

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Jayne Harvie  
474-7964 jbharvie@alaska.edu

For Audio conferencing:

Toll-free #: 1-800-893-8850  
Participant PIN: 1109306

**AGENDA**

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #181

Monday, March 5, 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 #180                                                                                                                                                                          |         |
|      |     | C. Adoption of Agenda                                                                                                                                                                                           |         |
| 1:04 | II  | STATUS OF CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE ACTIONS                                                                                                                                                                           | 1 Min.  |
|      |     | A. Motions Approved:                                                                                                                                                                                            |         |
|      |     | 1. Motion to Define the Academic Credit Hour Requirements for Laboratory Instruction                                                                                                                            |         |
|      |     | B. Motions Pending: None                                                                                                                                                                                        |         |
| 1:05 | III | A. President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds                                                                                                                                                                | 5 Min.  |
| 1:10 | IV  | A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers                                                                                                                                                                          | 15 Min. |
|      |     | B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs                                                                                                                                                                           |         |
|      |     | C. Vice Provost's Remarks – Dana Thomas                                                                                                                                                                         |         |
| 1:25 | V   | New Business                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 35 Min. |
|      |     | A. Call for Nominations for President-Elect of the Faculty Senate, 2012-2013                                                                                                                                    |         |
|      |     | B. Motion to Amend the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science Degree Requirements, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/1)                                                           |         |
|      |     | C. Motion to Amend the Educational Effectiveness Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/2)                                                                                           |         |
|      |     | D. Motion to Approve an Updated Procedure for the Program Review Process, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 181/3)                                                                              |         |
|      |     | E. Motion to Clarify the Academic Honors Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/4)                                                                                                   |         |
|      |     | F. Motion to Approve a New "Directed Study" Category of Registration, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/5)                                                                              |         |
|      |     | G. Motion to Amend the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee Definition in the Faculty Senate Bylaws, submitted by the Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee (Attachment 181/6) |         |
| 2:00 |     | BREAK                                                                                                                                                                                                           |         |

- 2:10 VI Public Comments/Questions 5 Min.
- 2:15 VII Guest Speaker 15 Min.  
 A. Eric Madsen and Dana Thomas  
 Topic: Electronic Annual Activity Reporting Software  
 See Handout: "Data180-DigitalMeasures\_SideBySideComparsion" at:  
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#181>
- 2:30 VIII Governance Reports 10 Min.  
 A. Staff Council – Pips Veazey  
 B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag, Robert Kinnard  
 C. UNAC – Melanie Arthur  
 UAFT – Jane Weber
- 2:40 IX Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements 15 Min.  
 A. Announcements  
 B. Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)  
 Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 181/7)  
 Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Chair  
 Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair (Attachment 181/8)  
 Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair  
 (Attachment 181/9)  
 Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair  
 Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair  
 Faculty Appeals & Oversight  
 Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair  
 (Attachment 181/10)  
 Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair  
 (Attachment 181/11)  
 Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair  
 (Attachment 181/12)  
 Research Advisory Committee – Peter Webley, Orion Lawlor, Co-chairs  
 (Attachment 181/13)  
 C. Other Comments
- 2:55 X Adjournment

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degree requirements as indicated below:

EFFECTIVE:        Fall 2012

RATIONALE:        There are many cases in which a course might be required for a major or a minor (example: PSY F101 for a BA in Psychology) but that course also carries a General Education designator (such as “S” for Social Sciences). Strictly interpreted the way it’s written, the PSY F101 could not be counted toward the required credits in Social Sciences and Humanities, no matter how many PSY credits were earned (say, 36). This would have the unintended and unfortunate consequence of requiring well over 120 credits for a B.A. degree and well over 130 for a B.S. degree if the language is not altered. This is something that has been broadly misunderstood in the advising community for many years (ever since the inception of the Core, as far as we can tell). This was brought before Curricular Affairs in 2009 and both the Registrar’s Office and the Academic Advising Center was under the impression this change had already taken place.

Note that with this change, no credits used toward the major could be used toward GERs until they have gone over 30, or for a minor over 15.

