

11-8-2011

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 8, 2011

Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs Committee, "Minutes, Arts and Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 8, 2011" (2011). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 14.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/14

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.



Academic Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes
November 8, 2011

Opening:

The regular meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee was called to order at 12:33 pm on November 8, 2011 in the Chapel-Room Classroom #1 by Gloria Cook.

Present:

Mark Anderson, Sara Bishop, Gloria Cook, Nancy Decker, Fiona Harper, Sharon Lusk, Sebastian Novak, Samuel Sanabria, Wenxian Zhang

Visitors:

Jennifer Cavanaugh, Associate Dean of Arts & Sciences

A. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were awaiting final approval from Toni Holbrook, Associate Dean for Academic Administration.

B. Review of Agenda

C. New Business (1 item)

RP Assessment –Peggy Maki’s Visit/ Schedule/ Scope of inquiry

What do the faculty need to see in the Spring Rollins Plans? What do we want Peggy to include on her report? She is an expert in assessing programs and was chosen because she would help us figure out what goes into a report like this. Peggy was brought in to assess the program from the beginning; she started the summer of 2009 prior to the program’s launch. Her responsibility was with assessment.

With only a few students remaining, can we get an honest assessment? Mark Anderson admitted that he may have a bias in presenting on this program because it is “his baby.” Better to hear from her on what was the failure. Although, we don’t have enough data to prove anything, we have learned a lot, there are trends and we feel confident that we have learned enough to launch a successful program in the future. We need Peggy Maki’s opinion on a large-scale rollout. If there are any questions for Peggy Maki, please forward them to Mark Anderson.

D. Old Business (2 items)

(Item 1) AAC recommendation on the grading of Peer Mentor

Some faculty members are really engaging their peer mentors, they view their peer mentors as outside support members to help students with their first year. Executive Committee felt that we should uphold the one credit rule with regards to staff. Gloria stressed the evident need for better communication between RCC faculty and Explorations. Mark Anderson suggested that we ask for a report from Explorations leadership to be sent to the RCC faculty. This would solve the communication problem. Was agreed that report should be sent as well as a recommendation for a grade. If there is a discrepancy, then the two parties should meet to discuss. Sebastian inquired on the high turnover rate? The RCC Faculty Director does not have high contact hours with the faculty.

The report should go to Mario and RCC Faculty member. Mario's role is as coordinator. Having Mario assign grades brings consistency, making sure all peer mentors get graded equally for equal performance. We need to set a process. Executive Committee was told that we would recommend rather than mandate. If we don't put our decision into writing, it will be lost by next year. If we recommend guidelines for peer mentors, these recommendations could be ignored. Do we take this to the floor of the faculty? Or use a colloquium as a middle ground...a bigger audience without voting privileges?

Fiona suggested that the Explorations staff both recommended a grade and send a rubric for each peer mentor. If there was a disparity between the grade recommended by Explorations and that given by the professor of the RCC class, then a meeting would be required. Mario will enter the grade and be the balance and check point person for the students overall. RCC faculty sends the recommended grade to Mario D'Amato/ Gabriel Barreneche. Recommendation will be sent by e-mail for review. Should we have Meghan Harte come in and hear our recommendation and give feedback? She would love our faculty to get to know the scope of the Explorations program. Mario will be informed of the meeting as well. We will ask for Meghan's input on the following: Exploration staff are to submit both a rubric and a grade to RCC faculty and Explorations leadership. Focus on increasing communication between these two populations and more specificity of grading elements.

The following statement is what the committee finally agreed on:

AAC Recommendations for Peer Mentor Grading

Peer mentors play an important role in the life of the first year students. AAC recognizes the importance of the work of the Exploration staff as well as the RCC faculty and faculty director in their contribution to the success of the first year experience through their work with the peer mentors.

Because it is important for faculty teaching RCC classes to understand all aspects of what their peer mentors do, the Academic Affairs Committee recommends that at the end of the semester, the Explorations staff submits to both the RCC instructor and the RCC Faculty Director an assessment of each peer mentor. These assessments should provide a summary of what activities the peer mentors were required to do, how well these activities performed, and recommended grades for this work. The RCC instructors then submit grades to the faculty director for the peer mentors in their RCC classes. In the event that there is a discrepancy between a grade recommended by the Explorations staff and a grade submitted by the RCC instructor, the RCC Faculty Director will meet with both the Explorations staff and the RCC instructor in order to come to a consensus for the grade.

(Item 2) Eligible Leaders of Field Study Programs

The following revised guidelines, brought to AAC by Giselda, were approved.

Eligible Leaders of Field Study Programs

Individuals eligible to lead field study programs must still submit a proposal for review and selection

1. Tenured faculty
 2. Tenure-track faculty who have been at Rollins at least three semesters by the time of travel
 3. Non-tenure track teaching staff, visiting scholars, and emeritus faculty must co-lead with a tenure-track or tenured faculty member
 4. Full-time staff members are eligible to lead no-credit field study but must co-lead with a tenure-track or tenured faculty member for credit-bearing field study
- PLEASE NOTE: Documented problems on past field study programs may make an individual ineligible to lead future field study programs

Field Study Review and Selection

1. Field study proposals are reviewed in full by International Programs with consideration towards:
 - a. audience and potential student interest
 - b. logistics and itinerary
 - c. academics
 - d. cost
 - e. risk management
 - f. past field study experiences
 - g. past student interest (if proposing a field study that has been offered before)
 - h. the development of a strategic slate of field study offerings for the academic year
2. IP presents the proposals to and receives approval from the appropriate dean and/or supervisor
 - a. Teaching and/or performance evaluations at Rollins will be considered
3. If the field study location is deemed high-risk by IP, IP sends the proposal to Risk Management for review
4. All new field study courses are then sent to AAC or CPS for academic approval

E. Agenda Topics for Future Meetings

November 15, 2011 → Next meeting date

- Meghan Harte?
 - o Peer Mentor Grading
- Toni Holbrook?
 - o General Education Form

Adjournment:

Meeting was adjourned at 1:14 pm by Gloria Cook. The next general meeting will be at 12:30 pm on November 15 in Chapel-Room Classroom #2.

Minutes submitted by:

Mark Anderson

Approved by:
