

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Jayne Harvie

474-7964 jbharvie@alaska.edu

For Audio conferencing:

Toll-free #: 1-800-893-8850

Participant PIN: 1109306

A G E N D A

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #185

Monday, October 8, 2012

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

- | | | | |
|------|-----|---|---------|
| 1:00 | I | Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds | 4 Min. |
| | A. | Roll Call | |
| | B. | Approval of Minutes to Meeting #184 | |
| | C. | Adoption of Agenda | |
| 1:04 | II | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions | 1 Min. |
| | A. | Motions Approved: | |
| | | 1. Motion to Delete the MAT in Biology Program | |
| | B. | Motions Pending: None | |
| 1:05 | III | A. President's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds | 10 Min. |
| | | B. President-Elect's Remarks – David Valentine | |
| 1:15 | IV | A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers | 15 Min. |
| | | B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs | |
| 1:30 | V | Old Business | 15 Min. |
| | A. | Motion to amend the Bylaws requirement that all represented units have at least 2 Senators, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/1) | |
| | B. | Motion to amend the Bylaws to increase the target number of elected seats in the Faculty Senate, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/2) | |
| | C. | Motion to amend the Bylaws with regard to non-voting members of the Faculty Senate, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/3) | |
| | D. | Motion to conduct reapportionment of representation among the qualifying units at UAF, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/4) | |
| 1:45 | VI | New Business | 5 Min. |
| | A. | Motion to amend the Student Probation policy, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 185/5) | |
| 1:50 | | PHOTO SHOOT WITH TODD PARIS; SHORT BREAK | |

2:00	VII	Discussion Items	15 Min.
		A. Commencement Schedule – Jennifer Reynolds	
		B. Update on General Education Revitalization – David Valentine	
		C. Posting course syllabi online in a central repository	
2:15	VIII	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:20	IX	Guest Speaker: Dana Thomas, VPAA Topic: Strategic Direction Initiatives (SDI)	20 Min.
2:40	X	Governance Reports	10 Min.
		A. Staff Council – Claudia Koch	
		B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag	
		C. UNAC – Debu Misra	
		UAFT – Jane Weber	
2:50	XI	Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements	10 Min.
		A. General Comments/Announcements	
		B. Committee Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)	
		Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 185/6)	
		Faculty Affairs – Cecile Lardon, Chair (Attachment 185/7)	
		Unit Criteria – Karen Jensen, Chair (Attachment 185/8)	
		Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair	
		Core Review Committee – Latrice Bowman, Chair	
		Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair	
		Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair (Attachment 185/9)	
		Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair (Attachment 185/10)	
		Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair (Attachment 185/11)	
		Research Advisory Committee – Jon Dehn, Chair (Attachment 185/12)	
3:00	XII	Adjournment	

ATTACHMENT 185/1
UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection B (page 14). This amendment removes a requirement that all represented units have at least 2 Senators.

EFFECTIVE: November 2012

RATIONALE: Apportionment of representatives on the Faculty Senate is calculated based on the number of qualifying faculty in the unit. Units with as few as 9 faculty now qualify for representation, and for the smallest units the “minimum 2 senators” rule (plus 1 alternate) requires participation by up to one third of their faculty at all times. This is likely to result in unwilling and/or unrepresentative Senators, serving neither the interests of the unit nor of the Faculty Senate.

This amendment to the bylaws would drop the “minimum 2 senators” rule, so that the smallest units would be represented by 1 senator rather than 2. It would not change whether or not a unit qualified for representation on the Faculty Senate.

This change would go into effect with the upcoming reapportionment in November 2012 and would affect elections in Spring 2013.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

B. Representation shall be by academic or research unit and based on the number of qualifying faculty in each unit as described below.

[[7. Each unit will have at least 2 representatives.]]

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsections A and B (pages 13-14). This amendment increases the target number of elected seats in the Faculty Senate.

EFFECTIVE: November 2012

RATIONALE: The Bylaws specify a target number of 35 elected senators, to be apportioned among the units according to the number of qualifying faculty in each unit. In practice, because of the "minimum 2 senators" rule that is addressed by a separate motion the UAF Faculty Senate has had 37 senators for approximately a decade until reapportionment in Fall 2010. This reapportionment added two small units and increased the size of the Faculty Senate to 39 elected members. That is the current size.

The Faculty Senate functions well with 39 elected senators, and it is easier to fully staff the Standing and Permanent Committees with this larger number of senators. If the Faculty Senate removes the rule that all units have a minimum of 2 senators without making other changes to the Bylaws, the number of senators will drop to the Bylaws' target level of 35 senators. This amendment would enable the Faculty Senate to remain at its present size if the "minimum 2 senators" rule is removed. All seats would be distributed proportionately, according to the number of faculty in each unit.

