

Curricular Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes for Mon., Feb. 23, 2015 – 1-2 p.m. Audio Conference

Present: Brian Cook, Chair; Ken Abramowicz (audio); Rob Duke (audio); Libby Eddy (audio); Doug Goering (audio); Cathy Hanks; Cindy Hardy (audio); Jayne Harvie (audio); Stacey Howdeshell (audio); Dennis Moser (audio); Rainer Newberry; Caty Oehring (audio); Todd Radenbaugh (remote).

I. **Approve minutes from Feb. 9 meeting**

Minutes for February 9 were approved as submitted.

II. **New business**

A. Allowing Double Concentrations (Recommended by Registrar Libby Eddy)

Page 129 of the 2014-15 Course Catalog states:

Concentrations

A concentration is an area of emphasis including the major core courses within a student's degree program. Some programs at UAF require a concentration, others do not. A student may only earn one degree in a specific discipline once. Using different concentrations within a degree program to count as different degrees is not allowed. Double concentrations may be permitted but must be petitioned through the standard undergraduate petition process.

Libby recommends changing the last sentence to: “Double concentrations may be permitted with department approval.”

Justification: currently a student can get multiple minors under one Bachelor degree without petitioning. As long as a student meets the requirements for the additional concentrations and is willing to take those additional credits, we should allow them to graduate with two concentrations. This would be reflected on their transcript as well which would be beneficial for those students who are needing to document knowledge in that content area for jobs, raises, graduate school applications, etc.

[**NOTE:** the student would still only receive ONE degree, they'd just have the additional experience that taking extra courses to achieve multiple concentrations would provide. This is currently allowed via petition; changing the wording would remove the need for petitions.]

Libby explained that currently petitions are used to approve and document that a student has done two concentrations within a degree program. Rainer suggested changing “may be” to “are” and this was adopted. Changing this process to one where the approval is completed at the department level was approved by the majority of the committee.

II. **Old business**

A. O/W Change to Communications requirement

- Current motion (forwarded from GERC – edit/notes are mine)
 - See also attached copy of the draft Communications plan form, created by GERC for use by departments
- One issue emerges: Core Review currently deals with multiple petitions for O/W courses; is there anything that should be done to stem a possible tidal wave of petitions across the next year between approval and the change taking effect in the catalog? It won't be advantageous to every student to change their catalog year to avoid taking specific O and W courses.

Draft MOTION:

=====

The General Education Revitalization Committee and the Curricular Affairs Committee recommend that the Faculty Senate move to replace the upper division Oral (O) and Written (W) designators with the requirement that each degree program must satisfy the following Communications Learning Outcomes within the degree program:

UAF undergraduates will demonstrate effective communication when they are able to:

- Explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication.
- Communicate to audiences in the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions.
- Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities.
- Integrate feedback from others to enhance or revise communication.

Each baccalaureate degree program must submit a Communications Plan that demonstrates how students will achieve each of the learning outcomes as part of the requirements of the major or degree program. Not all courses or requirements need to support every outcome; however, all the outcomes must be met by the completion of the degree.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2016

RATIONALE: The GERC committee and Curricular Affairs, as part of ~~its~~ THEIR work to revise UAF's core requirements in response to the Faculty Senate adoption of the LEAP outcomes, propose replacing the current W/O designators with a requirement that students achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes that is integrated into each baccalaureate degree program and major.

The responsibility for ensuring that students achieve these Communications Learning Outcomes is being moved from the University level (via specific O and W courses) to the departments (via the requirements of the degree programs), and from a specific degree requirement (taking two Ws and one O) to a requirement that is transparent to the student and is achieved simply by the student completing the degree requirements associated with their program.

To ensure student achievement of these Communications Learning Outcomes, each department will demonstrate how they address these learning outcomes by developing a Communications Plan that integrates communication at the lower- and upper-level into each degree or program, typically via a collection of courses and/or non-curricular degree requirements chosen to meet the needs of the particular program, in such a way that all the outcomes are met somewhere in the collection of

courses. The Communications Plan for each degree will describe the collection of courses (possibly, both in and out of the department) and other requirements (if any) and how they contribute to meeting these outcomes.

