

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for Monday, November 21, 2016
1-2 pm, eLearning Conference Room

Members Present: Ken Abramowicz; Ana Aguilar-Islas; Casey Byrne; Jennie Carroll; Mike Earnest; Alex Fitts; Cindy Hardy; Eileen Harney, Co-Chair; Jayne Harvie; Ginny Kinne; Rainer Newberry; Caty Oehring; Kate Quick; Holly Sherouse; Claire Gelvin-Smith.

Members Absent: Lisa Lunn; Bradley Moran; Dejan Raskovic

Guest: Colby Freel, ASUAF

A quorum was not present at the start of the meeting, but was obtained about 10-15 minutes into the meeting.

1. Approval/Amendment of Agenda

Item 2.b. (Misconduct Policy) was discussed first to accommodate guest Colby Freel.

2. Old Business

a. Program Review document

i. FAC's suggested changes (Edits by Eileen and Sine)

Eileen gave an overview of the most recent changes since her last discussion with Faculty Affairs Committee and Sine Anahita. This version includes verbiage about a Senate vote, and removes the two-tiered process. Additions were made to clarify the timing of different steps. The biggest change in this version is in section 1 regarding the faculty program review committee composition which will be reviewed by Faculty Senate. The confidentiality statement about program findings was discussed and the impracticality of keeping findings "confidential" was noted. Faculty Senate's role in program elimination was discussed, and the need for keeping shared governance in the process. Faculty Senate "vote" or "vote of approval" language and the ramifications of such wording was discussed. It was decided to send the motion to Administrative Committee with the agreed upon changes.

b. Misconduct Policy (ASUAF Rep may attend)

i. Materials from the Dean of Students

The committee picked up its discussion from where the November 14 CAC meeting left off. Eileen had made changes recommended at the Nov. 14 meeting. The only remaining question from Laura McCollough was on page 4 under the Disciplinary Sanctions heading, in the Procedures section, about documenting a disciplinary sanction. Rainer noted that Faculty Senate should review and approve the new procedures in time for them to be included in the next Catalog (at least by the March Faculty Senate meeting). He suggested putting it forward as a discussion or information item at the December meeting after some clean-up of the document. Eileen will take the document with the agreed-upon changes by CAC back to Laura.

Colby asked if a student can still bring a grade appeal forward after this type of sanction. The procedures in the Appeals Rights section do indicate the dean's decision may be appealed by the student through the grade appeal process.

Rainer noted that the grounds for a grade appeal are different than this type of action. "Arbitrary and capricious" is the basis for a grade appeal. There would be merit in removing that second paragraph under Appeals Rights altogether. Having the grade appeal process mentioned in here just adds confusion – how is giving an "F" for cheating arbitrary and capricious? Modified language was suggested to replace that paragraph ("a student may appeal a grade through the grade appeals process").

Colby noted he didn't see a reference regarding the burden of proof or standard of proof. Rainer noted the difficulty in spelling out what might constitute sufficient evidence. The student's first recourse is the dean's review. If the dean's decision is based upon the evidence presented, that provides some measure of safeguard for the student. Ken noted it behooves the faculty to be careful about coming forward without sufficient proof.

Rainer commented that the real question is how the instructor moves to the second step of imposing a sanction. The only criterion for moving forward on a formal basis appears to be that the instructor continues to believe an infraction has occurred. He suggested changing the language to be more specific, e.g., "the instructor has evidence" -- which is more substantive than a belief. Alex suggested adding language to the effect that if the informal meeting has not resolved the matter, then the next step is more formal. The heading "Formal Sanctions" was suggested at section #2 following "(1) Informal meeting."

There was discussion about whether or not an instructor has to report cheating. Alex commented that the dean of students would like for that reporting to occur in case this is happening in other classes with the same student (a chronic abuser type of situation). Jennie asked if it weren't sufficient that a department knows and keeps track of their students. Does this have to go further to the dean of students and what determines that course of action? It takes the matter beyond the involved faculty. If a record is kept with the dean of students, who else has access to it? Moving between informal and formal steps seems to be the faculty's call.

Ken suggested that before this policy is formalized, it be reviewed by general counsel. Eileen asked faculty to make comments on the google doc by noon tomorrow, and then she'll share the feedback with Laura.

3. New Business

a. New WRTG designator (Rainer and Cindy)

Cindy recapped the GER alignment meetings and the decision to create the WRTG course subject code to help align the courses at each of the campuses. Whether or not to accept the course paperwork that was submitted for WRTG F212 (a UAA course, currently) was discussed, as the English Department does not have faculty to teach it at UAF currently. Sarah Stanley will be invited to come and speak at Faculty Senate about these course changes.

The following two items could not be addressed due to time constraints.

- b. Possible modifications to undergraduate petition form (Rainer and Holly)
- c. Ad hoc committee

CAC adjourned at 2:00 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for December 12.