

**Minutes: Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting
9/28/2011, 3:30-4:30 pm Kayak Room**

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry, Anthony Arendt, Carrie Baker, Jungho Baek, Dave Valentine, Debra Moses, Retchenda George-Bettisworth, Brian Himelbloom (audio), Todd Radenbaugh (audio).

Voting members absent: Diane McEachern

Non-voting members present: Doug Goering (audio), Dana Thomas, Lillian Anderson-Misel

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

A. OLD Business

1. Approval of 14 Sept Minutes

Minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Chairperson and minutes taker elections (or whatever) for the year

Rainer formally accepted chairship of the committee.

Jayne agreed to take meeting notes to serve as minutes of the meetings and to help her stay tuned to the committee's ongoing business.

3. Request to approve R Newberry as chair of Curriculum Review Committee 2011-2012

Rainer was approved to continue chairing the Curriculum Review Committee.

4. Recent GERC issues (chairperson, etc) —comments by Dave/Carrie

David recapped the GERC meeting that took place on Sept. 26. The group discussed characteristics they would like a committee chair to have. Carrie Baker was asked if she would consider co-chairing this fall semester with David; however, the issue of needing a chair beyond this fall remains an important consideration. Neither David nor Carrie can continue the chairship through spring.

Rainer liked the idea of considering emeriti for the position, but this idea met with tepid response at the GERC meeting. The group would prefer a faculty. However, the time commitment is significant, and so is the accompanying responsibility for what is to be accomplished. Ultimately, Curricular Affairs Committee must take responsibility for getting the work of GERC underway soon. Several emeriti faculty were mentioned (Paul Reichardt, Phyllis Morrow, Rudy Krejci, and Barbara Lando) as individuals to consider.

5. 'Stacked' courses -- comments by Tony or Rainer

Tony (Anthony A.) is on the subcommittee that was formed between CAC and GAAC members to address issues about stacked courses. Both undergraduate and graduate surveys have been formulated and Tony gave some examples of questions from each. A list of faculty teaching stacked courses is needed, and approaching the Registrar for this was suggested. Dana Thomas mentioned that full-fledged access to SurveyMonkey is available from the Provost's Office for CAC to use on this project.

Pros and cons of course stacking were discussed. Dana mentioned he would for any NWCCU accreditation rules that may apply. Doug G. mentioned that the issue has not come up with ABET accreditation of CEM because only the undergraduate programs are accredited.

6. NON-UAF courses taught AT high schools FOR high school students with UAF 100-level designators—Rainer Suggestion: students *taking such must have passed the SOA HS Exit Exams*

Discussion on this topic was postponed for the next meeting.

B. NEW Business

1. Proposed motion #1

...UAF Faculty Senate re-affirms its policy of I F after a year and requests Faculty Senate president to pursue making this OK with the BOR.

The consensus reached after much discussion online is to have existing policy reaffirmed by the senate. Brian H. will follow up on some of the specific problems that have been raised.

Additional data has been shared from the Registrar, and this will be included in the Faculty Senate agenda for Monday, October 3.

2. Proposed motion #2:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered wholly or in part by distance delivery, and all existing courses adapted or converted to distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the Faculty Senate. Furthermore, if the mode of distance delivery changes, then the course must be re-reviewed by the appropriate committee.

Modes of distance delivery are those defined by the UA Office of Academic Affairs & Research: Independent Learning/Correspondence; Audio Conferencing; Video Conferencing; Web Meeting; Live Television/UATV; and Online/Web Delivered.

Effective: Spring 2012

Rationale: The Faculty Senate has primary authority to initiate, develop, review and approve academic criteria, regulation and policy (Faculty Senate Constitution, Article 1, Section 1). This includes curriculum review.

Distance delivery methods are fundamentally different methods of communication than face-to-face instruction. Effective instruction by distance delivery requires adapting or designing content for new formats and modes of communication. It cannot be assumed that a course approved for face-to-face delivery automatically passes review for a different mode of delivery. The structure and content of courses intended wholly or in part for distance delivery must be separately reviewed.

This motion applies to all distance delivery courses within UAF, whether listed by an academic department, a rural campus, or the Center for Distance Education (CDE).

The committee discussed concerns about the lack of review of courses being converted for distance delivery. Doug G. noted concerns relating to faculty workloads, and the fact that the deans are not necessarily aware of what courses are also being offered by distance delivery.

Dana noted that conversion of entire programs for distance delivery is under discussion. The senate needs to take note of this while considering courses. He noted the issue of academic drift where over time courses offered by distance lose their focus and faculty become out of touch with the courses and their students. There are also issues to be addressed with delivery of core courses by distance.

Carrie suggested inviting the CDE director to talk with the committee and provide input on their procedures and approach to converting courses for distance delivery. It was also noted that distance courses are being offered by the colleges or schools themselves, outside of CDE offerings.

Debra mentioned that because of student failure rates, they pulled their developmental courses out of distance delivery. Doug and Dana both mentioned the fact that deans and department chairs may be totally unaware that courses in their units are being offered by distance, and the

fact is that faculty can make extra money doing it. They can also earn extra money grading coursework for CDE.

Debra asked if these issues are brought up under the Program Review process, and Dana responded that they're not, but should be. Pass/fail rates need to be discussed.

Dana reiterated that consideration of converting programs to distance delivery needs to be included in the proposed motion. Doug noted that the motion is broad and there's the issue to consider of who is administering distance courses and programs – the schools and colleges or CDE. Faculty workload is another significant issue that needs to be looked at.

David noted this motion addresses only new offerings, not existing ones. There was general agreement that synchronous course offerings (e.g., video conference courses) were more positive overall than asynchronous offerings. There are also hybrid issues such as eLive to be considered. It was also generally agreed that departments need to be aware of what courses are being distance delivered. Ongoing communication with every department chair is needed on a regular basis and student outcomes and completion rates need to be examined because of how they're being affected by distance delivery. Dana encouraged the group to ask Alex Hwu to visit from CDE.