

Curric Affairs Committee **Weds 3 Sept 2014 Agenda** 2-3 pm Reich 300

audio conference information: 1-800-893-8850 Participants' PIN: 1109306

invited: Brian Cook, Catherine Hanks, Cindy Hardy, Dennis Moser, Joan Hornig, Ken Abramowicz, Rainer Newberry, Rob Duke (remote), Todd Radenbaugh (remote), Doug Goering, Jayne Harvie, Alex Fitts, Carol Gering, Casey Byrne, Holly Sherouse, Libby Eddy, Linda Hapsmith, Stacey Howdeshell

I. Confirmation of meeting day, time, place and frequency (every other weds)

II. Review of results from last Friday's AdComm meeting

A. Presentation of proposed changes in Univ Regs RE (attachment)

B. Adcomm felt that 'capstone' motion was too much but...good opportunity to discuss 'faculty as a whole' vs. 'fac senate' votes for various proposals.

III. New business: moving forward on finding middle ground between O/W or C and complete deregulation

Cindy has agreed to chair a subcommittee dedicated to finding solutions

Discuss problems with W/O and how not fixed by C

Draft Guidelines for 'C' courses Minimum criteria for course approval:

1. Explicitly address at least three of these objectives:

- A. Students will be able to revise written work in response to instructor and peer feedback.
- B. Students will be able to write effectively for diverse audiences.
- C. Students will be able to recognize and navigate the concepts, genres, and conventions of the course discipline.
- D. Students will be able to select appropriate writing technologies to collaborate in personal, professional and civic relationships.
- E. Students will be able to listen effectively and respond effectively to communication practices in the course.

2. At least 50% of the grade must come from assignments utilizing the types of writing and combination of written and non-written forms of communication most appropriate to disciplinary needs and standards and course content. Non-written forms of communication may include, but are not limited to: oral presentations, discussions, training, videography, podcasting, or performance.

3. Provide guided and prompt feedback and opportunities for student revision on student projects, presentations, and papers.

4. In addition to written and spoken communication, address other forms of communication in the course discipline, such as reading and listening and multimodal, digital, or visual communication.

5. Address and practice accurate and ethical referencing/citation practices of source material as it pertains to source authority, academic honesty, and personal credibility.

The motion is intended to de-centralize UAF's communications requirements beyond the 34-credit UA GER. Assessment and monitoring of the existing communications requirement has been difficult and ineffective. The current system of 2Ws + 1 O is conceptually simple and easy to enforce on students but is a 'one size fits all' approach to a complex problem. Having a single set of rules for the O and W classes theoretically makes them possess uniform characteristics—but in practice neither course content nor effectiveness are actually monitored.

Piggybacking on the existing assessment and program review processes will likely increase the effectiveness of both monitoring student communications outcomes and taking more appropriate remedial action that may be necessary to ensure that students meet the communication objectives. Use of the existing assessment and program review processes will potentially be more efficient for both faculty and administrators.

Taking this approach would allow individual applicable units to tailor their communications requirements to the specific needs of students in a given applicable unit. Both the number of courses to be so required and the content of the courses would potentially vary across between applicable units.

Taking this approach would require that each applicable unit take responsibility for ensuring the communications abilities of its students. This is both a golden opportunity and a heavy responsibility.