

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for 18 April 2012

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry, David Valentine, Jungho Baek, Cindy Hardy, Brian Himelbloom (phone), Diane McEachern (phone), Todd Radenbaugh (phone), Jun Watabe.
Voting members absent: Anthony Arendt, Retchenda George-Bettisworth.

Non-voting members present: Carol Gering, Donald Crocker, Lillian Misel, Linda Hapsmith.
Jayne Harvie present to take notes.

1. Approve minutes from previous meeting

April 4 minutes were approved as submitted.

2. UPDATE ON GENERAL EDUCATION REVITALIZATION COMMITTEE (GERC) (short version):

We've been working diligently, have made progress, are committed to BOR policy and the SLOs, but feel that it's premature to present a proposal at this point. There are two major dangers to presenting something that isn't finished: 1) getting a lot of feedback at this point will distract and derail our progress. We need to come up with a well-articulated curriculum that reflects the whole of our discussions; 2) it will lead to a lot of hand-wringing, worry, complaints, and maybe even work (in the planning of new courses, etc.) based on something that is unfinished and will certainly change between now and its final version.

David V. commented on the diversity of viewpoints represented on the committee, and the importance of there being willingness to compromise on how requirements are fulfilled. Rainer noted the different approach from when the Core was first created. At that time there were individual committees for each section of the core and it was extremely hard to put it all together. At that time, Faculty Senate voted it down when it was first presented. He also noted the critical need for the whole academy to buy in to the changes, not just Faculty Senate.

3. Report from subcommittee (stacking): ...short version...

Results from Faculty Survey were mixed (not too surprising). Student survey was recently sent out. Subcommittee plans to pursue this topic over the summer (???) and come up with a short report to GAAC and CAC by fall 2012.

The topic was not discussed at this meeting by the committee.

4. Approval of proposed new form for regular classes to be held as 'individual studies'

Libby Eddy is going to send out an email vote on the finalized form (also distributed via email).

5. Proposed Academic Calendars, continued: need a process to create BEST Wintermester solutions

Rainer stated the need to have a fix for the Wintermester problems this fall 2012 to best serve the students. There are not enough days between the end of hard closure and the start of spring semester to offer courses without breaking them up or shortening them down. The easy solution would be not allowing 3-credit courses to be offered and to have shorter sessions (only 2- and 1-credit courses could

be offered). Otherwise, solutions must include having courses meet during hard closure or meet over weekends, which are problematic solutions.

Todd R. asked how popular Wintermester is, and Mike commented that there were over 100 students last time and that students want the 3-credit courses. Todd noted that offering only 1- and 2-credit courses won't solve the problem.

David V. commented on the pressure to push students through. He asked about doing away with hard closure instead. Mike E. noted his office can not close because of course registration for Wintermester and grades. It would also require Financial Aid, Admissions and the Business Office to stay open. Libraries are closed. Other student services are closed.

Carol G. commented on the fact that each week of Wintermester technically requires 67 hours of effort each week. Rainer asked about the number of students being served relative to the number of staff and faculty required to pull it off. The idea of having an ad hoc committee address the question was suggested. It would report to CAC.

Cindy H. wanted to know how successful the students are during Wintermester – what is the pass rate? Rainer asked if students who take courses during Wintermester are more likely to graduate? Lillian M. noted that very few students need Wintermester to graduate, perhaps two or three.

Donald C. suggested offering hybrid courses (part online, part classroom). Rainer responded that a mechanism to solve the Wintermester calendar problem is needed, rather than a workaround. Discussion followed about the minimum three days per credit requirement.

The committee will continue this discussion at the next meeting (May 2). In the meantime, Mike E. will get some numbers, and David V. will consider who needs to be on an ad hoc committee to address the problem.

