Draft Minutes for Curricular Affairs Committee
Oct 12 2011, 3:30-4:30 pm Kayak

Voting Members Present:
Brian Himelbloom (audio); Carrie Baker; Dave Valentine; Debra Moses; Diane McEachern (audio);
Jungho Baek; Rainer Newberry, Chair; Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Todd Radenbaugh (audio)
Voting Members Absent: Anthony Arendt,

Non-voting Members Present: Lillian Misel, Libby Eddy (for Mike Earnest); Linda Hapsmith; Donald Crocker.
Non-voting Members Absent: Dana Thomas; Doug Goering
Guest: Pete Pinney
Taking Notes: Jayne Harvie

A. OLD Business
1. Approval of 28 Sept Minutes
   Minutes were approved as distributed.

2. Recent GERC issues (chairperson, etc) — comments by Carrie Baker

   Alex Fitts was chosen by the GERC to chair the committee. She’s a good fit for the position because she’s a full professor with general education background. She will be a voting member of the committee.

   The GER Committee decided upon a two-thirds’ majority standard for decision-making; though they may be able to use the consensus method based on the committee’s past experience.

   CEM membership is still lacking; Doug Goering is still talking to Rajive Ganguli.

   The representative for the A.A. program will be Mahla Strohmaier, but in her absence (family medical leave) Arvid Weflen has agreed to substitute.

   Pete P. asked about having Michael Koskey on the committee to represent the university's mission regarding Alaska Natives. Carrie said the committee had initially considered his nomination as a rep from Rural Development, which is a relatively small department; but, in this broader context they would be willing to consider him again. Pete will write an email statement for Carrie to take to the committee.

   Linda Hapsmith noted that Latrice L. and Leah Berman will rep for Math, depending upon what fits into their teaching schedules.

   Rainer asked the group if there was a consensus on having Alex Fitts chair the GERC, and the answer was yes.

3. ‘Stacked’ courses — Tony was not able to present at this meeting, so the topic will be taken up at the next committee meeting.

4. NON-UAF courses taught AT high schools FOR high school students with UAF 100-level designators—Rainer  Suggestion: students taking such must have passed the SOA HS Exit Exams

   Rainer clarified that the courses under discussion are those which are non-UAF courses taught at high schools and designed specifically for high school students. Curriculum Review Committee is seeing them proposed more frequently for the purpose of attracting the students to a particular field of study (e.g., teaching, fisheries) and to UAF. The problem lies in the fact
that instructors and schools wish the courses to have 100-level status so that students earn college credit while taking them at the high school. The issue becomes whether or not the course is rigorous enough to merit 100-level status. Right now, CRC has handled the course requests by approving them as trial courses only.

It's been suggested that the State of Alaska High School exit exam scores be used to gauge student eligibility to enroll in such courses. If the student had passing grades in all three areas of these exams, they would be allowed to enroll in the course and earn college credit. The majority of eligible students would thus be juniors in high school.

Discussion followed about the rigor of the SOA HS exams and what passing scores actually mean, which is a minimal level of skills to graduate from high school. Libby E. asked who would actually monitor these scores at the high schools, noting that it could be a very subjective process. It was generally agreed that a student should have to present evidence of passing scores on the exit exams.

Pete P. noted two perspectives on college courses in high school. 1.) There's a marked difference in a vocation or tech prep course vs. a course in physics; and 2.) With an instructor's permission anyone of any age can technically take a college course. Rainer noted it's the prerequisites for a course that indicate course-level, and that HS exit exam scores would serve as the prerequisite for college 100-level courses at the high school.

Frequency of offering of the SOA HS exit exams was brought up. Rainer noted they are offered usually once a year in the spring, and 10th-graders on up are encouraged to take them, essentially making prospective students juniors by the time they can enroll in the courses.

Linda H. noted that a two-tiered approach could be considered for allowing enrollment: passing exit exam scores for students wishing to earn college credit, and allowance for those students who wish to take the course out of interest alone without earning college credit.

5. **Incompletes…cont.**

A. "Fairbanks CDE" & "Rural Ed CDE" high % of I and I ➔ F: ANTH, ENGL, HIST, and MATH. Single high % INC were ABUS, ECON, and HLTH for "Fairbanks CDE" and only BA for "Rural Ed CDE".

51.5% of all the INC in Spring 2010 were given by CDE (Fairbanks) and Rural Ed CDE which resulted in 43.4% of all the INC becoming F. If the 289 INC which remain in the combined CDE (amounting to 9% of UAF enrollment) could be resolved, the effect would be to reduce the overall UAF INC from 2.9% to 1.9%.

I recommend that a goal for UAF (campus and off-campus) should be to reduce the overall UAF INC to 1% in academic year 2012-2013 (highlighted in blue). GREAT…so…now what????

Discussion: Rainer summarized Brian Himelbloom’s data summary. The meeting attachment is posted online at:

http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/curricular-affairs-commit/

The question was obviously what is going on at CDE to understand how and why instructors are giving such a higher percentage of Incompletes. It was noted that if Item #6 on the agenda is to be addressed, item #5 first needs to be understood.

