

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #188
Monday, February 4, 2013
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds

A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (13)	VALENTINE, Dave
ALBERTSON, Leif (14) – Julie Cascio	WEBER, Jane (14)
ALEXEEV, Vladimir (13)	WEBLEY, Peter (14)
BANDOPADHYAY, Sukumar (13)	WINFREE, Cathy (13)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (13)	WINSOR, Peter (14)
CEE, Vincent (14)	YARIE, John (14)
CHAMBERS, Izetta (14)	
COOK, Christine (14)	Members Absent:
DAVIS, Mike (14)	BROWN, Stephen (13)
FALLEN, Chris (13) – Georgina Gibson	CHEN, Cheng-fu (14) - Excused
FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)	HARDY, Sarah (13) - Excused
GEORGE-BETTISWORTH, Retchenda (13)	HEALY, Joanne (13) - Excused
GUSTAFSON, Karen (13)	ZHANG, Xiong (14)
HARDY, Cindy (13)	
HEATON, John (14) – Rob Duke	Others Present:
HENRY, David (13)	Chancellor Brian Rogers
JENSEN, Karen (14) – Kathy Arndt	Provost Susan Henrichs
JOHNSTON, DUFF (13)	Paul Layer, Dean, CNSM
JOLY, Julie (13)	Dani Sheppard
LARDON, Cecile (13)	Debu Misra
LAWLOR, Orion (13)	Eric Madsen
MARR, Wayne (14)	Libby Eddy
MCEACHERN, Diane (13)	Jon Dehn, Past President
MEYER, Franz (13)	Derek Miller
NADIN, Elisabeth (13)	Julie Larweth
NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)	Mike Castellini
NG, Chung-Sang (13)	Joy Morrison
RADENBAUGH, Todd (13)	Caty Oehring
REYNOLDS, Jennifer	Martha Mason
SHORT, Margaret (13)	Colleen Angaiak

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #187

The minutes for the December meeting were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as revised on February 1, 2013.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to approve the Unit Criteria for Cooperative Extension Service
2. Motion to amend the student attendance policy
3. Motion to approve a new minor in Interdisciplinary Studies
4. Motion to approve a new minor in Emergency Management
5. Motion to amend transfer credit policy

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Comments – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer provided an update on the eLabs taskforce report, reminding everyone that this was an effort started by the Faculty Alliance last year. UAF sent three representatives to a statewide committee which drew up recommendations for science labs in general education science courses. The report was then discussed and proposed changes were written by this body last spring. The UAF version was sent to UAA and UAS; and, UAS adopted it with one change to a deadline. UAA has just approved it with two small changes. At this point Faculty Alliance will edit the document, and then return it to the three Faculty Senates for formal adoption later this spring.

The survey link regarding an online repository for posting syllabi or expanded course descriptions has been sent out to all faculty. The aim of the survey is to get wide input and identify concerns and see if there is any consensus about this issue. The survey is short, with six main questions and five demographic questions.

Faculty Senate elections were announced. Communication has gone out to deans and directors who are charged with administering the elections, and an announcement has been emailed to all faculty. March 20 is the completion date.

Nominations will be opened at the March 4 Faculty Senate meeting for president-elect, and the outstanding senator of the year. Jennifer shared information about the process for Outstanding Senator of the Year Award (OSYA) selection, noting guidelines are available from the Faculty Senate Office. The OSYA selection results will be announced at the April Faculty Senate meeting, which is also when the election will occur for next year's president-elect. She encouraged members to consider nominations for president-elect. Self-nomination is fine. She noted that if one nominates someone else, to please check with that individual first.

Mike Davis will host an event after the meeting today involving the Legislative Information Office. Senators were encouraged to stay and hear from Mike about his recent visit to Juneau, and hear from the local LIO staff.

B. President-Elect's Comments – David Valentine

David announced that volunteers from Senate were being sought for the OSYA selection committee.

He announced that Libby Eddy has been named as permanent registrar and extended congratulations to her. Faculty senators responded with a round of applause.

David reported about a workshop sponsored by the UA statewide system which was attended by 10 representatives from each MAU in January. They discussed issues concerning general education requirements and their revitalization. A motion under today's new business is directly related to this workshop.

Members of the ad hoc faculty committee on interdisciplinary issues were named: Ginny Eckert, Gary Kofinas, Josh Greenberg, Chanda Meek, Craig Gerlach, Larry Duffy, Ray Barnhardt, Ron Barry, Gary Jacobsen, and Silke Schiewer. They have been tasked to identify institutional barriers and hurdles to interdisciplinary research and instruction. Please contact any of these members if you have input about items they should look into and include in their report.

David shared that he is unable to continue as the Faculty Senate liaison with the General Education Revitalization Committee (GERC). Cindy Hardy has agreed to be the Faculty Senate representative on the committee for the remainder of this semester.

The Learning Management Systems (LMS) pilot tests have started. Tests will include Moodle, Desire2Learn, and Canvas, as alternative systems to Blackboard. Carol Gering, director of eLearning has several of her faculty offering courses in two of these systems. In the near future, they'll identify a focus group of faculty to do some tasks on these different systems. If anyone is interested in participating, please let David know.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers just returned from the Kuskokwim Campus at Bethel. Vice Chancellor Bernice Joseph also made the trip. They met with the faculty, staff and the advisory committee about the future leadership of CRCED since Vice Chancellor Joseph plans to retire in May or June. They are planning to visit each of the rural campuses this spring to hold similar discussions.

The Board of Regents recently held their annual retreat. During the portion of the retreat in which the chancellors participate, they discussed program review. BOR policy concerning program review actually includes the areas of academic research, extension, and other types of programs which are not presently reviewed. Chancellor Rogers noted it's a topic that calls upon UAF to take a leadership role, particularly with regard to research. Next academic year the research and extension programs will be reviewed, so he has been talking with the Research Advisory Committee about how this will be accomplished. He noted that Faculty Senate participation is invited and important to the process. Student Services and administrative programs will be looked at as well. He is open to what the process and review product will be, and wants UAF to take the lead with it so that a process does not become dictated to us.

The Chancellor announced the decision that Commencement will be held on Sunday this year and in the future years of 2015 and 2016.

The Alaska legislature has started on the UA budget review. It's slated for work at the House Finance Subcommittee on February 19. The FY14 Governor's request is pretty slim, with funds to cover only half of the pay raises and to open buildings. The university also faces whatever happens at the Federal level with sequestration or alternative sequestration. There is also only a very small tuition increase. It's the same situation on the capitol budget side, with the Governor only looking at deferred maintenance

funding. There is, however, key legislative interest in the funding of the new unfinished engineering buildings at UAA and UAF. He'll report in further detail in March on the budget.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs announced that the template for filing FY15 budget requests was emailed out to deans, directors and vice chancellors today. She noted that the university may be limited to three million dollars in new operating requests by the Board of Regents and President, which has also been the case for the past couple of years. At the end of the budget request documentation is a special sheet that may be used by deans, directors or vice chancellors to bring forward their biggest budget problem or challenge. This will aid in tracking such problems with the goal of finding ways to address them. The Provost also mentioned there will be a one-year hiatus for internal reallocation requests, as all the internal reallocations are committed to existing requests. Budget requests are due back to her on March 1.

V Discussion Items

A. Comments from Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

Franz Meyer, Chair of the FDAI Committee, informed the group about the student course evaluations project to identify and evaluate electronic evaluation programs. FDAI has been collaborating with Eric Madsen and the Provost's Office on this project. Twelve vendors have been identified that meet UAF objectives. The next step is to hold demos by the vendors for the committee and any interested faculty. Past concern has been the return rate of student evaluations which is historically low. Each of the vendors will comment on this concern.

Email distributed on January 18 by Eric Madsen contains the demo schedule. Most of the demos will occur at Rasmuson 503 on Fridays, 9-10 am. Franz encouraged faculty attendance at these demos, suggesting that the unit deans help identify at least one faculty to attend and be involved in selecting finalists from the twelve vendors. He also encouraged those who do e-Learning or other special types of teaching to get involved. The goal is to narrow down the selection to three or four final vendors. The next step will be trial periods with the software.

Rainer N. asked Franz if there were really more than cosmetic differences among the twelve. Franz responded that the demos will help them determine the answer to that question. They are looking at vendor experience and their ability to provide support to the end-user, along with the ability to mix paper and various types of e-reviews from smart devices, as well.

Cecile L. commented that the current system was designed to give feedback to the faculty. Student evaluations are now also used for performance evaluation. Faculty need to pay attention to how these systems will be used and what exactly will be measured. Franz noted people have varying opinions about these concerns, and the more faculty they can get involved the better. He again invited and encouraged participation.

