FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
  Jayne Harvie
  474-7964   jbharvie@alaska.edu
For Audio conferencing:
  Toll-free #: 1-800-893-8850
  Participant PIN: 1109306

<u>**A G E N D A**</u>
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #180
Monday, February 6, 2012
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1:00   I   Call to Order – Catherine Cahill   4 Min.
              A.   Roll Call
              B.   Approval of Minutes to Meeting #179
              C.   Adoption of Agenda

1:04   II   Status of Chancellor's Office Actions   1 Min.
              A.   Motions Approved:
                      1. Motion to approve a Certificate in Baking and Pastry Arts
                      2. Motion to amend the title of the General Education Objectives and
                          Student Learning Outcomes Motion of May 2, 2011
              B.   Motions Pending: None

1:05   III   A.   President's Remarks – Cathy Cahill   10 Min.
              B.   President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds

1:15   IV   A.   Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers   15 Min.
              B.   Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs
              C.   Vice Provost's Remarks – Dana Thomas

1:30   V   New Business   10 Min.
              A.   Motion to Define the Academic Credit Hour Requirements for
                      Laboratory Instruction, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee
                      (Attachment 180/1)

1:40   VI   Discussion Items   25 Min.
              A.   Draft of New UAF Mission Statement –Dana Thomas
                      (Attachment 180/2)
              B.   Draft modification to Accreditation Core Themes –Dana Thomas
                      (Attachment 180/3)
              C.   Proposed Motion to Amend the Educational Effectiveness Policy, with draft
                      model assessment templates –Susan Henrichs and Dana Thomas. Discussion
                      limited to 10 minutes, to be continued online.
                      (Attachment 180/4)

2:05   BREAK

| 2:10 | VII | Public Comments/Questions | 5 Min. |

2:15	VIII	Guest Speaker
		A. Claudia Lampman, Professor of Psychology, UAA 15 Min.
		Topic: Student Incivility, Bullying and Aggression

2:10   VII   Public Comments/Questions   5 Min.

2:15   VIII   Guest Speaker
              A.   Claudia Lampman, Professor of Psychology, UAA   15 Min.
                     Topic: Student Incivility, Bullying and Aggression

2:30   IX   Governance Reports   10 Min.
            A.   Staff Council – Pips Veazey
            B.   ASUAF – Mari Freitag, Robert Kinnard
            C.   UNAC – Jordan Titus
                   UAFT – Jane Weber

2:40   X   Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements   15 Min.
            A.   Announcements
            B.   Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)
                   Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 180/5)
                   Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Chair
                   Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair
                   Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair
                        (Attachment 180/6)
                   Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair
                   Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
                   Faculty Appeals & Oversight
                   Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair
                        (Attachment 180/7)
                   Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair
                        (Attachment 180/8)
                   Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
                        (Attachment 180/9)
                   Research Advisory Committee – Peter Webley, Orion Lawlor, Co-chairs
            C.   Other Comments

2:55   XI   Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 180/1
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to more clearly define the academic credit hour requirements for laboratory instruction at UAF and include this definition in the UAF Catalog (currently found in the 2011-2012 UAF Catalog, page 247).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: Redefine the academic credit hour requirements for laboratory instruction to bring UAF academic policies in line with **UA Regulation 10.04.090** (emphases added below):
Evaluation of Student Performance and Course Level Definitions.
F. Course Numbering system
2. Academic Credit Courses
Courses with these numbers count toward undergraduate and graduate degrees and certificates as described below. Each course includes a component for evaluation of student performance. Student effort is indicated by credit hours. **One credit hour represents three hours of student work** per week for a 15-week semester (e.g., one class-hour of lecture and two hours of study or **three class-hours of laboratory**) for a minimum of 2250 minutes of total student engagement, which may include exam periods.

****

[[ ]] – Deletion
CAPS – Addition
Underlined – Faculty Senate action from Meeting #175 (May 2, 2011) to be incorporated into the next Catalog.

From the 2011-2012 UAF Catalog, page 247:

Course Credits

One credit represents satisfactory completion of 800 minutes **(1 HOUR/WEEK)** of lecture, 1,600 or 2,400 minutes of laboratory (or studio or other similar activity), whichever is appropriate. (It is understood that an average student will be expected to spend 1,600 **(2 HOURS/WEEK)** minutes of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.)

