

8-31-2010

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, August 31, 2010

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, August 31, 2010" (2010). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 41.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_aa/41](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/41)

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 – August 31, 2010

In attendance: Barry Levis (Chair), Alex Boguslawski, Rick Bommelje (Secretary), Gloria Cook, Chris Fuse, Sebastian Novak, Dawn Roe, Darren Stoub, Martina Vidovic, Deb Wellman

Guests in attendance: Toni Holbrook, Robin Mateo, Sharon Lusk

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

**Minutes.** The minutes of the August 31, 2010 meeting were approved.

**New Business.**

**Final Changes to Music Major**

Barry stated that this is a minor correction to the previously approved Music Major from last spring. Gloria Cook presented the proposed change and noted that in the AAC minutes of April 12, 2010, the final item was for the Senior Project to be approved. Gloria stated that the course was sent to the new course subcommittee last week and it was approved. As part of this proposal the course will be reduced from 5 credits to 4. Barry emphasized that this was the focus of the change in today's meeting.

Summarizing, Gloria asked for AAC to give final approval of the Music curriculum. Barry asked for the rationale on the reduction to 4 hours. Gloria stated that the Theory course had a lab component of 1 credit hours and the course itself was 4 credit hours, for a total of 5 credit hours. In actuality, this was not a lab course but a separate Keyboard Harmony course. The Music department separated the two courses so that now the Keyboard Harmony gets 2 credit hours and the Theory course gets 4 credit hours, without the Lab. This was a course reduction and was proposed and passed by the new course subcommittee. The Senior Capstone is the course that AAC previously discussed in the April 5, 2010 meeting. The Music department wants all seniors to take the Senior Project. This can be done as a recital, a research project or a composition. Darren stated that he understood that a capstone course was a community type of course for seniors. He asked if the word 'capstone' was appropriate, even though it was not in the proposal. Gloria emphasized that the preferred term is Senior Project. Deb noted that there are different definitions of capstone and reinforced that the purpose is for it to serve as the final experience. Darren emphasized that the language in the 'map' should match the term in the new course proposal form so that there is no confusion in terms of what is required. Rick asked if the preferred term is Senior Seminar or Senior Project and Gloria confirmed Senior Project. Toni asked if she could get a copy of the approved minutes for this meeting because the term 'capstone' is currently being used. Barry agreed that the term 'project' is more appropriate and that the History Department has a capstone course which is a community

experience. Rick stated that this was also the case in the Communication department and the term 'Senior Seminar' is used.

A motion was made by Alex to call the course a Senior Project and the motion was seconded by Chris. **The motion passed unanimously as well as a unanimous vote for the course being included in the Music curriculum.**

Barry asked for clarification on curricular changes for majors being sent to the faculty. Deb stated that items go to the faculty when there is a major curricular change. Barry confirmed that this change will be reported to the Executive Committee.

## **2. On-Line Live Registration Proposal**

Barry gave an introduction to the topic of the on-line live registration proposal by stating that he had invited Toni to present an update to the Committee. Toni stated that a proposal was being developed but was not ready yet. She indicated that she would present a preliminary overview of the on-line registration proposal to date. Toni introduced Robin Mateo, who is joining the staff as Director of Student Records. Additionally she noted that Rosa Disla, who is currently out on leave, will be returning on Oct. 1. Rosa, who is an information systems specialist, will team with Robin to assist with the on-line registration process. Toni asked for clarification that the Committee is requesting a full proposal for the on-line registration process and that it would be developed for AAC's review and approval. Barry confirmed this was the case. Toni estimated that the proposal would be ready in November or by the end of the semester.

Toni stated that an appropriate software solution has been identified in a product called DegreeWorks. This is highly interfaced with Banner's academic modules. She distributed a handout on a case study from Rhodes College, which uses DegreeWorks. The implementation requires multiple stages and it is a labor intensive venture. Toni noted that compliance is an important part of the system and allows the creation of a compliance template for degree planning. The intent is to tie the template, which is basically a four year degree plan, to pre-registration. This would also apply to the add/drop function. Students will be able to process their own requests unless there is a change in their program. Changes or substitutions will continue to require that the student must consult with their advisor. The intent is for the process to be more user-friendly.

Barry queried if the advising will take place when the student enters the major. Toni responded that it could be done when the student enters as a freshman. The idea is to build a two year plan for them based on Gen Ed's. A template will then be built for each major, which is driven by course title and number. It will take a considerable amount of effort to be able to bring the system on line. Toni indicated that there are many schools that use DegreeWorks, including Stetson. Another major decision point is how the system will be rolled out. One possibility is to begin with the add/drop function first, while the compliance system is being developed. Another option is to begin with compliance and let the other functions follow. The full scope of alternatives must be explored before a plan is developed to bring to AAC.

Darren asked if it is the tacit assumption that the faculty motion that was passed on students being able to get their course preferences will be maintained. Toni stated that the controllable categories are seniors, Honors and A&P students. Beyond this, the policy of other students getting their first, second or third choices by class cannot be honored.

