

9-14-2010

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 14, 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, September 14, 2010" (2010). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 43.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_aa/43](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/43)

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 – September 14, 2010

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

Guests in attendance: Sharon Lusk

The meeting was called to order at 12:31 PM.

**Minutes.** The minutes of the September 7, 2010 meeting were approved.

**Announcement:** Barry welcomed Christian Ricaurte, the AAC student representative from the Holt School.

**Old Business**

**1. Evaluation of Maymester**

Barry summarized the email from Deb requesting that AAC postpone the review of syllabi and stated that a formal report on Maymester that is being prepared by Laurie Joyner that is addressing similar concerns that the committee has discussed. Chris stated that this would not postpone discussing the draft of the New Course Proposal Form which could cover more than Maymester. Barry concurred and indicated that any course that was being taught in a mode other than it was originally approved would have to go through the new course subcommittee.

Chris distributed the form and identified the one question was added to Section IV Academic Standards.

*If the course has been taught during the semester and is to be in a shortened time frame (i.e. topics courses, Maymester), how will the course, course objectives, and the learning outcomes differ?*

He worded this in a way that applies to a course that is taught in a shortened time frame, such as Maymester. If the intent is to include a course being taught in a method other than what it was originally approved, the question would have to be reworded. For example, if a course is being taught in a blended learning format, this would be enough of a change that it would require the new submission.

Darren stated that the fundamental problem with the original form is that there is no place on the form to discuss pedagogical approaches. This debate is about the pedagogy of an accelerated four hour class time in place of a one week regular class time. He asked if we are suggesting that the new course subcommittee also has to evaluate pedagogical approaches. Chris stated this is a question that the committee came to last year and Barry

indicated that it was not resolved. Barry stated that it is important to be consistent. He noted that if a course is approved by the new course subcommittee and a change in the means of delivery will take place, then it has to be reviewed again. Darren questioned what 'means of delivery' means and Barry responded that it could be such things as a change in time frame or blended learning format. Chris raised the example of a course that shifts to a two day format from a four day format and questioned how much the method of delivery has actually changed. Is it a big enough change that it has to be reviewed by the new course subcommittee? Chris stated that we should not have to re-evaluate courses if they have this type of time change. Darren stated that he thought the whole discussion of evaluating the Maymester is because a course that is offered in a semester is compressed to a three week format. Dawn indicated that this would not apply to a course like Barry seminar which meets for four hours once a week. Gloria stated that pedagogically we have to determine if the same objectives and learning outcomes are being met given the compressed time of the course. Chris stated that it is unlikely that in a three week time frame that the students have the time to reflect and evaluate what they are doing. Barry stated that we have to be careful not to get into micromanaging. The key is if it is a significant difference. Gloria emphasized that if the course content is changed, then the method of delivery and outcomes are going to be different. Barry stated that the question could be modified to 'how do the course content, course objectives and learning outcomes differ'? Chris's concern is that in Maymester that there is too little teaching done for it to be counted for Gen Ed credit. It would not hold up to the standards of a course taught in during the semester. Alex recalled that during the former Winter term, during the four week format, he would meet for eight full hours in a day. Barry indicated that since the courses taught in the Winter Term were topic courses and not Gen Ed's, it leant themselves to the format. Barry restated that the concern in Maymester is the question of whether or not the Gen Ed requirements are being fulfilled. Darren cautioned that we not be biased towards the Maymester. Chris stated that the question was written that would include any course that is shortened in any scale. Barry stated that the form is used by both A&S and Holt. Therefore it could also include the summer term courses that are offered in the regular term. Sharon asked if this would apply to all Holt summer courses and Barry responded that it would apply to a course that had originally been approved as a Fall or Spring term and is now approved to be offered in an abbreviated format during the summer. Dawn asked why can't we have a Maymester specific course proposal form? This would enable the relevant questions to be asked rather than including them in the current course proposal form. Barry agreed that this proposal is the easiest. The question about how the course will fulfill the Gen Ed requirement can then be asked. Alex stated that this was the most important question

Chris will develop a separate Maymester new course proposal form for review.

## **2. Valedictorian Requirements.**

Members reported on the information collected from the designated schools about requirements for Valedictorian. Barry spoke with Karen Hater to determine the current process. Karen gets a list of the highest GPA's from Toni and Karen selects the top one. They must have earned 60 hours. Barry explained the Holt school process with Karen and she found it to be interesting. Gloria suggested that a named award be given to the recipient who will deliver the presentation. Sharon shared the Holt process. Currently, the staff

identifies the top qualified students and the candidates are presented to the Holt directors for selection. For A&S, a faculty committee could be established to make a determination. Gloria suggested that the selected student's accomplishments and activities be tied into the Rollins mission statement of educating for global citizenship and responsible leadership. Darren stated that there is currently no student award that aligns with the mission statement. Barry stated that we will also have to determine what the GPA requirement is over a definite time period. Sebastian stated that he believes transfer students should not be allowed to earn the award. This is also the general belief of the SGA. Darren and Chris believe that a transfer student who attends Rollins for three years should not be penalized. Alex believes that accepting transfer students complicates the issue. Who would determine if one, two or three years of transfer credit would enable the student to be eligible? It would be easier to say we will not accept transfer students. Gloria stated that the profile of the student who has spent the full four years at Rollins will be different as opposed to someone who has spent two years at the institution. Martina queried if the students in the 3/2 program would not qualify. Barry asked if we should include in the process, similar to what was done in Holt in past years, the opportunity for the top students to submit an application and make a case. Darren suggested that a formal proposal should be developed and presented to the SGA for feedback. Additionally, before applications are distributed a faculty committee should be formed to write a rubric for evaluation.

Barry will develop a formal proposal to be voted on by the committee which then be passed on to students for discussion. Barry will then present it to the Executive Committee to determine where they want to go with it. Christian asked if this would be solely for A&S and Barry confirmed since the Holt School has a system in place. Sharon noted that if a rubric is developed for evaluation that it would be also be helpful in the Holt process.

Barry asked if there is a consensus on the direction of this approach and it was confirmed

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. Asian Studies Major Colloquium.**

Barry stated that the Asian Studies major will be an item of business that is coming to the committee soon. Last year, AAC approved the proposal for the new major and it was voted down by the faculty. Barry's recommendation to Ilan Alon was to have a discussion with the dissenting faculty members to determine their concerns and then hold a colloquium. The colloquium will be held on Tues., 9/21/10 @ 12:30 PM in the Faculty Club. Barry suggested the members attend the session and also become acquainted with the minutes from last year's meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:27 PM.

Rick Bommelje  
Secretary

