

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 #190

Monday, April 1, 2013 – 1:00-3:00 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

- | | | | |
|------|-------|---|---------|
| 1:00 | I | Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds | 4 Min. |
| | | A. Roll Call | |
| | | B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #188 and #189 | |
| | | C. Adoption of Agenda | |
| 1:04 | II | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions | 1 Min. |
| | | A. Motions Approved: | |
| | | 1. Motion to approve the Library Science Unit Criteria | |
| | | 2. Motion to amend the grading policy for C- (1.7) as minimum acceptable grade for major / minor degree requirements and prerequisites | |
| | | 3. Motion to revise the grade appeals policy to clarify the time period within which grade appeals will be reviewed (Section III: Procedures, Article B, Subsection 5) | |
| | | 4. Motion to change UAF Catalog descriptions of letter grades | |
| | | B. Motions Pending: None | |
| 1:05 | III | A. President's Comments – Jennifer Reynolds | 10 Min. |
| | | B. President-Elect's Comments – David Valentine | |
| 1:15 | IV | A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers | 25 Min. |
| | | B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs | |
| 1:40 | V | Old Business | 10 Min. |
| | | A. Motion to confirm the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award, submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee (Attachment 190/1) | |
| | | B. Motion to affirm the election of the Faculty Senate President-Elect for 2013-14, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 190/2) | |
| | | C. Faculty Senate Election Results (Attachment 190/3) | |
| 1:50 | VI | New Business | 10 Min. |
| | | A. Motion to approve a new B.A. degree in Secondary Education with Content Area, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 190/4) | |
| | | The full proposal and related document containing 4 – 5 year timelines are posted at: | |
| | | http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/curriculum-review-committ/12-13-curric-review/ | |
| 2:00 | BREAK | | |

2:10	VI	New Business Continued	15 Min.
		B. Resolution to recommend ending automatic university-wide review in post-tenure faculty evaluation, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 190/5)	
		C. Motion to approve establishment of a central online collection of expanded course descriptions for all UAF courses, and template, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 190/6)	
2:25	VII	Discussion Items	5 Min.
		A. Invitation for feedback to FDAI on “Assessment of Electronic Course Evaluation Options for UAF” – Franz Meyer (Attachment 190/7)	
2: 30	VIII	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:35	IX	Governance Reports	15 Min.
		A. Staff Council – Juella Sparks	
		B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag	
		C. Athletics – Dani Sheppard	
		D. UNAC – Debu Misra	
		UAFT – Jane Weber	
2:50	X	Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements	10 Min.
		A. General Comments/Announcements	
		B. Committee Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)	
		Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 190/8)	
		Faculty Affairs – Cecile Lardon, Chair	
		Unit Criteria – Karen Jensen, Chair	
		Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 190/9)	
		Core Review Committee – Jean Richey, Chair	
		Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair	
		Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair (Attachment 190/10)	
		Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair (Attachment 190/11)	
		Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair (Attachment 190/12)	
		Research Advisory Committee – Jon Dehn, Chair (Attachment 190/13)	
3:00	XI	Adjournment	

ATTACHMENT 190/1

UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013

Submitted by the Outstanding Senator of the Year Selection Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the nomination of Cynthia Hardy for the 2012-2013 Outstanding Senator of the Year Award.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The selection committee has carefully reviewed the nominations according to the award criteria, and forwards the nomination of Cynthia Hardy as Outstanding Senator of the Year for confirmation by the Faculty Senate. Procedure stipulates that a simple majority vote of the Senate shall confirm the nomination, and a formal resolution shall be prepared for presentation to the recipient at the May meeting.

ATTACHMENT 190/2
UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to affirm the election of Cecile Lardon as the Faculty Senate President-Elect for 2013-2014.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: A single nomination has been received for the President-Elect position; therefore, a secret ballot election need not be held. A simple majority vote will suffice.

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF THE NOMINEE:

Cécile Lardon, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Psychology

I came to Fairbanks and to UAF in 1999 after earning an M.A. and Ph.D. in community and organizational psychology at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). I was a member of the Psychology Department for the first 13 years at UAF but joined the Sociology Department this year where I currently serve as the interim department chair. I have long been interested in organizational and community change and in leadership. While at UIC I worked at the Institute of Government and Public Affairs where I participated in organization development and strategic planning with government and not-for-profit agencies. My dissertation was on organizational cultures in state psychiatric hospitals. In Alaska I have worked with Alaska Native communities on health issues. A multi-year NIH funded project aimed to develop a community development approach to health promotion by designing a culturally based planning and evaluation process and then developing local expertise, infrastructure and processes to support that project plan.