The registration process will be driven off of specific timeframes. Barry stated that he will take the initiative to locate the motion that was previously passed by the faculty a number of years ago. Deb noted that if students have a four year plan there may be less of a need for the old system. Darren stated that we should try to get rid of the current policy. Barry emphasized that since this is faculty policy, we will have to go through the repeal process. Toni stated that the philosophy behind the system erred on the side of the newest students. Now, there are many student populations that are being given priority for course selection when they actually should not be given the priority. Freshmen and new transfer students get add/drop privileges and they have access to what is wide open. This term, by the end of the add/drop period, there was little left for returning students. Toni emphasized that these are retention issues. Darren stated that it is also important to engage in the discussion of developmental education as well as the process.

Toni stated that this will take much study and conversation before anything is brought on-line. The new system will put the bulk of the burden on the students and the faculty. The key is to equip students with what they are supposed to do with the process. Toni indicated that this will work well for approximately 80% of the students. The other 20% will have difficulty with completing these kinds of tasks. Barry raised the concern about Holt students taking certain courses out of sequence. Sharon confirmed that for transfer credit, equivalencies must be programmed into the computer. Toni stated the equivalency tables are currently being built for every transfer course. This is just one of the building blocks that must be completed before going live. From Toni's perspective, she does not believe that students see themselves as being responsible for their academic planning and advising.

Toni distributed a handout on the functionality of DegreeWorks. This will all be embedded on Foxlink and it is an integrated program with Banner. This is one of the primary reasons that the product is being considered. Toni stated that Stetson uses the product and that a trip will be made to see how it is being implemented. Rick asked if a commitment has been made to purchase this product. Toni stated that Provost wants this and Deb indicated that several departments have voiced favor in it.

Darren re-emphasized that the role of AAC is to negate the current policy and lay the groundwork for a new policy. Barry stated that he is skeptical because it may reduce the role of the faculty. Chris stated that he believed it would make the advisor even more important.

Darren stated that if we are to bring a proposal to the faculty, we must visit Stetson as well as get information from other schools that are using the system. It would also be beneficial to have some of our faculty members talk to faculty members from these other schools to learn about benefits and roadblocks in the system. Toni stated that there are many different types of on-line systems. Since Rollins is an SCT Banner school we should be looking at integrated systems. DegreeWorks is the highest rated, best recommended system.

Toni asked for clarity from AAC on what is being asked of her and her staff. Barry stated he would like to see a demo model. Darren noted that the key is to repeal the old faculty legislation on priority choices. Barry stated it would be beneficial for one or two AAC members to visit Stetson. Toni reinforced that we must have a demo first so that we can be satisfied that it will work for us. Otherwise, she could not recommend it to the faculty.

Alex voiced support for beginning with exploring the best program on the market and is very much in favor of pursuing this first than spending time looking at other systems. Barry asked Toni what to the product costs. She indicated it was between \$50,000-75,000 and an annual fee that would be added to the SCT contract.

Barry emphasized that we must do this right and in the right time frame. Toni concurred and stated that we must make the appropriate decisions on implementing the system rollout. She also underscored the desire to use AAC as the sounding board in the decision making process. Darren shared his experience at a former institution involving a small pilot study involving five faculty using the software. Toni stated that the compliance part of the system is enormous. As the curriculum changes and becomes more complicated, compliance is no longer something that one person can do. Currently, three to four staff members are involved in managing compliance. The primary purpose of Degreeworks is compliance and academic planning. The registration and add/drop processes are part of the system.

Dawn asked what the process is for getting this in front of the faculty for a vote. Barry stated that there would be several colloquium, workshops and demonstrations of the system. Ultimately AAC would take this to the faculty as a proposal to adopt this as the registration and compliance system over the existing system. Gloria stated that we need to be convinced that this is a better approach. Holding a series of colloquium on the system within the semester will help to spread the word about the merits of the system. Alex emphasized that Toni's team should be leading this initiative rather than a representative from a software company. Toni assured that Rosa, Robin and herself will be spearheading the effort. Chris stated that an important selling point to the faculty is that it is not going to adversely affect their majors and it's going to make their job easier. Barry wants to hear about the fairness issue. Toni pointed out that it will not take the advisor out of the process. The issue of fairness is also one of her concerns. Currently approximately 85% of the students are getting their preferred courses. She stated that creative thinking will be necessary in order to insure that students are able to get their course needs met. This may mean changes for AAC in asking departments to meet the demand. Currently there is a terrible situation with courses being scheduled within two day a week, between 10:00 AM and 2:00 PM time slots. Students cannot get adequate class schedules because of the ways departments scheduling. This is an issue that must be resolved. Deb stated that it was her job to stop job to keep departments from submitting schedules that are outside of the matrix. Dawn asked for an example. Deb supplied a specific example of a faculty member who desires a longer block than 50 minutes and asks for a Monday and Wednesday from 1:00 – 3:00 PM. The student is not able to take courses over the two hour time period. Toni indicated that there is a one day per week meeting time in the block but it goes outside of the scheduling rules. She also stated that Laurie has brought up the possibility of looking at the matrix issue. Chris asked if

this is a good time to begin looking at this issue. Toni noted that the biggest problem is that there is a compression of courses being offered on Monday/Wednesday and Tuesday/Thursday between 10:00 AM and 2:00 PM. We have to spread out the scheduling.

