

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Notes - Weds Jan 26

Voting Members Present: Rainer Newberry (Chair), Anthony Arendt, Jungho Baek, Carrie Baker, Christa Bartlett, Sarah Fowell, Brian Himelbloom (phone), Falk Huettmann (phone), and Dave Valentine.

Nonvoting Members Present: Mike Earnest, Libby Eddy, Linda Hapsmith, Dana Thomas, Elizabeth Izaki, Jayne Harvie (notes).

1. GER Committee Status – Dave Valentine

Dave is gathering resources to send to the group members when the meeting invitation is sent out. Dana has provided Blackboard access to Dave so he can add the committee members to the site. The site contains materials used by the past committee which will be useful to the new committee.

2. Motion: Students transferring to UAF with an Associate in Science (AS) or Associate in Arts (AA) degree from a regionally accredited school satisfying one of the criteria below will be considered as having satisfied the **100 and 200 level** UAF Core Curriculum (General Education) requirements.

1. The AA or AS degree is from the University of Alaska

OR

2. The public Universities in the State that the community college is located also waive their core requirements in lieu of completing an AA or AS degree, that is, have an established 2+2 program.

OR

3. The community college and (or) community college district is accredited by the NW Commission on Colleges and Universities. (This is the one we are in).

OR

4. The associate program is not an AA or AS, but is approved by the public University in its state for meeting general education requirements.

OR

5. The associate program has been approved by the Core Review Committee as satisfying the 100 and 200 level General Education requirements.

HOWEVER, schools and degree programs which meet the above criteria but supply inadequately prepared students may be designated 'unacceptable' if so voted by the Core Review Committee.

****Specify in the motion's rationale that AAS degrees are not included since they do not require the Core.**

Rainer presented the motion, noting that Core Review Committee had made revisions to it earlier this week and then approved it. Committee members were asked to encourage support of the motion among other faculty senators and their constituents. Linda H. made the suggestion to specify that AAS degrees are not included in this motion. The committee unanimously passed the revised motion. Jayne will especially urge faculty senators to read this motion ahead of time via the meeting reminder email.

3. FYI—from Mike Earnest Catalog Production Schedule

Last year the Registrar's Office worked

had always been distributed in April, we determined that it could be delayed until August. Given the timeline for producing such a publication, catalog text has to be submitted in early March.

Since we hold students accountable for graduation requirements and academic policies as published in the catalog, I request that the Faculty Senate consider the catalog production schedule when making decisions during the spring semester.

Changes to existing programs and courses approved by March 1 can be effective for the upcoming fall term (e.g. March 1, 2011 for Fall 2011) and will be published in the next catalog. Changes approved after March 1 should be made effective for the *following* fall term (e.g. April 2011 for Fall 2012).

Changes that affect course descriptions (prerequisites, number of credits, applicability to Core, general education distribution, etc) cannot be accommodated after March 1. Course descriptions are pulled for the catalog in early March, and students begin registration around April 1 for the following fall term.

Changes to existing programs approved by March 1 will be published in the upcoming catalog. This would include changes to degree, major or minor requirements. Changes approved after March 1 will not be published and therefore should be made effective for the following year's catalog.

New programs approved by the Board of Regents at their February meeting will be

circumstances. To be eligible for reinstatement in an academic degree program, the student is expected to earn at least a C grade (2.0) in all courses taken as a non-degree student. To be restored to degree-seeking status, the student must apply for readmission. A student may be reinstated but may still be on probation.

PROPOSED catalog language:

Academic Disqualification

Undergraduate students – Undergraduate students on probation whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below a 2.0 for two consecutive regular (Fall/Spring or Spring/Fall) semesters will be placed on Academic Disqualification. Academically disqualified students may continue their enrollment at UAF only as non-degree students, are limited to 10 credits per semester, and are ineligible for most types of financial aid.

To be eligible for readmission to an academic degree program, the student must:

1. achieve a 2.0 cumulative grade point average by repeating courses previously failed at UAF and reapply for admission

OR *CHANGES DISCUSSED TO #2 (below in notes) – Mike Earnest will revise.

2. complete twelve (12) credits for a baccalaureate program, or six (6) credits for an associate, certificate or occupational endorsement program, with a 2.0 GPA or higher. The courses may be completed at UAF and/or another regionally-accredited institution and must be letter-graded. Grades of ‘P’ or ‘CR’ will not be considered. In considering students for readmission, deans will look for coursework taken that relates to the student’s intended program.)

Readmission to a degree program is not automatic or guaranteed. The student must reapply and the application must be approved by the dean. The student may apply to the same program from which they were disqualified, or to a different program or level (e.g. baccalaureate, associate or certificate).

Readmission may be granted with a status of “probation” or with other conditions as specified by the dean. It is vitally important for academically disqualified students to work closely with their academic advisor in developing a realistic and timely educational plan.

Fall 2011

Logistics of Stacking:

The course description and syllabus of a stacked course must clearly articulate the difference in experience, performance and evaluation of students at different levels, including graduate students vs. undergraduate students. If a graduate-level course is stacked with a 400-level course, or if undergraduate students are taking the course as part of their baccalaureate degree, the justification must clearly describe how the quality of the graduate students' experience will be maintained in a mixed-level classroom.

Whatever means, methods, and criteria are used to distinguish graduate vs. undergraduate experience and grading in the course, they must be clearly outlined in the course proposal and clearly described in the course syllabus. It is highly recommended that TWO SEPARATE SYLLABI be created for the graduate and undergraduate aspects of the course. This will prevent confusion among students, and force instructors to clearly distinguish the courses and grading schemes.

Some suggested outcomes/assessments that may be appropriate for 600-level students in a stacked course: