

## Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Notes - Weds Jan 26

Voting Members Present: Rainer Newberry (Chair), Anthony Arendt, Jungho Baek, Carrie Baker, Christa Bartlett, Sarah Fowell, Brian Himelbloom (phone), Falk Huettmann (phone), and Dave Valentine.

Nonvoting Members Present: Mike Earnest, Libby Eddy, Linda Hapsmith, Dana Thomas, Elizabeth Izaki, Jayne Harvie (notes).

### 1. GER Committee Status – Dave Valentine

Dave is gathering resources to send to the group members when the meeting invitation is sent out. Dana has provided Blackboard access to Dave so he can add the committee members to the site. The site contains materials used by the past committee which will be useful to the new committee.

2. Motion: Students transferring to UAF with an Associate in Science (AS) or Associate in Arts (AA) degree from a regionally accredited school satisfying **one** of the criteria below will be considered as having satisfied the **100 and 200 level** UAF Core Curriculum (General Education) requirements.

1. The AA or AS degree is from the University of Alaska

OR

2. The public Universities in the State that the community college is located also waive their core requirements in lieu of completing an AA or AS degree, that is, have an established 2+2 program.

OR

3. The community college and (or) community college district is accredited by the NW Commission on Colleges and Universities. (This is the one we are in).

OR

4. The associate program is not an AA or AS, but is approved by the public University in its state for meeting general education requirements.

OR

5. The associate program has been approved by the Core Review Committee as satisfying the 100 and 200 level General Education requirements.

HOWEVER, schools and degree programs which meet the above criteria but supply inadequately prepared students may be designated 'unacceptable' if so voted by the Core Review Committee.

**\*\*Specify in the motion's rationale that AAS degrees are not included since they do not require the Core.**

Rainer presented the motion, noting that Core Review Committee had made revisions to it earlier this week and then approved it. Committee members were asked to encourage support of the motion among other faculty senators and their constituents. Linda H. made the suggestion to specify that AAS degrees are not included in this motion. The committee unanimously passed the revised motion. Jayne will especially urge faculty senators to read this motion ahead of time via the meeting reminder email.

### 3. FYI—from Mike Earnest Catalog Production Schedule

Last year the Registrar's Office worked with Marketing & Communications to push our catalog production schedule as late as possible to accommodate spring Faculty Senate actions. Whereas in prior years the catalog

had always been distributed in April, we determined that it could be delayed until August. Given the timeline for producing such a publication, catalog text has to be submitted in early March.

Since we hold students accountable for graduation requirements and academic policies as published in the catalog, I request that the Faculty Senate consider the catalog production schedule when making decisions during the spring semester.

**Changes to existing programs and courses approved by March 1 can be effective for the upcoming fall term (e.g. March 1, 2011 for Fall 2011) and will be published in the next catalog. Changes approved after March 1 should be made effective for the *following* fall term (e.g. April 2011 for Fall 2012).**

- Changes that affect course descriptions (prerequisites, number of credits, applicability to Core, general education distribution, etc) cannot be accommodated after March 1. Course descriptions are pulled for the catalog in early March, and students begin registration around April 1 for the following fall term.
- Changes to existing programs approved by March 1 will be published in the upcoming catalog. This would include changes to degree, major or minor requirements. Changes approved after March 1 will not be published and therefore should be made effective for the following year's catalog.
- New programs approved by the Board of Regents at their February meeting will be published in the catalog. New programs approved at the April BOR meeting may or may not be published. Programs approved at the June BOR meeting will definitely not be published.

Mike presented the difficulties of dealing with new and changing programs throughout the academic year with regard to the printing of the UAF Catalog, as well as students registering for changing courses. The above information needs to be taken into consideration at the curriculum review committees of the senate as they work on curriculum submissions. Dave V. suggested a comprehensive curriculum timeline or calendar that shows the progression of a proposed new /changed program through the process. Jayne will start assembling one that can be used to illustrate the timeline to everyone involved. Someone suggested putting together a list of the entire current curriculum directly affected by the information from Mike in light of the upcoming February 7 Faculty Senate meeting. Dana T. suggested that curriculum committees could be tasked differently – assign proposals to subgroups handling one type of submission (perhaps prioritizing them at the same time for time-sensitivity).

**4. MOTION** to amend catalog language for readmission of academically disqualified students.

Submitted by Mike Earnest, Registrar, and by Dana Thomas, Vice Provost, January 14, 2011.