This change would go into effect with the next reapportionment and would affect the first elections thereafter.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

- A. The membership of the Faculty Senate, hereinafter referred to as "Senate," shall consist of approximately **45** **[[41]]** members plus one non-voting presiding officer. Approximately **39** **[[35]]** members shall be elected by and from the faculty and will have voting privileges.

...

- B. Representation shall be by academic or research unit and based on the number of qualifying faculty in each unit as described below.

...

4. Each unit will elect the number of representatives to the Senate equal to the number of qualifying faculty in that unit divided by the total number of qualifying faculty at UAF, multiplied by **39** **[[35]]** and rounded to the nearest integer.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection A (page 13). This amendment modifies the bylaws regarding non-voting members of the Faculty Senate to conform with recent and current practice.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately.

RATIONALE: The Bylaws provide for nine non-voting members of the UAF Faculty Senate. These bylaws have not been followed in recent years. The following amendments to the bylaws change the number of non-voting members to seven and adopt recent practices as official Faculty Senate policy.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

- A. The membership of the Faculty Senate, hereinafter referred to as "Senate," ... **FOUR** **[[Six]]** non-voting members will be selected by and from other university constituencies as follows: one **[[non-graduate student and one graduate]]** student selected by the ASUAF; one **DEAN OR DIRECTOR SELECTED BY THE PROVOST** **[[professional school dean and one college dean selected by the Deans' Council]]**; one staff representative from the registrar's office; and one additional staff member selected by the Staff Council. **[[If the staff representative from the registrar's office is APT, the second staff member must come from the classified staff ranks. If the staff representative from the registrar's office is classified, the second staff member must be APT.]]** Three additional non-voting members will be selected by and from the **FACULTY** unions as follows: one elected official each from United Academics-AAUP/AFT, UAFT, **AND** Adjuncts (United Academics)-AAUP/AFT.

ATTACHMENT 185/4
UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to conduct reapportionment of representation among the qualifying units at UAF.

EFFECTIVE: November 2012.

RATIONALE: According to Faculty Senate Bylaws, "Re-apportionment will be done in the year of accreditation review of UAF, expected to be every seven years, or upon two-thirds vote of the Senate." The Libraries faculty have requested that the Faculty Senate conduct reapportionment under the second option, requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Until recently Library faculty were academically housed in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and the Libraries faculty were represented on the Faculty Senate as part of CLA. In the past year the Libraries have become an independent unit and their dean now reports directly to the Provost. They also wish to have separate representation on Faculty Senate.

Reapportionment will be conducted by the Faculty Affairs Committee with October 2012 data provided by the Provost's Office, and the results will take effect with the Faculty Senate elections in Spring 2013.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the academic policy regarding undergraduate probation.

Effective: Fall 2013

Rationale: Adding the summer session to the undergraduate probation policy will help clarify this policy. No change is intended to the disqualification policy which would remain as it is (referring to fall/spring and spring/fall semesters).

NOTE: The current printed version of the Catalog contains an error to the first sentence of this policy. However, the online version of the Catalog contains correct wording, which is used below.

Current *UAF Catalog* language from the online version, page 50:

PROBATION

Undergraduate students -- Students whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after each fall and spring semester will be put on academic probation. Students on probation may not enroll in more than 13 credits a semester, unless an exception is granted by the appropriate dean. Probation may include additional conditions, as determined by the dean of the college or school in which the student's major is located. Students on probation will be referred for developmental advising/education and/or to an advising or support counseling center. The student will work with an academic advisor to prepare an academic plan for achieving a higher GPA; the advisor is responsible for forwarding this plan to the appropriate dean. A student on probation will not be allowed to register unless the academic plan is on file. Removal from probation requires the student's cumulative and semester GPAs to be at least 2.0.

CAPS = Additions

[[]] = Deletions

Proposed *UAF Catalog* policy language:

Undergraduate students -- Students whose semester and (or) cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after **ANY SEMESTER INCLUDING THE SUMMER SESSION** will be put on academic probation.

...

Curricular Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes for 10 Sept. 2012 (with attachments)

Voting Members present: Ken Abramowicz; Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy; David Henry; Rainer Newberry (convener); Todd Radenbaugh (audio).

Voting Members absent: Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Diane McEachern.

Non-voting members present: Donald Crocker; Libby Eddy; Doug Goering; Linda Hapsmith; Lillian Misel; Andrea Schmidt from Advising.

Non-voting members absent: Carol Gering; Ginnie Kinne. Jayne Harvie present to take notes.

1. Elect a chairperson

Rainer Newberry noted that earlier in the year he had emailed the membership, asking if anyone would be willing to chair so he could take on the chairship of the General Ed Revitalization subcommittee of CAC. No one has stepped forward. He offered another opportunity, but no takers. Rainer was unanimously approved to chair the committee, much to everyone's relief.