\*\*\*\*\*

**CAPS** = additions

**[[ ]]** = deletions

2011-12 *UAF Catalog*: Pages 136, Beyond the Core:

Under Bachelor of Arts, first column, paragraph after “Minimum credits required for degree”:

Of the above, at least 39 credits must be taken in upper-division (300-level or higher) courses. Courses beyond 30 credits in a major complex and 15 credits in a minor complex **[[that are not in the primary discipline of that major or minor]]** may be used to fulfill the B.A. degree requirements in humanities, social sciences or mathematics. Courses used to fulfill **[[minor degree]]** requirements **FOR A MINOR** may be used at the same time to fill major or general distribution requirements if so designated.

Similarly, under Bachelor of Science, second column:

Of the above, at least 39 credits must be taken in upper-division (300-level or higher) courses. Courses beyond 30 credits in a major complex and 15 credits in a minor complex **[[that are not in the primary**

discipline of that major or minor]] may be used to fulfill the B.S. degree requirements in mathematics or natural science. Courses used to fulfill [[minor degree]] requirements **FOR A MINOR** may be used at the same time to fill major or general distribution requirements if so designated.

ATTACHMENT 181/2  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

**MOTION**

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 two 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.

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve an updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regent policy and regulations (10.06).

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The existing program review process (Meeting #102, May 2001) does not fully meet Board of Regents policy and regulations on program review (10.06). The proposed process aligns with the new accreditation cycle, is a more efficient process, i.e., it is less burdensome on programs, and is intended to yield a more consistent quality of review. The process is intended for a program review cycle of 5 years, in accordance with Board of Regents policy.

\*\*\*\*\*

The new program review process will be completed as follows:

1. An initial brief review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit supplied two-page narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere in UA, and any special circumstances that explain features of the centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary (see attached program review template for more details). The information reviewed meets the requirements set by Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; attached). A single Faculty Program Review Committee comprised of one tenured-faculty member from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus five CRCD representatives will review the materials and make one of the following recommendations:

- Continue program
- Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
- Continue program but improve other specific areas or
- Discontinue program.

The committee will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review.

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and 4 administrative representatives from CRCD will review the recommendations of the Program Review Committee, may request additional information from about the program, and will state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.
3. The Provost will review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:
  - a. Program continuation is confirmed until next review cycle
  - b. Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.

- c. Recommend to discontinue program. Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, when appropriate admissions may be suspended pending action.

-----

Handouts:

1. Program Review Instructions
2. Program Review Evaluation Form
3. Program Review Example

Handouts are posted online at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#181>



ATTACHMENT 181/4  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Academic Honors policy as indicated below:

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: The current catalog language is vague enough that some students might expect to be on both lists, when the intention was that they are on one or the other, but not both.

\*\*\*\*\*

CAPS = additions

[[ ]] = deletions

Page 49, 2011-12 *UAF Catalog*:

**ACADEMIC HONORS**

*Undergraduate and certificate students* -- To be eligible for academic honors at the end of a semester, you must be a full-time undergraduate degree or certificate student who has completed at least 12 UA institutional credits graded with the letter grades A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D- or F. If you have received an incomplete or deferred grade, your academic honors cannot be determined until those grades have been changed to permanent grades. Academic honors are recorded on your permanent record. You will make the chancellor's list with a semester GPA of 3.9 **[[and]]** **OR** the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5 to 3.89. UAF announces the students who have earned honors each semester. Students with incompletes or deferred grades that are changed after publication of honors will not be announced separately. If you've requested that information not be released about you (under FERPA), your name will not be released to the media.

ATTACHMENT 181/5  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new category of registration, “Directed Study,” to allow a student to contract with an instructor to enroll individually in a course that exists in the catalog, outside of the regularly-scheduled sections of the course in a given semester. The difference between “Directed Study” and the current “Individual Study” would be that “Individual Study” would be reserved for contracted 1:1 courses that do not exist in the UAF catalog. Courses taken as Directed Study would be transcribed with the existing subject and course number from the catalog and the suffix (D.S.\*).

EFFECTIVE:        Fall 2012

RATIONALE:        The majority of current Individual Study enrollments are actually for courses that exist in the UAF catalog. The student contracts with an instructor to take an individual section of the course outside of the regular course schedule. These are posted to the student’s transcript as a -97 course number. It then raises questions about course content for transfer credit to other institutions; does not meet prerequisites in Banner; and does not automatically feed into degree requirements in DegreeWorks. Reserving the -97 “Independent Study” designation only for courses that do not exist in the UAF catalog would minimize these problems for students and advisors.

