

Curricular Affairs Committee
9-7-2010 CAC meeting notes
(Still under review)

Present: Mike Earnest, Anita Hughes, Ginny Kinne, Dave Valentine, Diane McEachern (audio), Rainer Newberry, convener; Carrie Baker, Jungho Baek, Anthony Arendt (audio); Linda Hapsmith; Jayne Harvie (audio).

Rainer shared about the importance of the CAC which affects every single undergraduate student at UAF. Members' attendance is vital. They can affect policy and get it through the senate (do much harm or much good). So, it's important to be prepared and read through agendas.

Continuity of membership, esp. the leadership, is also vital. Rainer explained the tie-in with Curriculum Review Committee. Whoever takes over needs to consider a time commitment of a year and a half. With regard to Curriculum Review, CR membership can change a lot. (These issues need to be settled soon, though probably not today.)

Motion to eliminate the BS Statistics:

Rainer introduced the motion to the group. The minor program would still exist. Students can still major in Math with an emphasis in statistics. It's an option in the Math degrees.

Dave V. asked the question about whether there were any major arguments against it? Rainer noted there were no substantive objections.

Rainer would like CAC members to be able to speak in favor of the motion at a senate meeting. The question was asked if any students are enrolled in the program right now. Diane or Ginny checked and found 1 student enrolled this Fall. Students would be accepted still, under the current Catalog.

Rainer asked if there any objections to the motion. Someone asked about transfer students – they would be subject to the current catalog, so would be accepted this year.

It was agreed this motion could go forward to the Senate.

Motion re +/- grading clarification:

Rainer summarized the attached letter and draft motion.

John Fox's letter addresses the catalog and how it should be interpreted. Dave is comfortable with a C and understands that it's different than a C-. Usage of +/- is optional for faculty in their courses. Question raised about courses taught in sections – one is taught with and the other without +/- . Rainer acknowledged the continual risk of

that and other uncontrolled ambiguities – different instructors, etc. The +/- policy really addresses students who habitually keep a “life on the edge” approach to classes.

We should be very explicit, esp. in the Catalog – use numbers. Reaffirm the 2.0 requirement for good standing. One place on page 43 of the Catalog needs clarification (Faculty-initiated drop or withdrawal section).

Dave V. asked if this really needs to be a motion. Rainer pointed out this makes faculty more aware of the issues by bringing it to the Senate. Motion language: senate affirms that a C means 2.0. The motion wouldn't read each page of the Catalog – but the committee should look at that detail and review it. Ideally, the committee should be able to say they looked at every catalog entry. Be picky here and now at the committee level, and then educate the faculty through the Senate.

Question asked if standards are being raised by this. John Fox feels it's unfair to some students who now get a GPA less than 2.0. But, the majority support setting C=2.0. They are raising the standard only in the sense of raising standards for those on the edge.

All faculty know a C grade counts for a major course, and can grade accordingly.

Page 35 of Catalog – transfer students can bring in a C-, and it's counting as a C in Banner (a 2.0). Traditionally has been done this way (before Banner). Issue of practice brought into question – Mike E. said this can be addressed now in Banner and brought more in line with the widely stated policy so that two standards aren't continued any longer.

Linda H. noted the issue of a passing grade = D, but a “D” is not specified in numbers. Internal transfer issues. The table on page 47 needs to be clarified – about D being a passing grade.

Dave proposed a blanket motion to clarify policy. Keep the language simple. Have an addendum with current examples. Don't vote on each one of those. Mike E., LJ Evans, and Linda H. will look at the catalog and send out e-copies at least three days before next meeting for discussion

Future meetings:

Every other Tuesday is good and the next meeting will be Sept. 21st at 2:00 PM. All members were OK with online voting and voting early if they couldn't make a meeting.

Carrie raised the topic of the ad hoc committee for the Baccalaureate Core. Rainer will include this in the next meeting and they will definitely establish an ad hoc to discuss those issues.