LABORATORY CLASSES REQUIRE A MINIMUM OF 2400 LAB MINUTES/CREDIT (3 HOURS/WEEK/CREDIT), OR THEY REQUIRE A MINIMUM OF 1600 LAB MINUTES (2 HOURS/WEEK/CREDIT) PLUS 800 MINUTES (1 HOUR/WEEK) OF STUDY AND/OR PREPARATION OUTSIDE OF CLASS. A COURSE SUBMISSION WITH A LAB

COMPONENT MUST INCLUDE A JUSTIFICATION (IN TERMS OF REQUIRED STUDENT WORK MINUTES OUTSIDE OF LABORATORY) IF THE LABORATORY DOES NOT REQUIRE AT LEAST 2400 LAB MINUTES PER CREDIT.

The following standards establish the minimum requirements for an academic unit of credit:
1. 800 minutes of lecture (plus 1,600 minutes of study)
2. 1,600 or 2,400 minutes of laboratory (or studio or other similar activity) + **800 OR 0 MINUTES OF OUTSIDE STUDENT WORK.**
3. 2,400-4,800 minutes of supervised practicum
4. 2,400-8,000 minutes of internship (or externship, clinical)
5. 2,400-4,800 minutes of supervised scholarly activity

Credit hours may not be divided, except half-credit hours may be granted at the appropriate rate. For short courses and classes of less than one semester in duration, course hours may not be compressed into fewer than three days per credit. Any existing semester-long course that is to be offered in a "compressed to less than six weeks" format must be approved by the college or school's curriculum council and the appropriate UAF Faculty Senate committee (Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee, Core Review Committee, Curriculum Review Committee, or Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee). Any new course proposal must indicate those course compression format(s) in which the course will be taught. Only approved course formats will be allowed for scheduling.

Following the title of each course, the number of credits is listed for each semester. Thus "3 credits" means three credits may be earned. Credit may not be given more than once for a course unless the course has been designated as repeatable for credit. Figures in parentheses at the end of course descriptions indicate the number of lecture; laboratory; and practicum, internship or scholarly activity hours the class meets each week for one semester. The first number represents lecture hours; the second, laboratory; and the third, practicum, internship or scholarly activity. For example (2+3) indicates that a class has two hours of lecture and three of laboratory work each week. A designation of (1+0+6) indicates that the course meets for one hour each week of lecture and 6 hours each week of practicum, internship or other scholarly activity.

1. Draft UAF Mission Statement:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks integrates teaching, research, and engagement, emphasizing the circumpolar north and its diverse peoples, as it prepares students for careers and leading roles in their communities.

2. Revised Draft UAF Mission Statement:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks integrates teaching, research, and engagement, emphasizing the circumpolar north and its diverse peoples, as it educates students for careers, leading roles in their communities, and lifelong learning.

Current UAF Mission Statement:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks, the nation's northernmost Land, Sea and Space Grant university and international research center, advances and disseminates knowledge through teaching, research and public service with an emphasis on Alaska, the circumpolar North and their diverse peoples. UAF--America's arctic university--promotes academic excellence, student success and lifelong learning.

Draft Modification to Accreditation Core Themes:

Educate: Undergraduate and Graduate Students

REPLACE
Discover: Through Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity including an Emphasis on the North and its Peoples
WITH
Research: Create and disseminate new knowledge, insight, technology, artistic and scholarly works, with an emphasis on the circumpolar north and its peoples.

Prepare: Alaska's Career, Technical, and Professional Workforce

Connect: Alaska Native, Rural, and Urban Communities through Contemporary and Traditional Knowledge

Engage: Alaskans via Lifelong Learning, Outreach, and Community and Economic Development

DRAFT **MOTION for discussion only**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness policy as indicated below:

      EFFECTIVE: Upon approval by the Chancellor

      RATIONALE: UAF institutional and specialized accreditation requires outcomes assessment reporting and assessment is important for the continuing improvement of curricula. To ensure that outcomes assessment information is collected regularly, with no long gaps, each program is asked to prepare a report every 2 years. This is consistent with the typical two year commitments that department chairs make so each department chair will know a report must be filed during their service. In addition, this change will provide timely information to summarize the implementation and results of assessment practices reported annually to the Board of Regents as required in policy P10.06.020.

                        ****

CAPS = Additions
[[   ]] = Deletions

UAF EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS POLICY

In accordance with its mission, the University of Alaska Fairbanks has a continuing responsibility to review and improve performance of its students, faculty, and programs. The UAF therefore establishes the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation to describe the effects of curriculum, instruction, and other institutional programs.

The process will be useful for curricular and institutional reform and will be consistent with UA Board of Regents Policy and institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

The university shall ensure the academic freedom of the academic community in the development and maintenance of this process.

The data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty. Furthermore, no student shall be denied graduation based solely upon information gathered for the educational effectiveness evaluation process.