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E, Permanent Committees.2. This amendment updates terminology in the bylaws and removes redundant language from the committee definition.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The current definition of the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee is out of date. This amendment corrects an outdated campus name, removes an unnecessarily convoluted and redundant sentence, and refines the definition of committee membership.

\*\*\*\*\*

**CAPS** = Addition

**[[ ]]** = Deletion

Section 3 (ART V: Committees), subsection E., Permanent Committees:

2. The Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee will include one representative from each of the following units of the College of Rural and Community Development: Bristol Bay Campus, Chukchi Campus, Interior-Aleutians Campus, Kuskokwim Campus, Northwest Campus, and **[[Tanana Valley Campus]] COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE**. One or more of these should be from rural campus student services. The committee will also include one representative from the Department of Developmental Education; two **AT LARGE** representatives from the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics: one from the Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, or Physics) and one from Math; one from the College of Liberal Arts English Department; and one each from Rural Student Services, the Academic Advising Center, and the Student Support Services Program.

The Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee shall consider policies concerning student development and retention. This committee will function as a curriculum **[[council]]** review committee for all developmental education courses and other courses facilitating student progress. **[[Discipline based developmental education courses and other courses facilitating student progress will be reviewed by the appropriate college curriculum council before submission to this committee for review and coordination.]]**

**Curricular Affairs Committee  
Meeting Minutes for January 25, 2012**

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry (chair); Jungho Baek; Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Brian Himelbloom (phone); Diane McEachern (phone); Todd Radenbaugh (phone); Dave Valentine; Jun Watabe.

Voting Members not present: Anthony Arendt; Debra Moses.

Non-voting Members present: Lillian Anderson-Misel; Donald Crocker; Mike Earnest; Libby Eddy; Carol Gering; Linda Hapsmith; Susan Henrichs (for Dana Thomas); Pete Pinney; Michelle Stalder.  
Not present: Doug Goering.

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

**A. OLD Business**

1. Is this an ok day/time?? If not....suggestions?

This item was not discussed, though mentioned briefly. [Wednesdays from 2-3 p.m. accommodates the most members, based on the Doodle Poll results.]

2. Recent GERK issues and such —comments by Dave

Dave reported that GERK is meeting weekly this semester.

They are hearing about faculty frustration with the lack of writing skills being exhibited by students in upper division courses. Is ENGL F111X enough preparation for upper division courses? The idea of utilizing TAs from the English Department as a resource in writing-intensive courses was discussed. It was noted, however, that English graduate students are working on creative writing, not scientific writing. Rainer suggested bringing the English department into the discussion.

Jun asked if the issue of student plagiarism is being discussed at GERK. Dave indicated it's not been brought up.

Susan Henrichs asked if the frustration with student writing skills is echoed in the arts and humanities and social sciences, as well. The consensus was that that this frustration is shared there, as well.

Pete and Carol mentioned strategies they are using at their units to address reading and writing skills in various courses. Linda asked how such courses might translate to the Core requirements. Dave mentioned that GERK is reviewing several Core models and how learning outcomes will be identified for Core. Susan stressed the need for a Core structure that is identifiable and transferable.

Pete mentioned that Mike Koskey can not serve on GERK and wanted to know what procedure to use to replace him. It was agreed that Miranda Wright will follow up and see that a statement of interest is submitted by a candidate to fill the CRCD seat.

3. 'Stacked' courses -- comments by Tony? [Item postponed. Anthony was traveling.]

**B. NEW Business**

**1. Proposed motion #1**

**Change this:**

One academic credit hour of non-laboratory instruction at UAF will consist of a minimum of 800 minutes of instruction" (FS meeting #3, March 25, 1988). It is understood that an average student will

be expected to spend 1600 minutes of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.

The number of minutes required for one credit of laboratory (1600 or 2400) depends on the amount of instruction given during the lab. For typical science and engineering labs where students work with teaching assistant guidance performing preset exercises, 2400 minutes (3 hours/week/credit for a 14 week semester) is used. For labs in which a faculty member interacts with students and provides feedback throughout the laboratory period (clinical labs, art studio, automotive technical labs) 1600 minutes (2 hours/week/credit for a 14 week semester) is used. A course submission with a lab component should include a justification for the number of minutes of lab per credit employed.”

