

B. Motion to approved "O" syllabus requirements, submitted by Core Review

Doug Schamel indicated that the Core Review Committee would like to provide guidance to faculty teaching "O" & "W" courses. About half the courses do not designate in their syllabus why the course is "O" or "W" and don't explain to students what they have to do to complete work to earn that. What the committee is attempting to do is clarify to the faculty and students what the designator means. Abel Bult was confused about a couple of points in the motion. A couple of friendly amendments were made to the statement on syllabus content. After discussion about the different syllabus requirements for the different "O" categories, the motion failed.

MOTION FAILED:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the recommendation of the Core Review Committee requiring a syllabus statement for Oral Intensive "O" courses.

EFFECTIVE: Fall semester 2002.

RATIONALE: With the high turnover of faculty teaching "O" courses, there seems to be confusion about what needs to be included in such courses. The inclusion of wording such as this in the course syllabus will better insure that the course actually contains the appropriate material AND that students are aware that this is indeed an "O" course.

C. Motion to approved "W" syllabus requirements, submitted by Core Review

Doug Schamel stated that this was a similar motion to require a syllabus statement on "W" courses. The motion passed.

MOTION PASSED:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the recommendation of the Core Review Committee requiring a syllabus statement for Writing Intensive "W" courses.

EFFECTIVE: Fall semester 2002.

RATIONALE: With the high turnover of faculty, there appears to be some confusion about what constitutes a "W" course. The inclusion of this type of statement will guide the faculty in formulating the course, and inform students not only that this is a "W" course, but the