2. Approve Rainer Newberry as CAC representative to (and chair of) Curriculum Review Committee

Rainer explained that Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) is another subcommittee of CAC, and its function with the college/school curriculum councils. The committee unanimously approved Rainer to continue as the CAC representative (and chair of) Curriculum Review Committee. He was sincerely thanked by the committee members for being willing to continue in that role, as well.

Future meeting times and locations were discussed. Monday afternoons were suggested and tentatively agreed upon, depending upon faculty schedules.

3. Approval of GERC 'action plan'

Rainer provided some background about the formation of GERC as a CAC subcommittee, and its continuing work. He described the General Education Revitalization Committee's (GERC) action plan (attached to the agenda) noting the need for its approval by the committee as an overall approach to changing general education (emphasizing that the details of the plan would remain fluid in that they are still being discussed at GERC). He also noted that GERC needs a chairperson as well as representation from CAC.

The approach that GERC wishes to take by means of this plan is to get faculty involved early on in this change process. They do not wish to merely devise a new core and then just foist it on the rest of the faculty.

One of the key parts of this action plan is that faculty will be formally surveyed to see if they wish to move from a Core of 39 credits to one of 34 credits. GERC also wishes to provide faculty with opportunities to contribute to general education changes by means of campus-wide discussions, along with discussions at the department level.

Rainer noted that GERC needs a CAC member to attend its meetings and report back to CAC. This would also serve to provide Faculty Senate representation on the committee. Cindy H. requested to have a member of the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee on the GERC. Rainer concurred that this was a good suggestion and would be acted upon.

Rainer reported that the action plan had been examined and approved by Faculty Senate leadership, Dean's Council, and the Chancellor. The Chancellor will mention the project in his convocation tomorrow.

With regard to the position of Dean of University Studies mentioned in the action plan, Cindy asked if this position would replace the existing dean of general studies. Rainer provided some history on general studies (which concerns students who have not yet declared majors) and noted that the new position of dean would preside over "university studies": the baccalaureate core and all related requirements for graduation (i.e., "W" and "O" courses). The long-term position would not be a vice provost. Alex Fitts, now interim vice provost (and former GERC chair), has general studies along with university studies as part of her assignment, but without the accreditation piece.

Ken A. expressed concerns over just rubberstamping the action plan. He noted several items of concern on the action plan, particularly II.e. which is both time-consuming and involves talking to new students who are unfamiliar with the core. He noted that speaking with juniors and seniors would make more sense because they understand what the core means. Rainer agreed that this item could be taken out and that there were many details of the action plan that could be further discussed. But he stressed the overall need to approve the overall concept of the plan so the committee could move forward and approach all the faculty. The details would be refined further down the road. CAC members agreed that the overall concept of the plan could be endorsed, but not necessarily every detail of it at this time.

The committee next discussed item 5 on the agenda.

4. Proposal for revision in probation policy

Current wording: Students whose semester and cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after each fall and spring semester will be put on academic probation.

New suggested wording:

Students whose cumulative and (or) semester GPA falls below 2.0 after any semester including the summer session will be put on academic probation.

Note that, the disqualification entry would remain as it is now, and would refer to fall/spring and spring/fall semesters (two terms in a row).

Doug G. mentioned that Dean's Council had looked at the revised wording and thought it was appropriate.

Ken A. asked how the Mesters and summer session are figured in. Donald C. clarified that Wintermester is rolled into spring semester, and that Maymester and Summer Sessions are rolled into

one. Donald asked if a student could be put on probation after Summer Sessions, could they be pulled off as well? Libby responded that probation could occur following Summer Sessions, but not disqualification. There isn't enough turnaround time between summer and fall.

It was clarified that the changed wording of the policy means that probation can occur because of one term with a semester GPA below 2.0, or an overall (cumulative) GPA below 2.0. But disqualification would only be determined on fall/spring or spring/fall semesters. Donald asked about a scenario where the GPA is below 2.0 in spring, OK in summer, and then below 2.0 in fall. The result would be probation (not disqualification). Disqualification occurs on the basis of two semester below 2.0 and an overall GPA below 2.0. A student might be on probation for two semesters, but with a GPA above 2.0 they would not be disqualified.

A discussion occurred about this change being a correction to the existing Catalog because of a "cut and paste" error made last year that shows in the printed Catalog. The online addendum is correct and in line with current practice.

Donald asked about how financial aid is affected for summer. Libby will check on that.

The need for academic advising in the summer session was noted. Dean Goering noted seeing some bad examples resulting from students not being advised about the summer courses. Everyone seemed to agree the ramifications of this change needs to be addressed by further discussion, and that the Summer Sessions Office should be included (as far as it affects degree-seeking students).

Rainer proposed carrying on this discussion to the next meeting and that financial aid and other ramifications (e.g., being put on probation at the end of the summer; advising and registration issues) be looked into further between now and the next meeting. Libby will look into the financial aid issues.

