1-2 pm, eLearning Conference Room

Members Present: Ken Abramowicz; Ana Aguilar-Islas; Casey Byrne; Jennie Carroll, Co-Chair; Alex Fitts; Eileen Harney, Co-Chair; Cindy Hardy; Jayne Harvie; Ginny Kinne; Lisa Lunn (Zoom); Holly McDonald; Rainer Newberry; Caty Oehring; Kate Quick; Dejan Raskovic
Members Absent: Claire Gelvin-Smith; Bradley Moran

1. Approval/Amendment of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the two past November meetings were approved as submitted.

3. Old Business
    a. Update on Misconduct Policy

Eileen informed everyone there is a meeting planned with the dean of students on Friday at 2 PM. Rainer will attend unless he has a conflict.

A future CAC meeting date was discussed before the spring semester starts, in order to advance the academic misconduct policy action to the Faculty Senate. Friday, January 13 at 1:00 PM in the eLearning Conference Room was agreed upon. Faculty Affairs also wishes to have input on the policy.

4. New Business
    a. Possible modifications to undergraduate petition form (Rainer and Holly)

Holly noted the form for baccalaureate core petitions is being updated to reflect the General Education Requirements (GERs). Rainer noted that there are two undergraduate petition forms. The normal petition form is routed through the advisor and the appropriate department chair and dean, whereas the baccalaureate core (now GER) form is routed through the Core Review Committee.

More recently, petitions have been submitted to request that a particular course be counted toward the General Education requirements. The Core Committee has worked from the perspective that a core substitution of that sort is beyond their charge as it would essentially allow students to dictate what courses are counted as GERs. The question is how to communicate to students that such requests will not be considered. The observation was made that it should start with advisors, though the decision to request a petition is ultimately the prerogative of the student. Denied petitions may be appealed to the Provost who has the authority to approve them.

The petition process has worked well for "O" and "W" requirements of the baccalaureate core, especially in cases where course changes in progress haven't made it to the Catalog. Suggested language was put forth to modify the disability statement on the current form to the effect that

petitions to substitute one UAF course for an existing GER course will be automatically denied. "Automatically denied" was modified to "not petitionable." Some possible exceptions to the rule were discussed. Adding catalog years on the appropriate forms to help distinguish "baccalaureate core" matters from the "16-17 GERs" was suggested.

Getting the word out can be accomplished by means of the advising listserve, but that won't reach all advising faculty. Alex will ask the deans to help get the word out. She will also talk to the Provost about the proposed language to indicate GER course substitutions are not petitionable. Adding this language to the Catalog was also mentioned. Rainer has already spoken with the Core Review Committee Chair; and, Holly will share proposed language changes with both committees once they've heard back from the Provost on the suggested language.

b. ANS GER requirement

Jennie described how the idea for an ANS GER requirement had been brought before the Board of Regents by the Alaska Native Studies Council last year. The BOR punted it to Faculty Alliance. Jennie discussed it with CAC last spring and shared some feedback with the Council. Unfortunately, the matter has seemed to partially become a UAA vs. UAF matter.

Currently, the Council continues to work on the idea with Faculty Alliance and the statewide GER committee. Rainer and Cindy, who are both on the SW GER committee, noted that they had received an email a couple of weeks ago from the statewide committee chair (who is from UAA). The email stated, rather out of the blue, that everyone unanimously supports the idea of the new ANS GER. Should UAF be proactive about this and look into whether or not we can do this? Is it feasible given the current faculty resources, and, if not, how much should be allocated to it? It was acknowledged that anything that can be done to head off the BOR mandating something is worth the effort to look into it. The UAF GERC efforts had already identified courses with an Alaskan emphasis. Such a requirement will need to accommodate hundreds of potential new students, and it would be better to utilize a variety of courses that are already in place than to restrict it to one required new course.

Possible aspects of what might comprise a broad standard for such a course requirement were discussed. Jennie agreed to chair a subcommittee to examine the issues. She'll ask Jessica Black and Sean Topkok to be involved. Rainer suggested informing the Provost and the CLA dean of what they find, particularly from the aspect of what resources might be needed. Ken voiced his concern about siphoning enrollments from other courses to courses that meet a new requirement. Jennie said they will examine this aspect, as well. A tentative timeline to have a report by spring break was mentioned.

c. Student Learning Outcomes
    i. Conversation with GAAC (Jennie and Eileen
    ii. Rainer's Document "Course Goals vs. SLOs"

Jennie and Eileen reported on a meeting they had recently with GAAC members (Donie Bret-Harte, Mike Daku, Sean McGee). Jennie had noted the inconsistencies at the various levels of course review, from within CRCD to the various faculty senate review levels concerning student learning outcomes. They

talked about course goals and objectives, as well as grading modes and stacked courses at this meeting. CAC talked about guides and examples that could be used at the various review levels, including college / school curriculum councils, and whether or not new policy was needed to back it up.

The remaining items below were not discussed due to time constraints.

d. Change in