Departments will submit the Communications Plan for each degree program as part of their SLOA plans, and subsequently, by submitting a short summary report addressing how the plan is working (and revising the plan as necessary). Once a department has submitted a plan, which will include a required path/collection of paths through the degree wherein students will achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes, then all students in that degree will achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes by virtue of satisfying the degree requirements of that program.

To facilitate implementation, GERC recommends an ad hoc committee be formed to review the initial Communications Plans. They suggest the addition of an additional checkbox on Major/Minor course change forms asking “does this change affect Communications Outcomes Plans?”, so that departments are aware of potential changes.

[NOTE: This ad hoc committee could also be tasked with approving the bucket list courses?]

Faculty Senate should determine how best to assess how well departments and majors are achieving the Communications outcomes as implemented in the Communications plan associated with each program and degree. GERC recommend a long-term committee that can serve as a resource for communications-related courses, as well as to assess the long-term efficacy of Communications plans.

[NOTE: We discussed at our last CAC meeting about college/school-level committees, which I did mention to GERC. They are still recommending a university-wide committee.]

Finally, GERC recommends a web page (similar to the SLOA) where communications plans are collected and disseminated across the university.

CAPS = additions

[[]] = deletions

This motion will delete the following statements from the ~~2014-15~~ [2016-17?] UAF Catalog:

Page 132, Course Recommendations for the Baccalaureate Core, fourth sentence: [[Courses

meeting the upper division writing-intensive and oral communication-intensive requirements for the baccalaureate core are identified in the course description of the catalog with the following designators:

O—oral communication intensive course W—writing intensive course

Two courses designated O/2 are required to complete the oral intensive requirement.]] And

page 133, final section of the listing under “Baccalaureate Core”:

[[Upper-Division Writing and Oral Communication

Complete the following at the upper-division level:

Two writing intensive courses designated (W) and one oral communication intensive course designated (O), or two oral communication intensive courses designated (O/2) (see degree and/or major requirements)]]

And page 136-7, text in boxes across top row of chart:

[[2 designated upper-division writing-intensive (W) and either 1 designated upper-division oral-intensive (O) course or 2 upper-division oral-intensive courses designated O/2]]

And page 248, Special or Reserved Numbers, first paragraph, second sentence:

[[Courses with suffixes O or W meet upper division writing intensive or oral communication intensive course requirements for the baccalaureate core.]]

And page 249, under Course Credits:

[[O—Oral Communication Intensive Course W—Writing Intensive Course

Courses meeting upper-division writing and oral communication intensive requirements for the baccalaureate core are identified in the course description section of the catalog with the suffixes O and W.

Two courses designated O/2 are required to complete the oral communication intensive requirement.]]

The committee discussed the merits of keeping O and W designators with courses vs. removing them entirely. GERC does not wish there to be any designator, not even "C" for Communication. Instead, they would like to see all Communication requirements embedded within the coursework required by each program.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA) at each department would be used to track and assess the communication requirements. This would remove any review of requirements from DegreeWorks. It accommodates specialized accreditation requirements and processes at some of those units having specialized accreditation.

Transfer credit determinations would be made by the departments.

Keeping the O and W designations attached to courses was discussed. This might be confusing to students, and over time there would not be a clear process to assign new courses with designators or to change those designations to courses.

Two ideas for reviewing SLOA plans from GERC are: 1.) a Faculty Senate committee would review all SLOA plans, and 2.) each department would establish its own review committee. Brian asked what assessment committees exist now to review SLOA at departments.