Each faculty member's activities in developing and/or implementing programmatic and institutional educational effectiveness efforts may be summarized in the instructional section of annual evaluations and promotion and tenure files.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

1) Student Information
    Students shall be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.
2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum
    Evaluation of the CORE curriculum shall include course assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.
3) Programmatic assessment
    Each degree and certificate program shall establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.
4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning
    An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of activities and student support services will be conducted.

The chair of each department (or equivalent as identified by the Dean or Director) shall prepare a report at least **EVERY TWO YEARS [[**four years**]]** summarizing the Educational Effectiveness program for each certificate and degree program offered by that department. The report shall include a summary of the following:

A. Student outcome goals and objectives of the program,
B. The methods and criteria used to evaluate whether the goals and objectives are being met,
C. A description of what information is collected annually, and
D. How the results of such information are being used to improve the curriculum.

The report shall be presented to the dean or director's office **AND THE ACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT ASSISTANT IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE BY THE END OF 9-MONTH FACULTY CONTRACTS IN MAY [[**during the month of May**]]**. At least some information gathering for this process shall occur annually.

Once an educational effectiveness evaluation program has been implemented for the core, the core review committee of the faculty senate shall prepare a report, at least biannually, summarizing the educational effectiveness of the components of the core curriculum. This report shall be similar in content to the report described above for individual programs but shall provide a summary for the components of the core curriculum. The components of the Core may be summarized in the report on a rotational basis, but at least some information should be gathered annually.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
<< AAS or CERT>>
<<School/College Name Here>>

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose	Intended Objectives/Outcomes	Assessment Criteria and Procedures	Implementation (what, when, who)
MISSION STATEMENT: **Unit specific**	Writing skills sufficient for employment	Writing samples collected in appropriate class (taken by students near completion) evaluated using standard rubric. OR Workkeys	Course instructor (s). If not taught by more than one faculty member, an evaluation committee. OR (Course instructor if administered in class; Testing Services?)
GOAL STATEMENT: **Prepare students for employment in [subject matter].** **(Will vary)**	Oral communication skills sufficient for employment And Understanding of human relations	Exit interview (including some questions that would reveal student understanding of HR issues). (Interview could be conducted as part of an upper level class, rather than exactly at exit).	Interviewer, according to standard rubric
	Computation	Exam(s) or part(s) of exam(s) collected from an appropriate class. OR Standardized test such as Workkeys.	Course instructor OR (Course instructor if administered in class; Testing Services?)
	Knowledge of field (statement should be somewhat specific as to expected areas)	1. Nationally standardized test, such as FAA AF&PP, CNA or others. OR 2. Final exams (or portions of final exams) in select courses, if content is agreed upon by department and consistent over time.	Collect data from organizations that administer exams OR Instructors in upper level course(s) administer exam or make assignment and evaluate.

		OR 3. Comprehensive assignments of other types, such as a report, a construction project or meal preparation (or….), can be evaluated by a standard rubric.	
	Prepared for career {Optional: Returns tend to be low}	Alumni survey addressing employment, and sufficiency of preparation to carry out job. (Should be specific as to weaknesses and strengths.) OR Written assessment of employers or employer group about skills of employed graduates. (The information can be collected orally…e.g., at an advisory committee meeting… and written down by program faculty or staff.)	Distribute at regular intervals, but at least every two years recommended except for very small programs; must maintain contact with alums to improve response rate. OR Collect information from employers at least every two years.

<date revised and by whom >

Important: At least once per year, the faculty responsible for the program must collectively review the information and decide (1) whether there is an area or area(s) where learning outcomes need improvement and (2) what changes need to be made to bring about the improvement. These could be changes in curriculum (e.g., a new course), but they also might be smaller changes. For example, there could be agreement to add additional reading or writing assignments to a given course, or to change the subject matter covered in part of a course. (3) Any changes made should be documented in the Assessment Summary Report. (4) Further, assessment information should be examined after the change(s) are implemented, to see if they have been effective.

Review is facilitated if the faculty or staff members who are primarily responsible for assessment reporting summarize the information collected before the faculty meet to consider it.

Programs with specialized accreditation that must follow an assessment plan different from this model are free to do so. Programs that have other special needs can request to use a different plan. Programs that want to collect any sort of additional information above and beyond this model are free to do so. Finally, programs that have consistently implemented a different plan for at least three years may continue with that plan if it meets basic requirements (see program review).