**To THIS:**

“One academic credit hour of non-laboratory instruction at UAF will consist of a minimum of 800 minutes (1 hour/week) of instruction. It is understood that an average student will be expected to spend 1600 minutes (2 hours/week) of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.

Laboratory activities invariably require students to spend AT LEAST ONE HOUR OF STUDY OR PREPARATION time before and (or) after the lab PERIOD, outside of the lab. Traditionally, credits for lab activities in science and engineering ignore this and use 2400 lab hours/credit (3 hours/week/per credit for a 14 week semester). Conversely, lab hours for fields outside of science and engineering traditionally use 1600 hours of lab activities per credit (2 hours/week/credit). A course submission with a lab component should include a justification (in terms of student work hours) for the number of minutes of lab per credit employed.”

**OR POSSIBLY THIS.... for 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph...**

“Laboratory classes may require a minimum of 2400 lab minutes/credit (3 hours/week/credit), or they may require a minimum of 1600 lab minutes (2 hours/week/credit) AND 800 minutes (1 hour/week) of study and/or preparation outside of class. A course submission with a lab component should 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.”

Justification: brings UAF policies in line with BOR

**R10.04.090. 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

There was consensus that the second version was preferred by the committee with a change in the last sentence: “A course submission with a lab component [[should]] **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 effect should bring UAF in line with UA regulation without changing the traditional science / non-science labs at UAF. The committee agreed to bring the revised motion to the Administrative Committee.

## **2. Proposed motion #2 on Educational Effectiveness**

Susan spoke to the committee about the motion. The cycle of assessment needs to be addressed because of the recommendation by the NWCCU accreditation team. Student learning outcomes assessment must be continuously performed, not sporadically (as has been the case). While many units are gathering data, there is no evidence to demonstrate that data results are being applied. Many surveys are being used which are too generalized (e.g., student exit surveys). The two year interval is proposed by this motion because department chairs serve two-year terms, and aligning the cycle with the term will help ensure that assessment is regularly addressed and not skipped over. Susan has also encouraged the deans to put assessment duties into workloads.

She explained the larger picture which includes higher education accountability and standards, and the fact that if universities do not take the initiative in the near future, it could become mandated by government down the road. Currently, UAF must take the NWCCU recommendation very seriously, and the report due to the accreditors next fall must show some positive effort and change.

It was noted that many programs which have specialized accreditation are using capstone courses for their senior students. These courses fit well with assessing student learning outcomes for programs.

The issue of Faculty Senate wishing to separate the matter of program review from outcomes assessment was discussed. Susan explained that all that is being changed right now is the frequency of required reports. Dave mentioned the need for training department chairs and faculty how to do the assessments, considering there is such a wide variation in how well it's being done across campus. Susan agreed. She noted they are looking at model assessment templates and promised to share those with Faculty Senate. Rainer reiterated that faculty are concerned about the workload involved in doing assessments, and Susan reiterated that they are looking for a process that will require reasonable amounts of work. Time is a great factor, both for faculty doing the work of assessments, and for the university to respond to the accreditation recommendation.

Curricular Affairs Committee agreed that this topic would be discussed at the February Faculty Senate meeting with the goal of a vote on the motion in March.

## **3. Core science labs—update from meeting in Anchorage - Jan 15 & 16.**

Report / discussion on this topic was postponed to the next meeting due to time constraints.

---

### **Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes for 8 February 2012**

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry, Chair; Anthony Arendt; Jungho Baek; Retchenda George-Bettisworth (phone); Brian Himelbloom (phone); Jun Watabe.

Voting members absent: Diane McEachern; Deb Moses; Todd Radenbaugh (traveling); Dave Valentine.

Non-voting members present: Donald Crocker; Mike Earnest; Libby Eddy; Carol Gering; Doug Goering; Linda Hapsmith; Dana Thomas.

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

#### **OLD Business**

1. Approval of previous meeting minutes.  
January 25 meeting minutes were approved as submitted.
2. Recent GERC issues

Comments postponed for next meeting.

3. 'Stacked' courses

Anthony gave a brief report, reporting that results are in from the surveys of faculty and students. He and Lara Horstmann are compiling the results and writing a report.

4. Proposed motion to amend the Educational Effectiveness policy:

(A copy of the motion is included at the end of these minutes.)

Jun asked how the assessment data are used, and if reporting is required or just recommended. Doug G. commented on the fact that assessment is required and why. He noted how ABET accreditation drives the review of their undergraduate programs, vs. the review of their graduate programs which is much looser. Senior capstone courses were mentioned as a means that NWCCU recommends for ongoing assessment because it's easier to tie assessment to those courses.

Rainer commented that the ultimate test is after the student leaves. Doug noted it's harder to document then and that external factors start to drive the results (the job market, for example). Rainer also commented that the work not only involves improving programs, but documenting the effort to do so.

There was agreement that there needs to be faculty buy-in in the process. It seems to be driven by administration, rather than faculty driven. All agree that no one wants to do it if it's not useful to them. Dana commented on its need as a feedback mechanism to faculty to have real knowledge of how well students are doing in their courses and programs. Dave Veazey's name was mentioned as a potential guest to speak to the committee on this topic. In the meantime, Rainer urged that an electronic discussion of the matter be initiated.

The CAC passed the motion and it will move on to the Administrative Committee.

NEW Business:

1. *Proposed motion to amend Catalog language to clarify the difference between the Dean's List and the Chancellor's List:*

Currently, the catalog states that dean's list is for students with a GPA of >3.5 and chancellor's list for >3.9. Presumably, then, this logic means that a student with >3.9 is on both Dean's List AND Chancellor's List. The intention was that dean's list would be 3.5 to 3.89, and chancellor's list > or = 3.9.

Current catalog language (Under "ACADEMIC HONORS" on page 49)

You will make the chancellor's list with a GPA of 3.9 and the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5 or higher.

**CHANGE TO:**

You will make the chancellor's list with a GPA of 3.9 or higher, ~~and~~ **or** the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5 to 3.89.

**EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012**

**RATIONALE:** The current catalog language is vague enough that some students might expect to be on both lists, when our intention was that they are on one or the other, but not both.

The committee passed this motion and it will move forward to the Administrative Committee.

2. Mike Earnest brought the topic of a new category of registration called Directed Study before the committee. It would be similar to Independent Study courses (numbered -97), except that the course

already exists and would retain its catalog number. A flag in Banner could be used to indicate that the student took the course as Directed Study (as opposed to taking it in a normal class setting). Some workload and core course issues were discussed. The item will be discussed further at the next CAC meeting.

- 3. Item: *X wants to teach microbio BIOL F240 next semester because there is a high local demand. However, most of those students already take A&P 112, and experience says that they can't handle 2 such big classes in one semester. So X hopes to can teach microbio 240 spread out over 2 semesters instead, fall 2012 and spring 2013. X has taught the class before in a traditional 1-semester setting so X is already approved as an instructor, but what process would be needed for a 2-semester format?*

*In effect, students would register for the 4 credits in Fall 2012, but the lecture and lab would be spread over the September to May time frame, with a grade not being posted (or credit earned) until May.*

The committee discussed this question, noting the issues of faculty workloads, the pace of the course not being equal to a semester course, and Financial Aid issues, as well as grading issues. It was agreed that the easiest approach would be to split the course in half at 1.5 credits each.

-----  
Copy of the Educational Effectiveness motion (from Item 4 under Old Business):

**DRAFT MOTION**

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 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.

ATTACHMENT 181/8  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by Unit Criteria Committee

**Unit Criteria Committee  
Meeting Minutes for Friday 3 February 2012**

Attending: Cathleen Winfree, Vladimir Alexeev, Stefan Golux, Mark Hermann, Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Debra Jones, Perry Barboza

Minutes prepared by P. Barboza

1. BOR document comments on 04.04
  - Some redundant passages that could be clarified regarding fractional appointments (P040403. G).
  - No other comments regarding conflicts with governance and unit criteria
2. SOE criteria
  - Format CAPS BOLD ITALIC per template
  - Comments and suggested edits were discussed and added to a word document.
  - Return to SOE for amendment. Committee will consider modified document for vote by e-mail.
3. CES criteria
  - The document diverges from the established template in length and scope
  - Additions to the preamble must be shortened to only describe how this unit differs from what is already described in general terms for all units.
  - The unit should review approved criteria for CEM and Fisheries that are posted on the FS site.
  - Invite a representative of CES to meet with Unit Committee
4. Pending criteria and other issues
  - Barboza will meet with Music Faculty on 14 February to discuss revisions to Criteria
  - Next meeting tentatively scheduled for 9:30 am Friday 10 February

