

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 19, 2016

Members present: Ken Abramowicz; Ana Aguilar-Islas; Casey Byrne

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

1. Approval / Amendment of Agenda

An issue regarding Athletics students' notification to their instructors was added to Old Business. The memo used this fall incorrectly followed Tuesday 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 memorandum from Athletics this fall. Ken A. added that policy need Athletics to notify the students of their travel schedules. Suggest students be notified of their likely absences before the first day of class [by] to eliminate some of the late notifications to instructors, though it may not be enforceable. Who might be the appropriate enforcer of such a policy?

There are also

out.

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

b. Input/suggestions for upcoming meeting

Cindy H. suggested discussing the GERC course attrition (e.g., lack of diversity, Alaska/northern relevance, etc.) that have been discussed in the past.

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**