

2-1-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Monday, February 1, 2010

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, Monday, February 1, 2010" (2010). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 73.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/73

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.

Minutes approved at the meeting of February 8, 2010

AAC Minutes – February 1, 2010

In attendance: Jim Small (Chair), Alex Boguslawski, Wendy Brandon, Chris Fuse, Laurie Joyner, Barry Levis, Tocarra Mallard, Sebastian Novak, Dawn Roe, Don Rogers, Steven St. John (Secretary), Lito Valdivia

Guests in attendance: Rick Foglesong, Bruce Stephenson

The meeting was called to order at 7:34 a.m.

Minutes. Discussion of the minutes of January 26 was postponed until the next meeting.

Old Business.

Grade Appeal Case

(Note: for confidentiality reasons, some details, such as the student's name, have been omitted.)

Laurie noted that one of the problems with the procedure of the student grade appeal case was that a sentence was missing from the student catalog. Grade appeals should go first to a committee that includes the relevant Department Chair, President of the Faculty, and Dean of Student Affairs. The student's father wrote a letter asking if AAC had reviewed the wrong syllabus in adjudicating the grade appeal. Don Davison provided the Fall, 2008 syllabus to AAC from the secure Dean of Faculty server. According to that syllabus, "Exams may not be made up unless prior arrangements are made." The student's appeal was based upon perceived unequal treatment in taking a make up exam for a shorter amount of time (1 hour rather than 2) and earning a reduced grade. AAC determined that if the professor had followed the stated policy of not allowing a make up exam (as the student overslept and did not make "prior arrangements"), the student's exam grade would have been a zero. Since strict adherence to the syllabus policy would have resulted in an even lower final grade for the student, AAC decided unanimously that the student was not treated unfairly.

CE Designation

Jim brought a clarification request from Micki Meyer regarding the procedure for giving courses a "CE Designation" (Community Engagement) – whether the final call was made by AAC or AAC's New Course Subcommittee. Steve reported that, in anticipation of the AAC meeting, he had consulted the published minutes of AAC from October 7, 2009, which read: "The CE Designation Committee, it was agreed, would make the judgments as to the courses earning this label and would inform AAC and the registrar's office of the courses that qualify each semester." Additional text from those minutes clarified that the final decision was that of the CE Designation Committee with no "final say" by any arm of AAC. AAC's oversight of this committee is via approval of the slate of members who form the committee at the beginning of each academic year, but that AAC would not wish to "redo the work" of the CE Designation Committee.

Masters of Planning in Civic Urbanism

Bruce and Rick attended to answer any further questions about the Masters of Planning in Civic Urbanism. Wendy and Alex asked for the estimated cost of the program to A&S in terms of faculty load, staffing, and the costs of accruing library resources. Bruce noted that there are both costs and benefits. Rick specified that only one A&S course was “lost” to the program each academic year (Rick’s). A&S was financially compensated for this at 1/6 salary, and Rick’s department is in support of this trade off. The program would also make use of 1.5 courses of overload hours, mostly in summers. In terms of staff, the program was making use of a staff line that had been freed up when another program had been discontinued. In terms of library resources, Bruce reported that he met with Jonathan Miller. In most cases, the library already had the relevant journals and books (Bruce noted he’d been asking the library to buy these topical books for years), and that he and Jonathan identified 5 journals for which the library should obtain a new online license. He was assured that this could be provided by the current library budget.

Dawn asked whether courses would be cross-linked to A&S courses. Rick reminded the committee that the program aspires, in the future, to create such a link perhaps by a 3/2 type model, though there would be issues to work out in the future (such as whether A&S or the Program would receive revenue from the courses).

When there were no more questions, Don complimented Bruce and Rick on their presentation. Barry made a motion that AAC recommend to Executive Committee that the Program be brought to the faculty. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Curriculum Renewal Committee Phase II

Laurie reported that she had reviewed the “white papers” of the Curriculum Renewal Committee, and recommended that the Phase II committee be charged with a specific list of topics for investigation, and that the committee report to AAC in November, 2010. (Discussion clarified that this report would not be a final report, but a preliminary one.) The topics recommended by the Curriculum Renewal Committee included: 1) Process for systematic, ongoing review of major and minor programs of study with an effort to link the goals of these programs to the goals of the college; 2) Consideration of graduation hours such as the status of PE courses and number of courses required within majors; 3) Exploration of ideas that might distinguish Rollins as a leader in curricular innovation. It was proposed that the committee be created as soon as possible, with one member elected from each Division (elections to be conducted by Division Heads) and three members (one student) appointed by AAC, preferably from a pool of faculty who have served in the past in Rollins curricular renewal effort. This proposal had broad support in AAC. Jim would inform the Executive Committee at the next meeting and initiate the election process. Jim would also begin to contact faculty members with experience on previous curriculum committees and work groups to gauge their interest in a two-year appointment.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 a.m.

AAC Minutes of the February 1, 2010 Meeting