

9-9-2008

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 9, 2008

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, Tuesday, September 9, 2008" (2008). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 114.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_aa/114](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/114)

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 Meeting Minutes 9/9/08

In Attendance: Wendy Brandon, Laurie Joyner, James Small, Scott Rubarth, Steve St. John, Eric Zivot, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Susan Lackman, Yusheng Yao, Alex Winfree

The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the request by the Curriculum Review and Renew Committee to approve and authorize their pilot proposal for a new General Education Curriculum.

Some members expressed concerns whether we had enough time to do this before the faculty meeting on Sept. 23. Other concerns included the proposal presented by CRRC on Sept. 5 colloquy was not detailed enough (or seemed unready) to make a persuasive case to the faculty.

Members agreed after Wendy Brandon's explanation that we raised our concerns and questions to the CRRC. AAC's feedback would help CRRC to improve the proposal before AAC would make its formal authorization.

The following was AAC's feedback to the CRRC's RP proposal:

Strengths: Breadth, interdisciplinary which brings faculty together for cooperative teaching and learning, unique program marketable for Rollins.

Weaknesses: Student's may pick through the courses in the way that undermines the intended breadth. Suggestion: no student can pick more than one RP course from one department or two courses from one division?

A list of questions to be addressed:

1. student representative's concern: Does RP have enough flexibility to accommodate all students including transferred and those study abroad?
2. How long and in what way does a faculty have to commit to the RP if he/she teaches it? (Will a long commitment affect small departments?)
3. What unites RPs other than the four learning objectives? (Do we need to address the content issue?)
4. Who will decide what "big ideas" or big themes guide the RP courses?
5. How does RP affect the minor (replace, enhance or make it redundant?)?
6. How well do you think RP (pilot, experiment) can sustain the interest of the faculty and students?
7. How can RCC be used to educate, connect and contextualize RP?
8. How many faculty members are needed for the proposals of RP, for the vetting group? What is their composition?
9. How to develop special evaluation criteria for RP pilots and how to implement them? Do we need a special new curriculum group to review the proposals and evaluate their experiment?

AAC suggested not to use the Florida plan in its presentation to the faculty. (The theme is not broad enough? A more significant theme can make a better case?) To win faculty support for the pilot, a more specific plan should be developed including timeline (maybe use a float chart for illustration?)