

10-25-2011

## Minutes, Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 25, 2011

Arts and 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 and Sciences Academic Affairs Committee, "Minutes, Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 25, 2011" (2011). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 13.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_aa/13](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/13)

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 Academic Affairs Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).



## **Academic Affairs Committee**

Meeting Minutes  
October 25, 2011

### **Opening:**

The regular meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee was called to order at 12:34 pm on October 25, 2011 in the Chapel-Room Classroom #1 by Gloria Cook.

### **Present:**

Mark Anderson, Sara Bishop, Gloria Cook, Nancy Decker, Fiona Harper, Jana Matthews, Sebastian Novak, Maria Ruiz, Samuel Sanabria, Wenxian Zhang

### **Visitors:**

Jennifer Cavanaugh, Associate Dean of Arts & Sciences  
Mario D'Amato, RCC Faculty Director  
Toni Holbrook, Associate Dean for Academic Administration  
Robin Mateo, Director of Student Records

### **A. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved as distributed.

### **B. Review of Agenda**

### **C. New Business (2 items)**

#### **(Item 1) Registration & The Banner System**

Toni Holbrook reiterated that the registration and the Banner system fall under Robin Mateo's area of responsibility. The transition to live online registration began in the Fall. Toni took over registration in the 1990's on paper from the old governance system and this carried forward. During Dean Casey's term, we automated the procedure, which involved a large expenditure and on-line pre-registration began. With Dean Joyner's arrival, the directive was made to go to online registration. It was used last Spring for the first time. Seniors, Honor students, AMP's were given priority.

Some students don't pay attention to priority status time tickets. When this happens, tickets have to be re-issued and the students then lose their priority status. We have seen instances in which students go to register, not see what they wanted to take available and then not register. Some students put in courses that are meaningless or offer no alternates in an effort to beat the system.

In response to Dr. Lauer's point, Banner will accommodate a major restriction if the student has a major declared. Banner does not apply priority to majors at the exclusion of other students. In order to give priority to majors, a major restriction is left on during the first part of the process, and then removed for the latter part. Students, who don't do things on time, should not retain priority in course selection. Student Records has had to "unseat" students in the past; this is not right. With us going online, this situation has been exacerbated. We can't do human intervention as easily as we did in the past.

There has to be a cultural shift along with the technology. The question was raised concerning whether all advising should be done by "professionals." TJ's advising is a staff of three professional advisors for 1,850 students, including transfer students, AMP's, RCC, students under academic warning and students with special needs all on a walk-in basis. Sometimes an individual student case takes hours. Gail Ridgeway has an incredible load. TJ's advising is not meant to replace academic advising--it should be a partnership. In the freshman advising pilot, we hope for students to have a vision statement and focus on the bigger picture. Advising that is inquiry-based, motivating and inspirational formulated in six stages. The intention is to get them to understand the path from A to B and how to complete it. Grand Valley had a model plan for each of the four years of college; it looks pretty good (see attached).

It was brought up that both student accountability and the culture at Rollins indicate that there are no consequences for their actions or lack of action. How do we improve personal accountability? We do this by not enabling the student to not be accountable. Lack of positive focus, personal responsibility and accountability has cultural and generational sources. The literature says that this trend is a generational issue--students today are more needy. Need to consider this when making accommodations and special allowances, it ends up being a judgment call. We allow for a one-time grace. Everyone makes mistakes, as Dr. Duncan says, this is a place of second chances. With the second mistake, students have to go through the appeals procedure. We recommend appeals if we observe that the student is transferring blame or unable to produce documentation. Appreciative advising doesn't mean always saying yes.

Robin Mateo added that Banner provides a visible audit trail for each student account. Robin takes each student issue as a case-by-case basis to determine if they try to take responsibility.

Wenxian asked what is your recommendation then? Robin said that we need to all stop blaming Banner. Toni felt the main issue is that we need group and faculty training on the registration system. We created instructional YouTube videos <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mOjnkDtOrnM> and [http://www.youtube.com/user/RollinsStdRecords#p/a/u/1/7aJNQvC\\_87U](http://www.youtube.com/user/RollinsStdRecords#p/a/u/1/7aJNQvC_87U) and this helped a small population. Robin felt it was most important that students pay attention to dates. Toni asked how we value advising? A broader conversation is needed on campus. With developmental advising, peer coaching, academic counseling we can support them all the way to graduation. Toni has a list of potential graduates dating back to 1999 who haven't graduated despite only needing a class or two. The Advising Task Force is looking at literature and advising materials.

Sam pondered a scenario in which faculty assigned consequences for an action and then Student Records or TJ's fixes it. Feels that the culture allows students to go to Academic Appeals, then the Dean of the Faculty, then to the Provost, Dean Joyner and then President Duncan. Faculty have made difficult choices and they have been supported, occasionally the decisions have been mitigated. Many universities are shifting their culture from viewing

students as customer rather than students as students. There is a fine line between responsibility and teachable moments. Jennifer assured everyone that when a student goes to Academic Appeals, the advisor is contacted, so there is some touchback follow-up.