B. Grade of C- to become acceptable for courses in one's major and for prerequisites

Rainer Newberry described the C- grade issues, acknowledging that this is a lengthy item for actual discussion. He noted the Curricular Affairs Committee faculty present today, encouraging senators to talk with them about this issue: Retchenda George-Bettisworth, Todd Radenbaugh, Diane McEachern, Cindy Hardy, Sarah Hardy, Karen Gustafson, David Henry and Ken Abramowicz.

Before plus/minus grades were in use, the grade of C was the minimum acceptable grade for courses in one's major and/or minor and for prerequisites. Then, after plus/minus grading was instituted, there were several years where it was unclear which grade of C sufficed for major, minor and prerequisite courses. So, Faculty Senate passed policy to the effect that C (2.0) was the minimum acceptable grade for courses in the major, and/or minor, and prerequisites, which made C- (1.7) not acceptable for these. Presently, faculty give C- either knowing or not knowing its effect on prerequisites and major and/or minor degree requirements. University regulation accepts all grades of C (plus/minus included) as acceptable. Thus, a C- grade for a course in a student's major could transfer in as credit, but does not end up counting for their major and the student must re-take the course. Such inconsistencies have been the result of the present policies. Add these issues to the fact that the C- (1.7) grade is the minimum acceptable grade for baccalaureate core courses.

A potential solution is to make C- (1.7) acceptable across the board academically. Doing so will mean there are some repercussions for faculty who awarded C- with the intention that a student retake a course in the major. With such a policy change, a student in that situation would potentially petition to have the grade accepted for the course, and it would take a couple of years to smooth out these kinds of effects. But in the long term it would make policy concerning C grades consistent and less confusing for both faculty and students. A motion will be brought up at the March meeting, which if passed, would go into the next printed Catalog. Rainer encouraged senators to talk with CAC members and come prepared to vote on this issue at the next meeting.

VI New Business

- A. Motion to authorize UAF faculty representatives to serve on cross-MAU committee to develop a common set of general education learning outcomes, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 188/1)

Jennifer read a portion the motion, as follows:

This senate supports the formation of a Faculty Alliance GE Learning Outcomes UA Coordination Subcommittee, to include equal representation from each MAU and to work on the general charge of identifying a common set of General Education learning outcomes (i.e., broad goals) to recommend to the faculty senates at each MAU in late 2013.

This same motion has been sent to the UAA and UAS faculty senates. It looks like UAA will agree to this quickly, but there's no word yet from UAS.

David V. described how this was related to the workshop sponsored by statewide last January to examine how to revitalize general education across the MAUs. One objective of the meeting was to see if there were any ways the MAUs could target common learning outcomes, and there was support at the meeting for exploring that idea. The motion above has come out of that discussion. A couple of years ago, the UAF Faculty Senate approved a set of student learning outcomes. The faculty at other MAUs recognize our leadership in having done so and are willing to use those outcomes as a starting point. So the question before everyone today is whether or not faculty should be appointed from UAF to participate in the General Education Learning Outcomes Committee (GELO).

There were no questions about this and a vote was taken. With one abstention, the motion was passed by majority.

- B. Motion to require the student transcript to distinguish between Master's with thesis and Master's with project, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 188/2)

Donie B. explained that the motion and resolution (item C.) go together. Many of the Master's programs offer degrees with either a thesis or a project, and some do not require either of these. At present they are distinguished only in the sense that on the transcript projects generally require six credits of research (listed as 698 courses), and theses often require 12 credits of research (listed as 699 courses). Concerns had been brought to the committee about how unhelpful it was for the two types of programs to be listed on a transcript in this cryptic manner. Employers looking at a transcript might not understand the differences between 698 and 699 courses. The approval process for a thesis is more stringent, requiring more levels of review than that for approving a project. The motion asks the Registrar's Office to distinguish on the transcript by the title between a Master's with Thesis and a Master's with Project (if applicable to the degree). Paul Layer asked that the rationale be revised to give the actual titles of 698 and 699 courses. Jennifer added "non-thesis" research to the 698 title and "thesis" research to the 699. The amendments made on the floor were approved.

Christine C. asked if this motion changes any existing Master's degree programs. Donie assured her it does not change any existing program requirements; it only changes transcripts.

Georgina G. asked about the effect of this transcript change on current Master's students enrolled in these courses. Donie explained this would go into effect in Fall 2013. She described that in some cases where the program allowed for students to select either a project or a thesis, that students doing poorly with the thesis were switched over to projects to get them through more easily. Georgina agreed in principle with Donie's rationale, but felt that retroactively enforcing it was unfair. Jennifer R. commented this matter also concerned truth in advertising about the degree. This motion simply asks that the transcript state in more detail what the degree is.

A vote was taken. There were two nays, and ayes passed the motion to require the student transcript to distinguish between Master's with thesis and Master's with project.

- C. Resolution on archiving master's projects and theses, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 188/3)

Donie described the resolution and how it came about during the discussion of making the student transcript distinguish between projects and theses. GAAC learned that projects were not being uniformly archived (some were archived at the units, and some not at all), unlike theses which are archived at the Rasmuson Library. It turned out that in 1997 the Faculty Senate had passed a motion requiring projects to be archived along with theses, but somehow over the years the requirement fell out of the catalog by error. This resolution reaffirms the original motion to correct that error. Donie also noted the Library is on board with archiving projects.

Cindy H. commented that the language should be inclusive of other types of Master's degrees, including the MFA. Donie agreed that would be the intent of this.

Debu noted that currently some projects are only archived electronically and asked if this were possible at the Library. Kathy A. responded that the Library can archive electronically via the Institutional Repository. Izetta C. spoke in support of this resolution and its benefit to students and employers, noting an example of practical experience in an employment setting where degree credentials could not be verified.

Paul Layer commented about the approval process for Master's with project degrees. He doesn't get to review them, and neither does the Graduate School. Yet, they are going into the archives and represent the institution. He would like GAAC to address the approval process for Master's with project degrees. Math and Physics use projects, and so he is concerned about quality control issues. Donie agreed that GAAC will take up this topic.

The resolution was formally amended to make the language more inclusive of all types of Master's degrees. A vote was taken and the Resolution was passed unanimously as amended.

The break occurred at this point in the meeting due to time constraints and the scheduled photo shoot.

- D. Motion to require graduate student enrollment in credits within discipline during semester of thesis defense and semester of graduation, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 188/4)

Donie explained the reasons that the Graduate School asked for this motion. Mainly, the Graduate School needs to be able to track the students. Currently, a student might enroll in courses to comply, but later just drop the courses. Upon discussion in committee, everyone realized there can be two different situations. Students might defend their thesis and graduate in the same semester, or they might defend their thesis and not be able to finish everything required within that same semester. In this second scenario, it becomes very difficult for the Graduate School to keep track of the student. The motion would require that a student enroll and maintain enrollment in a minimum of three credits in their discipline during the semester of their thesis defense, and if they graduate after this semester they must enroll and maintain enrollment in a minimum of one credit in their discipline in the semester in which they graduate. While there may be some loss of revenues with this change, the committee felt it was fairer to the students. Susan Henrichs commented that she did a rough estimate of the revenue involved. She found that up to \$50,000 each semester might be involved – it's not a vast amount, but not small, either.

Debu M. asked about the scenario of a student who defends his thesis successfully and graduates in the same semester. Donie responded this would require enrollment in three credits and falls under the current policy which is not being changed. Jennifer noted that the word "minimum" in the motion language clarifies both scenarios clearly enough.

Julie J. pointed out the variety of reasons students extend their potential graduation date, such as job opportunities. It is another factor she wanted to mention.

David V. commented that the motion is likewise merciful to the faculty involved by decreasing pressure for faculty to ensure that the student graduates in the same semester as the thesis defense. This will work well for faculty who serve on more than one graduate committee, while making it easier for the student who needs more time to fully finish their work after defending their thesis.

Paul L. asked how many semesters a student may enroll in one credit only. Some ambiguity was acknowledged in the motion. Orion L. asked about the six credits per year required to maintain good standing. Donie responded that students are given leeway now, and this motion will further make it easier for those trying to finish up and graduate. Ken A. asked what happens if the student doesn't graduate in that last semester, and it was pointed out that they then fall out of good standing with the Graduate School.