ATTACHMENT 181/9  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by Committee on the Status of Women

**Committee on the Status of Women,  
Meeting Minutes for Fri, Feb 17, 2012; 10:00-11:00 am, Gruening 718**

Members Present: Melanie Arthur, Derek Sikes, Kayt Sunwood, Jane Weber, Ellen Lopez, Nilima Hullavarad

Members absent: Jenny Liu, Johnny Payne, Ellen Lopez, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Shawn Russell

- 1) Difficult Dialogues Workshop with Libby Roderick recap. Valuable issue.
- 2) Brown Bag - "Negotiating with Deans" 2/16 Good event and discussion on a rarely addressed topic. Paul Layer enriched the discussion with much appreciated information.  
"Career Development Mapping" 3/22 brown bag in preparation.
- 3) Speaker for Women Faculty Luncheon, Sep 2012. Possible - Peggy Shumaker, Wendy Redmond, Jennifer McBeath, Sherri Modrow, Elena Sparrow (Others?). Ellen suggested maybe focusing event around a theme that could turn the luncheon into a large discussion / workshop?
- 4) Panelists for Promotion / Tenure Workshop, April 27. Discussion of possible panelists: Roxie Dinstel, Sine Anahita, Paul Layer? Paul has always been good in the past. Suggestion that maybe the panel should be only faculty? Avoid redundancy with Provost's P&T workshop by not having Paul Layer (who gives identical talks?). Fourth year review suggestions: Andres Lopez, Andrea Bursamin? Recently promoted suggestions: Either Melanie Arthur or Steffi Ickert-Bond? Steffi might address the challenges of being a mother with young children. Suggestion for a research professor: Elena Sparrow?
- 5) Melanie Arthur proposed agenda item for next time: UAF spousal hire policy. Ten years since faculty senate dealt with this. In Chancellor's list of goals for 2012. Draft of policy that we could work with - Melanie will send it around by email. Also information on best practices from other institutions.

**Next Meeting** - Thurs 29 March 2012, 11:30AM - 1PM (to accommodate guest Mae Marsh).

Meeting was adjourned at 10:50; Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

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

ATTACHMENT 181/10

UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee  
Meeting Minutes for January 31, 2012**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:15 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Julie Joly, Franz Meyer, Channon Price

Excused: Mike Castellini, Stephen Brown, Joy Morrison, Alexandra Oliveira

III. Report from Joy

Joy was unable to attend as her flight was delayed.

Travel proposals were due January 31 at 5:00 pm. Duff and CP volunteered to assist in evaluating the proposals on February 1 at 3:30 pm.

There is an upcoming seminar on Student Incivility, Bullying, and Aggression on Monday, February 6 from 3:30 – 5:00 pm in the Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom. Dr. Claudia Lampman, UAA Professor of Psychology, will present. This is jointly sponsored by UAF Faculty Senate, UNAC, and the UAFT.

IV. Old Business

1. BOR Review

The BOR review by the Faculty Senate has concluded.

2. Faculty survey

The five question areas that our committee discussed at our last meeting are as follows:

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?

We discussed how we can advance this, and Josef will ask Melanie Arthur to join us for our next meeting to lend her expertise. It was pointed out that some new faculty members are not aware of the OFD and what services it provides. We decided to split our five question areas up amongst committee members to focus on in more depth.

Types of sessions/presentations were discussed and it was agreed that practical sessions vs “information dumps” are more attractive and helpful for faculty. We also discussed the possibility of encouraging and facilitating a bottom-up, grassroots approach by inviting current faculty members to present sessions in their area of expertise or have them share their viewpoints and techniques that they are using. These sessions could be limited to the professor’s department or opened up for all faculty members. What are the possibilities of having such sessions scheduled through, and sanctioned by, the OFD? There are small groups of faculty members meeting already.

Josef informed us that Dana Thomas indicated that the accreditation report suggests that we need a stronger focus on Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment. A new Educational Effectiveness program should be implemented in the future. However, the draft motion submitted for discussion to the faculty senate states that the “data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty.’

V. Next Meeting (tentative): Tuesday, February 28, 2012, 8:15 – 9:15 am, Bunnell 222

Committee members are encouraged to utilize Google Calendar so convening our upcoming meetings will be more easily facilitated.

