

4-16-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 16, 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, Thursday, April 16, 2009" (2009). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 109.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/109

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.

AAC Minutes (April, 16, 2009)

In attendance: Wendy Brandon, Deb Wellman, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Steve St. John, Scott Rubarth, Jim Small, Susan Lackman, Mark Anderson, Yusheng Yao, Alex Winfree, Tocarra Mallard, Alex Grammenos

Wendy: the approval of April 2nd minutes will be postponed to the next meeting. Wendy alerted members of the two versions—Yusheng’s original one and the one with her modifications to the best of her knowledge and discretion.

Susan’s report on RP’s development: Two out of five were recommended—Florida Studies and Revolutions. One other [Enduring Question] was a backup. Susan briefed members of the vetting and evaluating process. (See the attached) She pointed out that advisors for freshmen should not put them to courses at 300 or 400 level. The four courses for the first semester should be foreign language, math, writing and RCC. Debra: For the new students we ask them on line the questions like “what do you think your major might be or your interests are?” There will be link four courses to these questions. Jim: Is this the way to sort out those interested for the RP courses? Susan and Mark will use the power point to explain to the faculty about the RP evaluation and selection process. Mark: The process was based on a set of criteria: 1. How good is the big idea? 2. How feasible to scale it to the full RP sequence? 3 How well to meet the learning outcomes? 4. How well was it designed? The decision was made based on the survey of the 10 committee members to ensure equal voices and input. The RP proposal and plan for announcement was passed. Members thanked the good work done by the committee, in particular, Susan and Mark.

Wendy made an announcement: Before the last faculty meeting this semester, AAC will send out a call for volunteers to form the second phase curriculum renew committee. The committee consists of two members from each of the four divisions, two student members and one from AAC. Members will serve on staggered terms.

Rick Bommelje came to answer AAC questions about a curriculum change—elimination of a core course on theory-- for the Communication major in the Holt School. He pointed out that at least 90 theories (a sheet of these theories were provided to the committee) were taught for the Organization communication major and the department thought students would be better served if these theories were taught in specific courses. Susan: what about the adjunct faculty? Are they expected to cover these theories as well? R: our adjunct professors are retired professors from UCF, all retired tenured professors or regulars. Scott: How many theories in capital letter or meta-theories, which are different [from the theories you provide on the sheet]—they are meta-analysis to bring unity to the field of study. And when are they taught? R: fewer than half a dozen. They are taught in senior seminar. Scott: how do you do quality control with this core course? Jennifer: Why not have this course early on rather than the senior seminar? Rick: the course number was there before I came. Jim: the issue we have for the elimination of the core course on theory is that the rationale in the proposal is not clear. Rick: this is a learning process for us. If we had more insight[about what you want], we would have acted differently. Jim: you

have not made a good case [in the proposal for the change]. Scott: We treat it as we did the African-American Studies. It took it five times to complete the process. The proposal should include learning objectives, outcomes, logical structure. We can't see them clearly in your proposal. The change seems to downgrade the major. How does this change affect the minor? Rick: at this point we are only concerned with the major, which is the locus of our responsibility. Jennifer: With this change, your electives will be from six to seven. Is there any benefit to have a course to synthesize, recapture? Not just free up for an elective. Rick: The "listening" course has been taught since 1992. It was a growing field and should be a core course. We had multiple discussions about it. Wendy: you may treat the historical major as a container. Maybe you should consider developmental goals, experience, etc. As we did with the African-American Studies, AAC can assist you with a matrix. Steve: It [the matrix] is in progress. Jim: the department needs to address these issues. Matrix will help you think about how they [the courses] are numbered, developmentally sequenced, the rationale for not having an introduction course on meta-theories at the beginning. Scott: This is a governance procedure. We want it to be in writing. Maybe a foundation course to bring unity, intelligibility. Wendy: to lay things out. We will send you a matrix about foundation, outcomes, developmental sequence. The motion was passed to table the Communication Department's curriculum change proposal.

Pedro Bernal came to discuss the rationale for the Chemistry Department's proposed curriculum change. Pedro: Last year the American Chemical Society issued a new set of curriculum guidelines. Basically we repackaged our program accordingly. We also reversed a change made four years ago because those teaching the one-semester course are deeply dissatisfied with the result of the change. Now we have two seminar courses to hold the students' hands in designing a senior proposal. We have regular guest speakers on Friday afternoon. This is to formalize that experience. Jim: I don't see the advanced integrated lab in your proposal. Pedro: I will send you that. Scott: Any content loss with this change? Pedro: No. Jennifer: Any implications for other departments? Pedro: for biology. Jim: We have to make due changes. Scott: any financial impact, like hiring? Pedro: No. By reintroducing the Chemistry 121, we actually strengthen for those who in pre-med program. The proposal was passed.

Wendy made a few announcements: First, the Classical Studies is reinstated. Wendy: who does major/minor remapping of the courses? Debra: The Dean's office working with the Chairs of the departments. Wendy: Steve, you will put them on line. Second, about a course addition in Counseling Program required for accreditation standard. Steve: tell her to send us the new course proposal. Wendy: next time we will discuss the "incomplete" policy and academic appeal issue. Wendy asked Alex Winfree about the new student members from the SGA.

Discussion on what Wendy should report on the issue of bullying on today's faculty meeting. (See Wendy's version)

Jim brought up the issue of Holt's graduate program. How to submit changes? How has the jurisdiction over the program? Rollins does not have the structure as other universities to deal with the issue.

The meeting was adjourned