Barry thanked Toni for her presentation.

### **3. Maymester Questionnaire**

Barry developed a draft of the questionnaire to send to faculty who taught in the 2009 and/or 2010 Maymesters. There is a request to also include the General Education assessment matrix. He indicated that this is essential for the accreditation process for SACS. Gloria queried as to what is being taken out of a course during the compressed Maymester time frame yet the student still receives 4 credit hours. Barry stated that this is one of the questions on the survey. The survey is also asking faculty for a copy of the Maymester syllabus and a copy of the syllabus for a regular term. Deb stated that the seat time is the same as a regular term course. Barry is asking if students are actually doing 55 hours of week outside of class. Deb stated that we can't prove that this is happening in a regular term. Some students are taking 2 Maymester courses. Sebastian asked if it is possible to restrict students to take only one course. Barry believes that money is the driving issue. He has heard Laurie talk about the revenue that the Maymester has produced and also that it clears up the Gen Ed. backlog. Deb stated that some students want to take two courses because if they are taking summer school at another institution, they can take two courses. Darren asked if portfolios were being completed on the courses for SACS accreditation purposes. Barry stated that faculty members are required to complete the Gen Ed matrix. Darren stated that the quality of the work should also be evaluated. Chris indicated that there are some courses that should not be offered in a 3 week format. Deb stated that it is her understanding that Maymester should be restricted to Gen Ed courses.

Dawn noted that the discussion on limiting the number of transfer credits from other institutions is also part of the issue. Barry agreed and stated our committee's charge is to be concerned about the academic quality. Martina stated that another issue of academic quality is that if the course is taught here, we have control. Darren emphasized that we need to make sure that AAC has control over academic quality. Deb stated that it is important to compare apples with apples and apples with oranges. You will see some differences between a regular semester course and a Maymester course. It is also to pay attention to the Maymester course and what they would be getting at a community college if they took it there during the summer. Darren asked Deb if there is a policy that if a person has more than 60 hours, they have to take any outside courses at a four year institution. Deb replied that if a student needs a Gen Ed course and it meets the requirements, they can take it at another institution, including a community college. Deb also stated that if they take a course in their major, it must be from a four year institution. She also confirmed that all majors require that a certain number of courses are taken at Rollins.

Rick asked what the anticipated number of faculty who would complete the survey. Barry estimated that it would be 50%. Darren asked if we have demographic data on students who

take Maymester courses. Deb stated that is her assumption that they are those students who have put off taking a Gen Ed course.

Barry asked for any edits on the wording of the survey. Deb asked if there was another format other than the essay format. Chris stated that it is important to receive a copy of the syllabus. Deb stated that it may be difficult for faculty to fill out the survey in the essay format. Darren suggested that it could be placed in an on-line survey format. Gloria asked what do we expect to get out of this and what is the next step? Barry responded that Maymester is a trial and would need to be approved again. The next step would be making it a permanent part of the curriculum. Gloria suggested that one possibility is that Maymester courses would need to go through the new course proposal process. Darren noted that this does not address timelines. Barry reinforced that there is anecdotal evidence that faculty are not teaching the same course. Deb stated that the issue is whether or not faculty members are meeting their goals for the course. Darren stated that we should be cautious about considering this as a permanent part of the curriculum, especially with the RP. Deb indicated that there will need to be massive changes in the current RP system. Until the Gen Ed courses change, there is still a need for it.

Rick asked if a vote is required and Barry confirmed that it is necessary to proceed. Deb raised a concern about how the survey will be received by faculty. Dawn stated that it is useful to evaluate it and Chris concurred that we can state that it has evaluated form multiple forms. Barry stated he wants to find out if faculty members are aware of the need to have goals and to measure the goals, especially if it is a Gen Ed. Martina asked if people will be self-selecting in completing the survey. Barry stated that he will be sending the survey out to faculty members who have taught in the Maymester in 2009 and 2010.

Deb requested that the distribution of the survey be held off for one week so that she can review it. She would like to make suggestions on how to best get the information that is requested. Barry agreed.

#### **4. Item for next meeting.**

The President has asked AAC to explore the questions of valedictorians. Last year, there was resentment because the valedictorian was a transfer student. The question to be explored is whether the valedictorian should spend the full 4 years at the institution. As a first step, we can survey our peer and aspirant schools to see what they are doing. Barry will distribute a list and identify a few schools for each member to contact.

The meeting was adjourned at 1: 54 PM.

Rick Bommelje  
Secretary