

2-5-2009

# Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 5, 2009

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, Thursday, February 5, 2009" (2009). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 102.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_aa/102](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/102)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports 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 (Feb. 5, 09)

In attendance: Wendy Brandon, Deb Wellman, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Steve St. John, Eric Zivot, Scott Rubarth, Yusheng Yao, Alex Winfree, Tocarra Mallard, Kory Eylmann, Alex Grammenos

Minutes of Jan. 29 were passed with corrections.

Discussion on issues about Phase II of curriculum reform and a model for staggered terms and committee composition. The committee will have 8 members: one from each division, who can be appointed or elected at the discretion of the division chair. These 4 members will serve 2 years. AAC will select another 4 members (one from each division) who will serve a one-year term. Wendy on behalf of AAC will email division chairs, asking them to nominate candidates or to call for volunteers. If Marc Sardy stays on from the Phase I committee, AAC will ask him to be the chair for Phase II committee. The initial discussion of the committee should include the following: 1. philosophical visions of the new curriculum; 2. curriculum issues not related to GE, such as majors, RCC, capstones, community engagement, etc, 3. to identify issues in any part of the curriculum that need to be resolved, 4. to ask Tom Cook, chair of Phase I curriculum committee for his ideas about further reform.

Emily Russell came to report on the revisions to the English major and minor requirements. The rationale for the change: The core courses including literature have focused on survey courses. The methodology is only historical. With new changes, the core courses still retain the historical perspective but will add on genres studies of poetry, drama and fiction to draw in more faculty members and to redistribute students more evenly in these courses. Deb Wellman will check if the changed numbers affect the Banner system. Scott asked if the department offered literary theories such as Neo-Marxism, post-colonial theory etc. The answer was yes; only it was not part of the required core courses. The number of courses required to be taken for major and minor will not change. Wendy and Jennifer asked Emily to fill in the new course proposal form next week to expedite the review process. Wendy and Scott talked about putting a PDF form on AAC web page with the link to the model by Studio Art Department.

Eric explained to AAC a loophole (#2 for academic appeals in AAC's Jan. 29 minutes) that students on suspension could take advantage of in their future appeal to be reinstated in Rollins. The new rule he crafted would deny their opportunity to transfer any credits they could obtain from another school during the time of suspension. He also suggested that AAC make distinctions between academic and social suspension. Students belonging to the latter category must show evidence of counseling or other ways of addressing the issue during their suspension. Before AAC could vote on the new rule (or amendment?), Paul Stephenson and Gabriel Barreneche arrived to present a proposal on changes in community engagement courses.

Paul gave a brief account on the development of the courses with significant community engagement/service component and the recognition Rollins recently received by Carnegie

classification (only top 4% colleges and universities are recognized as such). He then presented the rationale for the proposed change (putting “CE” designation on the courses): 1. it is the shared practice by the best schools; 2. the standards are made by Rollins faculty who have taught community engagement courses; 3. it is convenient for students to identify this kind of courses pre-registration and ask questions about them. He clarified that CE courses were not general education courses. These courses, like other new courses proposals, would go through the new course review committee and faculty members who teach CE courses can form ad hoc committee to help the new course review process.

Queries followed. Debra asked about the differences between CE and service learning courses. Paul answered that CE courses could be research courses, not service *per se*. Community engagement could be participating in a town hall meeting. It broadened the ability of the faculty to do research. Eric expressed his concern for the watering down of the service front (contribution to the community) in this broadly conceived concept. Wendy asked about the difference between field work and community research. She stressed community engagement as a reciprocal arrangement in which both Rollins and local community are benefited. Gabriel explained to AAC members that under the umbrella of community engagement there are three components: 1. service learning, 2. community research, 3. civil engagement. He admitted that there was a debate in the field about the definition and components.

Tocarra Mollard and Alex Winfree, student representatives, liked the proposed CE designation idea for easy identification as well as the broadened content. Scott raised the practical question of reviewing these courses without proper expertise. In response, Gabriel offered his and his fellow group’s help. AAC tabled the issue for further discussion because time had run out.

Next meeting will be on Feb. 10, next Tuesday.