Sukumar asked about the effect upon foreign students who must be enrolled in nine credits to stay in good standing with immigration. Provost Henrichs noted that requirements are different for foreign

students, but they are allowed to take only three credits in their final semester. She is not sure how this motion about one credit in the last semester would affect them, suggesting International Programs could be consulted. The rules are already different for foreign students. For example, American students can take a semester off during their program but foreign students may not. Sukumar responded that the Catalog language does not specify these differences. Jennifer noted that this motion addresses university requirements, but that federal requirements take precedent and override the university in the case of foreign students (where applicable). Sukumar noted there should be one set of rules; however David felt that such an effort is outside the scope of this motion before them.

The motion was voted upon, and carried. There was one nay and three abstentions.

VI New Business Continued

- E. Motion to revise the grade appeals policy to clarify the time period within which grade appeals will be reviewed (Section III: Procedures, Article B, Subsection 5), submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 188/5)

Cecile brought the motion to the floor and described what happens when grade appeals are brought forward in the summer. This motion changes when such appeals would be reviewed, although they could still be submitted in the summer by the student.

Jennifer read the language change in the motion which helps clarify to the students what they can expect in terms of when a review will take place.

THE REVIEW OF GRADE APPEALS SUBMITTED DURING THE SUMMER (I.E., AFTER COMPLETION OF FINAL EXAMS IN THE SPRING SEMESTER) MUST BE SCHEDULED NO LATER THAN THE 15TH WORKING DAY OF THE BEGINNING OF THE SUBSEQUENT FALL SEMESTER.

David asked if the 15th working day means from the contract start date or from when classes start. Consensus was that this means the start of the semester. Paul L. then asked about a submission on January 2, when faculty are still on contract, but away on winter break. He suggested tying this to the start of the semester. Orion L. suggested changing “working” days to “class” days instead. Ken A. noted this creates problems in other areas of the policy where “days” are mentioned but not specified as either “working” or “business” days. The language needs to be uniform throughout the policy to be less confusing.

Julie J., also on Faculty Affairs, suggested this motion should go back to Faculty Affairs Committee for further wordsmithing. Jennifer R. agreed and the motion was tabled.

- F. Motion to approve a new minor in Military Security Studies, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 188/6)

Rainer presented the motion, emphasizing that it’s entirely harmless. Jennifer noted that it’s housed in the School of Management, as well as that it will mainly be of interest to veterans and active military. No discussion ensued and a vote was unanimous to pass the new minor.

- G. Motion to amend transfer credit policy, submitted by Core Review and Curricular Affairs Committees (Attachment 188/7)

Rainer explained how this motion was adding to the similar one passed last month concerning the same policy – but different section. Rainer noted that the present policy requires a large amount of time and

energy utilized in the Registrar's Office to sort of all of these transfer issues out. This change simplifies the entire policy with regard to the 100-200-level of the Core. The original fear that allowing AA and AS degrees to count for the 100-200 level of the Core would cause the floodgates to be opened, has not materialized. Rainer responded this change better than harmless – it would accomplish good and is consistent with what has already been done.

Jennifer noted the motion is cleaning up what has been done at the last meeting. A vote was taken, and the motion was passed unanimously.

H. Motion to amend the Credit by Exam policy, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 188/8)

Rainer explained that the current policy as contained in the Catalog basically says “go for it” in terms of taking a test and getting course credit, but in actual practice when one starts through the paperwork processes it becomes apparent that this is either possible or it isn't depending upon department faculty who have the final say. This motion clarifies to all audiences that credit by exam cannot be demanded. Faculty and departments have the final say in what can be accomplished via credit by exam (the current practice).

Orion L. asked if a fee could be charged for this by the department. Registrar Libby E. said there is already a fee charged by Testing Services, and Sukumar and Retchenda confirmed it's \$40 per credit. Sukumar asked about the situation of a student getting an “F” in a course – could they get credit by exam? Libby explained that this motion has come about to clarify exactly that sort of situation, so that a student earning an “F” in a course could not turn around and just get credit by exam.

Izetta asked what differentiates a credit by exam course from an independent study course if an instructor also asks for extra work on top of the exam. Libby noted that individual study courses do not exist in the Catalog and must later be petitioned; credit by exam is for existing Catalog courses. Libby also described Directed Study courses which are existing Catalog courses taken individually by students with the instructor's permission.

The motion was passed by majority, with two abstentions.

VII Guest Speakers

1. Derek Miller, Julie Larweth: UAF Office of Management and Budget
Topic: FY14 UAF Budget Request Pocket Guide (handout)

Julie Larweth introduced the new office while Derek Miller distributed handouts. Julie noted the pocket guides being distributed are also available online.

The role of the office is to help fill the gap between the ongoing budget processes and the need for information to the campus units and departments who have submitted requests and want to track them. The office was created this past year to focus on UAF planning and budget requests in addition to analysis and reporting. They are located next to the Planning and Institutional Research (PAIR) office which they utilize for data.

They are also involved in process improvement. They have teams currently looking at recruiting and hiring processes, and grant processes, whose goals are to add efficiency to the administrative processes which affect faculty and others. They will do their best to keep UAF informed on the budget process as things move up through the system and to the legislature.

Their office will assist the Provost's Office with the Planning and Budget Committee. Julie noted the email sent out today from the Provost regarding the FY15 requests. The packet includes an opportunity for units to provide internal information in critical areas that administration may not be fully aware about. Derek mentioned information which is available on their web site, and offered to come back and update everyone on the Legislative progress in the future.

2. Mike Davis, Faculty Senator
Topic: Legislative Affairs

Mike shared a brochure of the UA FY14 Budget Request that he picked up in Juneau which will be scanned and distributed later on. [It is posted on the Faculty Senate web site on the Meetings page and has been distributed to Faculty Senate members via email since the meeting.] He passed around two copies to share. He also described his recent visit to Juneau with a group of students from all over Alaska, which was quite successful. They held a workshop with over 30 legislators giving presentations to the students. Izetta commented this was an excellent class last year when she had participated in it, and gave Mike credit for instilling great confidence in the student groups he hosts.

A representative from the local Legislative Information Office will come at 3:15 PM today and walk through how to access the large amount of information on the LIO web site and utilize many online tools that are available to the public.

Mike also shared some slides and information about key budget points and the shortfall situation for the university. Bar graphs of budget trends over time illustrated the implications of declining revenues on budget projections for the future.

VIII Public Comments/Questions

There were no public comments.

IX Governance Reports
A. Staff Council – Claudia Koch

No report was available.

B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag

No report was available.

C. UNAC – Debu Misra
UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane reported on the February 1 JHCC meeting. For FY14, the three plan options which will be available to employees include the 750 plan, the high deductible plan, and a consumer-driven health plan. The consumer-driven plan will feature a health savings account (HSA). Following feedback from the January health care forums, the JHCC has withdrawn the motions regarding the spousal surcharge and restricting the opt-out provision.

D. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

Dani's comments were reserved for the next meeting.

X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements
 A. General Comments/Announcements

No additional comments or reports were given.

- B. Committee Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)
- Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 188/9)
 - Faculty Affairs – Cecile Lardon, Chair
 - Unit Criteria – Karen Jensen, Chair
 - Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 188/10)
 - Core Review Committee – Latrice Bowman, Chair
 - Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
 - Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
(Attachment 188/11)
 - Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair
(Attachment 188/12)
 - Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair
(Attachment 188/13)
 - Research Advisory Committee – Jon Dehn, Chair

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:03 PM.

MOTION:

This senate supports the formation of a Faculty Alliance GE Learning Outcomes UA Coordination Subcommittee, to include equal representation from each MAU and to work on the general charge of identifying a common set of General Education learning outcomes (I.E., BROAD GOALS) to recommend to the faculty senates at each MAU in late 2013.

Rationale: This January faculty and registrars from UAA, UAF, and UAS met for two days and had a facilitated dialogue with General Education Curriculum and Assessment experts from the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

The workshop focused on presenting current best practices in General Education and Assessment. Topics included the AAC&U LEAP initiative, careful articulation of learning outcomes, logic models for designing assessment of GE outcomes, High Impact Practices, and e-portfolios. The facilitators also encouraged the assembled faculty to consider the GE learning outcomes at each of their MAUs and asked them to identify points of agreement and disagreement across the MAUs. In general the assembled faculty noted more agreement than not and also acknowledged that the modified LEAP outcomes adopted by the UAF faculty senate are a good starting point for an attempt to coordinate GE learning outcomes across the three MAUs. There was also general consensus among the assembled faculty that since BOR policy allows students to freely mix and match GER curriculum between the three MAUs that better coordination of GE learning outcomes would better serve our students and the faculty who anticipate certain general competencies as students engage upper division coursework. The faculty also resolved that a subcommittee of the Faculty Alliance with representation from each MAU be created and charged with having an ongoing dialogue about coordination of GE learning outcomes across the MAUs.

