

## Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes for November 16, 2010

Present: Lili Anderson-Misel, Anthony Arendt, Jungho Baek, Carrie Baker, Anita Hughes, Libby Eddy, Linda Hapsmith, Jayne Harvie, Rainer Newberry (Chair), David Valentine  
Audio: Brian Himelbloom, Diane McEachern

1. November 2 meeting minutes were revised and approved. References to the “core revitalization” committee in item #2, discussion of the committee charge, were changed to General Education Revitalization Committee.

2. Old Business:

### A. Revised Motion to Publicize Grading Policy to Students

Rainer submitted a revised draft for the committee to discuss.

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that course instructors publicize to students on the first day of class UAF regulations with regards to the grades of ‘C’ and ‘C-’. These include: a minimum grade of ‘C’ = 2.0 (not C- = 1.7) is required for any course used as a prerequisite for another. A minimum grade of ‘C’ (not C-) is required for all courses in the student’s major. A grade of C- = 1.7 will potentially cause a student’s GPA to fall below 2.0. Finally: C- is the minimum grade allowed for a core course to count towards the core requirements, assuming that it’s neither a prerequisite for another class nor in the student’s major.

Effective: Fall 2011

Rationale: Specifying the consequences of grades <C will warn students (and faculty!) in advance of the minimum grade needed for the course. Students and faculty might still suffer from UAF’s C/C- policies, but at least they’ll do so KNOWING the consequences of their actions.

Dave V. suggested using “minimum passing grade” language in the motion, but this doesn’t address the situation of the minimum grade to pass and not have to repeat a course. The phrase “non-Pass/Fail instructors” was suggested, which would eliminate some of those having to respond to the request. Linda H. asked about necessary vs. sufficient grades. It was suggested a table of C and D grades be included, which specifies the ramifications of those grades. There was some discussion on wording of “distribute” vs. “publicize” the information. It was also suggested that **the Marketing and Communications faculty listserve be used to disseminate the information each semester**, along with putting it on the Syllabus Requirements checklist. Rainer will send the committee another revised version and see if it’s possible to have it finalized for the November 29 Administrative Committee meeting.

### B. General Education Revitalization Committee

Rainer has sent names or requested names (as needed) for the committee membership to all the deans. So far, only two or three responses have been received. (CNSM and SOEd have responded.)

The committee looked at a draft appointment letter to the GER Committee. It was noted in reference to paragraph three of the draft that Carrie was not on the original committee appointed by Dana Thomas. Anne Armstrong had been on that original committee. Some revision to that paragraph will be necessary.

C. Update on 'prereq's for 100-level courses designed primarily for high school students: Rainer reported that the Curriculum Review Committee discussed this and recommends that a.) junior high school standing; and, b.) cumulative GPA of 2.0, should both be required of the students allowed into the courses. These courses are delivered at the high schools, and assurance from FNSBSD has been given that prereq's will be checked for the students enrolled. The current discussion applied to a trial course for Spring 2011 at Curriculum Review, but additional biology courses will be affected for the Summer 2011 semester.

Dave V. commented: the higher the group GPA, the higher the likely level of the class. More motivated students are likely to raise the overall class participation. Lillian mentioned that high school counselors would be guiding students into the courses, which would help ensure a good GPA. Libby noted that the courses can be specially coded, making evaluation of them easier later on. Rainer noted that we should bring this to Fac Senate...but not right away.

### 3. New Business:

The new A.A.S. in Paramedicine was explained by Rainer and discussed. The program is being broken out from the Emergency Management concentrations, making it "new" though it's actually been in existence. Minor corrections to the proposal have been requested by Curriculum Review. CAC members had no objections to it as long as those corrections are made.

Linda H. asked if corresponding changes to the B.E.M. have been considered. Jayne has seen some B.E.M. paperwork which does mention that the A.A.S. would fit with the bachelor's. CAC meets again just after the Administrative Committee, so has one more opportunity to discuss the proposal.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 PM.