5. Calendar revision for AY 2013-2014

Proposed change: grades required by TUESDAY NOON Dec 24 instead of the Usual Weds noon (Dec 25). This would give the AR folks a bit of a holiday...

Rainer described the need to amend the 2013-14 academic calendar because the due date for grades would fall on a holiday or the day after a holiday if left unchanged. The problem affects both faculty and staff. He suggested the committee approve a change to that semester so that the due date would be December 24. The committee agreed that the due date should not be delayed because it adversely affects students, as well as faculty and staff.

Libby E. brought up the problem of Wintermester dates during AY14. There is not enough time to hold Wintermester between Jan. 2 and the first day of spring semester classes. The problem was acknowledged by Rainer, but more time is needed to resolve it. A subcommittee will be specifically examining it. Mid-October would be optimistic for having this problem resolved. Libby will let Marketing know they need to wait on this one before they can publish the calendar.

Ken A. noted problems with Maymester in the past and with when spring semester starts (before or after Alaska Civil Rights Day). This problem is different in that it affects the period of hard closure. Cindy H. asked about holding class on Saturdays and Rainer responded that is one potential solution.

6. Proposed modification of excused absence policy (Catalog pg. 49)

Current. You are expected to attend classes regularly; unexcused absences may result in a failing grade. You must have prior written approval to miss the first class meeting or your instructor may drop you. You are responsible for conferring with your instructor concerning absences and the possibility of making up missed work.

New suggested wording: Students are expected to adhere to the attendance policies set by their instructors. Students must have prior written approval to miss the first class meeting; otherwise, they may be dropped. Students are responsible for conferring with their instructors in advance concerning absences and the possibility of arranging alternate ways of learning the missed course material.

Further discussion on this item was postponed until the next meeting.

7. Proposed modification of absence notification (Catalog, pg. 49)

Current: You must notify your instructor(s) of all scheduled UAF-required absences for the semester (e.g., travel to athletic events) during the first week of classes.

Suggested modification: You must notify your instructor(s) of all scheduled UAF-required absences for the semester (e.g., travel to athletic events) by the end of the second week of classes (the deadline for late registration).

Note: the above is apparently what happens now, in violation of the catalog. But should it be further changed????? (Reference the copy of Sine Anahita's memo which was attached to the agenda).

Ken A. asked the committee to strongly consider not changing the notification by the student to the instructor to the second week of classes, but instead it should remain notification to the instructor on the first day of class. The second week can bring students too close the drop date and create more problems for both students and instructors. Rainer stressed the need for the committee members to look this over for the next meeting.

Karen G. noted that the first day of class for individual courses can vary.

Rainer requested the committee members have at least one sleepless night considering the issues at hand and come prepared for more discussion. He also suggested that online discussion could occur on these issues. He will try to get Athletics involved in the discussion with the committee.

8. OLD business that will be rearing its ugly Head.....Wintermester and etc.

(This item was rolled into the academic calendar discussion earlier in the meeting.)

Meeting was adjourned shortly after 10:00 AM.

ATTACHMENT 185/7

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee

September 21, 2012 Recap of Meeting

1. Cecile Lardon was elected as committee chair
2. The committee will meet on Mondays from 1 - 2, dates to be decided. The next meeting will be on October 15th. We will meet on lower campus this semester. (Jayne, could you see if the Kayak room is available for the 15th? And reserve the call-in code for that time? Thanks!!)
3. Revision of Blue Book: The committee will hold a joint meeting with the unit criteria committee and the provost to clarify what needs to be done to revise the Blue Book. This meeting will be on October 10th after 3:00 pm. Jayne Harvey will let us know what time the Provost is available. Cecile will make the necessary documents available to the committee.
4. The committee will resume work on the non-regular instructor project but will seek clarification from the Admin committee as to the specific goals for this project at this time. Cecile will send out info to committee members.

ATTACHMENT 185/8

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Faculty Senate – Unit Criteria Meeting Meeting Minutes for September 18, 2012

Members Present: Karen Jensen, chair; Christine Cook, Vladimir Alexeev, Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Javier Fochesatto, Jun Watabe, Cathy Winfree (audio)

Will work on Cooperative Extension Service (CES) unit criteria today, but also the Blue Book information throughout the semester

CES Revisions for discussion:

Page 4: B. Criteria for Instruction - 1 (Effectiveness in Teaching)

b. express positive regard for students, BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THEIR PUBLIC, develop good rapport with students AND CLIENTELE, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject; - **what does PUBLIC mean? Is it student public or community public?**

Page 4: 2 (Components of Evaluation)

a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms OR LETTERS, - **what is meant by LETTERS; are they recommendations letters, testimonials or letters of support from students, other professionals, etc.; need to clarify**

Page 5: 2 (Components of Evaluation)

