

Curricular Affairs Committee  
Draft Minutes for 1 October 2014 3-4 pm Reich 300

Present: Ken Abramowicz, Casey Byrne, Brian Cook, Rob Duke, , Alex Fitts, Doug Goering, Catherine Hanks, Linda Hapsmith, Cindy Hardy, , Joan Hornig, Rainer Newberry - Chair, Todd Radenbaugh (audio); Caty Oering (audio), Holly Sherouse (audio); Jayne Harvie

**I. Approved revised minutes of Sept 17 meeting**

**II. Old business: what to do about C/O/W??**

**A. Progress Report from O/W/C subcommittee**

*Problems with current O/W: no consistent outcomes assessments*

*W regulations are relatively complicated and subject to interpretation; O regulations are more flexible but very complicated (2+ pages to cover a variety of possibilities)*

*Proposed C: only writing is assessed*

*Proposed C regulations are both complex and vague*

**The committee agreed to send GERC Chair Leah Berman a letter asking the committee to again take up the question of what to do with oral- and written-intensive requirements in light of the proposed 'C' for communication. Feedback and questions from Curricular Affairs Committee will be included.**

From October 1 Agenda:

We met with several GERC members and discussed the O/W/C issues.

In both meetings, we all agreed that students need work on writing consistently throughout their degree programs. It's less clear that students need oral communication instruction beyond the 131/141 class, however. Our experience is that students in O classes do receive adequate training in oral communication, and indeed, the 'C' –as currently proposed--is essentially a glorified 'W' but with vague guidelines.

**Courtesy would suggest that we ask GERC to take another look at the proposed C and to provide a clearer set of proposed regulations to replace the existing O and W OR to think about modifications in the existing O and W. Many of us on the COW subcommittee think that fixing the model that we're already using--recycling, as it were--is a more productive way to go than trying to reinvent upper division writing across the curriculum from scratch. If we go this route, we need to come up with some language as the request to GERC their further consideration of the O/W/C requirement.**

- A. General guidelines for credit course with "W" designator
  1. The lower division writing sequence will be prerequisite for all "W" designated courses.
  2. Instructors are encouraged to have students write an ungraded diagnostic composition on or near the first day of class to help assess writing ability and general competence in the discipline. [If diagnostic tests indicate that remedial work may be needed, teachers can set up specialized tutoring for their students with UAF Writing Center tutors.]
  3. Teachers regularly evaluate students' writing and inform students of their progress. If a major written project (research project) is part of the course, the project should be ~~designed~~ <sup>designed</sup> in stages. If possible, a writing activity should comprise a major portion of the final examination.
  4. At least one personal conference should be devoted to the student's writing per term and drafts of papers should receive evaluation from the teacher and ~~others~~ <sup>others</sup>.
  5. Written material should comprise a majority of the graded work in the course for it to be designated "intensive." "Written material" can consist of quizzes and exams with short answers or essay sections, journals, field notes, informal responses ~~adding~~ <sup>adding</sup> or class lectures, structured essays, research projects, performance reviews, lab reports, or any forms suitable to the discipline being taught.
- B. Guidelines for the "W" designator in Technical courses
  6. In order to ensure that technical disciplines ~~meet~~ <sup>meet</sup> the goals of the writing intensive requirements without compromising the technical quality of their courses, such disciplines may substitute longer courses or a series of courses (typically credit labs) for each of the two necessary credit writing intensive or "W"-designated courses. Courses meeting all the general guidelines will, of course, also be acceptable.
  7. The longer course option allows the "W" designator for a 4-credit course in which written material comprises a portion of the grade equivalent to "a majority" of a 3-credit course. The course must also meet the other general guidelines.
  8. The series option allows a student to replace one or ~~more~~ <sup>more</sup> credit "W" courses with a series of courses, each of which may be less than three credits, a series of 1-credit or 1-credit equivalent laboratories. Each series, however, must sum to the equivalent of at least ~~one~~ <sup>one</sup> credit "W"-designated course. The initial course in the series will be designated "W1" and, while less than three credits, will fulfill all the other general requirements for a "W." The subsequent courses will base a majority of the grade on written material. Students must take the "W1" course before taking the other courses in the series.

Requirements for O and O/2 courses are two pages long. They include variations on public speaking vs. discussions and large class vs. small class

Syllabus Statement Regarding the Oral Intensive (O) Requirement:

This statement, or a statement similar to it, MUST appear in the syllabus of each "O" or "O/2" course. Courses failing to provide this information jeopardize their continuing status as "O" or "O/2" courses.

This course is designated as ~~Comprehensive~~ (O). This designation means that the "O" or "O/2" is evident in the course number on the syllabus (e.g., Education F4526). This designation applies to upper

- Provide guided and prompt feedback and opportunities for student revision on student projects, presentations and papers.
- In addition to written and spoken communication, address other forms of communication in the course discipline, such as reading and listening and multimodal, digital, or visual communication. [WHAT EXACTLY DOES THIS REQUIRE??]
- Address and practice accurate and ethical referencing/citation practices of source material as it pertains to source authority, academic honesty, and personal credibility.
- Faculty must have attended a training workshop, to be offered every semester. [How is this a criteria for Course APPROVAL?]