ATTACHMENT 188/2
UAF Faculty Senate 188, February 4, 2013
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that the Office of Admissions and the Registrar distinguish *Master's* degrees within the student's transcript as "Master's with thesis" or "Master's with project" in the title of the degree granted when applicable.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE: At UAF, Master's Degrees can be granted with either a thesis or a project.

Projects generally require 6 credits of research (698), while theses often (but not always) require 12 credits of research (699). Many Departments distinguish between Master's Degrees with thesis or with project in the titles of the degree, but not all do. Concern has been raised that confusion arises when a Master's degree is granted with thesis or project and there is no distinction (other than the number and type of credits on the transcript) between degrees, and that this confusion does not serve the students or prospective employers well.

RESOLUTION

The UAF Faculty Senate reaffirms its previous motion to require that both theses and projects for Master's of Arts and Master's of Science degrees be archived in the Rasmuson Library, and to put this requirement into the UAF Catalog. The Rasmuson Library already archives theses, and is willing to centrally archive projects in a variety of formats.

Motivation and Background:

- A Faculty Senate Motion from Meeting #71 (April 1997) concerning Master's degree requirements included the stipulation that Projects are archived at the Library, as well as theses, and that project archival is a degree requirement. The entire motion is copied below.
- Subsequent motions concerning master's degrees (Meeting #88, May 1999; Meeting #123, May 2004) made some credit requirement changes, but did not address the requirement to archive projects.
- The 1999-2000 UAF Catalog (page 43-44) contained the language that projects are archived in the UAF Rasmuson Library for both MA and MS degrees. This language was subsequently dropped from the Catalog in 2000-2001, which was a change that did not involve Faculty Senate approval.
- At the present time, not all Master's projects are archived in the Rasmuson Library. Some are archived in the Rasmuson Library, some are archived by individual departments, and some are not archived at all
- It is in the interest of students and their potential employers that all Master's theses and projects be archived.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #71 on April 14, 1997:

MOTION PASSED (unanimous)
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the minimum requirements for Master's Degrees shall be as follows:

For all Master's Degree Programs, the following must be met:

- a. Submit a Graduate Study Plan (GSP) and an Appointment of Committee Form to the Graduate School by the end of the second semester in attendance.
- b. Be registered for at least 6 credits per year (fall, spring, and summer combined), or have an approved leave of absence form on file.
- c. Submit an Advancement to Candidacy form to the Graduate School. Once submitted, this form supplants the GSP and serves to formally establish specific degree requirements.
- d. Submit an application for graduation and be registered for at least 3 graduate credits in the semester in which the degree is to be awarded; and
- e. Complete all degree requirements within the 7-year time limit allowed.

Furthermore, the following additional requirements are the minimum for Master's Degrees:

For a Master's of Science or Master's of Arts Degree - with thesis

Successfully complete at least 30 credits of course work including at least 6 credits of thesis (699). (No more than 12 thesis/research (699/698) credits may be counted towards the minimum degree credits).

At least 24 credits must be at the 600 or above, except for a Master's of Arts in Music, which must have at least 21 credits at the 600 level or above.

Pass a written and/or oral comprehensive exam (may be combined with the thesis defense).

Publicly present and defend thesis.

Submit a completed and signed thesis defense form to the Graduate School.

Archive thesis in UAF Library.

Master's of Science or Master's of Arts Degree - with project

Successfully complete at least 30 credits of course work including at least 6 credits of project work (698). (No more than 6 research (698) credits may be counted towards the minimum degree credits.)

At least 24 credits must be at the 600 level or above, except for a Master's of Arts in Music, which must have at least 21 credits at the 600 level or above.

Pass a written and/or oral comprehensive exam (may be combined with the project defense.)

Publicly present and defend project.

Submit a completed and signed project defense form to the Graduate School.

Archive project in UAF Library.

For a Professional Master's Degree (i.e. Master's of Business Administration, Education, etc.)

Successfully complete at least 30 credits of course work (research or thesis credits NOT included). At least 24 credits must be at the 600 level or above (research or thesis credits NOT included).

Successful completion of a comprehensive exam or capstone course that includes demonstration of the ability to synthesize information in the field at a level appropriate for a Master's degree.

Note on Implementation of Motion: It is the understanding of the Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee that changes to existing programs degree requirements or the name of the degree which may be necessitated by this policy, if implemented, will need final approval of the Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee, but does not constitute a new degree offering, and will not need approval by the Board of Regents. No minimum presented herein prohibits programs from requiring additional work. The adjustments that have been made from existing programs include the requirement for the non-thesis project to be documented and in some manner archived in the Library (i.e. slides, recording, report.)

EFFECTIVE: Fall 1998

RATIONALE: Currently there is great disparity in the administration of Master's degrees using a thesis or non-thesis option. In addition, there is an increasing movement towards Professional Master's Degrees which require only course work. To ensure the quality and workload for a degree is comparable for the thesis, project option, and professional (non-thesis and non-project) minimum must be set and applied across all degrees.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves that the UAF Catalog wording in the section relating to Master's and Ph.D. degrees be changed to include the following language pertaining to graduate degrees: "You must be registered for a minimum of three graduate credits within your discipline and maintain enrollment in the semester that you successfully defend your thesis and you must be registered for a minimum of one graduate credit within your discipline and maintain enrollment during the semester that you graduate."

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE: Currently, the Catalog states "You must be registered for at least 3 graduate credits in the semester in which you receive your degree" (p. 205). There is no requirement that these credits be within the discipline of study, or that students maintain enrollment during the semester that they graduate, thus it is possible to register and then drop the credits. Making these proposed changes to the catalog will eliminate these possibilities, but will allow students who have defended their thesis or project but not officially completed degree requirements to register for a minimum of credits in their last semester.

CAPS = Addition
[[]] = Deletion

GRADUATION [as currently in the *UAF Catalog*, page 205]

...

- **Application for Graduation**

You must be registered for [[at least 3]] **A MINIMUM OF THREE** graduate credits **WITHIN YOUR DISCIPLINE AND MAINTAIN ENROLLMENT** in the semester [[in which you receive your degree]] **THAT YOU SUCCESSFULLY DEFEND YOUR THESIS AND YOU MUST BE REGISTERED FOR A MINIMUM OF ONE GRADUATE CREDIT WITHIN YOUR DISCIPLINE AND MAINTAIN ENROLLMENT DURING THE SEMESTER THAT YOU GRADUATE.** You must file an application for graduation and a non-refundable fee with the Registrar's Office. We encourage you to apply for graduation in the semester prior to the semester you plan to graduate. Applications for graduation filed after the published deadline will be processed for graduation the following semester. You need not have all requirements met before you apply for graduation. The application is an indication that you are planning to finish all degree requirements during the intended graduation semester. Students who apply for graduation and who do not complete degree requirements by the end of the semester must reapply for graduation and pay the fee again.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the Grade Appeals Policy of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section III: Procedures, Article B, Subsection 5. This revision clarifies the time period within which grade appeals will be reviewed.

EFFECTIVE: January 2013

RATIONALE: As currently stated the policy makes it possible for a grade appeals to be received during the summer when many faculty are off contract. Depending on the department and program it may be difficult to find enough faculty to serve on a grade appeals committee during those summer months. The proposed revisions allow for a more flexible time period for processing grade appeals submitted during the summer.

CAPS & BOLD = Addition

[] = Deletion

Sect. III (Article B: Procedures)

III. Procedures

B. If no such error occurred, the remaining option is by review for alleged arbitrary and capricious grading, or for instances where the course instructor is unavailable and satisfaction is not forthcoming from the appropriate department chair.

1. This review is initiated by the student through a signed, written request to the department chair with a copy to the dean of the college or school in which the course was offered.
 - a. The student's request for review may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and available at the Registrar's Office.
 - b. By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the review of the grade, and that the university's administration can not influence or affect the outcome of the review.
 - c. The request for a review must be received **WITHIN 30 CLASS DAYS AFTER THE BEGINNING OF** the next regular semester (i.e., fall semester for grade issued at the end of the previous spring semester or summer session; spring semester for grade issued at the end of the previous fall semester) or within 5 days of receipt of notification of the process by the dean/director of the college or school in which the course was offered.

...

