

11-11-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Wednesday, November 11, 2009

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, Wednesday, November 11, 2009" (2009). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 95.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/95

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 11/18 meeting

AAC Minutes – November 11, 2009

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

Guests in attendance: Don Davison, Rick Foglesong, Bruce Stephenson, Deb Wellman

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

Announcements. Jim reported on a meeting with Thom Moore about AAC's process with the Blended Learning Initiative. Barry noted that in a Holt Director's Meeting, Jim Eck seemed to be unaware that AAC was reviewing the Initiative. Laurie said that she had made it clear to Jim Eck that PSC might very well consult with AAC about the proposals. AAC reaffirmed its intention to invite Jim Eck to a future meeting.

Minutes. The minutes of the 11/4 meeting were unanimously approved pending two changes, one regarding the academic appeals case brought to AAC and one involving the description of the Dean of Faculty budget.

Old Business.

Academic Honor Code

Don Davison reported on an issue that had arisen at the previous meeting in regard to wording in the revision of the Academic Honor Code (hereafter, AHC-r) about the disposition of documents after a honor case was resolved. AAC had asked that the wording be made more clear. After consulting with the college attorney, the AHC-r was altered to read "The record shall be the property of the College and destroyed seven (7) years after graduation or date of last attendance." Don noted that this also brought the language in line with national recommendations of "Retention and Archival Procedures".

Deb Wellman resumed raising specific issues in the AHC-r that went beyond the level of mere wording and document organization changes. First was a proposal to allow students to write a shortened version of the honor code on tests and papers after the freshman year. Second was a proposal for the acting honor council to conduct interviews and provide recommendations about candidates for the next year's honor council, in the event that there are more applicants than positions. Third involved the section on the submission of work prepared for another course – previously, the student required permission from both the current professor and the previous course professor; the AHC-r amends this to just the current professor. Fourth was a change in the language to clarify that the honor council can recommend suspension and dismissal, but that the final decision on suspension and dismissal would be the purview of the Dean of Faculty.

AAC briefly discussed whether this should be true of any decision by the honor council – not only in cases of suspension or dismissal. This was discussed when the AHC was first being devised; Jim noted that many faculty were uncomfortable with the notion that the council would have decision-making power (rather than advisory input). It was agreed though that this argument had already been made and that to retract the powers of the honor council at this point did not make sense and there was no specific evidence that any such rollback needed to be considered.

Annie asked what the procedure was if a student does not respond to an honor case. Deb responded that the honor council makes every effort to contact the student, but if multiple attempts fail to elicit a response from the student, a hearing can commence without the student. Annie said that this was not clear in the policy. Don Davison said that this was clear in the policy and was also clear in the letter sent to the student who is the subject of an honors code violation allegation: the student must respond within 5 days of receiving the letter and that a hearing can commence after a “reasonable amount of time” passes. Annie asked what that reasonable time was – should that be explicit? Don responded that reasonable meant that the attempts to contact the student were reasonable in providing the student an opportunity to respond. He and Deb also noted that attempts to make the AHC “more prescriptive” – hard coding deadlines and decision making – would make the AHC less just in practice. Many of the proposals in the AHC-r, in fact, were to provide more flexibility in the process so that the honors council was free to make a reasonable adjudication considering the particulars of each case. Don Davison noted that what was important was that regardless of the decision making process, a clear and fair appeals process was also in place.

Deb resumed iterating other key issues in the AHC-r. Fifth and sixth were proposals to make more flexible the wording involving suspension and dismissal. “Suspension... is an appropriate sanction for intentional dishonesty, even on the first offense and is mandatory for the second offense” – the proposal is to change “mandatory” to “recommended”. A similar change is propose for the statement of policy on Dismissal (“appropriate... even on a second offense, mandatory/recommended for a third offense”).

This led to some discussion. Barry noted that there was a history to this policy – that faculty felt like it was important to “tie the Dean’s hands” on this issue and assure that repeat offenders were given an appropriately stiff penalty. Laurie said that she too would have voted for such stiff language at the time, but on seeing actual cases had come to believe that the flexibility was required. She likened the wording to the “Three strikes and you’re out” legalism which required a certain penalty even when each individual offense might be minor. Although specific cases were not discussed, Deb and Laurie suggested that in some cases a clear violation can occur even when there is no intent of the part of the student.

Jim said that the process here was to go from AAC to EC to the faculty, and he argued that AAC could send this wording along in the process. Faculty would have an opportunity to voice objections. Jim agreed that when you put something in practice, you always find things that

don't work, and clearly Deb, Don, and Laurie's experiences reflected in the AHC-r were an attempt to improve the justice of the honor council.

