

Curricular Affairs Committee

Weds 12 November 2014 MINUTES 3-4 pm Reich 300

Present: Brian Cook, Catherine Hanks, Cindy Hardy, Dennis Moser, Joan Hornig, Ken Abramowicz, Rainer Newberry, Rob Duke, Todd Radenbaugh (remote), Jayne Harvie, Alex Fitts, Caty Oehring, Holly Sherouse, Linda Hapsmith and Guest John Heaton UAF history Dept.

I. Approve minutes of Oct 29 meeting

II. Old business

- A. Guest John Heaton, History Dept**—discussed how can History at UAF be compatible with GER regulations and UAA & UAS. Basically, History would prefer having its courses classified as ‘social sciences’ with regards to the GERs, in violation of current regulations. Second choice: have History courses count as either/both social science and humanities.

B. Update from GERC concerning ‘C’ requirement: see notes below

“The consensus is that—especially for disciplines outside of CLA—while there is great interest in ensuring that students indeed can communicate according to the above learning outcomes (and perhaps some more that have not yet been articulated), it is a huge burden to try to do all those learning outcomes (especially in the micromanaged way of the current O requirement) in the context of a single course or two. The discussion settled on

Every major must submit a plan for how students in that particular major will satisfy the C outcomes.

the point is to meet our upper-division communication-in-the-discipline outcomes through a variety of required courses, rather than in one or two courses specifically chosen to meet the requirement.

After the plan is submitted and has been approved (presumably by the Core Review committee), then majors/departments would have to assess how the plan is working, e.g., as part of their SLOA reports.

Still To Do:

It would be great if this requirement—with the added flexibility—did not just turn into a joke requirement.

(1) What does the initial plan look like?

(a) How do we ensure that every department has appropriately stringent requirements within their program description, as opposed to just “oh we’re doing everything fine now”?

(b) How do we ensure that this doesn’t just become more busywork on faculty plates, but instead helps departments and majors actually achieve their communication goals?

(c) In terms of bureaucracy, do we need to devise a sequence of questions that programs would need to answer, detailing what sorts of communication-related assessment happens when & where?”

The members of CAC unanimously approved a motion to GERC supporting their efforts in this direction

- C. Where we stand RE Fac Alliance and GERs:** *David Valentine promised (by email) that GERs would be on the Agenda of the Fac Alliance meeting on Friday in 2 days. Rainer promised an update at the next CAC meeting.*

D. Approval by email of a proposed minor in Forestry Mangement

No one voted against, all voted to approve or abstained. This minor will consequently be on the December Fac Senate Agenda.