb emphasized that this committee should not be telling a department what courses to teach. Rick pointed that this will cause problems with the AACSB requirements. Barry indicated that if we rescind, INB will have to develop an alternative because the proposal was passed with a misconception. Martina queried if we could ask what INB prefers. Barry recognized Marc S, INB department chair. He stated that he has observed two departments put through major changes that effect other departments with virtually no discussion. Multiple discussions have been held about the issues. Barry asked if he wants us to take this forward to the faculty with a 19 course major or rescind the vote and have the INB department develop and alternative. Marc S recognized Don to speak on behalf of the department. Don stated that given the choice, he misunderstood the economics department's position and confirmed that there is no agreement. He would rather see this rescinded since the key point is to get EC 202 out of the INB major. Barry stated that he believes that one of the early proposals that he received from Don in which the program would be left intact with the addition of INB 200 would probably pass and not have to go to the faculty. Don stated that that proposal was not endorsed by the INB department. Don stated that if INB cannot be seriously heard that there is a course that should

be removed from the curriculum, then there is a problem. Don emphasized that rescinding is the best solution.

**Darren made a motion to rescind last week's vote.**

**Sebastian seconded the motion.**

**Motion passes unanimously**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM.

Rick Bommelje  
Secretary