

Minutes for CAC Meeting on November 20

In attendance: Kate Quick, Deanna Waters, Eileen Harney, Holly McDonald, Amy Bristor, Mike Earnest, Ken Abramowicz, Carol Gering, Alex Fitts, Nicole Cundiff, Ginny Kinne, Rainer Newberry, Karen Taylor, Ana Aguilar-Islas

Eileen asks about agenda, Karen moves to approve agenda and minutes, Ana seconds.

Eileen updates that quorum is not present and we need to wait on a report from Jessica which will be post-holiday (Thanksgiving), for any further consideration of the AKNS GER changes.

Eileen highlights FYE and other materials in shared agenda folder which will be forwarded among all of Faculty Senate.

Mike is next on agenda regarding incompletes.

Rainer back to FYE's asks about strategy. Given that realistically most will not read, do we need a bullet point summary in addition to the large collection of documents in the folder?

Eileen says the email Chris sends around will have that summary (which will be largely drafted by Alex)

Rainer says that reassurance re: merit is what seems needed, show relevance in the email.

Eileen offers to share draft of email, Rainer asks Alex to summarize issues, Alex assents.

Eileen offers to forward the questions to AdCom that had been asked, which is also accepted. General grumbling about the senate agenda having too many issues and too little time, mostly sotto voce.

Mike shares new draft of incompletes policy, highlighting the change to language re student requesting, and shares that dean's council feedback had been positive. Karen moves to approve, Ken and Anna second.

Eileen raises request for communication plan workshop that was promised, Kate is voluntold if somebody from English (Sarah?) is not interested. Alex Kate and Karen will determine dates. Eileen questions timing in relation to deadlines, Alex recommends January, when we have some specifics to work on.

Eileen updates re GERC mtg held last Friday, asks those who participated to report. It goes forward to Faculty Senate next. Ginny reports that still discussing double counting but other changes going forward. Ginny says hour discussion had grown heated, many scenarios considered, Alex agrees that the split is fairly wide. Those in favor see NO issues, those against it can't articulate why it seems (to them) obviously problematic.

Holly had worked up some examples of current worst case scenarios. Interdisciplinary becomes particularly messy, and next worst case is Journalism major with history minor, which drops it from required 120 credit hours for the degree to require only 96 credit hours with the remainder just empty credit hours. Is it problematic to have all those credit hours unfilled? That isn't clear--would there be anger on the students' part? Would they make good use of it? Do we care what they do with it? Most students are not on track so it will never be an issue, but should we gamble on that?

Ken points to the finances--finish in four is facilitated if at least viable to have such options.

Rainer agrees it is rare enough we don't care. Karen says it isn't about the rare students, it's the departmental politics. Ginny argues that it's about the philosophy or purpose of GER's. Rainer says that it happens, Ken points to competition with UAA more than internal.

Anna argues that all of it counts as valuable experience. Ken says this is highlighting need for good advising, and that students need to be smart about preparing for jobhunting.

re: online students in current jobs, advantage to them of double-counting for electives, with worst case being a sudden spike in Latin enrollment (general laughter). (and defense of Latin!)

Rainer says concerns arise only because of ambiguous wording--interpreted one way minors double count, or not? Probably UAA ignores the rule because it is vague, not because of philosophy. If we can, should wording clarified and approved by all Senates.

"can't count toward degree requirements exclusive of specific major and minor requirements" as suggested wording. This wording would then have CLA have a policy of majors not double-counting, and would allow UAF to maintain current rules while other colleges can negotiate.

Eileen points out actually President has sole decision, since this is a regulation not a policy. But President usually will abide if chancellors all agree, which usually means going through senates? Discussion briefly of Paul Layer's interim appointment, Alex informally thinks he is ok with it.

Holly says do we need to change language? Can't have computers do one thing for one unit and handle another differently, separate programming. Eileen suggests that degree program change procedure has some checks/restrictions already in place, it would at least have to get defended before any abuses could even possibly happen. Mike mentions one might expect similarly checks/restrictions for programs require 42 instead of 30. Ken says we need to let programs have latitude and show some professional judgement, there's too much cost to micromanaging.

Holly points out that any decision made needs to be clear for people doing the advising. It has to be understood by all, including those not trained or updated specifically. However, for now that can be handled as separate steps. Eileen and Ken agree, noting that there could be multiple ways forward procedurally.

Rainer points out that even worst cases not huge, Karen says it looks like we approve, Eileen notes we actually don't have to approve since it is a regulation not a policy. The goal had been primarily to have the discussion and raise any concerns, agrees that if we're happy then moving on to new business.

Holly asks to remove OEC language, Mike points out that the OEC memo is now antiquated because it is all automated.

Mike suggests we consider limiting max enrollments for overload calculations. Alex gives example of abuse in form of enrolling for twice as many classes and then just planning to drop. Mike offers to draft up a recommendation for the December meeting. There are multiple sidebars now, as some are still discussing the OEC (including uncertainty about definition) and some are now discussing (with laughter) maximum enrollment abuses.

Ginny asks for brainstorming about BA options for math given lack of online options, points at that we currently direct students to UAS. Rainer says math department has options coming soon. Question is asked as to whether the options will still require placement testing? Questions also raised about how UAA handles DEV105.

At this point continuation (informal) of brainstorming, with sidebar conversations, but your note-taker left so we adjourned the official part of the meeting.