Note that for large programs or classes, it is fine to subsample; it's not necessary to collect or review *every* paper or exam from a class of 100 students; a sample size of 10/year should be adequate and more than 20 per year of a particular assignment is probably not going to add a lot of additional information. Consider culling the work of "F" students from the sample, since by definition it's not expected that they have met the intended learning outcomes.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
<< Baccalaureate Program>>
<<School/College Name Here>>

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose	Intended Objectives/Outcomes	Assessment Criteria and Procedures	Implementation (what, when, who)
MISSION STATEMENT: Unit specific	Good technical writing skills in field	Capstone class (or other senior class) writing samples evaluated using standard rubric.	Course instructor (s). If not taught by more than one faculty member, an evaluation committee.
	Good critical thinking skills	Appropriate writing assignment(s) in capstone or other senior class, or senior thesis	Course instructor (s). If not taught by more than one faculty member, use an evaluation committee.
GOAL STATEMENT: Prepare students to think critically and communicate effectively about [subject matter]. (Will vary, programs aimed at specific professions will have more specific goals.)	Knowledge of field (statement should be somewhat specific as to expected areas)	1. Nationally standardized test, such as ETS major field test or professional association test. OR 2. Final exams (or portions of final exams) in select courses, if content is agreed upon by department and consistent over time. OR 3. In some cases, comprehensive assignments of other types, such as a senior thesis, a performance, or an exhibit, can be evaluated.	Instructors in senior or capstone course(s) administer.
	Good oral communication skills	1. Presentation in senior or capstone class. OR 2. Exit interview	1. Audience evaluates according to standard rubric 2. Interviewer, according to standard rubric
	Prepared for career {Optional: Returns tend to	Alumni survey addressing	Distribute at regular intervals, but at least

	be low for surveys.}	employment, and sufficiency of preparation to carry out job. (Should be specific as to weaknesses and strengths.) OR Written assessment of employers or employer group about skills of employed graduates. (The information can be collected orally…e.g., at an advisory committee meeting… and written down by program faculty or staff.)	every two years recommended except for very small programs; must maintain contact with alums to improve response rate. OR Collect information from employers at least every two years.

<date revised and by whom >

Important: At least once per year, the faculty responsible for the program must <u>collectively</u> review the information and decide (1) whether there is an area or area(s) where learning outcomes need improvement and (2) what changes need to be made to bring about the improvement. These could be changes in curriculum (e.g., a new course), but they also might be smaller changes. For example, there could be agreement to add additional reading or writing assignments to a given course, or to change the subject matter covered in part of a course. (3) Any changes made should be documented in the Assessment Summary Report. (4) Further, assessment information should be examined after the change(s) are implemented, to see if they have been effective.

Review is facilitated if the faculty or staff members who are primarily responsible for assessment reporting summarize the information collected before the faculty meet to consider it.

Programs with specialized accreditation that must follow an assessment plan different from this model are free to do so. Programs that have other special needs can request to use a different plan. Programs that want to collect any sort of additional information above and beyond this model are free to do so. Finally, programs that have consistently implemented a different plan for at least three years may continue with that plan if it meets basic requirements (see program review).

Note that for large programs or classes, it is fine to subsample; it's not necessary to collect or review *every* paper or exam from a class of 100 students; a sample size of 10/year should be adequate and more than 20 per year of a particular assignment is probably not going to add a lot of additional information. Consider culling the work of "F" students from the sample, since by definition it's not expected that they have met the intended learning outcomes.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
<< Graduate Program>>
<<School/College Name Here>>

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose	Intended Objectives/Outcomes	Assessment Criteria and Procedures	Implementation (what, when, who)
MISSION STATEMENT: Unit specific	Strong technical writing skills in field	Thesis or project evaluated according to standard rubric	Graduate advisory committee and department chair, when reviewing final draft of thesis or project.
GOAL STATEMENT: Prepare students to be effective researchers or faculty members or to have leading roles in [subject area]. (Will vary)	Ability to formulate a research topic, gather data, and interpret it according to the standards of the field OR Capable of creative writing or performance	Thesis or project or performance or exhibition evaluated according to standard rubric (also may include evaluation of thesis proposal if that is a requirement of the department)	Graduate advisory committee and department chair, when reviewing final draft of thesis or project.
	Conduct research at the national standard of quality for the field (most appropriate for Ph.D. programs) Prepared for career {Optional: Publication not a priority for some programs}	Student or alumni refereed publications in journals or other appropriate venue for field, based on research while a student	Publication list, perhaps including impact factors or other assessments of the quality of the publication venue. Update at least annually.
	Strong oral communication (or teaching) skills, to both technical and student or public audience.	1. Oral thesis or project defense evaluated according to standard rubric OR 2. Classroom teaching or public presentation	1. Audience evaluates according to standard rubric 2. IAS and mentor evaluation OR audience evaluation
	Expert knowledge of the discipline	1. Comprehensive examination evaluated	1. Comprehensive exam committee

		according to rubric; this should be somewhat specific as to any deficient areas. 2. OR Thesis/project + oral defense evaluation; this should be somewhat specific as to any deficient areas..	2. Thesis/project committee
	Prepared for career in field {Optional: Returns tend to be low}	Alumni survey addressing employment, and sufficiency of preparation to carry out job. (Should be specific as to weaknesses and strengths.) OR Written input from local employers or employer organization on specific strengths and weaknesses. (Might be gathered orally and summarized in writing by a faculty or staff member).	Distribute at regular intervals, but at least every two years recommended except for very small programs; must maintain contact with alums to improve response rate. OR Seek input at least every two years.