6. PROPOSAL TO CHANGE DISQUAL AND PROBATION TO INCLUDE SUMMER *(we need to create a strategy for this one, too, beyond “Deal with it next year”) ...*

SUGGESTED REVISED LANGUAGE:

PROBATION: Undergraduate students – Students who's cumulative and/or semester GPA falls below 2.0 after each ~~fall and spring~~ semester will be put on academic probation. Students on probation may not enroll in more than 13 credits a semester, unless an exception is granted by the appropriate dean. Probation may include additional conditions, as determined by the dean of the college or school in which the student's major is located. Students on probation will be referred for developmental advising/education and/or to an advising or support counseling center. The student will work with an academic advisor to prepare an academic plan for achieving a higher GPA; the advisor is responsible for forwarding this plan to the appropriate dean. A student on probation will not be allowed to register unless the academic plan is on file. Removal from probation requires the student's cumulative and semester GPAs to be at least 2.0.

[Academic Disqualification Note from Mike: again, why do we distinguish “regular” semesters from summer? Summer is Financial Aid eligible and counts toward degree programs....]

SUGGESTED REVISED LANGUAGE:

Undergraduate students -- Undergraduate students on probation whose semester ~~and/or~~ and 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.

The committee agreed to address this proposal at a future meeting.

7. THREE Motions from Core Review Committee for our consideration (as modified)

Motion#1: *Submitted by Core Review Committee 19 March 2012*

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the recommendation of the Core Review Committee that BOTH the lower-division communication requirement and the lower-division writing sequence that are specified in the Core Curriculum will all be prerequisites for all “W”, “O”- and “O/2” designated courses.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012 and/or upon chancellor’s approval

RATIONALE: To remove inconsistencies in the requirements for lower-division communication and writing courses as prerequisites for all upper-division “W”, “O” and “O/2” designated courses.

Rainer clarified that Core Review Committee did indeed mean that both Communication and English prerequisites must be met to take the upper division “O” and “W” courses. He proposed that this motion not be considered for the May Faculty Senate meeting. Cindy H. spoke in support of requiring both Communication and English prerequisites because students typically put them off too long. Carol G. noted that enforcing this would impact non-traditional students, and that Center for Distance Ed can not offer “O” courses.

David V. said there could instead be two rules to address “O” and “W” separately. Rainer asked members to think about this topic for the next meeting.

Motion#2: *(looking for final approval–wording has not changed since 4 April meeting)*

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the recommendation of the Core Review Committee requiring a syllabus statement for Oral Intensive O and O/2 courses.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012 and/or upon chancellor’s approval

RATIONALE: The Core Review Committee’s assessment of W and O course syllabi has found that there is frequent confusion amongst some faculty members about the general and specific requirements for the three options of the oral intensive O designator and for the single O/2 designator. The inclusion of this statement in a course syllabus will make explicit the general course requirements for the O or O/2 designation and provide a reference location for the numerous specific requirements. Inclusion of this statement will make the syllabus requirement for the O and O/2 courses consistent with the existing syllabus requirement statement for Writing Intensive W courses, per Faculty Senate Meeting #109 on May 6, 2002. No new course requirements result from this action. These syllabus requirements should be added to the Faculty Senate’s “UAF Syllabus Requirements.”

Syllabus Statement Regarding the Oral-Intensive (O) Requirement

This statement, or a statement similar to it, MUST appear in the syllabus of each "O" or "O/2"

course. Courses failing to provide this information jeopardize their continuing status as "O" or "O/2" courses.

"This course is designated as Oral-Intensive (O). This designation means that the "O" or "O/2" is evident in the course number on the syllabus (e.g., EducationF452 O). The designation applies to upper-division courses. ORAL ACTIVITIES IN THIS COURSE WILL FOLLOW THESE RULES:

- * A minimum of 15 percent of the graded work in the O course (7.5 percent for "O/2") will be based on effectiveness of oral communications.*
- * Students will receive intermediate instructor assistance in developing presentational competency.*
- * Students will utilize their communication competency across the span of the semester, not just in a final project.*
- * Students will receive instructor feedback on the success of their efforts at each stage of preparing their presentations. "*

In addition, THE SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS APPROPRIATE FOR THE PARTICULAR 'O' OPTION REPRESENTED BY THE COURSE (FOUND AT <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course-degree-procedures-/guidelines-for-core-design/>) WILL BE LISTED.

This motion on the required syllabus statement had the committee's support. It was approved to move forward to the Administrative Committee.