Don Rogers moved to send this on to EC with the changes discussed (i.e., some minor wording suggestions, including changing "alleged student" to simply "student"). The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

LACS Major and Minor Maps

Having reviewed the LACS major and minor maps prior to the meeting, Jim asked if there was a motion to approve the maps. Don made such a motion, which was seconded and unanimously approved.

New Business.

Masters of Planning in Civic Urbanism

Bruce Stephenson and Rick Foglesong provided AAC with a 40-page bound document and additional executive summary of a proposal to bring a Masters of Planning in Civic Urbanism graduate program to Rollins College. The proposal represented a "due-diligence study" requested by Rollins administrators in the wake of a Cornell Innovation Grant. Bruce noted that the program also represented the culmination of community and campus support that had been building for 25 years. He stated that he believed this program built upon Rollins' strengths and on what has been done elsewhere, but that the program at Rollins would also be distinguished by its liberal arts orientation.

Rick Foglesong summarized some of the strengths of the proposal. He noted that it was fortunate that both he and Bruce were on the same campus combining their strengths as nationally recognized experts in the area, and that on campus and in the local community there was a great deal of additional expertise. He and Bruce both emphasized that the campus itself was built around many of the principles of planning that underscored the ideals of the program, and that in conferences held on the topic on campus, members of the local and national community interested in urban environment planning recognized this feature of our campus – that it is walkable, has a democratic design, and has buildings constructed to human scale.

Bruce noted that similar programs are often taught from a scientific or engineering perspective, and that the Rollins program would fill an important niche in being taught from a liberal arts perspective. He noted that local employers indicated that graduates of such a program would be highly desirable to them. (These comments came out of well-attended focus group meetings with developers, planning consultants, and public sector planners.)

Jim asked what the staffing impact would be, in light of the fact that Bruce, Rick, and a host of other faculty would be contributing to the program (e.g., Paul Stephenson, Paul Harris, John Houston, Mike Gunter, and Rachel Simmons). He also asked if there would be financial costs. Rick responded that he and Bruce would teach 2 courses a year, but one would be in summer so only one would be on load. Bruce noted that his on-load course would come from his Holt

School commitments. He also reminded AAC that A&S would be reimbursed \$10,000 out of the Masters program budget for each on load course. He viewed the possibility of other A&S faculty teaching in summer as a point of attraction for the program. The budget provided in the proposal forecasts that the program would be self-supporting by a comfortable financial margin, while maintaining tuition rates in line with other programs.

Laurie asked if Rick and Bruce could provide letters of support from the Chairs of the relevant departments who might have contributing faculty (i.e., psychology, biology, political science, and art).

Rick suggested that faculty might also teach overload courses to contribute during the semester to the Masters program. Laurie noted that the college was trying to reduce overload commitments. Rick stated that many faculty view it as their right to teach overload as a means of increasing income. Laurie stated that according to the faculty handbook, during Fall and Spring semesters, no such right existed.

Wendy asked if there was a plan to involve undergraduates in the program. Rick raised the possibility of, perhaps eventually, using a 3/2 program model to attract undergraduates to Rollins and steer them into the Masters program. Don Rogers noted that trying to mix undergraduates with professionals in the Masters of Human Resources program was attempted for one year and then abandoned as “a disaster for the undergraduates.”

Barry asked whether the program would fill its first year. Bruce said that they were aiming for 20-25 students and that he already had “about ten” letters from students interested in enrolling in such a program. He noted that there is a budget for marketing the program. Bruce also offered another advantage to the college in having such a program: enhancing its reputation, and providing teaching and research opportunities for faculty to bring back into their A&S teaching. Bruce felt that this seemed to be something the Dean of Faculty should support.

Laurie responded that the Dean of Faculty certainly does support this endeavor as long as it does not detract from the undergraduate program. Jim also stated that he felt the program “was very well thought out” but was concerned about impact to the undergraduate program, concluding “we’ll have to think about this”.

Don Rogers asked what feedback there has been from other faculty. Barry and Wendy wondered if it wouldn’t be a good idea to hold a colloquium on the program, not only to solicit feedback, but also to provide the faculty time to think about the program before being asked to vote on it. Rick and Bruce agreed that this was a good idea – they had thought about such an idea but had decided that the proper protocol would be to go first to AAC. Wendy agreed with this and went on to say that she wouldn’t feel comfortable without a conversation with the faculty at this point. In terms of getting the program off the ground, Rick felt that getting the program to a faculty vote by about February 1 would provide enough time. Several faculty

moved that Jim, Rick, and Bruce plan an informational colloquium open to all faculty; this was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:36 am.