VI. Adjourned at 9:17 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 181/11

UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012

Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate  
2012-02-10 Meeting Minutes**

Voting Members: Orion Lawlor, Susan Renes, Donie Bret-Harte, Elisabeth Nadin, Vincent Cee, Chung-Sang Ng

Non-Voting: Tim Bartholomaus, Laura Bender, Larry Duffy, Lillian Misel

Curriculum progress:

- The construction management 1-credit courses are withdrawn, pending updated syllabi.
- The program change in geophysics (5-GPCh) is fully approved, after the new math admission requirements were double checked.
- ED 682 (25-GNC) is approved, with updated 2012-02-09 syllabus.
- Program changes in the education post-baccalaureate and M.Ed. degrees (18-GPCh, 19-GPCh, and 20-GPCh) were approved.
- PETE/GEOS 608 (31-GNC) was approved.

The ad-hoc stacked course subgroup surveyed all UAF faculty listed as in Banner as teaching a stacked course. We sent a personal email plea to 82 instructors, and got back 44 responses. 52% of instructors reported differentiating between 400 and 600 level courses on a weekly basis; but over 90% differentiated between them at least once per month. Over 91% had differences in projects between levels, and 64% had differences in readings. Most stacked courses were stacked due to low enrollment in separate courses, and to expand the variety of electives offered. We still need to survey graduate students. GAAC members: what policy recommendations does this data suggest?

The graduate school has proposed a new Responsible Conduct in Research (RCR) requirement:

"All Graduate Students who are currently or have received NSF or NIH funding while at UAF are required to take a Responsible Conduct in Research course ([LAS601](#)) or an approved alternative."

Start Date: Students whose first enrollment is after 10/25/2012.

Rationale: RCR training is required by [42 CFR Parts 50 and 93](#) for NIH grants, and [Section 7009 of the America COMPETES Act](#) for NSF grants.

Background: LAS601 (approved by [GAAC fall 2009](#)) is a two-credit course, and will be run every semester. Not a lecture course, this uses a case study review and discussion approach. Example issues: authorship disputes, ethical issues in mentoring, treatment of cell lines. Typically each meeting starts with a 15 minute introductory lecture, followed by a lively discussion between students. Students can either sign up for the course officially; or attend 10 total meetings, sign the attendance sheet, and participate in the discussion. Biology already requires a research design course, and scientific writing course, which may have some overlap with these topics, and could eventually be approved by the graduate college as an alternative.

Next meeting: Friday, February 24, 9am in the Kayak Room (Rasmuson 408).

ATTACHMENT 181/12

UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee  
Meeting Minutes for February 2, 2012**

**Attending:**

Sarah Stanley, Dana Greci, David Maxwell, Cindy Hardy, Amy Barnsley, Sandra Wildfeur, Curt Szuberla, Gabrielle Russell, Nancy Ayagarak

Not attending: Diane Erickson, Deseree Salvador, Erin from Nome, Elizabeth Izaki, David Veazy, John Creed, Alan Morotti

**Approval of December minutes:**

Approved by acclaim.

**Motion on Committee Definition**

We discussed how to encourage rural faculty to participate in this committee. We decided to list all those who don't attend meetings along with those attending. Cindy will contact specific people to see if they are continuing to represent their campus on the committee.

The motion to revise and update the committee definition was approved.

**Learning Commons update**

Library is setting up tables with dividers, white boards. They will do that in March.

**Ideas on support for student success**

This is an ongoing item on our agenda. We discussed the Very Early Warning and Freshman Progress Reports. Let's encourage our departments to participate.

Sandra suggested a rural student award as means of encouraging student success. This may already be done through CRCD.

Gabrielle mentioned that there have been changes to the withdrawal process, such as the elimination of the drop/swap. She asked whether these policy changes are getting out to faculty and advisors.

**SADA data requests**

We continued our discussion of gathering data on student outcomes in entry-level courses. Dana G reports that Developmental Education's NADE data request will be in by Feb 15 from institutional research. David will find out if any data requests have been made for math. Sarah S reported that a request was made for placement data for English. Dana Thomas may have some data reports as well. At the next meeting, we will look at the data that exists and see what further questions we want to address. We would like to have two or three standing requests for yearly data from PAIR so that we can track the success of initiatives such as mandatory placement or advising.