F. REPEATED INVITATIONS TO TEACH – **explanation is needed; further clarification as to why this is showing effectiveness**

Page 5: C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FACULTY HAVE LIMITED OPPORTUNITIES TO CONDUCT TRADITIONAL RESEARCH AND VERY LIMITED ACCESS TO LABORATORIES AND GRADUATE STUDENTS. ADDITIONALLY, BIPARTITE FACULTY MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE A RESEARCH OBLIGATION. – **this paragraph is a general statement versus a criteria; it should be added to the end of the first paragraph in this section**

Page 6: 1 (Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity)

d. They must be judged to make a contribution AND BE RELEVANT TO CURRENT ALASKAN ISSUES. – **why only current issues; recommend deleting current**

2. Components of Research, Scholarly

Page 6: 2 (Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity)

f. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations AND CES PUBLICATIONS. – **why are the CES publications singled out? Are they also peer reviewed and/or refereed? Possible say AND IN-HOUSE CES PUBLICATIONS**

Page 7: D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is a fundamental part of the university's obligation to the people of its state. In this tradition, faculty providing their

professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge,* is identified as "public service." The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assumes a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service." – clarify with the chancellor regarding the term "free of charge" as this implies there will be no charges to the participant

* CES FACULTY WORK IS COUNTED AS PUBLIC SERVICE EVEN THOUGH THE UNIVERSITY MAY CHARGE A FEE FOR SOME ACTIVITIES. THESE FEES ARE NECESSARY TO RECOVER COSTS SUCH AS THOSE FOR ROOM RENT, PRINTED MATERIALS PROVIDED TO PARTICIPANTS, EQUIPMENT, AND OTHERS AND ARE NOT PAYMENT FOR FACULTY TIME NOR ARE THE FEES EVER RETAINED BY INDIVIDUAL FACULTY. – differentiates between faculty being paid on top of their original salary versus charges to the participant; do not feel this paragraph is necessary unless there is a specific reason for inclusion; clarification needed

Page 8: 1 (Public Service)

b. Service on or to government or public committees, COLLABORATIONS & PARTNERSHIPS ESTABLISHED WITH AGENCIES AND GROUPS AND UTILIZATION OF DISTRICT OR REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARDS, TASK FORCES, FOCUS GROUPS OR PUBLIC SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS TO IDENTIFY RELEVANT ISSUES AND PROBLEMS. – very wordy; might be beneficial to combine section b with l as there does not seem to be the necessity for both (L. ENGAGE THE PUBLIC IN ASSESSING RESEARCH NEEDS – AND COMMUNICATE THOSE NEEDS TO THE APPROPRIATE RESEARCH UNITS.)

Page 8: 1 (Public Service)

f. Consulting INCLUDING FACE TO FACE IN THE OFFICE OR OFF-SITE USING THE TELEPHONE, OR E-MAIL, (I.E. PRESSURE-GAUGE TESTING, INTERPRETATION OF SOIL TEST RESULTS, OR IDENTIFICATION OF INSECT, DISEASE OR WEED SPECIMENS). – the examples in the parenthesis are not necessary as they could be limiting; recommend taking the entire parenthesis out; also, is the clarification of face-to-face, in the office, or off-site using telephone, or e-mail necessary? Explain why this is specified; Just saying Consulting may be sufficient, or Consulting as Appropriate to the Unit; it would be beneficial to include a definition of consulting in the preamble to that section that is located on the bottom of page 7 with the introduction to Public Service

Page 9: 1 (Public Service)

M. MANAGING AN EFFECTIVE PARAPROFESSIONAL AND/OR VOLUNTEER PROGRAM TO HELP EXTEND CES RESOURCES OR DEVELOP LEADERSHIP SKILLS. – how do you know if they are effective? This appears to be more of an outcome measure versus criteria

N. EXEMPLARY RESPONSE IN EMERGENCY SITUATIONS RENDERED IN AN EXTENSION ROLE, TO CLIENTELE WHICH FACED THE EMERGENCY. – what is meant by exemplary? How would you measure whether it is exemplary? There need to be criteria in place to measure it

Karen will talk with CES to discuss some of these aspects and get clarification on some of the recommendations; she will ask Jayne who the chair of the CES Unit Criteria is to help get started.

Christine will type up the feedback to provide to Karen; Karen will talk with CES; if they have

changes prior to October 1st, then the Unit Criteria Committee can review and if approve then provide to the Faculty Senate for the October 8th meeting

Blue Book Review

Need to review the Blue Book to make sure it is in line with the Collective Bargaining Agreement; the Unit Criteria Committee is to meet with the Provost after 3pm on October 10 or sometime on October 11th to discuss what to address in the Blue Book; members reviewed their scheduled and decided on October 3rd. Karen was to determine a specific time and send the meeting information out to the committee.

Karen will also send the link to the Collective Bargaining Agreement so all committee members can be familiar with that document.

Committee Meeting Schedule

Members agreed that we will meet every two weeks and as demand warrants; a doodle poll will go out for the next meeting date and time, but then we will try to set a regular meeting schedule.

ATTACHMENT 185/9

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 26, 2012**

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

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Castellini, Izetta Chambers, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Amy Vinlove

Excused: Stephen Brown, Diane Erickson

Absent: David Fazzino

III. Changes to the FDAI team

We discussed adding Cindy Fabbri from the School of Education to the committee and decided that she would be a good addition. Franz will talk to her about becoming a member.

IV. Report from Joy

Joy reports that there have been many well-attended social events for new faculty members. She notes that there are several more planned and that our new faculty are getting out into the community.

Travel awards have been granted for the fall semester with a smaller amount given to more faculty members in UNAC. She notes that UAFT faculty members will need to work with their union to get faculty development funds raised to a top priority.

Joy is gearing up for October's presentations for CNSM and passed out a schedule of events. She also continues to work on the Lilly West conference and says that seven faculty members will be attending along with her. Because the conference occurs during spring break, travel arrangements are proving to be difficult and expensive.

Regarding postdocs, Joy has started collecting email addresses for adjunct faculty and TAs, noting that it is proving difficult to get a list of adjuncts from various departments.

She reports that last Friday's Blackboard pedagogy presentation at the eLearning and Distance Education Center was excellent and well-attended, and that there will be a presentation on eLive pedagogy this Friday.

Franz brought up his concern that the CNSM faculty had not yet heard about the schedule of faculty development presentations tailored for their college and feels that postdocs should be included. He will forward an email invitation from Joy to people at GI who may not be on the notification list from the Dean. This led to a discussion on how SOE faculty found out about the presentations tailor-made for them this month. Amy noted that she did not receive any emails early on but that faculty members did

attend many sessions. Joy noted that SOE faculty did not attend the session last Friday on Blackboard pedagogy despite requesting the session. After some discussion it was discovered that several issues came into play: 1) there was some confusion regarding communication of scheduling; 2) SOE faculty wanted a higher-level presentation than the basic level; and 3) the 3-hour block of time is too long for most teaching faculty. Joy noted that she is willing to present on Saturdays, but there is concern that faculty may not show up. Franz noted that there should be some encouragement in the form of a reminder to faculty that these development sessions are a part of their tenure process. Izetta mentioned that rural campus faculty members find it difficult to join in the faculty development opportunities. Joy pointed out that audio conferences are easy to set up if faculty from the rural campuses request it, while video conferencing – which is sometimes necessary for visual-intense presentations – is more difficult due to the limited number of available video conferencing rooms.

V. Discussion of including postdocs in the FDAI activities

Mike noted that he will be meeting with John Eichelberger next week and will talk with him about unifying postdocs. He will report back to our committee after their discussion. Mike mentioned that he recently attended two national-level postdoc meetings and can share the latest information. Andrea explained the postdoc situation at his previous institution, the Medical College of Wisconsin, and shared their Office of Postdoctoral Education website showing us the impressive various support features in place. Our committee decided to include postdocs in our activities in order to help them become organized since they are at a pivotal crossroad in their careers. Joy feels that postdocs should be invited to attend the informal teaching training that Laura Connor will be offering for CNSM faculty.

VI. Other business

CNSM will be hosting a New Faculty Lunch with Dean Paul Layer on October 25 from 12:45 – 2:15 p.m. in the Runcorn Room (Reichardt Building)

VII. Upcoming events

Administrative Committee meeting: Friday, September 29. Franz says he will remind faculty to attend development opportunities and try out the tailoring effort.

Faculty Senate meeting: Monday, October 8.

VIII. Our next meeting will be Wednesday, October 31 (costume optional) from 1:00 – 2:00 p.m. in Bunnell 222.

VII. Adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 185/10

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes 8/30/12**

Present: Donie Bret-Harte*, John Yarie*, Mike Daku*, Franz Mueter* (on the phone), Vince Cee*, Lillian Misel, Laura Bender, Cheng-Fu Chen*, Tim Bartholomaus, Lara Horstmann* (on the phone), Libby Eddy, Larry Duffy, Jayne Harvie, special guest Cathy Hanks

* Voting members

4 agenda items:

- 1) choose Chair of GAAC for fall
- 2) Department of Petroleum Engineering Master's theses (Cathy Hanks)
- 3) Biology Department termination of MAT program (in email from Jayne)
- 4) Biology Department trial course

1) GAAC votes to confirm Donie Bret-Harte as Chair of GAAC

2) Cathy Hanks presented about the M.S. program in Petroleum Engineering. In this program, a student can get an M.S. with either a thesis or a project. The requirements for thesis and project, and the level of oversight, are different. She reported a desire for greater vetting of projects, and a concern that confusion arises because the same degree can have different requirements (project vs. thesis), with no way to distinguish them other than the number of credits on the transcript. This does not serve the students well. She asks that Faculty Senate consider a resolution to distinguish M.S. degrees if they can have either a project or thesis.

