

**Curricular Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes for September 19, 2016**

Members present: Ken Abramowicz; Ana Aguilar-Islas; Casey Byrne; Jennie Carroll, Chair; Mike Earnest; Alex Fitts; Cindy Hardy; Eileen Harney; Jayne Harvie; Ginny Kinne; Lisa Lunn; Rainer Newberry; Kathleen Quick; Dejan Raskovic.

Members absent: Clair Gelvin-Smith; Caty Oehring; Holly Sherouse

1. Approval / Amendment of Agenda

An issue regarding Athletics students' notification to their instructors of their travel schedules was added to Old Business. The memo used this fall incorrectly followed the old class start day of Thursday rather than Monday.

2. Approval of Minutes

- a. 08/24/2016 Minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Old Business

- a. Athletics Issue

A motion will be developed to fix the language issue concerning a class start date discrepancy in the memorandum from Athletics this fall. Ken A. added that policy needs to also address a timeframe for Athletics to notify the students of their travel schedules. Suggested: "It is expected that students will be notified of their likely absences before the first day of class [by coaches]." This should help eliminate some of the late notifications to instructors, though it may not necessarily be all that enforceable. Who might be the appropriate enforcer of such a policy was discussed.

There are also other types of situations where students won't know about potential travel until mid-semester (e.g., steel bridge competition; athletic play-offs, music, theatre). Any policy is for the university, though it might apply mainly to Athletics which typically causes more absences. Just like early warning program emails go to all faculty, perhaps something applicable could be similarly sent out.

Jennie will write up a motion addressing the five-day notification issue discussed earlier, for the next meeting. Dani S. will be invited to discuss this with the committee.

- b. Input/suggestions for upcoming meetings?

Cindy H. suggested discussing the GERC course attributes (or elements) such as civic engagement, diversity, Alaska/northern relevance, etc.) that have not been addressed yet.

Rainer suggested an information packet be included for those new to the committee.

Alex mentioned an alignment issue that has been pointed out by UAA that UAF has ethics and library skills course requirements. Re-labeling these as degree requirements rather than GERs could help eliminate UAA's complaint. The committee agreed to discuss in the future.

#### 4. New Business

##### a. Good Standing Policy

- i. Related email from Provost regarding a gap in the policy
- ii. Draft Motion

Mike E. spoke about the email that had been received from the Provost's office. He explained how the Academic Warning category fills the gap between Good Standing and Academic Probation. The draft motion was not necessary.

##### b. Program deletion and suspension policy

- i. Draft revised policy
- ii. Revised format 4 department initiated
- iii. Revised format 4 administration initiated

A small group had met to discuss the processes for non-voluntary (administration-initiated) program deletions and suspensions. The group included Jennie Carroll; Rainer Newberry; Donie Bret-Harte; Alex Fitts; Susan Henrichs; Holly Sherouse and Jayne Harvie. With program deletions and suspensions resulting from Academic Program Review (i.e., administration-initiated deletions) likely to be on the rise, further discussion about what role or ability the faculty have in the process of deletions (or to say no to them) needs further discussion.

Officially, there has to be paperwork which ends up at the Board of Regents and the NWCCU. Faculty Senate passes a motion to agree to or disagree to a program deletion after the Academic Program Review process. The Chancellor has the ultimate authority, however, on whether or not to delete a program, and can also suspend enrollments to programs.

The format 4 paperwork has now been differentiated between program-initiated-, and administration-initiated deletions.

A revised draft document (copy attached) about the review process was discussed, particularly with regard to where and how in the process the Faculty Senate deals with a recommended program deletion. The revised language of the process states more clearly that the Senate's role is not the final decision about a deletion. (That authority resides with the Chancellor.) The older, vaguer statement of "program deletion will require Faculty Senate action" has been changed to "Faculty Senate reviews the

recommendations and states their collective agreement or disagreement with the Provost's recommendation" (less vague, but still factual). Is making it clear better than keeping it intentionally vague?

The change in number of CRCD representatives from five to two at Step 1 was a concern. Historically, though, it has been difficult to actually get five individuals to actually participate. Also in Step 1, whether or not faculty on the Faculty Program Review Committee must be tenured was discussed. Replacing the word "tenured" with "tenure track" was suggested, but not adopted as an edit.

Some edits were discussed and made to the document (change 3.d. and e. to numbered items 4 and 5 instead). It was agreed to bring it to the Administrative Committee with the recommendation that it be discussed at the full Faculty Senate in October for the purpose of returning feedback to the CAC. A formal motion could be voted upon at the November Faculty Senate.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 2:00 PM.

The ~~new~~ program review process will be completed as follows:

1. An initial ~~brief~~ review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit provided ~~two-page brief~~ narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere at UA, and any special circumstances that explain features of the centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary (see attached program review template for more details). The information reviewed meets the Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; attached). A single Faculty Program Review Committee comprised of one ~~tenured~~ faculty representative from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus ~~five CRCD representatives~~ **one representative from CRCD and one representative from CTC** will review the materials and make the following recommendations:
  - Continue program
  - Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
  - Continue program but improve other specific areas ~~or~~
  - **Suspend admissions to program or**
  - Discontinue program

The committee will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review.

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and 4 administrative representatives from CRCD will review the recommendations of the Program Review Committee, may request additional information from ~~about~~ the program, and will state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.
3. The Provost in consultation with the Chancellor's Cabinet will review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:
  - a) Program continuation is confirmed ~~until the next review cycle.~~
  - b) Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by the next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.
  - c) Recommend to discontinue program. ~~Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, w~~ When appropriate admissions may be suspended pending action.
  - d) **Faculty Senate reviews the recommendations and states their collective agreement or disagreement with the Provost's recommendation.**
  - e) **The Chancellor reviews all levels of recommendations and decides whether to recommend program discontinuation to the Board of Regents.**

Other attachments referred to in the agenda are posted online at:  
[http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/16-17\\_cac/](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/16-17_cac/)