Minutes, Curriculum Committee Meeting, Tuesday, February 11, 2020

Curriculum Committee
Curriculum Committee Meeting Agenda
Date: February 11, 2020
Location: Chapel, Classroom 101

Voting members:
- Martina Vidovic (Chair)
- Valerie Summet
- Brian Mosby
- Kip Kiefer
- Caitlin Mohr
- Blake Robinson
- Julia Maskivker (Secretary)
- Brendaliz Santiago-Narvaez
- Steven Schoen
- Rachel Simmons
- Samuel Alvarez

Non-voting members:
- Emily Russell
- Stephanie Henning
- Rob Sanders
- Kyle Bennett
- Cece Carrico
- Bet Tauscher

Guests:
- Mae Fitchett
- Toni Holbrook
- Tiffany Griffin
- Steve Booker
- Erik Kenyon
- Karla Knight
- Gabriel Barreneche

Agenda

1. Approve minutes from the February 4, 2020 meeting approved moved by Valerie approved

2. Sub-committee reports
   a. New course: nothing to report
   b. Academic Appeals: no meeting
   c. EC: no meeting
   d. Registration, nothing to report formally
   e. SGA: announces 3 new members, 2 of those will be mentioned in next meeting, they are not present, another one is Wisly Zephir, international student from Haiti

4. Old business
   a. Graduate Course Repeat Policy (Holt and CLA): Robert Sanders sent the sentence he added for the policy and Martina took same sentence and added it to the policy for CLA. A question arose about the use of the word “repeated” in Sanders’ phrasing and how it created confusion.iscussion ensued. Robert defends his use of repeated. He says a repeated course is different than a course you can take several times (like an English writing course). It is important to know we had a repeated course policy and clarity is improved. It is decided that the phrasing will be this: “credit may only be earned once for a course. However, in the instance” and everything else stays. Moved by Steven S, voted on, passed.

   b. Make-up Class Policy for College Closures: Toni Holbrook sent updated version for policy to the cc. She met with deans for Holt and Crummer and CLA to check: Made clarifications and answered all questions that were raised by them--except how to decide on contingency dates. It is suggested that she adds a statement to the effect that in case of multiple storms, days will be cumulative. In regards to
Absences and notification policy for faculty members: This is driven by college emergency operation plan. This plan is physically only with campus safety dept—not on college website. The plan states that Deans and provost will be notified and then communications flow. After much discussion, it is decided that Toni will strike off from new updated policy the phrase about “new content on make-up dates.” It is decided that most faculty members are sensitive to the gravity of an emergency situation already, they know how to accommodate students, we don’t need the phrase. Toni will make final revisions and bring it to the committee again.

5. New business

a. Strategic Planning Task Force Recommendations: Carol Lauer is here, says that the president asked her to meet with the CC in order to get a sense of our general opinion about how the prior strategic planning went and what we have in mind for the near future carol here. It is reminded that when the prior strategic plan developed, the cc was involved in it but it was completely composed of different members than currently. Carols explains that she is interested in learning our views about how the strategic plan succeeded in connecting Rollins mission of student engagement with academic programs. Then she proceeds to explain that, in this regard, the Rfla general education program imposed new requirements for students. She also says that there were two sub-committees of the cc for these reforms. She also tells us that the college website was redone and each dept had to show how major went along with mission of the college. She asks So, what do you think of these changes? One answer is heard:” we did what we said we were going to do, so that’s positive.” Question is asked: What about the new reflective essay for major declaration? Who reads that? Emily?” Yes, Emily does, Emily replies. She explains that she does qualitative assessment and reads report (200 word response). A Student raises the question: “can we make this essay longer? It is really difficult to explain your choice in 200 words.”

b. The observation is made that from a science division perspective: deferred declaration of major forces students to take courses and get started and complete major on time.

c. The question is asked: what is really the intent of the essay for the major declaration? Carol replies: That idea came from the taskforce in place years ago. Martina adds that many times, students are forced into major by a parent, with the essay, they have reasons to argue for themselves. Carol also adds that this new requisite may depress number of students who change majors. Emily Russell adds that 80 percent of students nationally change majors.

d. The point is made that there is a disconnect between student majors and their advisors, we don’t have a way to match them in place. Repercussions: students miss a class because someone is not advising them right. In the Sciences, the problem is more acute. Carol adds that another item in the strategic planning effort from last years was that each department would adopt autonomous
measures to control number of majors because there are big differences between some depts. Carol asks: “any other ideas? Question is asked: “are we training advisors in these deferred major process?” A faculty member who went through RCC training recently responds:” yes, it is very clear that the training is good.” It is agreed that the strategic plan has worked positively in connecting departmental achievements with the mission of the college

6. **Announcements none**
7. **Adjourn**