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following changes to the readmission of academically disqualified students policy described in the catalog:

**Current UAF catalog language:**

#### **Academic Disqualification**

Undergraduate students -- Undergraduate students on probation whose semester and cumulative GPAs are less than 2.0 at the end of spring semester will be disqualified from degree-seeking status. Disqualified students may continue their enrollment at UAF only as non-degree students, are limited to a maximum of 10 credits per semester and must register in person. Credit load overrides are permitted under certain

circumstances. To be eligible for reinstatement in an academic degree program, the student is expected to earn at least a C grade (2.0) in all courses taken as a non-degree student. To be restored to degree-seeking status, the student must apply for readmission. A student may be reinstated but may still be on probation.

---

## **PROPOSED catalog language:**

### **Academic Disqualification**

Undergraduate students – Undergraduate students on probation whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below a 2.0 for two consecutive regular (Fall/Spring or Spring/Fall) semesters will be placed on Academic Disqualification. Academically disqualified students may continue their enrollment at UAF only as non-degree students, are limited to 10 credits per semester, and are ineligible for most types of financial aid.

To be eligible for readmission to an academic degree program, the student must:

1. achieve a 2.0 cumulative grade point average by repeating courses previously failed at UAF and reapply for admission

OR \*CHANGES DISCUSSED TO #2 (below in notes) – Mike Earnest will revise.

2. complete twelve (12) credits for a baccalaureate program, or six (6) credits for an associate, certificate or occupational endorsement program, with a 2.0 GPA or higher. The courses may be completed at UAF and/or another regionally-accredited institution and must be letter-graded. Grades of ‘P’ or ‘CR’ will not be considered. In considering students for readmission, deans will look for coursework taken that relates to the student’s intended program.)

Readmission to a degree program is not automatic or guaranteed. The student must reapply and the application must be approved by the dean. The student may apply to the same program from which they were disqualified, or to a different program or level (e.g. baccalaureate, associate or certificate).

Readmission may be granted with a status of “probation” or with other conditions as specified by the dean. It is vitally important for academically disqualified students to work closely with their academic advisor in developing a realistic and timely educational plan.

**Effective: Fall 2011**

---

### **Rationale**

Current catalog language is too vague to be helpful to faculty and staff in advising students who have been academically disqualified. It also provides no benchmarks to measure a student’s suitability for readmission.

As always, students with extenuating circumstances could request special consideration for readmission. Exceptions to the policy could be made per professional judgment of the Advisor, Dean, Registrar or Provost/Vice Provost.

\*There was much discussion about #2 of the proposed catalog language. It was agreed to change the 12 credits to nine (9) credits for baccalaureate AND associate degrees; and use six (6) credits for certificates. All agreed that occupational endorsements could instead be addressed by a simple statement stating that the student’s GPA must be raised. Mike E. will revise the wording of this and send it to Jayne tomorrow for the senate agenda.

**5. Suggested Guidelines for the design and approval of Stacked 400-600 level courses.**  
**WE need to turn this into a MOTION!!!**

Difference between 400 vs 600 Level Courses: In general, the difference between 400 and 600 level courses are as follows (*emphases P.A. Heiser*):

A400-A499: Require the ability to analyze, synthesize, compare and contrast, research, create, innovate, develop, elaborate, transform, and/or apply course materials to solving complex problems. These courses are generally supported by a substantial body of lower-level courses.

A600-A699 – Require a background in the discipline, and an ability to contribute to written and oral discourse on advanced topics in the field at a level beyond that required by a bachelor’s degree. Require the ability to read, interpret and evaluate primary literature in the field. Students analyze raw data, evaluate models used in research and draw independent conclusions. Preparation includes demonstrated accomplishment in a specific course or discipline, or completion of a significant and related program of studies. Student activities are often self-directed and aimed not only at the formation of supportable conclusions, but also at a clear understanding of the process used in those formations.