5. The committee must schedule a mutually agreeable date, time and location for the appeal hearing within 10 working days of receipt of the student's request **AS PER B.1.c. ABOVE. THE REVIEW OF GRADE APPEALS SUBMITTED DURING THE SUMMER (I.E., AFTER COMPLETION OF FINAL EXAMS IN THE SPRING SEMESTER) MUST BE SCHEDULED NO LATER THAN THE 15TH WORKING DAY OF THE BEGINNING OF THE SUBSEQUENT FALL SEMESTER.**

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new minor in Military Security Studies (housed in the School of Management).

Effective: Fall 2013

Rationale: See the program proposal #64-UNP on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Overview:

The Military Security Studies minor focuses on academic aspects of military education and training. Students with military experience may use the structure of this minor to build on their education in military studies as part of a degree at UAF.

Students with a background and interest in military studies frequently go into high value jobs related to national security. The minor can serve as a formal statement of achievement that is useful for those career goals.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

1. Complete the following: 10 credits of MILS electives, as approved by the Program Director, Emergency Management and Homeland Security Department.
2. Choose 2 of the following:*

HSEM F301 – Principles of Emergency Management and Homeland Security -3 credits

HSEM F412 – Emergency Planning and Preparedness – 3 credits

HSEM F423 – Disaster Response Operations and Management – 3 credits

HSEM F434 – All Hazards Risk Analysis – 3 credits

HSEM F445 – Business Continuity and Crisis Management – 3 credits

HSEM F456W – Leadership and Influence During Crisis – 3 credits

MILS F442 – History of the American Military -3 credits

Or course(s) pre-approved by the Program Director, Emergency Management and Homeland Security Department

3. Minimum credits required: 16

* Students must earn a C grade (2.0) or better in these classes.

Relationship to the Purposes of the University:

Establishing this minor in Military Security Studies is in keeping with UAF's role in serving the needs of active duty and veteran students. UAF is a designated "Military Friendly Institution."

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the academic policy regarding transfer of credits.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE: The following reasons are submitted as the basis for amending the 2+2 portion of the AA / AS waiver policy:

1. General education requirements are substantially the same among the 6 regional accreditation bodies.
2. As the policy currently stands it is frequently difficult for others (advisors, recruiters, etc.), without consulting the Office of Admissions and the Registrar (OAR), to assure students with these degrees that they will receive waivers.
3. It is difficult to advertise because of the caveats (not everyone understands what NWCCU is and not everyone knows which states have been approved as having a 2+2 agreement.
4. If there is an easily understood policy in place, with a minimum of restrictions, it will make it easier for UAF's schools and colleges to develop MOUs with other institutions.
5. The Registrar's Office wants to produce transfer credit evaluations as quickly as possible so students can decide if they want to come to UAF or go elsewhere, or so they can work with their advisors to get registered. Given the 2+2 limitation it is difficult to complete the AA/AS core waiver portion of the evaluation in a timely fashion.

CAPS = Addition
[[]] = Deletion

Transferring Credits [as currently in the *UAF Catalog*, pages 36-38]

...

The following regulations apply to transfer of credit:

1. Students are eligible for transfer of credit if they have been admitted to an undergraduate degree or certificate program.
2. The applicability of transfer credit to a student's major and/or minor requirements is subject to approval by the major and/or minor department. Transfer students must fulfill the UAF graduation and residency requirements, including those specific to their programs.

3. Undergraduate credits earned at the 100-level or above with a C- grade or higher at institutions accredited by one of the six regional accrediting agencies will be considered for transfer. Transfer credit is not granted for courses with doctrinal religious content or for graduate courses (for undergraduate programs).
4. Transfer credit is awarded for courses in which the student received grades of C- or better. Instructor permission may be required for purposes of registration if the transfer credit courses have not satisfied the prerequisite requirements, or if the transferable grade is not equal to a C (2.0) or better (the minimum grade required for prerequisite courses).
5. Any student who has completed a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution will be considered to have completed the equivalent of the baccalaureate core and the associate of arts core when officially accepted to a baccalaureate degree program or associate of arts program at UAF. These students will also be considered to have completed the equivalent of the communication, computation and human relations requirements for the associate of applied science and the certificate.
6. Any student who has completed an associate of arts or an associate of science degree from a regionally accredited school [[satisfying one of the criteria below]] will be considered as having satisfied the 100- and 200-level UAF general education (core) requirements[[:]].

[[a. The AA or AS degree is from the University of Alaska, or

- b. The public universities in the state in which the community college is located also waive their core requirements in recognition of completing an AA or AS degree, that is, have established a 2+2 program, or
- c. The community college and/or community college district is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (the agency that accredits UAF), or
- d. The associate program has been approved by the UAF Core Review Committee as satisfying the 100- and 200-level general education (core) requirements.]]

...

Note: Faculty Senate approved additional changes at its earlier Meeting #187 (Dec. 3, 2012) which modify the subsequent numbered portions of this policy.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Credit by Exam policy as follows:

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The addition of this clarifying statement to the current Credit by Exam policy reduces confusion and reflects the current practice at UAF.

BOLD CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

CREDIT BY EXAM [as currently in the *UAF Catalog*, pages 38-41]

...

- **UAF Credit by Exam**

Credit by exam can be earned at UAF by students who are currently enrolled. Most courses are available for credit by exam, except those with numbers ending -90 through -99 (193, 292, 497, etc.). A course challenged for credit cannot duplicate a course for which credit has already been granted or in which the student is currently enrolled. **IT IS UP TO THE DISCRETION OF THE DEPARTMENT AND INSTRUCTOR TO DECIDE WHICH COURSES CAN BE CHALLENGED, AND THE TESTING METHOD AND GRADING PROCEDURES.** Credit by exam may not be requested for audited courses until one year has passed since the end of the semester in which the course was audited.

...

ATTACHMENT 188/9
UAF Faculty Senate 188, February 4, 2013
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

TO BE REVISED (definition added for the "hybrid AAS / AA degree") – Might or might not be in time for this agenda. Since this is not in the Catalog, it could be considered at another FS Meeting if not in time for Feb. 4.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to allow UAF schools and colleges to use Board of Regents regulations on general education requirements (R10.04.040), in place of the UAF baccalaureate core requirements, to create transfer (articulation) agreements for hybrid AAS / AA degrees with community colleges in states other than Alaska. To become effective, these agreements must be approved by the Faculty Senate Core Review Committee, the Faculty Senate President, and the UAF Provost. Such hybrid degrees can be used to satisfy core requirements or the requirement for a minor but not both, unless specifically approved as part of the articulation agreement.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE: Allowing the use of BOR regulations on general education requirements (R10.04.040) to create articulation agreements for hybrid AAS/AA degrees from community colleges outside of Alaska will facilitate such agreements. The UAF baccalaureate core requirements are too restrictive in the case of trying to create these hybrid-degree articulation agreements.

Curricular Affairs Committee 19 November 2012 Minutes 9-10 am Reichardt 301

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry (Chair); Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Ken Abramowicz (audio); Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy; David Henry; Todd Radenbaugh (audio),

Non-voting members present: Libby Eddy; Lillian Misel; Alex Fitts; Jayne Harvie (taking notes); Doug Goering (audio)

1. Approved minutes of 5 November meeting

2. Report from J Rosenberg (GERC): still coming to grips with result of Faculty Poll

3. Approved new minor: interdisciplinary studies (as slightly modified based on feedback from last meeting)

1. Contact the Academic Advising Center at 907-474-6396 or 1-888-823-8780 for materials and procedures.
2. Prepare and submit a draft declaration of interdisciplinary minor form and submit it electronically to the Academic Advising Center at uaf.advising@alaska.edu or in person at 509 Gruening Building. **This form asks the student to provide a title for their minor, briefly describe the body of knowledge and skills intended to fulfill the minor, including courses specifying the knowledge and skills relevant to the minor title** (for example, Food Science minor including relevant coursework from transfer credits in Food Science from a regionally accredited university, as well as credits from chemistry, fisheries or natural resources management, and biological sciences). An interdisciplinary minor **cannot be titled the same as an existing minor** and must demonstrate a cohesive body of knowledge and skills. The approved **title will appear on the student's transcript.**
3. Three faculty approved by the Dean of General Studies will serve as the interdisciplinary minor committee. This committee will ensure that an appropriate and cohesive body of knowledge and skills is addressed in the planned minor, ensure that the interdisciplinary minor does not overlap with an existing minor, and discuss alternatives with the student as needed.
4. Minimum credits required – 18 credits

4. Two new minors introduced for discussion:

(a) Emergency Management

Ooops. Older version sent around...well, we approved it in principle but agreed to review the revised version via email. [subsequently that was sent around and no one objected→ moved forward to AdComm]

(b) Military Security Studies

This one is a little more complicated, revolving around the issues of transferability of military basic and advanced individual training. Currently they transfer as officer training courses (MIL 101, 102, 201, 202), although clearly they're not. Derailed by the problem of transfer equivalences....will take up again next time, after discussions with the submitter.

