

2-5-2004

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 5, 2004

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 5, 2004" (2004). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 128.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/128

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 Executive Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

**Minutes of the Meeting
Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences
February 5, 2004**

Members attending: Y. Greenberg, R. Bornstein, P. Lancaster, R. Casey, S. Klemann, S. Ledbetter S. Lackman, J. Schmalstig, J. Siry.

I. Call to Order

A. Yudit Greenberg called the meeting to order at 12:37.

II. Approval of Minutes

A. The minutes of the meeting of January 15, 2003, were approved as presented.

III. Announcement: Dr. Bornstein: express thanks to everyone for hosting Julie Kidd. Her comments were full of praise for the faculty and their engagement with the students.

IV. Unresolved issue of PSC Proposal:

Greenberg reported concerns voiced regarding the possibility of a vote by email on this issue. She recommended that the motion be taken up at the next faculty meeting as “Old Business.” The committee agreed with this plan. Next, the committee discussed the concerns voiced during last faculty meeting’s discussion regarding the proposal.

Implementation remained the biggest concern, however. There were complaints at the faculty meeting about fairness, but to be in accordance with SACS requirements, the procedure (this or any one that we approve) must be implemented this Spring. This system will be developmental and will help plan for sabbatical. And this is a way to start, since faculty haven’t been evaluated in twelve years. Despite the SACS requirement, there was concern about whether an effective completion of this evaluation is a gatekeeping method for allowing faculty to take sabbatical. Provost Lancaster pointed out that “Our Sabbatical policy is an entitlement policy. I think we have to be very clear that sabbatical policy is not up for discussion at this meeting. I don’t want people to think we’re slipping this in to cut back on sabbatical entitlements.”

This led to the discussion that if this faculty wants to get to the next level, sabbatical entitlements might be something to consider. Dean Casey opined that “a greater number of people were saying this needed more teeth.” It was suggested that the self-evaluation for the first group this spring who are eligible for sabbatical in 2005-2006 be submitted to the Dean’s Office by August 1 instead of April 15, to allow them more time.

V. Academic Affairs Committee (Steve Klemann)

Klemann presented several proposals:

MATH: M 360 and 380 are proposed to be moved to the 400 level; they remain within the core of the program. The other change is to drop the principles of physics from the major, reducing the number of courses in the major by one. They would like to have PHY 130, calculus based, to be replaced by PHY 120.

COMPUTER SCIENCE: In essence, the program is reduced from 16 to 15 courses. This would change program to align the program with suggestion of their association. The emphasis on the “project based” structure of the courses as been diminished. A senior capstone course has been created as well as a change in the descriptions of the Senior Seminar. [See attachments/handouts for detail.]

Dr. Bornstein wondered, “In what way is this major and minor informed by the liberal arts ethos? These are all very technical.” Casey responded that he felt the same “until I sat in on classes. These courses are about critical thinking and problem-solving. The students are involved in problem-based work: Fire Department, the Orlando Fringe Festival.” There was further discussion on whether this was indeed a course that was suffused with the “liberal arts ethos.”

PROPOSED ORAL COMMUNICATION: There was a conversation with members of the Communication Department, people who teach the T., and some members of AAC. The language here is what was proposed last fall. This is the language that was circulated to the faculty in the fall, with the addition of some changes reflecting faculty comments. There are now goals and assessment mechanism, i.e., a competency-based rubric. The AAC had relatively little discussion on this; the one issue that arose on this discussion, “what competency based rubric”? Lisa Tillman-Healy suggested some examples for models for rubrics or templates for evaluation.

Motion: To approve that the Proposed Oral Communication revision be brought to the faculty. Motion passed.

AAC is still working on the plan for infusing R and T into majors. Klemann: We are not planning to bring this to the faculty at this time, but what we are thinking of with the T is to make it user friendly. Points are ways of implementing the plan for infusion into the majors. There should be adequate experience writing in the discipline and that there is adequate communication through the curriculum. There is concern that there is not adequate coursework with regard to the T. Department implementation plans will be reviewed by AAC. Assessment will be involved as part of the major. An intended focus is that one learns to write and do presentations appropriate to the discipline.

There was general consensus that there should be a month between presentation of T revision and this proposal for infusion to the faculty.

VI. QEP – There was general conversation on the future all-college colloquium. Students were anticipated to be more favorable to the issue of community as a goal of the college.

Meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Cohn Lackman, Secretary