

3-14-2013

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 14, 2013

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

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



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 14, 2013" (2013).
Executive Committee Minutes. Paper 1.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/1

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

MINUTES
A&S Executive Committee Meeting
March 14, 2013

In attendance: Dexter Boniface, Claire Strom, Joan Davison, Bob Moore, Jill Jones, Bob Smither, Ben Varnum, Carol Bresnahan, and Dan Crozier. Guests: Steve Neilson, James Zimmerman and Jennifer Cavanaugh.

- I. Call to Order.

- II. Approve the Minutes from the last Executive Committee meeting on February 28, 2013. The minutes are approved.

- III. New Business
 - a. **STUDENT AFFAIRS.** Steve Neilson provides an update about new student success initiatives, based on the recommendations of a recent task force. The two new initiatives, based out of the Student Affairs office are, first, the Sophomore Year initiative. The goal is to increase retention not only in the first year but in the second year as well. The second initiative regards career and life planning. They have brought in a consultant group to provide insights on this issue. The consultant group is now developing its initial report. They will later have an open session for the whole campus community. This is the beginning of the process. Student Affairs hopes to involve the faculty more as the process moves forward. He notes that summer internships are one area that the group is discussing. He welcomes questions from the committee. Joan Davison states that there has not been much dialogue between the faculty and student affairs on these topics. She states that some of these initiatives are not considered faculty priorities. For example, she notes, a third of the faculty did not consider the sophomore year experience as a priority. Steve replies that the broader issue is retention, which he believes is a faculty priority. Joan states, nevertheless, she does not believe faculty consider this specific program to be a priority. Jill Jones asks if this issue has come up at all within the context of the new general

education program; she suggests it would be a good idea to have a student affairs representative involved.

- b. GENERAL EDUCATION. Jennifer Cavanaugh and James Zimmerman report on the General Education Course Proposal Form (see attachment #1). Jennifer reviews what the committee is calling (for lack of a better term) the Rollins Integrated Core Curriculum. Jill Jones asks if RCC is part of this curriculum. Jennifer and James reply that, no, it is not included. Jennifer states that, as a general rule, the committee has tried to align the new plan with existing policies; for example, by keeping existing double-dipping policies in place. She notes that one of the questions that has come up is whether or not the competencies need to be completed at a certain stage in a student's career; for example, by their sophomore or junior year. Jennifer notes that the document currently conceptualizes the Honors Program as like a Gen Ed neighborhood while recognizing that it is different. Joan Davison states that this is a big issue to be discussed; she notes that treating it as like other neighborhoods offers both advantages and disadvantages. Jennifer states that this issue, the Honors Program, needs to be discussed in greater detail. She states that it is important that the Honors Program have some relationship to the new General Education system, though it is not clear now what that relationship will be. Joan Davison states that she has one problem with the document, namely that the College of Professional Studies is incorporated into the Social Science Division. She notes that this greatly expands the size of the division, creating an imbalance. Furthermore, Joan states that the College of Professional Studies has a different orientation which is not focused on liberal arts. Jennifer states that she recognizes that this is a heated issue but it is holding up progress. She believes a decision has to be made, and made soon, so that we can move forward with the implementation of this new program. She notes that the decision was ultimately tabled. She would like to make the case for including CPS into this structure, specifically the Social Sciences. She acknowledges that the burden will be vastly unequal across divisions. She notes that her own division, Expressive Arts, will be among the most burdened. Jennifer also acknowledges that there may be pedagogical reasons for excluding certain professionally oriented classes. She notes that AAC will be the ultimate arbiter. Jill Jones states that she has grave reservations about including a college, CPS, which has very clearly stated in its promotion criteria that it is not liberal arts-oriented. Joan states that this proposal would be a shift from what the faculty last voted on. Jennifer suggests that this issue should be put for a faculty vote. Claire notes that the committee has been trying to figure

out what the optimum and easiest solution is. She notes that there are alternative solutions. For example, CPS faculty could be asked to fill out the same application as A&S faculty seeking to teach outside their regular division. Joan Davison states that another alternative would be to have CPS faculty teach the fifth neighborhood class and not attach it to a specific division. Claire states that she does not think Joan's solution is viable since the fifth class is understood to be the capstone and is integrative. Jill Jones reiterates her reservation about the orientation of CPS, philosophically speaking. Jill asks Ben if he has an opinion. Ben Varnum states that students he has talked to are worried about the impact that this will have on their student experience. He is not convinced that even a great concept (the new gen ed system) needs to be well implemented in order to create a meaningful experience. Bob Moore asks why this new system might be viewed as more burdensome by students. Ben replies that the requirement of a 400-level class is questioned by students. Furthermore, he questions how this new system is any different from a minor. James states that, positively, students could complete their Gen Ed requirements much more quickly, even the 400-level class. Ben states that the perception students have is one of apprehension. Joan states that, unlike a minor, which is dedicated to content, the general education concept is aimed at fulfilling certain skills and outcomes. She notes that the subject matter is in a sense secondary. Jill Jones states that she looks forward to reaching the point where we can get back to the student experience aspect of the Gen Ed system. But, at the same time, these administrative issues are important to iron out first. The change to a new system, after all, is replacing Rollins' core liberal arts education. Bob Smither adds an additional consideration. He notes that CPS has not voted on the 5+ concept and may not ultimately endorse it. Therefore, it is not clear how closely CPS is invested in this broader discussion. Jennifer continues her discussion of the Gen Ed Implementation Committee document, noting the 'development path' students would follow. She notes that a few other practical issues that have come up include, for instance, double-dipping. The committee's philosophy is to follow as closely as possible our current policies. Therefore students can count one Gen Ed class and apply it to their major just as they do now. Joan asks if Neighborhood courses will have a departmental prefix or a neighborhood prefix. Jennifer states that she will address this question momentarily. She next turns to the issue of assessment. Carol Bresnahan states that one of the promises Gloria Cook made in her presentation to the Board of Trustees was that this new system would be easier to assess; she hopes to see this come to fruition. Jennifer, James and Claire aver that the new system will be easier to assess.