5. Request for change in catalog language from Libby Eddy, acting? Interim? registrar

Current policy

"A course challenged for credit [*that is, credit by exam*] cannot duplicate a course for which credit has already been granted or in which the student is currently enrolled." [*rjn in italics*]

Libby's revised suggestion: "A course challenged for credit cannot duplicate a course for which credit has already been granted, an F grade has been received, or the student is currently enrolled."

We agreed: It's a weird policy all around—as far as anyone knows, a student can essentially demand 'give me an exam for course X'. It's also potentially arbitrary: how are the standards set for such? And it does make sense for some courses—Alex brought up the case of a student getting credit for Spanish after failing the course—but clearly not for others. Courses with a lab component, for example, seem particularly ill-suited. Shouldn't the department/instructor have a choice about whether to allow such an exam? Lots of discussion, no obvious answers. We asked Libby to present something to us for our consideration next meeting. Rainer said he would ask around as well.

Note added after the meeting: the testing website includes the following: "It is up to the discretion of the department or instructor to decide which courses can be challenged, testing method and grading procedures." *Seems like this should be in the catalog.*

Form itself states: "and may not be used to replace a previously graded course for which you received credit" *which implicitly says 'you can use credit by exam for a course you've already taken'*

6. Request for a change in policy

'Any transfer student who has completed the baccalaureate General Education Requirements at any Regionally Accredited 4-year institution is considered to have completed the baccalaureate Core Requirements at UAF. A student wishing to do so is responsible for documenting GER requirement completion at the previous institution.'

Note that (a) we currently accept a baccalaureate degree as fulfilling our core and (b) we accept an AA/AS from a regionally accredited school as fulfilling the lower division parts of the core.

Rainer presented the above. We discussed the pros and cons. Several of us on the committee had the frustrating experiences of working with transfer students who take a year of UAF's core courses to replace the year of core courses taken elsewhere. Unanimously agreed to send to both Core Review committee for comments and to AdComm.

7. We discussed our meeting day/time/place for next semester*the consensus was that no one was especially wild about this day/time/place but we could live with it. and would plan to do so. However we'll try to arrange things so we don't meet the say day as faculty senate.*

8. We agreed to meet again in two weeks (Dec 3) but probably not Dec 17 unless something really ugly turns up

We quietly adjourned.

Curricular Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes for 3 December 2012 9-10 am Reichardt 301

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry (Chair), Retchenda George-Bettisworth (audio); David Henry; Ken Abramowicz (audio); Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy; Todd Radenbaugh (audio), Karen Gustafson (audio). absent: Diane McEachern

Non-voting members present: Doug Goering (audio); Carol Gering; Alex Fitts (audio); Jonathan Rosenberg (audio); Libby Eddy; Lillian Anderson-Misel; Caty Oehring. Jayne Harvie (notes).

1. Approve minutes of last meeting & Discuss: meeting 17 December? Next semester?

The minutes for the November 19 meeting were approved as submitted.

The next meeting will be Monday, December 17, 2012, same time and location as usual.

The first meeting of the spring semester was set for the Monday before classes begin and January 14 was settled upon. [Classes begin on the 17th.]

2. Report from J Rosenberg (GERC)

Jonathan R. reported that based on the survey results, they're going in the right direction. They're pursuing a more flexible program with a broader range of course choices for students to fulfill general ed requirements. Survey results showed that faculty want fewer than 39 core credits, but more than the minimum 34 required by BOR policy. They're aiming for about 36 credits.

New core designators may be added for civic engagement; intercultural and diversity content; and arctic or Alaskan issues. The LEAP outcomes cluster around four objectives. Capstone courses will cover one of those objectives. Next semester, GERC will propose a model (or models) to help identify courses fulfilling the learning objectives.

3. Old business—

A. status of proposed new minor Military Security Studies

Rainer communicated with Cam Carlson, the submitter of the new minor. It was agreed to drop mention of 'transfer from Joint Service Transcript (JST)' and change language to "10 credits of MILS electives, as approved by the Program Director, Emergency Management and Homeland Security Department."

The committee approved the new minor with the request that the ROTC program be appraised of it. The changes approved by the submitter remove the conflict with that program's officer training courses. The new minor will go forward to the Administrative Committee.

B. Credit by Exam, cont.

Current policy

"A course challenged for credit cannot duplicate a course for which credit has already been granted or in which the student is currently enrolled."

Suggested (earlier) by registrar: "A course challenged for credit cannot duplicate a course for which credit has already been granted, an F grade has been received, or the student is currently enrolled."

Lots of discussion about this last time...anything wrong with retaking a failed course w/ test as long as the department is willing to do so???

the testing website includes the following: "It is up to the discretion of the department or instructor to decide which courses can be challenged, testing method and grading procedures." *Seems like this should be in the catalog language.*

Form itself states: "and may not be used to replace a previously graded course for which you received credit" *again, this ought either be in the catalog or not.... Is there anything wrong with replacing grade with test grade????*

Suggested: *A course challenged for credit cannot duplicate a course for which credit has already been granted or the student is currently enrolled. It is up to the discretion of the department and instructor to decide which courses can be challenged, testing method and grading procedures.*

THIS WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED FOR SUBMISSION TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE
The committee supported having it remain the discretion of the department / instructor to decide which courses may be challenged for credit. All agreed that alignment of the required form with the web site and the Catalog with the language in the paragraph above would fix the issues they discussed

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Change in AA/AS = core

current policy: Any student who has completed an associate of arts or an associate of science degree from a regionally accredited school satisfying one of the criteria below will be considered as having satisfied the 100- and 200-level UAF general education (core) requirements:

- a. The AA or AS degree is from the University of Alaska, or
- b. The public universities in the state in which the community college is located also waive their core requirements in recognition of completing an AA or AS degree, that is, have established a 2+2 program, or
- c. The community college and/or community college district is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (the agency that accredits UAF), or
- d. The associate program has been approved by the UAF Core Review Committee as satisfying the 100- and 200-level general education (core) requirements.

Change to (Submitted by Registrar's office)

Any student who has completed an associate of arts or an associate of science degree from a regionally accredited 2-year or 4-year institution (other than UAF) will be considered as having satisfied the 100- and 200-level UAF general education (core) requirements.

justification for eliminating the 2+2 portion of the AA/AS waiver policy:

1. General education requirements are substantially the same among the 6 regional accreditation bodies
2. As the policy currently stands it is frequently difficult for others (advisors, recruiters, etc.), without consulting us, to assure students with these degrees that they will receive waivers
3. It is difficult to advertise because of the caveats (not everyone understands what NWCCU is and not everyone knows which states have been approved as having a 2+2 agreement)
4. If there is an easily understood policy in place, with a minimum of restrictions, it will make it easier for UAF's schools and colleges to develop MOUs with other institutions.
5. The Registrar's Office wants to produce transfer credit evaluations as quickly as possible so students can decide if they want to come to UAF or go elsewhere, or so they can work with their advisors to get registered. Given the 2+2 limitation it is difficult to complete the AA/AS core waiver portion of the evaluation in a timely fashion.

THIS CHANGE WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE
Meeting adjourned before all the items were discussed. Oh, well.

Curric Affairs Committee 17 December 2012 MINUTES 9-10 am Reichardt 301

Present: (in one form or another): Rainer Newberry (Chair), Retchenda George-Bettisworth David Henry, Ken Abramowicz, Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy, Todd Radenbaugh, Diane McEachern, Doug Goering, Carol Gering, Libby Eddy, Lillian Anderson-Misel, Caty Oehring, Dani Sheppard

I. Introductory matters

1. minutes of last meeting (3 December) Approved

2. Coming semester: same time and place...1st meeting 14 Jan 9 am Reichardt 301

3. Report from J Rosenberg (GERC) – looks like more designators are coming!!!

(intercultural competence, civic engagement, AK & Arctic Issues...+ existing O & W) CAC members expressed displeasure, verging on hysteria.