Motion#3: (wording modified slightly since 4 April meeting)

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Faculty Senate Bylaws, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E, Permanent Committees.6. and to approve the Core Review Committee's authority to revoke O or W status (Oral intensive or Writing intensive designator) for classes following the second consecutive time that they fail to pass review by the Core Review Committee.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012 and/or upon Chancellor's approval

RATIONALE: Many classes with the O or W designator fail multiple assessments by the Core Review Committee. The appropriate Dean and Department Chair are then informed of the need to bring syllabi into conformity with the O or W guidelines, but often no changes are made. It is hoped that this will spur action.

CAPS = Addition *[[]]* = Deletion

SECTION 3 (ART V: COMMITTEES), SUBSECTION E., PERMANENT COMMITTEES:

*6. The Core Review Committee reviews and approves courses submitted by the appropriate school/college curriculum councils for their inclusion in the core curriculum at UAF. The Core Review Committee coordinates and recommends changes to the core curriculum, develops the process for assessment of the core curriculum, regularly reports on assessment of the core curriculum, monitors transfer guidelines for core courses, acts on petitions for core credit, and evaluates guidelines in light of the total core experience. This committee will also review courses for oral, written, and natural science core classification. **IF THE COMMITTEE DETERMINES THAT***

A COURSE FAILS TWICE IN A ROW TO MEET O OR W GUIDELINES AS SPECIFIED BY THE FACULTY SENATE, THE COMMITTEE SHALL HAVE THE POWER TO REVOKE O OR W DESIGNATORS FROM THAT COURSE. * COMMITTEE ACTIONS MADE PRIOR TO MARCH 1 WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE IN THE NEXT YEAR'S CATALOG. DESIGNATORS WILL BE RESTORED AS SOON AS THE COURSE HAS BEEN REAPPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AS ONCE AGAIN CONFORMING TO O OR W GUIDELINES.

****AS FOUND AT: [HTTP://WWW.UAF.EDU/UAFGOV/FACULTY-SENATE/CURRICULUM/COURSE-DEGREE-PROCEDURES-/GUIDELINES-FOR-CORE-DESIG/](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course-degree-procedures-/guidelines-for-core-desig/)***

The committee shall be composed of one faculty member from each of the core component areas: (Social Sciences, English, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Communication, and Library Science) and one faculty member from a non-core component area. Membership on the committee will include an undergraduate student and representatives from the colleges specifically tasked with core assessment.

Committee members discussed different scenarios that might occur with this change to Core Review, allowing them to revoke a designator from a course. Discussion with the instructors of affected courses would first take place before any revocation occurred. It was noted that some courses with multiple sections are taught by many instructors. The length of a revocation and the catalog cycle were discussed, with some clarification that if the course had a “W” in the catalog when the student took it, that was the determining factor for the student. Rainer noted that the threat of action alone was probably enough to motivate departments and faculty to improve individual courses. Jun W. expressed concern over the length of time involved in the revocation / restoration cycle and the catalog.

8. KOMPLETE KOLLEGE AMURKA proposed resolution

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee and the Curricular Affairs Committee and probably will be modified more by AdComm.

RESOLUTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate admires the goals of, but nevertheless rejects joining “Complete College America”. Instead, the UAF Faculty Senate urges the Alaska State Legislature and the administration of the University of Alaska to support and encourage programs that are tailored to address the goals of Alaska’s students, rather than to bind Alaska to a rigid set of one-size-fits-all national rules. Or best strategy is to provide support, preparation, and access to programs and degrees without any real or implied penalty for length of time to degree.

Complete draft resolution is posted online at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#183>

Lillian M. suggested adding the fact that there is a core waiver in place for transferring AA / AS degrees from other institutions. Cindy H. noted that there is credit for prior learning, also. David V. expressed concern that academic standards were not mentioned in the resolution statement, and Cindy noted this fact had been moved into the body of the resolution document when it was re-formatted. Some modifications were suggested for the resolution statement itself to note that there should be no

compromise to the value and quality of programs. The committee agreed to give carte blanche to the Administrative Committee on the Motivation and Background sections.