

2-8-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Monday, February 8, 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 8, 2010" (2010). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 74.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/74

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 2/15/10

AAC Minutes – February 8, 2010

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

Guests in attendance: Adam Arthur

The meeting was called to order at 7:37 a.m.

Minutes. The minutes of January 26 and February 1 were approved.

Announcements. Jim informed Rick Foglesong about AAC's plans for the Curriculum Renewal Committee Phase II. Rick advised to proceed with plans to fill the committee. Jim will contact the Division Heads about elections and proceed to locate 2 faculty and 1 student for the AAC appointed seats. At the Executive Committee meeting, Jim learned that the Faculty Evaluation Committee was addressing the fact that some Holt School Course Instructor Evaluation forms (e.g., graduate school courses) are not consistent with the online forms used by Arts and Sciences. This concern was first addressed to Professional Standards by the Dean of Faculty. The Dean of Faculty has asked that all evaluation procedures and forms, including those used by International Programs, be the same. Jim also reported that Executive Committee has not yet dealt with the revisions (approved by AAC) to the Academic Honor Code. Laurie warned that some members of Executive Committee found the proposal difficult to interpret, and that the issue may come up again in AAC before Executive Committee could deal with it.

New Business.

Internship Clarification

Chris reported that Academic Appeals noted that the College Catalog was inconsistent with regard to whether internship experiences taken credit/no credit could be used to count toward major programs. In one place, "Courses taken CR/NC may not be used to fulfill general education, major, minor, or concentration requirements." In another: "A student who requests credit in a major or minor must obtain the approval of the respective Department Chair prior to the internship deadline. Departments that offer their own internships adhere to the standards established by the Office of Career Services." Don noted that, historically, that decision was left up to individual departments, and that in some majors, internships and similar experiences were fundamental.

Barry expressed his view that in some cases, grades of A seemed to be "given out" as a matter of course and that credit/no credit would be more appropriate than an automatic A merely for showing up. Tocarra seconded that sentiment, saying that in her experience, some internships required a lot of academic work (papers, etc.) to earn a grade, whereas others seemed to require very little for the same grade.

Laurie noted for some departments, such as Critical Media Studies, internships are carefully thought out and made integral to the program. She expressed a desire to allow individual departments to make use of internships in ways that made sense, but also that AAC fulfill its role in oversight of the curriculum. She suggested that each department might prepare a policy statement clarifying the role of internships and the strategy of assigning grades or credit.

Don proposed new language to the Catalog to resolve the contradictions brought by Chris, but most members of the committee felt that revising the language would be premature. After discussion, it was determined that Sharon Agee, Allisa Johnson, and Elizabeth Boggs would be invited to a future AAC meeting so that AAC could gather more information.

London Summer Program

Don and Adam Arthur presented a proposal to pilot a program in London, England, during Maymester, 2010. Don summarized that the program would feature Rollins courses taught by Rollins professors. The pilot would be 3.5 weeks with two faculty each teaching two courses. The target enrollment would be 16-24 students. Classes would include both classroom time and field experiences. Cost would be \$5695 per student. Don had brought the proposal to International Programs who have the program its blessing in October, 2009.

Wendy asked if this was modeled after Crummer's program and Adam responded that this would have a larger academic component to it. Laurie asked what responsibilities did the pilot faculty (Don and Keith Buckley) have during May. Don responded that he did not have other responsibilities during that time but was less certain about Keith Buckley.

There were additional questions as to the approval of faculty and staff for the program. It was decided that the proposal must clarify that all appointments be determined by the Dean of Faculty, because only that office had all of the data pertinent to such a decision (e.g., evaluation results).

Laurie noted that there was no budget attached to the proposal. She also wondered if the program would draw away enrollment from Maymester, which is an important revenue stream for the college – revenue from Maymester is the faculty travel budget.

Wendy moved that AAC approve the pilot program pending receipt of a detailed budget, clarification of the appointment process, and a report of Keith Buckley's May responsibilities. The motion carried with Don abstaining.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:36 a.m.