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. MOTION (submitted by Core Review committee)

The UAF Core Review & Curricular Affairs Committees moves that transfer students from California be considered to have met UAF's general education requirements if a California Community College certifies a student has completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) or the California State University General Education Breadth Requirements. Students will provide official documentation that these requirements have been met. **Approved, but see if can't be incorporated into current changes...**

2. Motion: (submitted by Core Review committee) ...*[this would potentially be passed by the faculty senate, but not appear in the catalog]*

To allow UAF colleges and schools to use the board of regents policy on general education (R10.04.040), in place of UAF's core requirements, to create transfer (articulation) agreements for hybrid AAS/AA degrees with community colleges in states other than Alaska. The core review committee, faculty senate president, and the provost must approve these agreements for them to become effective.

Unanimously approved

III. New Business just glanced at but nothing done.....

- A. Use of AA/AS for both core waiver and minor waiver
- B. Grades & how they're described in the catalog
- C. Course compression
- D. E courses

ATTACHMENT 188/11

UAF Faculty Senate 188, February 4, 2013

Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women

Minutes Tues, Dec 04, 2012; 2:00-3:00 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Derek Sikes, Kayt Sunwood, Jane Weber, Diana Di Stefano, Mary Ehrlander, Amy Barnsley, Megan McPhee, Nilima Hullavarad, Ellen Lopez

Members absent: Shawn Russell, Jenny Liu

1) Woman Faculty Luncheon: Carol Gold and Jane Weber will meet with Michael Sfraga re: funding for the Woman's Luncheon. Need a speaker - first meeting in spring. Date is April 26, 2013.

2) Women Center Advisory Board. Ellen Lopez and Jane Weber are CSW representatives on this and an introductory meeting has been held. A formal meeting will be held on Friday this week.

3) Report/follow-up on inquiries to Peer Institutions about faculty/administrative positions focusing on the issues of women faculty: Equivalent (n=11) and Aspirational (n=9) Peer institutions, as listed on UAF's website, were contacted by Amy Barnsley to ask if they had, or knew of, examples of such a position. 11 institutions responded which Amy compiled into an 8 page document that was distributed to members of CSW. Kayt Sunwood distributed four relevant publications (three by Sharon Bird) about which Kayt wrote: "The Unsettling Universities", Institutional Housekeeping, and Enhancing Departmental Climate documents are materials which should inform the discussion about a position to focus on Women Faculty issues." Mary pointed out that it would be interesting to see if there is a difference between the prevalence of such a position at 'Equivalent' vs 'Aspirational' peer institutions. Four responses (#s 7-10) were from the latter, the other 7 responses were from the former.

To do - CSW will study two apparently good examples found from Amy's survey: (1) The Ohio State - The Women's Place: <http://womensplace.osu.edu/staff.html> and the (2) University of Maine - the Rising Tide Center, an NSF funded program to increase the retention of women faculty and Sharon Bird's publications that Kayt distributed. CSW will read these with the goal of improving the draft rationale for the position that was written by Carol Gold. Mary emphasized that the rationale needs to be supported by UAF data and published findings. CSW needs empirical, not anecdotal, evidence that there are institutional problems that are holding women back at UAF.

The related UAF work life balance survey done by the Faculty Senate that was done in 2005 will be reconsidered by CSW in the spring.

3) Navigating Difference II Brown Bag report & suggestion/request for Conversation Cafes once or twice per month – perhaps instead of Brown Bags? Let's discuss: Kayt reported that the Brown Bag was well attended and generated an interesting discussion. Kayt suggested that having a meeting time that is constant will be better for planning. Mary suggested Fridays are good and that having it set for the same time once/twice a month for the next semester would be a great test. The idea of changing the name from Brown Bag to Conversation Cafe was received warmly - "it's a catchier name." Other institutions have had various 'cafes' named eg. Conversation Cafe, Global Cafe, World Cafe etc.

4) Next Semester Meetings - Fridays 10:30-11:30 with first meeting Feb 1, then Feb 22, March 22; Promotion and Tenure workshop April 26 10:00-12:00, Jane will reserve the room in Butrovitch. We need to think of panelists.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:00; Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/>

ATTACHMENT 188/12

UAF Faculty Senate 188, February 4, 2013

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee (SADA)

Meeting Minutes for November 15, 2012

Attending: Sandra Wildfeuer, Sarah Stanley, Joe Mason, Cindy Hardy, David Maxwell, Dana Greci

We had a number of members absent, so we limited our meeting to discussion-only items.

Learning Commons update: Dana Greci reported that the Learning Commons has made progress with several spaces now available in the library: four study rooms, a larger workshop space on the third floor, and a meeting space on the second floor. These are available on a sign-up basis. The library has asked us to let people know; we would like to see tutors, advisors, and financial aid people using the space for outreach to students.

We suggested that the library throw a party to announce the availability of the space. Dana will relay this suggestion. She also noted that the final piece of putting together a Learning Commons is to create a coordinator position, whose role would be to act as a clearing house of information related to the Learning Commons.

GERC: Sandra and Sarah updated us on this committee. The GERC poll results are in—Sarah read them to us. There were 250 respondents. A majority of respondents wanted to keep the number of Gen Ed requirements the same or at the minimum while 30% wanted to reduce the requirements. There is strong support for a more flexible core, for a capstone course, and for determination of learning outcomes to be with departments. The next step for the committee is to look at the comments to see what mandates and what surprises arise from the responses. The committee will send representatives to a statewide meeting on Gen Ed in Anchorage, January 10 and 11.

Attendance Policy (CAC motion): We read this and discussed the motion. We wondered how this will be communicated to students.

Statewide alignment of courses: This was a follow up to the earlier discussion of the October 19 statewide meeting on alignment of DEVE/ENGL placement and courses. David reported that he had checked with his colleagues in Math and couldn't find evidence that a similar discussion of coordination had happened in math. He noted that the UAF cutoff scores for Math classes are higher than those at UAA. He also noted that the Math Department is not happy with Accuplacer.

We discussed the advantages and difficulties of developing a UAF-specific placement test in math or English. We noted that UW has its own placement test aligned with their statewide HS curriculum, and that colleagues from that institution report that it was a huge effort and took some time to develop. Sarah noted that English and DEVE faculty have been discussing designing a writing placement test, based on a common writing prompt and human scoring. David noted that multiple choice tests work better for math, and that the issue with Accuplacer for Math faculty is that it can't distinguish Calculus 1 and 2 placement. He also noted that Math is looking at the lower-level classes to see if they are doing what the Math department wants to prepare students for higher-level math. He noted that UAF's Accuplacer contract is up in 2014. We considered drafting a motion that UAF not renew Accuplacer contract in 2014. We will revisit this at the next meeting.

Follow up on discussion with the Provost: Sandra noted that she recently attended a conference where there had been lots of discussion of reforming the current model of teaching developmental ed. She notes that the model at UAF, particularly in DEVM, is outdated. She noted that she is piloting classes which stress different pathways including math literacy and critical thinking. She is interested in the co-requisite model such as Intermediate Algebra and Precalculus taught together. She recommended bringing Uri Triesman, who is advocating math reform and pathways, to UAF to speak about his model.

We noted several attempts to pilot models to get students to “credit-bearing” classes faster. We also noted that there has been discussion of moving students from AAS degrees to the Bachelors and bridging classes such as ECE math to DEVM 105. David noted the Math Department’s bridging programs to bring students to precalculus and calculus level and the DEVM Fast Track classes to bring students through DEVM classes through a short intensive refresher.

Sarah and Dana G noted that DEVE and English are combining an English 111X class with a DEVE 068 class for students with high DEVE 070 placement. Alex Fitts in General Studies is paying student tuition for the additional 068 credit during the trial period of this model. We also noted that there are no computer lab classrooms in which writing and computer literacy can be taught in the main classroom areas on campus. Sandra noted that IAC is now offering integrated tutoring for their DEVE and DEVM classes and that this is having an impact.

We ended with more discussion on the Learning Commons model.

Next meeting: December 13, 3-4:30pm.

ATTACHMENT 188/13

UAF Faculty Senate 188, February 4, 2013

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes of November 28, 2012**

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 1:03 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Castellini, Diane Erickson, Cindy Fabbri, David Fazzino, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Eric Madsen, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Amy Vinlove

Excused: Stephen Brown, Izetta Chambers,

III. Report from Joy

Joy informed us that the faculty development focus for CEM went very well for the month of November and noted that the Dean provided food for yesterday's presentation by Maggie Griscavage, Director of the Office for Grants and Contracts Administration. The presentation was well-attended, but Joy noted that the majority of faculty members attending (indeed for the whole month) were not from CEM. Joy said that Maggie Griscavage will present again in April for CLA. The next faculty development focus month will be in February 2013 for SFOS.