I have served on the Faculty Senate for a total of 5 years: My first term in 2005/06 ended prematurely when I needed to take on the role of department chair in the Psychology Department. More recently I have served two full terms. My Faculty Senate committee work has included the Committee on the Status of Women (1 year) and the Faculty Affairs Committee (4 years) which I have chaired this year. Participating in governance has always been a priority for me. I grew up in Germany in the 60s and 70s as part of the second post-WWII generation. Being an active and critical member of one's society was a strong societal value that has shaped my life since. I strongly believe in the importance of shared governance in the academy. And to make that work faculty need to be active, informed, and critical participants. Although there are many ways for faculty to participate in the affairs of the university, the Faculty Senate is the main venue for faculty to shape policies and help set priorities that affect our work. To be an effective body the Senate needs to draw on the perspectives and talents of all its members. It also needs to take an active role in developing its future leaders. Serving as Faculty Senate President during a time of high levels of general disengagement and cynicism among the faculty can certainly be a challenge but I also see it as an opportunity to bring new interest in and attention to the issues the Senate deals with. I feel honored to have the opportunity to participate in the Senate's crucial role as a credible and forward thinking partner in university governance.

FS Election Results as of 3/22/2013:

College of Liberal Arts

Representatives	Alternates
Arts & Communication – Vince Cee (14)	Arts & Communication – Karl Knapp (15)
English & Humanities – Chris Coffman (15)	English & Humanities – Michael Edson (14)
Language & Culture – Anna Berge (15)	Language & Culture – Alla Grikurova (14)
Social Sciences – Amy Lovecraft (15)	Social Sciences – Chanda Meek (15)
Applied & Distance Program – J. Rob Duke (15)	Applied & Distance Programs – Vacancy
At large – Duff Johnston (14)	At large – Wendy Croskrey (15)
At large – Karen Gustafson (14)	

Libraries – New Representation

Leslie McCartney (15)	Elizabeth Humrickhouse (15)
Dennis Moser (14)	

College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics

Representatives	Alternates
Mark Conde (15)	Falk Huettmann (14)
Donie Bret-Harte (15)	Ataur Chowdhury (15)
Javier Fochesatto (14)	Brian Rasley (15)
Knut Kielland (14)	Vacancy
Franz Meyer (15)	
Rainer Newberry (14)	
Margaret Short (15)	

College of Rural & Community Development

Representatives	Alternates
Bill Barnes (15) – UAF CTC	Jennie Carroll (14) – IAC
Mike Davis (14) – BBC	Diane McEachern (15) - KUC
Galen Johnson (15) – UAF CTC	Patty Meritt (14) – CTC
Todd Radenbaugh (15) - BBC	
Jane Weber (14) – CRC	
Cathy Winfree (15) – UAF CTC	

Cooperative Extension Service

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Leslie Shallcross (15)	Julie Cascio (14)
Leif Albertson (14)	

College of Engineering & Mines

Representatives	Alternates
Cheng-fu Chen (14)	Orion Lawlor (14)
Debu Misra (15)	Rorik Peterson (15)
Xiong Zhang (14)	

School of Natural Resources & Agriculture

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Julie L. Joly (15)	Glenn Juday (14)
John Yarie (14)	

School of Education

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Christine Cook (14)	Phil Patterson (15)
Joanne Healy (15)	

School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences

Representatives	Alternates
Izetta Chambers (14)	Tori Baker (14)
Sarah Hardy (15)	Andrew McDonnell (15)
Lara Horstmann (15)	
Peter Winsor (14)	

School of Management

Representatives	Alternates
Xiaoqi Chelsea Han (15)	Jungho Baek (14)
Wayne Marr (14)	Charlie Sparks (15)

Geophysical Institute

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Jonathan Dehn (15)	Gerhard Kramm (15)
Peter Webley (14)	

Int'l Arctic Research Center

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Chris Fallen (15)	<i>Pending</i>
Georgina Gibson (14)	

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the new Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education with Content Area.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014, with Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: Alaska has a chronic need for teachers. This proposed new major provides a structured path, within a baccalaureate degree, for a student to gain the complete education necessary to become a secondary education teacher in the State of Alaska. The program is structured to improve access to interested students and to increase availability of qualified and successful secondary school teachers in Alaska, particularly in rural Alaska. The additional cost of this program is essentially administrative, with no new courses or faculty required, but the likely benefits are considerable.