<date revised and by whom >

Important: At least once per year, the faculty responsible for the program must <u>collectively</u> review the information and decide (1) whether there is an area or area(s) where learning outcomes need improvement and (2) what changes need to be made to bring about the improvement. These could be changes in curriculum (e.g., a new course), but they also might be smaller changes. For example, there could be agreement to add additional reading or writing assignments to a given course, or to change the subject matter covered in part of a course. (3) Any changes made should be documented in the Assessment Summary Report. (4) Further, assessment information should be examined after the change(s) are implemented, to see if they have been effective.

Review is facilitated if the faculty or staff members who are primarily responsible for assessment reporting summarize the information collected before the faculty meet to consider it.

Programs with separate accreditation that must follow an assessment plan different from this model are free to do so. Programs that have special needs can request to use a different plan. Programs that want to collect any sort of additional information above and beyond this model are free to do so. Finally, programs that have consistently implemented a different plan for at least three years may continue with that plan if it meets basic requirements (see program review).

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes
Nov 23 2011, 3:30-4:30 pm Kayak

Voting Members present: Anthony Arendt, Jungho Baek, Carrie Baker, Retchenda George-Bettisworth (audio), Diane McEachern (audio), Debra Moses (audio), Rainer Newberry, Todd Radenbaugh (audio), Dave Valentine. Voting Members absent: Brian Himelbloom.

Non-voting members present: Linda Hapsmith (audio), Carol Gering, Pete Pinney, GERC Chair Alex Fitts. Non-voting members absent: Doug Goering, Mike Earnest, Lillian Anderson-Misel.
Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

- **OLD Business**

- **Approval of November meetings minutes**

  November 9 minutes were approved as submitted.

- **Recent GERC issues report[1] and related-- Official approval of GERC membership? Approval of Bethany Marx as Carrie's spring 2012 replacement?[2]**

  Alex Fitts submitted notes (attachment #1) for the Committee's information. Discussion followed regarding representation on the GERC for CEM. Rajive G. does not wish to continue, but a replacement has not been identified. The seat will be noted as "vacant" until filled. Mike Koskey will represent CRCD; and Bethany Marx (attachment #2)will fill in for Carrie Baker who is going on maternity leave in Spring 2012.
  GERC next meets on December 2 and 16.

- **Stacked courses report (Anthony Arendt)**

  Anthony reported that online surveys have been sent to faculty who've taught stacked courses. The next step will be to send surveys out to students who've taken stacked courses.

- **CHANGES IN 'I' POLICY…. Change form, not requirements ?!?**

  Feedback from faculty included the common theme that no one wanted more hoops to jump through. A shorter time frame for completion (one full semester following the semester where the Incomplete was granted) was generally favored. Revising the actual form was discussed and possibly adding checkboxes on it for different time frames – but there's no way to police that. Still, a paper record was favored over an electronic one. Carol G. mentioned their CDE database notifies students about their incompletes. Rainer wants to meet with the Registrar's Office and discuss some sort of grade report to help track them better. Linda H. commented that the departments need a list of their Incompletes from the Registrar's Office.
  How to educate faculty about a change was discussed. Rainer suggested that the information come to faculty at the department level, via deans to chair council meetings to department meetings. Faculty Senators could also be asked to report to their departments but should not be the only means of getting the word out. Rainer will talk about this at Administrative Committee and Faculty Senate.
  Ideas for disincentives to students to help discourage them from asking for an incomplete were discussed. They included charging money for it, putting a limit of I's one could get in their

academic career, and charging points against their grade for an extension. The problem of repeat offenders was mentioned.

- **Proposed motion:**
  The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered wholly or in part by **ASYNCHRONOUS** distance delivery, and all existing courses adapted or converted to **ASYNCHRONOUS** distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the Faculty Senate -- continue sitting on this puppy???

     Several committee members noted that their faculty feel this is a departmental issue and departments should police it. Rainer noted the issue had actually come up because of an undergraduate course being offered by a department that doesn't have an undergraduate program. Currently there's nothing to trigger a review of courses that is associated with delivery mode changes. It's not obvious from looking at the catalog descriptions, for example, what various modes of delivery exist for courses.
     (This topic was the last to be discussed right before it was time to adjourn the meeting.)

