To: Gavin Keulks, Faculty Senate President

From: Janeanne Rockwell-Kincanon, Committee on Committees chair

Date: May 2, 2011

Re: Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) Structure and Charge Proposal

This memo presents a proposed revision of the charge and structure for Academic Requirements Committee, as directed by the Senate Executive Committee on March 3, 2011.

Current Charge:

The Academic Requirement Committee shall (1) assist the Registrar with the review of petitions regarding academic requirements; (2) consider various policies concerning academic requirements for admission, continuance in college and graduation; and (3) alert the Faculty Senate of issues concerning students and academic standards which the committee believes are of significance to faculty.

Proposed Charge:

The Academic Requirements Committee shall:

1. assist the Registrar with the review of petitions regarding academic requirements;
2. consider various policies concerning academic requirements for admission, continuance in college and graduation;
3. maintain requirements for LACC, Q, and D course designations, and review and revise one set of designation requirements per year;
4. manage information and processes for proposing courses for LACC, Q, and D designations, and review proposals according to the appropriate established criteria.
5. alert the Faculty Senate of issues concerning students and academic standards which the committee believes are of significance to faculty.

Proposed Structure:

COE (Special Educ)
COE (HPE)
COE (DTE)
LAS (Business)
LAS (Creative Arts)
LAS (Computer Science)
LAS (Humanities)
LAS (Math)
LAS (Psychology)
LAS (Social Science)
Library
Academic Advising (NV Ex-O)
Registrar’s Office (NV Ex-O)
Students (2)

Rationale and Discussion:

1. New charge has ARC being the “gatekeeper” for most course designations and maintaining and revising admission criteria for the designations. This specific task relates to ARC’s general objective to consider academic standards and graduation requirements. The Writing Intensive Committee (WIC) retains responsibility for W designation criteria and for W proposal review.[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Designation | Current Review Committee  | Proposed Review Committee |
| D | Curriculum | ARC |
| W | WIC | WIC |
| C (D+W) | Curriculum, WIC | ARC, WIC |
| Q | ARC | ARC |
| LACC | ARC (a recent addition to their charge) | ARC |

1. The Committee on Committees asserts that having a single committee oversee these designations provides consistency in terms of both process and rigor.
2. ARC is *not* charged with evaluating or assessing the existing courses against the designation criteria, nor is it charged with *general* oversight and assessment of any of these programs, including of LACC/Gen Ed.  Such programmatic assessment requires administrative backing and resources, as well as applicable subject expertise and theoretical understanding, and the Committee on Committees maintains that no Senate committee as we currently structure them has those assets.
3. The activity level of proposals for course designations is low. ARC will be able to accommodate the additional charge without additional committee meetings.
4. Full divisional representation provides for articulation of academic requirements with the whole of the undergraduate faculty. Currently five divisions are represented with an additional faculty slot vacant.
5. In light of the larger ARC, the Committee on Committees recommends that it follow the practice of the Graduate Committee in its review of student petitions: a subgroup (3 members of the Graduate Committee) meets periodically with the Registrar to review and decide upon them.

1. Committee on Committees also advocated moving W designation from WIC to ARC. Neither WIC nor ARC supported this idea, so we dropped it from the current proposal. However, Committee on Committees believes that doing so in the future would have two main benefits: a) all course designations would be applied according to the same standard of rigor; and b) the Writing Intensive Committee could focus attention on faculty development opportunities for writing-intensive and writing-across-the-curriculum methods. This was an original charge of WIC that it has not fulfilled, and it was dropped in the recent charge revision process.
 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)