Joy reminded us that the OFD website features a link to the Instructional Design site for UAF eLearning and Distance Education where all UAF faculty members can visit and request 3 hours of free help with instructional design. There are also several kinds of awards given for innovative teaching ideas. Also the next I-Teach training week is the first week of May. Attending faculty members are eligible for a stipend and travel funds for out-of-towners.

Joy also passed out copies of fliers for the OFD New Faculty Mentoring Program for us to take and make available in our respective departments.

Joy reminded us that the ASTE Conference is February 24 – 27 and travel funding grants for UNAC faculty are due to the OFD soon.

IV. Progress on analysis of electronic student evaluation options for UAF

Eric has scheduled a weekly demo for different vendors starting in January (varying times, but all in RASM 502). While the first demo set for 11-21-12 was cancelled at the last minute by the vendor, we still have one scheduled for this Wednesday, 12-5-12, at 1:00 pm in Brooks 108. Eric reminded us to invite our colleagues who may be interested in learning more about electronic student evaluation.

Franz found an interesting report from San Francisco State University that he emailed to our committee a while ago. He said he will re-send it because it has up-to-date information and criteria on choosing an electronic evaluation system.

Mike queried what our committee's responsibility is on reporting our findings: do we report to the Provost or to Faculty Senate? It was determined that we will report to Faculty Senate and they will report to Provost Henrichs.

V. Discussion on a potential inclusion of PostDocs into FDAI activities

Mike related that John Eichelberger wants to separate out the PostDocs into a group so specific, targeted information can be gotten from them. Joy says she has found 48 PostDocs and that so far they have responded positively to the idea, noting again the high response rate to the survey that was sent to them. She has forwarded the results of the survey to John and will talk further with him to determine if there is anything else that FDAI can do. Mike stated that our committee can report back to Faculty Senate what has been done so far.

VI. Discussion on access for new faculty to recently awarded grant proposals

Andrea has met with several successful NSF funding grantees and found it very helpful. He got information on how to re-package proposals for further consideration. He also got a couple of names for investigators on campus. Joy specified that Anna Kertulla from the Office of Polar Programs will present on NSF in April to encourage social science programs to submit proposals.

Andrea says he is continuing to look into this and is finding his way around the issue. For instance, he has found a way to get templates online for NSF proposals that have been successful. Joy added that Andrew Gray, Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs, along with his staff, are there to answer faculty questions and to work one-on-one with them.

VII. Discussion of a research speed dating session in March

Joy reported that Faye Gallant of the Office of Sponsored Programs gave her the idea for using the speed dating model to help faculty members learn about what research is being conducted across the state and help them connect with others that may be helpful for their own research. Joy passed around a sheet explaining the process in more detail. Faculty members will get the chance to explain their research to another faculty member who will in turn explain their own research as well – all within one or two minutes. Then partners will switch, connecting with more and more researchers during the 60-minute session. OIT will help set up computers so that people can talk face-to-face with researchers who are unable to appear in person. March was selected for setting up one of these sessions because there are no colleges receiving a faculty development focus that month.

VIII. Other business

It is with heavy heart that we must bid farewell to committee member Diane Erickson as she will be leaving UAF after the current semester to take up her new positions of Director of Academic Affairs and Assistant Campus Director at Mat-Su College. We greatly appreciate her time and expertise on our committee and all the work she has done, and we wish her the best as she moves closer to home.

Our meeting times for spring 2013 will be determined via a Doodle poll that Franz will send out.

IX. Upcoming events:

- a. Faculty Senate meeting: Monday, 12-3-12 (Franz will be out of town and unable to attend).

X. Adjourned at 1:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 29, 2013**

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 11:14 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Stephen Brown, Mike Castellini, Cindy Fabbri, David Fazzino, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Eric Madsen, Franz Meyer, Amy Vinlove
Excused: Izetta Chambers, Trina Mamoon, Joy Morrison

III. Report from Joy

We will hear Joy's updates at our next meeting in February as she is just travelling back to Fairbanks.

IV. Progress on analysis of electronic student evaluation options for UAF

Franz, Andrea, Kelly, and Eric have attended our first two demos along with a few others from OIT and faculty teaching distance courses. The information presented from the two vendors so far has been pretty similar, and so we discussed discerning true superiority of product versus superiority of the presenter. We discussed the suggested rating chart that Eric had emailed out to committee members last semester. While it is not intended to be a formal rating rubric, it does assist us in focusing on gleaning as much consistent information as possible from the various vendors.

A few suggestions that we discussed were perhaps choosing 3 – 4 vendors after the last demo in late March to look into next year in more comparative detail, and hosting a forum for the demo participants to summarize the overall impression of electronic student evaluations. It was suggested that at some point we need to have a more comprehensive forum to include students in the discussion. Franz boiled it down to two questions: 1) Should the university switch to electronic evaluations; and 2) if so, which one? The major concern is still the same as the last time the FDAI committee examined this issue: low response rates. Internet connectivity for classes taught out in the field is another issue (e.g. students cannot access the internet until returning home after the class is over so they may not actually do the course evaluation.) Some courses may still need to utilize paper-and-pencil evaluations even if the university switches to electronic. This is one of the questions we will be looking at as we view the product demos. While small grade incentives could be offered to students to encourage participation in electronic evaluations, many faculty members are not comfortable with this. The vendors we have seen demos from so far use a system of multiple emails for students that have not yet responded to the electronic evaluations. Both vendors also note that it needs to be made as visible as possible to students.

It was suggested that a few courses do a trial run to help in the decision, but Franz noted that consistency is a difficulty when running a trial. Mike suggested that the Psychology Department and the SOE design a study that would generate some data for us. Franz reminded us that we are also free to contact previous vendors with any questions that we might forget to ask. The last demo is in late March so our committee will have time to create a report for Faculty Senate. Franz will prepare a short update to be read to the Faculty Senate by Eric (as Franz has to leave early) so they are aware of the upcoming demos and what FDAI is working on.

V. Other Business

Mike reminded us that February is SFOS Faculty Development month. He will give a report on how it goes at our next meeting, noting that he is really encouraging his faculty, directors and department chairs to take advantage of the development opportunities.

VI. Upcoming events:

Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, February 4, 2013. This is a joint meeting of all the UA Faculty Senates, followed by the Chancellor's reception.

VII. Next FDAI Meeting: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 from 11:00 am to 12:00 pm.

VIII. Adjourned at 11:56 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 188/14

UAF Faculty Senate 188, February 4, 2013

Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for November 12, 2012**

Attending: Donie Bret-Harte, John Yarie, Cheng-fu Chen, Laura Bender, John Eichelberger, Vince Cee (by phone), Mike Daku, Elizabeth Nadin (by phone), Franz Mueter (by phone), Lara Horstmann (by phone), Chung-sang Ng, Tim Bartholemaus, and invited guests James Bicigo and Karen Gustafson from the Music Department.

I. Minutes from the last GAAC meeting were approved.

II. Discussion with Karen Gustafson and James Bicigo. James and Karen wished to express their concerns to us about the upcoming proposal to institute a Master's of Music in Performance degree, and drop the existing Master's of Arts in Music degree program. There was much productive discussion. James and Karen thanked us for our time and attention. Lara Horstmann suggested that we also invite the Chair of the Music Department to speak to us about his perspective on this proposal. Vince will provide contact information. We will hear from the Chair at a future meeting.

III. GAAC reviewed and passed 1) a resolution reaffirming the requirement that both Master's theses and Master's projects should be archived by the Rasmuson Library and 2) a motion to change the UAF Catalog wording to state that students must maintain enrollment during the semester that they graduate.

IV. GAAC reviewed and passed the following courses:

2-Trial NRM F694 - Terrestrial Carbon Management

11-GNC New course: MSL F632 - Oceanographic Data Analysis and Visualization

25-GNC New course CHEM F671 - Receptor Pharmacology

In addition, we learned that the Anthropology Department would still like to proceed with 41-GNC New course ANTH F659 - Language and Prehistory being taught by a different instructor. They will make the requested changes (but these have not been received yet).

We discussed the ED program and course changes. It is a bit confusing, because the program change depends on the course changes, and these were being reviewed by different groups of people. We will reassign, so that the people who review the program changes also review the relevant courses. Tim and Vince agreed to do the M.Ed in Elementary Education. Elisabeth and Mike agreed to deal with the M.Ed. – concentration areas of language and literacy, cross-cultural education, and secondary education. Donie will revise the table of Assignments. We will also invite someone from the Education Department to explain the course changes and program modifications.

V. We ran out of time before completing all of the new assignments. Donie will send the table of assignments around again, with some of the gaps filled in.