- **Review of BOR policies   lab credit hour distribution --we're not in compliance!!**
  Transfer policies -- not in compliance?   A+???   ANYTHING ELSE????

B. NEW BUSINESS:

   1. SUBMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF: Baking and Pastry Arts Certificate

     Rainer provided background on the program and the fact that it's not technically a new one but has been split out of an existing certificate where it had only been a concentration. By splitting it out it can better fulfill demand. It articulates easily into the A.A.S. for Culinary Arts. The committee approved moving it on to the December 5 Faculty Senate meeting.

   2. Motion to Faculty Senate:

   MOTION:

   The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the title of the general education objectives and student learning outcomes adopted by the UAF Faculty Senate at Meeting #175 on May 2, 2011 to clarify the undergraduate degrees to which the objectives and learning outcomes apply.

   Proposed new wording: General education objectives and learning outcomes for the undergraduate students seeking Baccalaureate, AA, and AS degrees at the University of Alaska Fairbanks:

   EFFECTIVE: Spring 2012

   Rationale

   In May 2011, the General Education Revitalization Committee proposed a new set of objectives and student learning outcomes intended to be used for all of UAF's baccalaureate degrees and two of UAF's associate degrees. These were adopted by the UAF Faculty Senate at meeting #175, held May 2, 2011, for the purposes of developing the next general education strategy and the strategies to be used in assessing it. Through unintentional oversight, only BA and BS degrees were listed, omitting the six other baccalaureate degrees offered at UAF. The proposed amendment brings the wording in line with the intended scope of the general education objectives and student learning outcomes.

     Rainer and Dave explained the need for the changed wording – to more correctly capture all baccalaureate degrees at the university. The committee approved the change and recommended putting it forth to the senate as presented above.

3. Suggested change in FS Bylaws:

Add to CAC's one-sentence membership statement in the bylaws, the sentence:

"In addition to the ex officio member(s) appointed by the Provost, the committee may add ex officio members for one-year terms as deemed necessary."

The committee agreed to add the statement to their bylaws. Rainer will take a motion to the Administrative Committee and then to the Faculty Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 PM.

----

[1]Nov. 23, 2011   GERC Notes
Committee members Fall 2011:

- Dave Valentine, SNRAS   Carrie Baker, CLA (Bethany Marks SP 2012?)
- Leah Berman, CNSM   Derick Burleson, CLA
- Anne Armstrong, SoED   Gerald McBeath, CLA
- Alex Fitts, CLA – Chair   Sarah Fowell, CNSM
- Greg Goering, SOM   Linda Hapsmith, Academic Advising Center
- Dana Thomas, Vice Provost   Mahla Strohmaier, CRCD
- Mike Koskey CRCD ?   Still no member from CEM

The committee's charge for this year is to implement the Student Learning Outcomes and Objectives that were passed last year. We are beginning by looking at a few different models of how some other institutions have handled this (mainly schools that have also adopted LEAP objectives). This could take the form of a strict core, a distribution model, a series of designators, a hybrid model, or even something entirely different. We have also discussed the possibility of a first-year experience and/ or a capstone experience. For the next meeting, committee members have been asked to come up with a draft of what a model that would work at UAF might look like, given Board of Regents policy, degree requirements, deans' recommendations, and ramifications for transfer students from within the UA system and from elsewhere.

[2]Bethany Marx is an Assistant Professor of Theatre in her third year at UAF. She is willing and able to serve as Carrie Baker's replacement on GERC for Spring 2012. During her time at UAF, Bethany has revised existing courses and designed many new courses for the Department of Theatre and served as the point person to the appropriate committees for those curricular changes.

Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes for Tues, Dec 13, 2011
1:30-3:00 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Melanie Arthur, Ellen Lopez, Shawn Russell, Derek Sikes, Kayt Sunwood, Jane Weber, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Nilima Hullavarad
Members absent: Jessica Larsen, Jenny Liu, Johnny Payne

- **BOR Policy and Regulations**

  CSW has been assigned the task to review some of the Board of Regents Policy and Regulations, details found on website: http://www.alaska.edu/bor/policy-regulations/.
  Shawn mentioned at the last meeting that only some sections have mention of 'sexual orientation', whereas some sections have left it out. Changes were suggested to various sections including:

P04.01.020 to improve the treatment of the term 'discrimination' and make it consistent with usage throughout the Policy and Regulations. To reduce redundancy this section was referred to from other sections rather than repeating the text, which originally was often not identical.
P04.01.061 to strike the requirement for prior written request by employees to see their files.
P04.02.024 'Consensual Sexual Relations' appears to lack any negative consequences other than a determination that the behavior of the supervisor is unprofessional and/or an abuse of power. Should this section be strengthed?