--GAAC is generally in favor of a motion to distinguish master's of science with project vs. thesis where the potential for confusion exists; Donie will draft a motion and distribute to GAAC before the next meeting

--Donie will seek input from the Administrative Committee on this topic

--Larry recommends that we invite dean and faculty of unit for discussion at Faculty Senate meeting where this is discussed. He feels that, because this program is already approved, we should tread cautiously. It is best if program requirements are generated by the faculty, rather than by the Senate.

3.) After discussion, GAAC votes in favor of discontinuing Biology MAT.

4.) Falk Huettmann's trial course: the description needs some work. There are no prerequisites, the course description is too long, the extent of overlap with current courses is not clear. How the course builds on previous courses is not clear. Shouldn't GIS be required as a prerequisite? The laboratory part of the course needs more description. The impacts for other departments and biology (both positive and negative) need to be specified, no library collections (Lara agrees to be the lead, Franz will also read)

Larry will turn over to John Eichelberger as graduate Dean at next meeting

--Larry cautions us to be aware of strong individuals imposing vision well on everyone; all faculty work best on the local level.

ATTACHMENT 185/11

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 20, 2012**

Attending:

Sarah Stanley , Cindy Hardy, Allan Morotti, David Maxwell, Gabrielle Russell, Joe Mason, Sandra Wildfeuer, Curt Szuberla, Linda Hapsmith, Andrea Schmidt

Not attending: Nancy Ayagarak, Diane Erickson, Dana Greci, Amy Barnsley

Approval of May minutes: Approved

Election of chair and co-chair: Cindy Hardy was re-elected as chair; Sandra Wildfeuer as co-chair.

Review of committee membership definition: Jennifer Reynolds, current Faculty Senate President, has been looking over committee definitions and membership and asked that we review how members are selected for SADA among other committees. We discussed the history of the committee, originating as a Developmental Studies committee and broadening its definition after the formation of the Department of Developmental Education. Currently the committee membership definition allows for sixteen members, including one from each rural campus, plus several “members” who attend meetings out of interest but have not gone through any selection process, and others who are elected or appointed by their colleges or departments. We considered the possibility of voting and ex-officio membership, perhaps moving those not in the committee definition or those in staff or administrative roles to ex-officio membership. The discussion led to an interest in widening the membership of the meeting to include one further representative from a core area of Liberal Arts beyond the current English Department representation and an ex-officio member from the registrar’s office. We agreed to return to this discussion at the next meeting. Cindy will draw up a proposal and run it by Jennifer to see if we are addressing her concerns, then bring it back to SADA.

SADA members on GERC committee: We are requesting that a SADA member join the GERC committee this year, to ensure that concerns of entering students, including rural and developmental students, are part of the discussion of revising the Core. We had a representative on the original committee two years ago, but were not asked to provide one last year. We approved Diane Erickson to represent SADA on the GERC committee. Cindy will take this request to the Curricular Affairs Committee (GERC is a subcommittee of CAC) for approval. (This was done 9/24—approved by CAC). We noted that Sarah Stanley and Linda Hapsmith are also on GERC, representing their areas. They reminded us of GERC’s Town Hall information sessions, Wed. Oct. 3:30-4:30 at CTC and Thurs. Oct 4 1-2 in the Library Media Classroom. GERC will also be sending out a poll to gather opinions and ideas on the core.

Status of Complete College America and other national initiatives: We did not discuss this topic at this time, but will continue to circulate articles and data as it arises. Pres. Gamble has forwarded our recommendation that Alaska not participate in CCA.

NADE summary data: Dana was unable to attend this meeting. She will present a summary of this data at our next meeting.

Brown bag student/faculty discussions: We will take this up at the next meeting. We are gathering ideas for this.

Celebration of Writing: Sarah S. announced the Celebration of Writing to be held Oct. 20 (National Day of writing). It will be similar to a science fair, but about writing. She invited committee members to attend a planning session on Friday at 4pm.

Other discussion items:

Sandra W. noted that IAC is implementing E-live math tutoring for all math students in IAC classes. They are also hiring full-time math and English tutoring and faculty support positions as part of a 2-3 year Title III grant.

Linda H. raised the issue of student movement between DEVM 105, DEVM 106, and Math 107. The CRCDD Academic Council approved a change in prerequisites from a C or better to B or better in order to move to the next class. She asked that there be an alert to advisors when such a change takes place. She noted that this has caused a difficulty for students who registered for a class before the prerequisites have changed. We discussed drafting a motion requiring an alert to advisors and departments when a prerequisite changes after the catalog is complete. Linda agreed to draft a motion for the next meeting.

