

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes for 25 Jan 2012

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry (chair); Jung-ho Baek; Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Brian Himelbloom (phone); Diane McEachern (phone); Todd Radenbaugh (phone); Dave Valentine; Jun Watabe.

Voting Members not present: Anthony Arendt; Debra Moses.

Non-voting Members present: Lillian Anderson-Misel; Donald Crocker; Mike Earnest; Libby Eddy; Carol Gering; Linda Hapsmith; Susan Henrichs (for Dana Thomas); Pete Pinney; Michelle Stalder.

Not present: Doug Goering.

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

A. OLD Business

1. Is this an ok day/time?? If not....suggestions?

This item was not discussed, though mentioned briefly. [Wednesdays from 2-3 p.m. accommodates the most members, based on the Doodle Poll results.]

2. Recent GERK issues and such —comments by Dave

Dave reported that GERC is meeting weekly this semester.

They are hearing about faculty frustration with the lack of writing skills being exhibited by students in upper division courses. Is ENGL F111X enough preparation for upper division courses? The idea of utilizing TAs from the English Department as a resource in writing-intensive courses was discussed. It was noted, however, that English graduate students are working on creative writing, not scientific writing. Rainer suggested bringing the English department into the discussion.

Jun asked if the issue of student plagiarism is being discussed at GERC. Dave indicated it's not been brought up.

Susan Henrichs asked if the frustration with student writing skills is echoed in the arts and humanities and social sciences, as well. The consensus was that that this frustration is shared there, as well.

Pete and Carol mentioned strategies they are using at their units to address reading and writing skills in various courses. Linda asked how such courses might translate to the Core requirements. Dave mentioned that GERC is reviewing several Core models and how learning outcomes will be identified for Core. Susan stressed the need for a Core structure that is identifiable and transferable.

Pete mentioned that Mike Koskey can not serve on GERC and wanted to know what procedure to use to replace him. It was agreed that Miranda Wright will follow up and see that a statement of interest is submitted by a candidate to fill the CRCD seat.

3. 'Stacked' courses -- comments by Tony? [Item postponed. Anthony was traveling.]

B. NEW Business

1. Proposed motion #1

Change this:

One academic credit hour of non-laboratory instruction at UAF will consist of a minimum of 800 minutes of instruction" (FS meeting #3, March 25, 1988). It is understood that an average student will be expected to spend 1600 minutes of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.

The number of minutes required for one credit of laboratory (1600 or 2400) depends on the amount of instruction given during the lab. For typical science and engineering labs where students work with teaching assistant guidance performing preset exercises, 2400 minutes (3 hours/week/credit for a 14 week semester) is used. For labs in which a faculty member interacts with students and provides feedback

throughout the laboratory period (clinical labs, art studio, automotive technical labs) 1600 minutes (2 hours/week/credit for a 14 week semester) is used. A course submission with a lab component should include a justification for the number of minutes of lab per credit employed.”

To THIS:

"One academic credit hour of non-laboratory instruction at UAF will consist of a minimum of 800 minutes (1 hour/week) of instruction. It is understood that an average student will be expected to spend 1600 minutes (2 hours/week) of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.

Laboratory activities invariably require students to spend AT LEAST ONE HOUR OF STUDY OR PREPARATION time before and (or) after the lab PERIOD, outside of the lab. Traditionally, credits for lab activities in science and engineering ignore this and use 2400 lab hours/credit (3 hours/week/per credit for a 14 week semester). Conversely, lab hours for fields outside of science and engineering traditionally use 1600 hours of lab activities per credit (2 hours/week/credit). A course submission with a lab component should include a justification (in terms of student work hours) for the number of minutes of lab per credit employed.”

OR POSSIBLY THIS.... for 2nd paragraph...

“Laboratory classes may require a minimum of 2400 lab minutes/credit (3 hours/week/credit), or they may require a minimum of 1600 lab minutes (2 hours/week/credit) AND 800 minutes (1 hour/week) of study and/or preparation outside of class. A course submission with a lab component should include a justification (in terms of required student work minutes outside of laboratory) if the laboratory does not require at least 2400 lab minutes per credit.”

Justification: brings UAF policies in line with BOR

R10.04.090. Evaluation of Student Performance and Course Level Definitions.

F. Course Numbering system

2. Academic Credit Courses

Courses with these numbers count toward undergraduate and graduate degrees and certificates as described below. Each course includes a component for evaluation of student performance. Student effort is indicated by credit hours. **One credit hour represents three hours of student work** per week for a 15-week semester (e.g., one class-hour of lecture and two hours of study or **three class-hours of laboratory**) for a minimum of 2250 minutes of total student engagement, which may include exam periods

There was consensus that the second version was preferred by the committee with a change in the last sentence: “A course submission with a lab component [[should]] **MUST** include a justification (in terms of required student work minutes outside of laboratory) if the laboratory does not require at least 2400 lab minutes per credit.” The effect should bring UAF in line with UA regulation without changing the traditional science / non-science labs at UAF. The committee agreed to bring the revised motion to the Administrative Committee.

