Curricular Affairs Committee  
Meeting Minutes of September 30, 2015, 1-2 pm at 131 Bunnell (eLearning Conf. Rm.)

Present: Ken Abramowicz, Casey Byrne, Jennie Carroll, Mike Earnest (audio), Alex Fitts, Doug Goering, Cindy Hardy (audio), Eileen Harney, Jayne Harvie, Ginny Kinne, Rainer Newberry

Absent: Eric Collins, Carol Gering, Catherine Hanks, Joan Hornig, Jenny Liu, Lisa Lunn, Caty Oehring, Patrick Plattet, Holly Sherouse

1. Approval/Amendment of Agenda

A quorum was not possible due to the effects of the winter storm closure and power outages. Some members were able to attend in person; and a couple were able to phone in via audio conference.

2. Approval of minutes from August 21 and 26, 2015

There was consensus to approve the August minutes as submitted.

3. Old Business
   a. Revised O/W Motion for discussion (attached)
   i. Departmental Communications plan examples

The members present focused on making further revisions to the proposed motion. It was agreed that the motion was not ready to vote upon at Faculty Senate, but there was consensus that a revised draft motion should be a discussion item at the October Faculty Senate meeting.

The effective date for the motion was discussed, with Fall 2017 seen as the most workable, providing adequate time for departments to formulate Communication Plans, and the new University Assessment Committee to get underway.

A long discussion took place about the emphasis of the motion – is its intent to modify the SLOA process (incorporating Communication into existing SLOAs), or is the intent to separately create processes for developing department Communication Plans? The current motion is confusing because it unclearly addresses both of these points, or can be construed to imply creation of a separate Communication SLOA.

Parts of the motion that actually belong in a more-detailed department Communication Plan were differentiated from parts that addressed a department SLOA. It was agreed that there should be one SLOA plan that incorporates Communication assessment within that SLOA; rather than a separate Communication SLOA all by itself. The new University Assessment Committee will look at the SLOA outcomes. The Communication Plans which lay out the processes departments will use to achieve student learning outcomes, will be developed individually by each department for their degree programs (and these will need a separate vetting process).

The motion will be edited to clarify the confusing references, particularly in the numbered sections (1-8). Section #3 and #4 will be edited, and the numbered sections moved around /
changed to differentiate between what belongs in the motion’s rationale, and what belongs in the motion itself or that can be left out for the University Assessment Committee to address later.

Whether or not to do any combining of the four bulleted items near the top of the motion was discussed. It was decided they should remain as they are. However, it was agreed that they mention processes that are outside of a SLOA plan.

A comment was made about the possible use of Capstone course plans to address the Communication Plan.

It was suggested that Sarah Stanley and a Communication faculty be invited to the October meeting. Sarah offered to assist departments at the September meeting of Faculty Senate.

Jennie and Rainer will work on revising the proposed motion again. The goal is to have it included in the Administrative Committee agenda for approval as a discussion item at the October Senate meeting.

The rest of the agenda items were deferred to the next CAC meeting.

   b. CAC Goals AY 15/16 (anything to add?)
4. New Business
   a. CAC GER Subcommittee Report
   b. Math and Science GER alignment (Rainer)
   c. Student Code of Conduct revision (proposal submitted by Catherine Hanks)
   d. Probation actions based on summer performance (Doug)
Revised O/W Proposal for 9-30-15 CAC meeting

The Faculty Senate moves to replace the upper division Oral (O) and Written (W) requirement with the requirement that each degree program must satisfy the following Communications Learning Outcomes within the degree program:

UAF undergraduates will demonstrate effective communication when they are able to:

• Explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication, including oral and written communication.

• Communicate to audiences in the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions.

• Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline as appropriate, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities.

• Integrate feedback from others to enhance or revise communication.

Each baccalaureate degree program must submit a Communications Plan that demonstrates how students will achieve each of the learning outcomes as part of the requirements of the major or degree program. Not all courses or requirements need to support every outcome; however, all the outcomes must be met by the completion of the degree.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2017

RATIONALE: The GERC committee and Curricular Affairs, as part of their work to revise UAF’s core requirements, propose replacing the current W/O designators with a requirement that students achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes that are integrated into each baccalaureate degree program and major.

1. The responsibility for ensuring that students achieve these Communications Learning Outcomes is being moved from the University level (via specific O and W courses) to the department level (via the requirements of the degree programs), and from a specific degree requirement (taking two Ws and one O) to a requirement that is achieved by the student completing the degree requirements associated with their program.

2. To ensure student achievement of these Communications Learning Outcomes, each department will demonstrate how their program addresses these learning outcomes by developing a Communications Plan that integrates communication into each degree or program, typically via a collection of lower and/or upper level courses and/or non-curricular degree requirements chosen to meet the needs of the particular program. This should be done in such a way that all the outcomes are met somewhere in the courses required for the completion of a degree. The Communications Plan for each degree will describe the collection of courses (both in and possibly out of the department) and other requirements (if any) and how they contribute to meeting these outcomes.

3. Departments will submit the Communications Plan for each degree program as part of their SLOA plans, and subsequently, submit a short summary report addressing how the plan is working (and revising the plan as necessary). Once a department has submitted a plan, which will include a required path/collection of paths through the degree wherein students will achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes, then all students in that degree will achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes by virtue of satisfying the degree requirements of that program.
4. **Committees** will be formed within each school or college (and made up of at least 1 member) to regularly review communications plans submitted by programs.

5. An additional checkbox will be added to Major/Minor course change forms asking “Does this change affect Communications Outcomes Plans?”, so that departments are aware of the impact of potential changes.

6. **Departments** should submit as part of their Communications Plans a clarification for how they will handle the transition away from O/W designators for students who fall under a catalog prior to Fall 2017.

7. A web page (similar to the SLOA) will be established where communications plans are collected and disseminated across the university.

8. **Implementation timeline for this transition:**
   a. **Department’s** will submit Communications Plans as part of their Student Learning Outcomes Plans submitted April 2016.
   b. **Plans** will be reviewed by the College or School’s Academic Council.
   c. During AY 2016/17 Departments will make any necessary changes to implement their plan.
   d. Plans will be in place and implemented by Fall 2017.
   e. **Existing O and W designators will remain in place (if appropriate) for a period of 2 years from Fall 2017 to facilitate students under catalogs with O/W requirements.**

---

**Comment [JLC1]:** Suggested for removal (Elizabeth Allman)
Is this a one-time thing to have the plans reviewed before implementation? (JC)

**Comment [JLC2]:** Suggested for removal (EA)

**Comment [JLC3]:** 2, 3

**Comment [JLC4]:** 4

**Comment [JLC5]:** 6