## Prep Courses

We looked over a list of “Prep” courses at Mike Earnest’s request, and, in general, all of the courses listed are preparatory or developmental. We discussed how some courses with different designators (ABUS, ECE, TTCH) relate to other content courses such as DEVM or DEVE courses. We raised the question of how “Prep” is defined on this list. We noted that some of the courses listed are required math courses for specific certificate and associates degrees, not “preparatory” for those degrees. We discussed how this request links with discussions of pass rates. Dana G suggested that this fits with our discussion of how to study D/F/Ws. We could limit it to two variables: those not doing well because of trouble learning the material and those not doing well because of external factors.

## UAA Questions

We discussed a list of questions UAA faculty sent to UAF DEVE faculty in preparation for meeting to discuss aligning assessment in our programs.

David noted that, in the past, Math and DEVM faculty enforced prerequisites by manually checking student prerequisites in UAonline. Mandatory placement has not improved their pass rates, but has eliminated this process and students’ need to change classes early in the semester.

Curt said he teaches upper level Physics classes, so placement isn’t really an issue. He does teach some 200 level classes, but he can talk with individual students to help with placement issues. He does not want to block a student who wants to try a class, though it may take three times before they successfully complete the class.

In response to the notion of state-wide standardized placement, Sarah recommends a more rounded look at each student in deciding placement through advising. We discussed the benefits of a locally designed placement test and of student self-directed placement.

We noted the advantages of Accuplacer, as well: no need to argue over placement, better reflection of current knowledge than HS transcripts (which may be out of date or mean varying things).

To further address placement issues, we will invite Linda Hapsmith to the next meeting. We will also invite Dana Thomas to the April meeting, once we have looked the data on hand and can formulate further questions.

**Next meetings:** Those in attendance agreed to 3:30 to 5:00, the first Thursday of the month. Semester meeting dates will be March 1, April 5, and May 3.



ATTACHMENT 181/13  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

**Research Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes - January 25<sup>th</sup> 2011**

Attending : Orion Lawlor (co-chair), Peter Webley (chair), Joanne Healy and John Heaton

Unable to attend: Kris Hundertmark, Sarah Hardy and Roger Hansen

Visitor: Flora Grabowska (GI Librarian)

Location : IARC 417

Started at 10:02 am

1. Open Access policy at UAF

Flora came to present to the committee on the Open Access for journals. Flora had presented to the Faculty Senate in the public comments at the October 2011 Faculty Senate meeting and it was felt that Flora should come to talk to the Research Advisory Committee.

Flora provided a detailed overview of what Open Access is and that every year there is Open Access week in October. Flora pointed out that if a paper is open access then there will be more citations than if it was kept in a 'Toll Access' journal.

The question is how do we allot those in UAF to have open access papers? John Heaton made the point that researchers should get to determine their journal of choice and what is this is always open access. Peter Webley spoke about that he submits to journals that offer open access but only at a cost of up to \$2000 per journal.

Flora pointed out that she was only advocating that UAF faculty, staff, students whom do submit to journals to be encouraged to make them open access papers. this will not only help the citation index of the paper but will help promote UAF research

Peter Webley stated that it might be institute, department, college level advisement to researchers to aim to include papers for open access rather than a faculty senate statement or policy decision. Might those with grants to write aim to include additional 'publication fees' only with those for printing color pages to manuscripts associated to that grant directly to also cover open access fees so that the paper can then be open?

Flora pointed out to all on the committee that the GI now is able to assist researchers in getting their manuscripts as open access.

2. Discussion on Policy and Regulations request from Admin Services Committee

Discussion on the requested sections of the UAF Regents Policy and Regulations documents from the UAF faculty Senate Administrative services committee. Orion Lawlor showed his edits and queries to several of the items and these were discussed by committee members attending. Orion will send his

version to all members and they will send edits to Peter Webley, Chair, by Friday am so that the edits can get the Administrative services committee.

### 3. Timing of monthly meeting

Request to have monthly meeting at similar time of the month. February meeting aimed to be 15th. Flora has offered GI Library conference room. Peter Webley, chair, will get response from full committee to get a time on February 15th.

The aim is for following meetings is 2nd to 3rd Wednesday of each month, Location: GI Library conference room

Ended at 11:17 am