Brown Bag Committee - topic: "Negotiating Workloads" Paul Layer & Johnny Payne will participate. Feb 16th, 1-2pm; March 22, 1-2pm "Career Development Mapping" with Susan Henrichs. Location TBD.

Next Meetings - Friday Feb 17th, 10-11AM; Friday March 30, 10-11AM.
Meeting was adjourned at 3:20

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/

Minutes of the Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee
November 15, 2011

Attending: Cindy Hardy, Dana Greci, Sandra Wildfeur, Amy Barnsley, Sarah Stanley, Curt Szuberla, David Maxwell, Deseree Salvador

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

BOR Policy: Cindy e-mailed the portions of the BOR policy we have been asked to review for the Faculty Alliance.   We will address these at the next meeting.

Learning Commons Update: The Learning Commons subcommittee met with Bella Gerlich, Dean of the Rasmuson Library.   She suggested that the Learning Commons might be more appropriate on the 4th floor rather than the 3rd floor, as we had been discussing. She noted that the Learning Commons is on the Library Strategic Plan, which will be discussed in January. She also wants to evaluate student needs, though the subcommittee did a needs assessment last year before she arrived. She does not want to rush the process, though she acknowledged all that we have done in this process.

Gerlich has offered us two tables and dividers to be set up on the third floor next semester. These can be reserved for tutoring and may be used by students when they are not reserved.

We discussed the delay of the learning center/learning commons process—and this means more delay since the original Faculty Senate motion mandating the establishment of a learning center. We discussed strategies for moving this process along. Some frustration was expressed.

SADA Committee definition: We looked at the committee definition in the Faculty Senate Handbook. It needs to be updated to fit the current name of CTC, at least. We also looked at the committee description and considered changes. We reviewed the representation of interested groups in committee membership. Cindy will draw up a draft motion to change the committee definition and bring it to the next meeting.

Data requests: Dana Greci reported on data being requested by the Department of Developmental Education. They will be looking at incoming students placing in DEV courses and their enrollment, grade distributions in DEV classes, pass rates in subsequent classes, grades at 24 credits, and grades in next college-level course. David suggested that we look at the entire incoming class to look for high rates of failure and repeated failure. Sarah is also interested in learning factors impacting students receiving D, F, I, W, or NB grades. We discussed what data may already exist and what we can do with the data. We are primarily concerned with finding out who are the students who need the most help. We also discussed how to generate data on what outside the classroom impacts students.

We considered that the Advising Center and Dana Thomas' office may be tracking some of this data. Cindy will contact Dana to invite him to a meeting next semester.

We continued the discussion, ranging across topics such as what the data could reveal about pedagogy, the impact of tuition waivers on success, comparison of this data at UAF and similar universities, the possibility of putting together a faculty development workshop that addresses this data, and the

possibility that—at least in math classes—failure is often simply a matter of lack of skills. We will continue this discussion and develop action items at the December meeting.

Next meeting: December 13, 12:30-2pm.

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for December 13, 2011

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 10:05 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Castellini, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Julie Joly, Alexandra Oliveira, Channon Price
Excused: Stephen Brown, Joy Morrison
Absent: Franz Meyer

III. Report from Joy

Joy will be gone for December and January.

Diane reported that Libby Roderick's presentation on Difficult Discussions was well attended: over 20 faculty members came and enjoyed the hands-on workshop. There were a lot of questions, and faculty indicated further interest in this topic.

UNAC will be sponsoring the next faculty development opportunity in February on the topic of bullying.

IV. Old Business

1. Faculty survey

Josef met again with Cyndee West to discuss UNAC putting together the survey on faculty development, but Cyndee requested that our committee provide a list of topics to include on the survey. We discussed the issue of restricting the survey to UAF faculty only and including UAFT faculty as well. Mike reminded us that we need to include all UAF faculty, not just those that are present in Fairbanks. As the future UNAC VP, Melanie Arthur will be helpful in creating the survey. She has a lot of experience developing surveys, and she has a lot of experience with our committee as a former member.

We discussed including the following topics on the survey:
     1. What kinds of sessions do faculty want?
     2. What kind of feedback is there on recent sessions?
     3. How are faculty meeting their development needs?
     4. Sessions on globalization – what do international faculty members need, and
        how can we be more aware of these needs and therefore more helpful?
     5. What are the needs of more experienced faculty?

The FDAI committee also discussed whether Joy can have a ranking system based on need since junior faculty have the greatest need and can no longer be given preference for funding based on their newness.

Josef indicated that Cyndee brought up the accountability issue as well – that faculty are seeking travel funding for relevant conferences, not just their particular favorites.