Currently a student intending to become a secondary educator earns a baccalaureate degree in a subject area and then undergoes 1-2 years of post-baccalaureate teacher training. There are numerous disadvantages to this approach, including extremely limited financial aid for the post-baccalaureate training and a disconnect between studying the major subject and learning to teaching that subject. The new approach addresses these problems by enrolling the student in a unified, integrated double major in Secondary Education combined with a major in an approved Secondary Education field (English, Mathematics, Art, Biology, etc.).

Other advantages of the proposed program stem directly from identification of interested students early in their career at UAF. These students interact with (and provide moral support to) each other and establish long-term working relationships with the secondary education faculty. Further, through integration of their education coursework and their major they receive consistent encouragement in their intended career path. Finally, through their continuous interaction with the secondary education faculty they receive encouragement to pursue careers in secondary education in rural Alaska.

This program addresses UA's Strategic Direction Initiatives, specifically SDI Theme 2: *Productive Partnerships With Alaska's Schools*, Topic 2.c *Teachers for Alaska Schools*. In particular, the program will address SDI through (1) improving teacher education, (2) providing greater incentives for Alaskan students to teach in rural communities, and (3) providing greater opportunities for incoming Alaskan minority educators. The program is also likely to result in the desired SDI effects of (1) high-quality UA-educated teachers, (2) a greater proportion of UA-educated Alaskan new teacher hires, and (3)-better retention of students interested in a career in secondary education.

The full program proposal, #31-UNP (revised) from the Fall 2012 review cycle, is available at <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/curriculum-review-committ/12-13-curric-review/>

**STATEMENT OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM, ITS OBJECTIVES
AND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES**
New Degree Request

The University of Alaska Secondary Education Department prepares teachers for 7-12 grade classrooms. The program's aim is to develop teachers who can demonstrate through standards-based, performance assessment that they will be effective teachers for all students. The primary mission is to provide teachers for the unique environments of Alaska's urban and rural communities. This will be a truly unique degree program as it is the only BA degree that requires a double major. In order for students to be certified by the State of Alaska, they need to complete a teacher education program as well as a content major for which they will be endorsed on their certificate. This double major results in more than 120 credits, which is the minimum number of credits for a degree in a content area. However, a student cannot be certified unless they have an accompanying content major along with the secondary education major.

The Alaska Content/Performance and Cultural Standards for school students are the foundations of education for children in Alaska. The Standards for Alaska Teachers adopted by the Department of Education and Early Development are recognized as indicators of successful teachers. The goal of the Secondary Education Department is to develop teachers who successfully incorporate Content/Performance and Cultural standards into their instruction and who successfully meet all Standards for Alaska Teachers.

To assist in meeting state mandated standards, the effective preparation of teachers requires participation of university faculty and master practitioners actively involved in the teaching profession. Currently, the secondary program involves collaborative partnerships among districts, schools and the university. It draws upon the expertise of public school teachers who serve as mentors throughout the academic year. The program seeks to build a collaborative learning community between the university and secondary faculties from schools throughout the state.

Students in the secondary teacher preparation program are assessed relative to state and national standards, including National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards, the Alaska Teacher Standards, Alaska Content Standards, Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools and standards relative to academic specialty organizations (i.e. National Council of Teachers of English, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Council of Social Studies, National Science Teachers Association, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages).

Specific Objectives of the new baccalaureate degree are:

1. To provide a teacher certification program that can be completed concurrent with an undergraduate degree.
2. To provide undergraduate teacher certification course work leading to a baccalaureate degree that includes both academic and classroom internship requirements necessary to meet NCATE Standards, standards of academic specialist areas, Alaska Teacher Standards, and Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools through close and on-going collaboration with districts and schools in urban and rural Alaska.

3. To provide an undergraduate teacher certification degree that responds to the State of Alaska's critical need for more teachers who are prepared to successfully teach in linguistically and culturally diverse schools.