When 400-level courses are stacked with 600-level courses, the faculty initiator must consider the impact of stacking the course on the graduate student experience and how that affects the criteria for 600- level courses. In general, ANY graduate-level course proposals should include the following justification:

- Clearly indicate required prior knowledge or skills (pre-requisite body of disciplinary knowledge and/or academic preparation).
- Specify “Graduate Standing”
- Describe how the course provides students with opportunities for independent critical thinking.
- Describe how the course meets goals applicable to field of study, for example:
  - a. Competence in a specialized field of knowledge
  - b. Self-directed written research projects
  - c. Analysis and synthesis of primary scholarship or research
  - d. Mastery of theoretical knowledge
  - e. Extensive experience with specialized client relationships
  - f. Application of expert knowledge within a recognized professional practice

#### Appropriate Courses, Course Design, and Criteria for Stacking:

1. *Course pre-requisites:*

It is difficult to justify stacked courses in which the graduates and undergraduates have a significantly different knowledge base relevant to the course material. If the knowledge is required for the course, the prerequisites must be comparable. If the knowledge is only required for extra coursework performed by the graduate students, this difference should be stated explicitly and addressed in the instructional goals, student outcomes and course activities sections syllabus and course proposal.

2. *Seminar or discussion based courses vs lecture-based courses:*

Seminar or discussion based courses are NOT likely to be suitable for stacking, as the discussion level/theoretical base can differ significantly between graduate and undergraduate students. Unless great care is made to design the course for both levels of student, dominantly seminar courses should not be stacked (outstanding undergraduates could always be admitted per instructor permission). Lecture course in which the major goal is to provide advanced or detailed knowledge set, with regular lectures, reading, and exercises are better adapted to stacking.

3. *Readings and information sources:*

In courses designed to provide detailed knowledge set to advanced undergraduates or graduate students, the primary reading and informational sources should be advanced texts or instructor compiled readings, and not research journal articles. Undergraduate students generally lack the knowledge base and experience to derive all information from the primary literature. While it is certainly valuable to expose undergrads to primary literature, it should not form the dominant reading source for the course. Graduate students could be expected to use professional literature for background reading and/or specific assignments. This is one potential way to clearly separate graduate and undergraduate expectations in the course.

### Logistics of Stacking:

The course description and syllabus of a stacked course must clearly articulate the difference in experience, performance and evaluation of students at different levels, including graduate students vs. undergraduate students. *If a graduate-level course is stacked with a 400-level course, or if undergraduate students are taking the course as part of their baccalaureate degree, the justification must clearly describe how the quality of the graduate students' experience will be maintained in a mixed-level classroom.*

Whatever means, methods, and criteria are used to distinguish graduate vs. undergraduate experience and grading in the course, they must be clearly outlined in the course proposal and clearly described in the course syllabus. It is highly recommended that **TWO SEPARATE SYLLABI** be created for the graduate and undergraduate aspects of the course. This will prevent confusion among students, and force instructors to clearly distinguish the courses and grading schemes.

### ***Some suggested outcomes/assessments that may be appropriate for 600-level students in a stacked course:***

- Extra reading assignments based in the primary research literature, evaluated via written critical reviews and/or oral presentations.
- Extra writing assignments that *evince ability to synthesize research fields* (comprehensive scholarly reviews or synthesis of other disciplinary areas with the course material)
- Assignments to measure the ability of graduate students to *integrate course material into experimental design*, such as writing formal research grant proposals, or oral or written presentation of how the course material informs the student's own thesis research
- Separate exams for graduate students that measure not only comprehension of the lecture material but the ability to integrate and apply the material at more advanced levels, such as hypothesis formulation and experimental design, or the ability to interpret raw research data. An option is to assign extra 'take-home' exam portions for graduate students. Grad student exams could include additional questions based on reading of research literature.
- Teaching experiences, in which graduate students instruct undergraduates, lead discussion groups or present analysis of primary research, offer another context in which graduate students may demonstrate and more advanced knowledge and be assessed accordingly. NOTE: It is *not* permissible to foist major lecture components of the course onto graduate students (e.g. each grad student teaches a full lecture). Graduate teaching experiences, if utilized, must be carefully planned, integrated, and supervised by the instructor.
- Distinct difference grading and assessment of work and exams. Graduate students should be held to a higher standard in grading all exams and assignments, especially those shared with undergrads.

Rainer shared that this information is also being examined at GAAC at their next meeting (Feb. 14); and Dana has agreed to bring up the issue of workload credit at Dean's Council.

Falk H. brought up student evaluations of instructors of stacked courses. Having deans consider that these student evaluations will generally be lower for stacked courses is important to him, perhaps moreso than workload credit.

When these guidelines go through the senate, if approved, it was noted that the curriculum forms must be changed to reflect the requirement.