Ex officio member Doug Goering was asked to bring this question up at

| Perspectives on the Human Condition | Current University Regulations |
|--|---|
| HIST F100X--Modern World History | "broad survey courses which provide the student with exposure to the theory, methods and data of the social sciences" |
| ECON/PS F100X--Political Economy | |
| ANTH/SOC F100X--Individual, Society and Culture | |
| ENGL/FL F200X--World Literatures | "courses that introduce the student to the humanistic fields of language, arts, literature, history, and philosophy within the context of their traditions" |
| ART/MUS/THR F200X, HUM F201X, ANS F202X--Aesthetic Appreciation | "an introduction to the visual arts and performing arts as academic disciplines as opposed to those that emphasize acquisition of skills" |
| ETHICS (BA F323X, COMM F300X, JUST F300X, NRM F303X, PS F300X, PHIL F322X) | [UAF-specific requirement] |

Brian talked to the committee about a potential Faculty Senate motion to officially change over to the bucket lists system. There was general support for this idea. He will work on a draft motion for the next meeting on March 9.

The committee considered a question about what process might be used to approve new courses to go into the bucket lists in the future. One idea is to use a transition committee whose sole purpose is to weather the transition. Later on, then, the Core Review Committee would pick up the task of approving course additions. Broader representation on the committee was endorsed. "How it will happen" is the logical next question to be considered.

C. Statewide Gen Ed committee update – Rainer Newberry

Rainer reported the new committee has had one (audio) meeting and has been communicating electronically. The nine-member group is supportive of changing the GERS contained in the UA regulations. He reiterated their goal is to work on a plan of GERS alignment for presentation to the BOR in Fall of 2016. At their next meeting, the committee will consider the GELO-recommended changes to the GERS.

D. Probation/disqualification policy – still on hold.

E. Aerospace engineering minor update – This minor will be on the agenda for the March Senate meeting. Michael Hatfield will be in attendance and will offer a short presentation on the rationale and importance of the minor.

This proposal was approved by the Faculty Senate on 3/2/2015.

B.[A./S.] in [Program]: Upper Division Communication Implementation Plan

Each baccalaureate degree program must include, as part of its degree plan, integration of communication at the upper-division level, as evidenced by baccalaureate graduates' abilities to address the following four communications-related Learning Outcomes:

UAF undergraduates demonstrate effective communication when they are able to:

- 1. Explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication.*
- 2. Communicate to audiences in the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions.*
- 3. Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities.*
- 4. Integrate feedback from others to enhance or revise communication.*

Address the following questions:

1. What kinds of communication-related products does your department need students to be able to produce? Are there particular modes of communication graduates should be expert in? (E.g., in biology, students need to be able to produce lab reports and present work via posters and in talks; in theatre, students need to be able to write synopses of plays and characters; in environmental engineering, students need to write reports and accessibly present technical ideas.)

[type your response here]

2. How will students in your program learn to explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication? In particular:
 - a. How/where will your students develop written communication skills, specifically?
 - b. How/where will your students develop oral communication skills, specifically?
 - c. How/where will your students develop other forms of communication, specifically? (e.g. visual, non-verbal, graphical, aural)

[type your response here]

3. How will students in your program learn to communicate to people within the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions? In particular:
 - a. How/where will your students learn the disciplinary conventions related to written communication?
 - b. How/where will your students learn the disciplinary conventions related to oral communication? (e.g., is the convention to give presentations with slides? Read scholarly articles?)

[type your response here]

4. How will students in your program learn to translate disciplinary content to people outside the discipline, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities? In particular:
 - a. How/where will your students learn to communicate disciplinary ideas to non-expert audiences?
 - b. How/where will students acquire practice at communicating in the discipline, via writing or oral presentations or other modes (e.g., poster presentations), to a variety of audiences?

[type your response here]

5. How will students in your program learn to integrate feedback from others to enhance or revise communication?
 - a. How/where will your students have recurring opportunities for students to practice disciplinary communication with feedback from instructor and peers?
 - b. How/where will students learn to integrate that feedback?

[type your response here]

6. How will this plan accommodate students who declare their major late? Transfer students?

[type your response here]