The central components of the new baccalaureate degree include:

1. Identified undergraduate majors in content areas suitable for public school teaching that can be completed concurrently with education courses leading to teaching certification.
2. Early, appropriate and consistent advising of students who seek to enter the teaching profession in an identified content area.
3. An integrated set of education courses and fieldwork experiences in school and community contexts throughout the degree offering to provide the foundation for a successful internship.
4. A year-long school internship with a mentor teacher with concurrent enrollment in professional coursework that focuses on the integration and application of theory, research and practice in both urban and rural school environments.

Career Opportunities

There are unlimited career opportunities for secondary teachers in the State of Alaska, as well as nearly every other state in the United States. This program is designed to help fill the hundreds of positions in the State of Alaska open every year to qualified teachers that are currently filled by candidates from outside the State. Existing and predicted shortages of teachers are well documented in the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, in the Alaska Teacher Placement Office and in the U.S. Office of Education.

Description of the Program

1. Program title B.A., Secondary Education; Content Area (e.g. English, history, biology, mathematics)

2. Credential level of the program, if appropriate Secondary (7-12) Teacher Licensure

3. Admission Requirements

- Complete the [general university requirements](#).
- Complete the [B.A. degree requirements](#).
- Enrollment in a major in a content area usually taught in public schools AND enrollment in a major in secondary education.

Admission to professional year

- a) Senior standing
- b) 2.75 Minimum grade point average
- c) Three current letters of reference that address potential as a teacher
- d) *A personal statement of 500-800 words addressing motivation to enter the teaching profession, self-assessed qualifications to teach, experiences which have prepared candidate for teaching.
- e) Alaska passing scores from the Praxis I exam in reading, writing and mathematics
- f) Academic Content Testing

Content Area Exams: Candidates must submit a score report from the relevant content knowledge Praxis II Subject test for each content area the applicant expects to teach. The scores must meet the score set by the State of Alaska

(www.eed.state.ak.us/TeacherCertification/pdf/Content_Area_Exams_2008.pdf)

World Language Exams: Applicants applying to teach a World Language are required to submit Praxis II scores in the target language AND are required to submit scores for the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) and Writing Proficiency Test (WPT). Applicants must meet the Advanced Low rating for both tests (www.languageTesting.com).

- g) An extemporaneous writing sample
- h) Interview with secondary faculty.

Each candidate is evaluated based on the above requirements. Each candidate must receive acceptable rating on each of the criteria and be interviewed by three faculty members prior to being accepted into the professional year. The entire faculty meets and either approves the candidate or rejects the candidate. In rare cases the candidate may be provisionally admitted with areas needing strengthening.

4. Course descriptions of required and recommended elective courses.

These required education courses are currently available through face-to-face delivery on the Fairbanks campus and through a variety of distance delivery modes (synchronous/asynchronous or a combination). Courses have been developed as part of an overall program that connects theory and practice and sufficiently grounds prospective teachers in pedagogical theory and classroom practice.

Content course selections are designed to both meet the requirements for specialty organizations and NCATE and to fulfill requirements for content area majors.

Proposed General Catalog Layout Copy of Program

Bachelor of Arts Secondary Education; Content Area (e.g. English, history, biology, mathematics)

The requirements for a secondary school teaching certificate include completion of both a teaching major in an academic subject area appropriate to the secondary school and the professional education sequence. The degree is awarded as a B.A. with a double major.

Upon declaration of a major in secondary education, students are assigned an advisor in the Education Department to plan the completion of the teaching major and the education sequence of courses.

Teaching Majors

The teaching major must be in an academic subject area approved for a State of Alaska secondary school teaching certificate and available as a B.A. degree: art, biology, chemistry, earth science, economics, English, French, German, history, mathematics, political science, or Spanish.

Course work provides students on the Fairbanks campus and in distance sites with the experience necessary to be eligible for a secondary teacher license. The integrated of content major degree requirements and secondary education degree requirements are designed to prepare students to meet standards that recognize, respect and build upon Alaska's cultural, linguistic and geographic factors.