Fiona inquired about waitlists. Student Records is still using waitlists as a primary way to determine demand. Waitlists are cleared and not open during Add/Drop. On November 7<sup>th</sup> registration starts, in January there will be no wait lists. The new Spring schedule will be posted on October 26<sup>th</sup>. Responding to Laurel Goj's idea submitted via e-mail, if we did utilize senior, junior and sophomore status that would mean that there are no classes left for freshman. Toni noted that every institution has a different system. Meeting demand is our priority.

Gloria Cook will clarify with faculty that the Banner system does work. She will share what we have learned about the waitlist being for administrative purposes; advocate campus-wide system training; and stress that it is important to pay attention to all registration dates.

Since the discussion of Registration and the Banner System was so in-depth Gloria made the decision to table the issue of Gen Ed Forms to a future meeting.

## **(Item 2) Grading of Peer Mentors**

With the current grading system of peer mentors, there is a perception from the faculty that there is a loss of control with regards to the grading of peer mentors.

Mario D'Amato is in his 3<sup>rd</sup> year as RCC Faculty Director. Gabriel Barreneche will take over the position in the Spring. The Faculty Director is responsible for assigning the grade. The campus-wide misunderstanding may have come from Mario himself during comments made during Fall training for RCC. His methodology for determining the peer mentor grade incorporates gathering as much information as possible from faculty members teaching in the RCC and from the Explorations staff: Meghan, Gabe and Jerrid. In addition to the peer mentoring responsibilities in the classroom, peer mentors must go through a two-week extensive training program involving a high number of contact hours. Then during the semester, they have a multitude of other requirements to complete for the leadership component of the course. Peer mentors have to attend a workshop seminar that Jerrid runs. They each have to file a report every week in which they discuss classroom discussions and they must consistently post to Blackboard as well. They are also committed to meet with their faculty member a couple of times during the semester. Throughout the semester, they have 10 activities around the five leadership points that Rollins has signed off on. They file a report prior to each activity and then after the activity.

Mario asks faculty for their grade and then also asks the RCC leadership what they think of each of the almost 70 students. If there is a B, Mario asks how were they not exceptional and gathers more information. The grades almost always match up, if there is a discrepancy between the two grades, Mario goes back to each for more information. The intent for gathering feedback from Explorations as a grade was Mario's attempt to simplify matters--it is not institutional policy. There is no grading going on from the RCC leadership. He is open to better ideas. Fiona mentioned that the perception out there is that it is 50/50.

Fiona brought up that the agreed ruling for only one credit hour from staff conflicts with the 50/50 business. This misperception is contrary to the goal. Mario said you have the instructor of record and faculty member of Rollins ... how should they assign the grade? Mark Anderson asked do we want to institutionalize how a grade gets assigned?

Mario added if there are further contradictions, students have a choice to go to Academic Appeals. Toni asked if peer mentors have a syllabus. Mario was not certain. He shared that expectations are clear, but not in a syllabus format. There is a contract with the RCC faculty member and their peer mentors. There is a separate set of expectations for the peer mentor course, the requirements are quite standard, readings, being prepared and ready to roll, including quizzes and blackboard posts. Not including examinations, reading responses or papers.

Gloria said the EEC/SGA representative was a peer mentor for the Music department and was allowed to teach music in the classroom. Then in a different semester she was assigned to Robert Moore's RCC class and she very much took a back seat. Each RCC experience is different. We have to trust our RCC Faculty Director. Sebastian felt faculty member needs input from RCC Leadership.

Mark added that faculty do not hear from Explorations as to the dedicated scope of work and time invested by the peer mentors. It would be nice to have a system in which faculty did learn all that their peer mentors had done. What is nice with the current system is that it brings consistency—each peer mentor is graded according to the same standards. I would be nice if the Explorations assessment also went to the faculty member teaching the course the peer mentor assists in. There has to be a rubric that Meghan uses. Fiona agreed that it would be helpful to have a clearing house rather than 30 faculty of record. This rubric information will be useful in writing student recommendations for the mentors in the future as well. Gloria summed it all up to communication--this is what is paramount. The faculty needs to talk with Explorations.

#### **D. Agenda Topics for Future Meetings**

**November 1, 2011 → No meeting**

**November 8, 2011 → Next meeting date**

– Toni Holbrook

- General Education Form

#### **Adjournment:**

Meeting was adjourned at 1:58 pm by Gloria Cook. The next general meeting will be at 12:30 pm on November 8 in Chapel-Room Classroom #2.

**Minutes submitted by:**

Mark Anderson

**Approved by:**

\_\_\_\_\_