Next meeting: Those attending agreed that Tuesday or Thursday afternoons work best. Cindy and Sandra will collaborate on times they are both available and will send out a Doodle poll for the best time. Cindy will work with Jayne to set future meetings.

ATTACHMENT 185/12

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

Research Advisory Committee Meeting Notes – Sept. 17, 2012

Rather than formal minutes a summary in the form of an outline is given, because the meetings are not strictly according to Robert's Rules. All are encouraged to correct or edit the summary before we submit it formally to the senate. Any motions we make will be posted here as drafts for consideration as well. The current meeting only will be on this page, past meetings will be linked at the bottom.

September 17, 2012 14:00-15:00

Present were: Dehn, Healy, Heaton, Hundertmark, Koch, Lawlor, Webley

An informal agenda was adopted:

- > 1. Nomination and election of a chair
- > 2. Past business updates, review of last years actions
- > 3. Accounting of F&A, and re framing the impression of what the research engine does for UAF
- > 4. Role of the RAC and VCR office, how we can be helpful
- > 5. Research Foundation at UAF, what sort of needs would the research community have

1. Jon Dehn was nominated and elected as Chair of the RAC for this academic year

2. Past business was discussed, led by Webley

a.) the FAQ for researchers at UAF, is a living document, Lawlor forwarded the document. We will host it here and suggested a home for it at the VCR's website. We should make sure the document stays current. I suggest it be on the agenda regularly for the RAC. Next meeting when all have access to it, we'll take a closer look.
(<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1u4-DvbJNefwKURNTLGyZzIEAWqEWqAS6-HdhdWkK1iw/edit>)

b. URSA, and how to have it work better for the research enterprise at UAF. Many ideas were suggested, including having undergrad research mentored by graduate students as well as faculty, and having more faculty involved in the courses URSA offers. Dehn will invite and engage Barbara Taylor and our new Grad School Dean, John Eichelberger.

(diversion from agenda with flow of discussion)

3. Role of the RAC at UAF

- a.) We should address the bylaws and see if they are fitting the committee's evolution, now in it's 3rd year.
- b.) How can we assist the VCR a few ideas were discussed
 - i.) act as a review board for top-down research ideas, to help the VCR stay in touch with the faculty
 - ii.) act a vehicle to spread information to the research community at UAF, too much now it works clique-like
 - iii.) assist and create research policy at UAF, much of which is now located in many different places, and sometimes conflicts (see policy review discussion below)
 - iv.) act as an appeal review body for research conflict (see below)

4. Research Foundation Overview

a.) what it is, an organization at UAF that moves at the speed of business (Adam Krynicki) to help get private businesses and foundations to support research, run mostly from Dan White's shop (AVCR)

- i.) uses university's status as a charitable organization (501c3)
- ii.) limited or no overhead on grants, though direct costs are ok and encouraged to help research entities recover costs
- iii.) hopes in increased revenue for grants, though at a lower cost recovery rate, yielding more over \$ for UAF an application of the Laffer Curve (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Laffer_curve)
- iv.) UAA already has one, as do many other universities, UAF is a little behind the curve on this one
- v.) must be approved by the Regents, they vote on it on September 27 at their meeting Juneau
- b.) discussion on how it may help, not just for commercialization, but also to pool many smaller resources (often charitable) into a larger useable fund

5. F&A study at UAF

- a.) a positive tone to show how research supports a lot of other things at UAF, to help us get the credit we deserve
- b.) large scale most of this is known (<http://www.uaf.edu/osp/policies-and-procedures/facilities-administrative/>)
- c.) but what about how each institute, center, college or school handles it (posed by Winsor via email), we'll formulate a request for next meeting to circulate

6. Followup on policy review at UAF

- a.) the committee looked at Regent's policy as one of many groups tasked to look for inconsistencies with funding agency policies, laws and practices at UAF
- b.) a list of these was produced, the question rose as to what has or will be done
- c.) the impression is that some of these will be acted upon at Regent's level, some not, we may not hear to much about it anymore

7. RACs role to serve as an arbiter for disputes with IACUC (<http://www.uaf.edu/iacuc/>) and IRB (<http://www.uaf.edu/irb/>) idea posed by Hundertmark

- a.) currently there is little recourse if one runs afoul of either of these bodies
- b.) we should research the potential impacts of this on RAC, is it a large workload?
- c.) there used to be a mediation group at UAF, Dehn was an active member with training, perhaps that body is a good place, or we should have trained mediators on RAC?

8. Future meeting schedule and communication

- a.) monthly may be sufficient, be prepared for more often as warranted
- b.) try to keep meetings focused an efficient
- c.) judicious use of online media, spawned this Google Site at UAF for RAC, please make avail of it and add info and tidbits!