Pete P. noted there has been a historically low success rate with paper-based courses which preclude an instructor and student relationship. CDE has a goal of converting those courses to the more successful cohort/instructor model. Paper-based courses will only be used for incarcerated students.

Lillian M. noted a problem of NB and I grades.
Pete talked about a new pilot program of 15 distance-delivered courses that hopefully will show a statistically significant improvement in the near future. Pete noted that quality improvement is the priority with Alex Hwu at CDE.

Linda H. mentioned Jodi Baxter who is the faculty liaison at CDE.

From the CDE web site --
The Faculty Liaison assists faculty with classroom management, monitors student satisfaction surveys, facilitates effective communication between faculty and students, provides helpful resources, and serves as a primary point of contact for faculty questions.

Rainer asked about getting data on the results of the pilot program. Pete P. responded that Carol Gering has that.

An orientation for students that teaches them how to be distance ed students was mentioned, along with the need for adequate resources and use of best practices.

Pete will follow up on getting pilot program results for the committee.

B. Exceptions to I$\rightarrow$F (e.g., military on active duty). How to make this less arbitrary, e.g., ‘exceptions will be granted in the following cases…’ Have Mike E supply suggested list for discussion next meeting??

Discussion: Faculty Senate is looking at the need for a policy to further define the exceptions to the rule that I turns to F. Everyone agrees that things like serious medical conditions or deployment of active military personnel qualify for an exception. But, it’s clear that many exceptions are being granted for much less serious reasons: Rainer asked the Registrar’s Office for a listing of all the reasons that have been used, to help formulate better guidelines.

Brian H. mentioned the web page information he supplied about what other locations are using. Rainer noted it was too inclusive, citing example of “transportation difficulty.”

Carrie B. asked about what the current policy is, and suggested sending it to all faculty to acquaint them with it and educate them about it.

Linda H. asked who gets to approve exceptions for I to F right now. Libby E. said there’s a committee out of the Registrar’s Office that looks at these.

Rainer asked that this discussion be continued electronically.

6. Proposed motion The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered wholly or in part by distance delivery, and all existing courses adapted or converted to distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the Faculty Senate. Furthermore, if the mode of distance delivery changes, then the course must be re-reviewed by the appropriate committee.

Modes of distance delivery are those defined by the UA Office of Academic Affairs & Research: Independent Learning/Correspondence; Audio Conferencing; Video Conferencing; Web Meeting; Live Television/UATV; and Online/Web Delivered.

Effective: Spring 2012

Rationale: The Faculty Senate has primary authority to initiate, develop, review and approve academic criteria, regulation and policy (Faculty Senate Constitution, Article 1, Section 1). This includes curriculum review. Current policy is that all courses with ‘major’ changes must be re-approved. This motion hereby DEFINES ‘change from face-to-face to Distance Delivery’ as a ‘major’ change.
Distance delivery methods are fundamentally different methods of communication than face-to-face instruction. Effective instruction by distance delivery requires adapting or designing content for new formats and modes of communication. It cannot be assumed that a course approved for face-to-face delivery automatically passes review for a different mode of delivery. The structure and content of courses intended wholly or in part for distance delivery must be separately reviewed.

This motion applies to all distance delivery courses within UAF, whether listed by an academic department, a rural campus, or the Center for Distance Education (CDE).

Discussion on this topic will resume following further discussion of Item #5.

B. NEW Business

1. Princess Tour CDL = 3 credit UAF 200 level course. Part of a bigger problem???

   Discussion: Rainer asked the group about what direction they want to take with this one. Debra M. shared that she had talked to Andy Anger at Applied Business about the course. He noted it had more than 45 hours of instruction. Rainer asked about the course content, however. Is it truly ABUS 267 course content if students are earning their CDLs?
   Pete P. asked why this course wasn’t being offered for credit out of the Automotive program. Lillian M. noted that the accounting for the course is hard to decipher. It appears Summer Sessions is waiving the tuition for the course. ABUS gets the student credit hours.
   Libby E. noted this IS a transfer credit mechanism for these types of courses that are partnered with a business. However, no regular mechanism was utilized to offer the ABUS 267 course out of Princess Tours’ driver training program. This was arranged by Michelle Bartlett and Charlie Dexter. As noted in the attachments (printouts of Princess Tours web pages) students are earning course credit (3 in 2008; 10 more recently). Now a student is asking for credit retroactively, which is how the Registrar’s Office learned this was happening.
   Rainer noted the particular problem of truth in advertising. Are these students actually getting the ABUS 267 course as advertised in the catalog? Is this an isolated instance, or are there other cases of it?

2. Moving date of graduation…Sunday → Saturday …should we weigh in?
3. Proposed MS ‘hooding’ ceremony to happen Thursday nite—conflicts with Final Exam Schedule.

   Should we weigh in?? Should we recommend GACK deal with this????
   There was brief discussion on items 2 and 3 of new business. Issues were mentioned, including semester start date in spring (before or after Alaska Civil Rights Day), and the end date (final exams, Mother’s Day). The process of actually changing the approved commencement date in 2013 will entail a motion that is approved out of CAC (originating from the Registrar), with final approval by the Governance Coordinating Committee and the Chancellor.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 PM.