2. Proposed motion #2 on Educational Effectiveness (Copy attached at the end of this document.)

Susan spoke to the committee about the motion. The cycle of assessment needs to be addressed because of the recommendation by the NWCCU accreditation team. Student learning outcomes assessment must be continuously performed, not sporadically (as has been the case). While many units are gathering data, there is no evidence to demonstrate that data results are being applied. Many surveys are being used which are too generalized (e.g., student exit surveys). The two year interval is proposed by this motion because department chairs serve two-year terms, and aligning the cycle with

the term will help ensure that assessment is regularly addressed and not skipped over. Susan has also encouraged the deans to put assessment duties into workloads.

She explained the larger picture which includes higher education accountability and standards, and the fact that if universities do not take the initiative in the near future, it could become mandated by government down the road. Currently, UAF must take the NWCCU recommendation very seriously, and the report due to the accreditors next fall must show some positive effort and change.

It was noted that many programs which have specialized accreditation are using capstone courses for their senior students. These courses fit well with assessing student learning outcomes for programs.

The issue of Faculty Senate wishing to separate the matter of program review from outcomes assessment was discussed. Susan explained that all that is being changed right now is the frequency of required reports. Dave mentioned the need for training department chairs and faculty how to do the assessments, considering there is such a wide variation in how well it's being done across campus. Susan agreed. She noted they are looking at model assessment templates and promised to share those with Faculty Senate. Rainer reiterated that faculty are concerned about the workload involved in doing assessments, and Susan reiterated that they are looking for a process that will require reasonable amounts of work. Time is a great factor, both for faculty doing the work of assessments, and for the university to respond to the accreditation recommendation.

Curricular Affairs Committee agreed that this topic would be discussed at the February Faculty Senate meeting with the goal of a vote on the motion in March.

3. Core science labs—update from meeting in Anchorage - Jan 15 & 16.

Report / discussion on this topic was postponed to the next meeting due to time constraints.

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness policy as indicated below:

EFFECTIVE: Upon approval by the Chancellor

RATIONALE: UAF institutional and specialized accreditation requires outcomes assessment reporting and assessment is important for the continuing improvement of curricula. To ensure that outcomes assessment information is collected regularly, with no long gaps, each program is asked to prepare a report every 2 years. This is consistent with the two year commitments that department chairs make so each department chair will know a report must be filed during their service. In addition, this change will provide timely information to summarize the implementation and results of assessment practices reported annually to the Board of Regents as required in policy P10.06.020.

CAPS = Additions

[[]] = Deletions

UAF EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS POLICY

In accordance with its mission, the University of Alaska Fairbanks has a continuing responsibility to review and improve performance of its students, faculty, and programs. The UAF therefore establishes the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation to describe the effects of curriculum, instruction, and other institutional programs.

The process will be useful for curricular and institutional reform and will be consistent with UA Board of Regents Policy and institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

The university shall ensure the academic freedom of the academic community in the development and maintenance of this process.

The data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty. Furthermore, no student shall be denied graduation based solely upon information gathered for the educational effectiveness evaluation process.

Each faculty member's activities in developing and/or implementing programmatic and institutional educational effectiveness efforts may be summarized in the instructional section of annual evaluations and promotion and tenure files.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

1) Student Information

Students shall be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.

2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum

Evaluation of the CORE curriculum shall include course assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.

3) Programmatic assessment

Each degree and certificate program shall establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning

An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of activities and student support services will be conducted.

The chair of each department (or equivalent as identified by the Dean or Director) shall prepare a report at least **BIANNUALLY** [[four years]] summarizing the Educational Effectiveness program for each certificate and degree program offered by that department. The report shall include a summary of the following:

- A. Student outcome goals and objectives of the program,
- B. The methods and criteria used to evaluate whether the goals and objectives are being met,
- C. A description of what information is collected annually, and
- D. How the results of such information are being used to improve the curriculum.

The report shall be presented to the dean or director's office **AND THE ACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT ASSISTANT IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE BY THE END OF 9-MONTH FACULTY CONTRACTS IN MAY** [[during the month of May]]. At least some information gathering for this process shall occur annually.

Once an educational effectiveness evaluation program has been implemented for the core, the core review committee of the faculty senate shall prepare a report, at least biannually, summarizing the educational effectiveness of the components of the core curriculum. This report shall be similar in content to the report described above for individual programs but shall provide a summary for the components of the core curriculum. The components of the Core may be summarized in the report on a rotational basis, but at least some information should be gathered annually.