

Curricular Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes for 8 February 2012

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry, Chair; Anthony Arendt; Jungho Baek; Retchenda George-Bettisworth (phone); Brian Himelbloom (phone); Jun Watabe.

Voting members absent: Diane McEachern; Deb Moses; Todd Radenbaugh (traveling); Dave Valentine.

Non-voting members present: Donald Crocker; Mike Earnest; Libby Eddy; Carol Gering; Doug Goering; Linda Hapsmith; Dana Thomas.

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

OLD Business

1. Approval of previous meeting minutes.

January 25 meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Recent GERC issues

Comments postponed for next meeting.

3. 'Stacked' courses

Anthony gave a brief report, reporting that results are in from the surveys of faculty and students. He and Lara Horstmann are compiling the results and writing a report.

4. Proposed motion to amend the Educational Effectiveness policy:

(A copy of the motion is included at the end of these minutes.)

Jun asked how the assessment data are used, and if reporting is required or just recommended. Doug G. commented on the fact that assessment is required and why. He noted how ABET accreditation drives the review of their undergraduate programs, vs. the review of their graduate programs which is much looser. Senior capstone courses were mentioned as a means that NWCCU recommends for ongoing assessment because it's easier to tie assessment to those courses.

Rainer commented that the ultimate test is after the student leaves. Doug noted it's harder to document then and that external factors start to drive the results (the job market, for example). Rainer also commented that the work not only involves improving programs, but documenting the effort to do so.

There was agreement that there needs to be faculty buy-in in the process. It seems to be driven by administration, rather than faculty driven. All agree that no one wants to do it if it's not useful to them. Dana commented on its need as a feedback mechanism to faculty to have real knowledge of how well students are doing in their courses and programs. Dave Veazey's name was mentioned as a potential guest to speak to the committee on this topic. In the meantime, Rainer urged that an electronic discussion of the matter be initiated.

The CAC passed the motion and it will move on to the Administrative Committee.

NEW Business:

1. *Proposed motion to amend Catalog language to clarify the difference between the Dean's List and the Chancellor's List:*

Currently, the catalog states that dean's list is for students with a GPA of >3.5 and chancellor's list for >3.9. Presumably, then, this logic means that a student with >3.9 is on both Dean's List AND Chancellor's List. The intention was that dean's list would be 3.5 to 3.89, and chancellor's list > or = 3.9.

Current catalog language (Under “ACADEMIC HONORS” on page 49)

You will make the chancellor’s list with a GPA of 3.9 and the dean’s list with a GPA of 3.5 or higher.

CHANGE TO:

You will make the chancellor’s list with a GPA of 3.9 or higher, ~~and~~ **or** the dean’s list with a GPA of 3.5 to 3.89.

EFFECTIVE: **Fall 2012**

RATIONALE: The current catalog language is vague enough that some students might expect to be on both lists, when our intention was that they are on one or the other, but not both.

The committee passed this motion and it will move forward to the Administrative Committee.

2. Mike Earnest brought the topic of a new category of registration called Directed Study before the committee. It would be similar to Independent Study courses (numbered -97), except that the course already exists and would retain its catalog number. A flag in Banner could be used to indicate that the student took the course as Directed Study (as opposed to taking it in a normal class setting). Some workload and core course issues were discussed. The item will be discussed further at the next CAC meeting.

3. Item: *X wants to teach microbio BIOL F240 next semester because there is a high local demand. However, most of those students already take A&P 112, and experience says that they can't handle 2 such big classes in one semester. So X hopes to can teach microbio 240 spread out over 2 semesters instead, fall 2012 and spring 2013. X has taught the class before in a traditional 1-semester setting so X is already approved as an instructor, but what process would be needed for a 2-semester format?*

In effect, students would register for the 4 credits in Fall 2012, but the lecture and lab would be spread over the September to May time frame, with a grade not being posted (or credit earned) until May.

The committee discussed this question, noting the issues of faculty workloads, the pace of the course not being equal to a semester course, and Financial Aid issues, as well as grading issues. It was agreed that the easiest approach would be to split the course in half at 1.5 credits each.

Copy of the Educational Effectiveness motion (from Item 4 under Old Business):

DRAFT MOTION

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 **EVERY TWO YEARS** [[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.