Special guest Melanie Arthur was unable to make our meeting today due to time conflicts. We look forward to having her join us in a future meeting.

2. Policy and Regulations Review

Mike sent out a repaired spreadsheet since many of the links in the original did not work correctly. We discussed the difficulty of finding "red flags" since so much of the information is out of our committee's purview. Within the realm of our various experiences, however, we did not find any red flags and do not feel that any changes are necessary, but we are thankful for the opportunity to serve.

V. New Business

Channon started a discussion of the CLA workload changes. Teaching is going from 5 courses per year to 6 courses per year. This represents a 20 per cent increase. What is being taken off the workload to compensate for this adjustment? Some of the points we discussed were a reduction in the areas of scholarly activity, service, advising, and graduate student committees. Will there be hires of academic advisors at the college level, and how will those advisors keep current with all the subtle details of how to satisfy degree requirements? How will these changes affect evaluations for faculty tenure? Our committee voiced much concern over these questions.

VI. Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 31, 2012, 8:15 – 9:15 am, Bunnell 222

VII. Adjourned at 10:56 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

**GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate
2011-12-06 Meeting Minutes**

Voting Members: Orion Lawlor, Sue Renes, Donie Bret-Harte, Elisabeth Nadin
Guest: Lillian Misel

We continue to work our way through our curriculum list.
     FISH 645, 670, and 672 (2-4 GNC) are approved.
     16-GPCh is approved.
     The counseling internship III and IV courses 29-GNC and 30-GNC are approved, even without an instructor assigned yet.

Discuss policies for post-baccalaureate certificates: are these under the purview of the graduate school? There are currently only three such programs, in Construction Management, Statistics, and Education.
- Pro: students already apply to the graduate admissions process, pay graduate tuition, get graduate financial aid, and are taking 600-level courses. If they weren't under the graduate school, where would they go?
- Con: students don't file advancement to candidacy like more typical Master's degrees, and some may not even have Bachelor's degrees yet.

The graduate school added a new requirement for an exit survey, asking graduating graduate students their opinions on UAF. Some have wondered how an anonymous survey can be required for graduation; the way this works is students print the end-of-survey page and turn it in to the graduate college.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Jan 24 at 3pm.

**GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate
2011-11-22 Meeting Minutes**

Voting Members: Orion Lawlor, Vincent Cee, Chung-Sang Ng, Sue Renes, Donie Bret-Harte, Elisabeth
    Nadin, Xiong Zhang
Ex officio: Timothy Bartholomaus, Anita Hughes, Karen Jensen, Larry Duffy
Guest: Lillian Misel

We worked our way through all the courses ready for approval on our curriculum list.

Approved this meeting:

- 8-GNC: New GEOS 436/636 – Programming and Automation for Geoscientists, a 2 credit pass/fail course on using matlab and shell scripts for automated data analysis.
- 10-GCDR: Drop GEOS 434/634 – Remote sensing of Cryosphere, an elective that was rarely offered after the instructor left UAF.
- 11-GPch: Rename the Wildlife PhD as Wildlife Biology & Conservation, instead of being a concentration within Biological Sciences.

- 21-GNC: New GEOS 431/631 Foundations of Geophysics, a single-course replacement for 620 and 602 proposed by those courses' instructors.
- 23-GNC: New GEOG 6xx: Sustainable Livelihoods and Community Well-Being, a new elective on sustainability.

GAAC approved the mouldy course drops from ED, CEM, Biology, Chemistry, and Wildlife, all listed at the bottom of the GAAC curriculum page.

President Gamble has asked the faculty senates to review the UA Policy & Regulations for readability, relevance, and consistency with the law and our collective bargaining agreement. GAAC has been assigned Chapter 09.05. Employment of Students, and (once the Provost's office has reviewed it) Chapter 10.02. Academic Administrative Organization. Step one is to flag anything we think may need changing by mid January; by the middle of spring semester we should be finished with our review, at which point we'll trade sections with UAA's faculty senate.

CNSM Dean Layer would like to adjust the Annual Report of Advisory Committee requirements, to make them every year (not just the second year) and always include a plan (not just those within two years of the graduation limit).   Many departments do file these every year already; probably a majority of students already do these. Some departments have vociferously opposed the more frequent reporting in the past. It might be difficult for a first-year PhD students to produce a plan; or for overworked advisors to produce more reports. Nonetheless, GAAC recommends accepting Dean Layer's plan.

Discuss policies for post-baccalaureate certificates: are these under the purview of the graduate school? There are currently only three such programs, in Construction Management, Statistics, and Education. Discussion will continue online.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Dec 6 at 3pm.