Claire states that the plan is to address these many issues at the upcoming colloquium. Jennifer turns to the New General Education Course Proposal Form itself. She notes that the AAC new course subcommittee will still be the point of entry for this course approval process. However, they would like to see this committee be divisionally representative (it currently has only three members). Jennifer reviews the document. Regarding Section 4, “Jumping Division – Justification”, the criteria will be established by the Divisions. Ben Varnum states that this program is very innovative but it also so different from what we have now, and this is why students are apprehensive. James states that a marketing campaign will need to accompany this process. Joan asks about her previous question: will faculty be able to teach courses using their departmental prefix and count those courses as a neighborhood and a major requirement. Jennifer states that this would not be the default but that it could be possible to cross-list. Two such examples are provided on page 2 of the document. Joan states that her question is a different one, namely what happens in a cross-listed class when it is full with half majors and half neighborhood students. She states that this is not an optimal environment pedagogically. Jennifer states that the premise would be that this cross-listing would take place primarily at the lower level classes. Jill Jones returns to the procedural issue of including CPS as a Social Science division. She believes that this could be a contentious issue, even if it reflects the consensus of the Gen Ed implementation committee. Claire states that the colloquium would hopefully resolve this issue before it is brought to the faculty in terms of coming to an understanding of where the faculty members stand on this issue. Jill Jones states that she, for one, could not endorse this document in full. She would endorse it but for the fact that it incorporates CPS into the Social Science division. A motion to endorse the document is made; however, the motion is not seconded. Joan Davison makes an alternative motion: to endorse the document but eliminating CPS from the Social Science division (i.e., striking the asterisk in the document). Bob Moore seconds the motion. The motion passes by majority vote (one vote opposed).

- IV. Other Business (these items were not discussed due to a lack of time).
- a. Report on the Vice-President of Student Affairs meeting (Carol Bresnahan).
 - b. March 21 A&S Faculty Meeting Agenda and Governance Elections.
 - c. FEC Ballot.
 - d. Mission Statement.

V. Committee Reports (sent by email)

- a. PSC. PSC met and ranked student-faculty collaborative grants for funding. Forty-eight proposals were submitted, and currently at least the top 18 can be funded. If additional resources come available, then additional grants will be funded. PSC discussed two issues related to grant requests: 1) whether there should be a separate process for large group collaborative projects, and 2) how to treat proposals which would include uncompensated work for businesses. PSC agreed it might be desirable to have a separate type of grant process and funding for group projects which range in size from 4-14 students participating. Yet, in the absence of such separate funding, PSC recommended that student applicants for group projects be held to the same proposal process and format as other students. Second, PSC agreed that a project which involves uncompensated work for a business is problematic, and that there should be an initial contract which addresses how profits associated with the project will be distributed. PSC is concerned about allocating Rollins grant funds for work which might produce profits for businesses, particularly profits which Rollins does not share.

- b. SLC. At its meeting this week, SLC had an update/discussion with Steve Neilson regarding what he sees as the main initiatives of his office for next year under its new Vice President. First, he discussed the structure of the administration of the Student Affairs area at Rollins, providing a flow chart to illustrate this. Then, he briefly outlined the following six areas of focus that deserve further discussion: Student Success; High Impact Practices; Sophomore Year initiatives; International Programs; Wellness initiatives; and Career and Life Planning (being studied by Keeling and Associates, consultants in higher education). Of these, he said that the two areas that he would like to see receive priority for next year are the Sophomore Year, and Career and Life Planning. Rather than suggesting specific agendas for these, his discussion focused on the rationale for choosing these areas in particular as deserving special attention by the Rollins community. After this discussion, he gave a brief update on the VPSA search. Furthermore, SLC granted the remaining SHIP funds now in place, splitting them evenly between two strong proposals. A third proposal was rejected. Finally, an additional \$2000 was pledged to the SHIP fund for this semester by Micki Meyer from the Office of Community Engagement.

VI. Adjourn

ATTACHMENT #1

New General Education Course Proposal Form

Section 1: Catalog Information

Course Title
Neighborhood [drop down box]
Instructor
Department
Division*
Requested Level [drop down box]
Catalog Description (30 words or less)
Transcript Title (30 characters or less)

Meeting Times:

100 level

MWF @ 9 am

OR

TTH @ 9.30 am

(If this is a lab class, please indicate time preference for lab)

200, 300, or 400 level

Days

Times

Section 2: How does this course fit the chosen neighborhood?

Section 3: Developmental Outcomes and Assessment

[repopulate this section of form with criteria for each level]

Section 4: Jumping Division Justification

Please complete this section ONLY if you wish your course to count in a division different from the one in which you are housed.

[repopulate this section of form with divisional criteria]

Section 5: Cross-listing Course with Major

Please complete this section ONLY if you wish your course to be cross-listed as a course within your department.

Yes/No [check box]

Departmental Course Number Assigned or Requested

Section 6: Approvals

Faculty

Department Chair

Interdisciplinary Chair

Interdisciplinary Chair

Director of General Education

AAC NCSC Chair

Dean of A&S

*For the purposes of the General Education Curriculum, the departments of Education, Communications, and International Business will be considered within the Social Sciences Division. Faculty members wishing to teach a course outside of her/his division need to complete Section 4 of this form.