- Complete the following secondary course work:
 - EDSC F110—Becoming a Middle School/High School Teacher (1)
 - EDSC F407--Reading Strategies for Secondary Teachers (3)
 - EDSC F414--Learning, Development and Special Needs Instruction (3)
 - or EDSE 422 – Curriculum and Strategies II: High Incidence (3)

or EDSE F482 Inclusive Classrooms for All Children (3)
EDSC F205--Introduction to Secondary Education (3)
or EDSC F415--Foundations of Modern Educational Practices (3)
EDSC F458--Classroom Organization and Management (3)

Must be admitted to the Professional year

EDSC F402--Methods of Teaching in the Secondary School (3)
EDSC F442 --Technology Applications in Education I (1)
EDSC F443--Technology Applications in Education II (2)
EDSC F457--Multicultural Education and School-Community Relations (4)
EDSC F471--Secondary Teaching: School Internship I and Seminar (3)
EDSC F472--Secondary Teaching: School Internship II and Seminar (3-9)

One of the following

EDSC F432--English/Language Arts Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3)*
or EDSC F433--Mathematics Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3)*
or EDSC F434--Science Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3)*
or EDSC F435--Social Studies Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3)*
or EDSC F436--Art Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3) *
or EDSC F437—World Language Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3) *

**Candidates must take the section or course that corresponds with their major teaching content areas*

Complete requirements for a major in content area: art, biology, chemistry, earth science, economics, English, French, German, history, mathematics, political science, or Spanish.

**RESOURCE COMMITMENT TO THE
PROPOSED DEGREE PROGRAM**

Resources	Existing	New		Total
	College/School	College/School	Others (Specify)	
Regular Faculty (FTE's & dollars)	\$392,970 budgeted salary, \$142,961 benefits 5.875 FTE	No Change	No Change	\$392,970 budgeted salary, \$142,961 benefits 5.875 FTE
Adjunct Faculty (FTE's & dollars)	\$106,969 budgeted salary, \$10,697 benefits 1.75 FTE	\$3,000	No Change	\$109,969 budgeted salary, \$10,697 benefits 1.75 FTE
Teaching Assistants (Headcount)	1	No Change	No Change	1
Instructional Facilities (in dollars and/or sq. footage)	160 Old U Park 820 sq. ft	No Change	No Change	160 Old U Park 820 sq. ft.
Office Space (Sq. footage)	701A, 714C, 714B, 709A, 719, 721, 723, 707C, 701A Gruening 973 sq. ft.	No Change	No Change	701A, 714C, 714B, 709A, 719, 721, 723, 707C, 701A Gruening 973 sq. ft.
Lab Space (Sq. Footage)	162 Old U Park 820 sq. ft.	No Change	No Change	162 Old U Park 820 sq. ft.
Computer & Networking (in dollars)	\$37,285 for all SOE	No Change	No Change	\$37,285 for all SOE
Research/ Instructional/ office Equipment (in dollars)	\$7,000 for SOE	No Change	No Change	\$7,000 for SOE
Support Staff (FTE's & dollars)	\$94,866 budgeted salary, \$45,214 benefits 1.5 FTE	\$5,000	No Change	\$99,866 budgeted salary, \$45,214 benefits 1.5 FTE
Supplies (in dollars)	Avg \$1,000 / FY	No Change	No Change	Avg \$1,000 / FY
Travel (in dollars)	Avg \$10,000 / FY	No Change	No Change	Avg \$10,000 / FY



Board of Regents Program Action Request
University of Alaska
 Proposal to Add, Change, or Delete a Program of Study

1a. Major Academic Unit (choose one) UAF	1b. School or College EDUCATION	1c. Department SECONDARY	
2. Complete Program Title SECONDARY EDUCATION; CONTENT AREA (e.g. English, History, Biology, Mathematics)			
3. Type of Program <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AAS x <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Baccalaureate <input type="checkbox"/> Post-Baccalaureate Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Master's <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate			
4. Type of Action x <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add <input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> Delete		5. Implementation date (semester, year) Fall, 2013	
6. Projected Revenue and Expenditure Summary. Not Required if the requested action is deletion. (Provide information for the 5 th year after program or program change approval if a baccalaureate or doctoral degree program; for the 3 rd year after program approval if a master's or associate degree program; and for the 2 nd year after program approval if a graduate or undergraduate certificate. If information is provided for another year, specify (1st) and explain in the program summary attached). Note that Revenues and Expenditures are not always entirely new; some may be current (see 7d.)			
Projected Annual Revenues in FY 2013-14		Projected Annual Expenditures in FY 2014 for all of Secondary not just this degree	
Unrestricted		Salaries & benefits (faculty and staff)	\$793,677
General Fund	\$-0-	Other (commodities, services, etc.)	\$45,285
Student Tuition & Fees	\$121,900-145,900	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$838,962
Indirect Cost Recovery	\$-0-	One-time Expenditures to Initiate Program (if >\$250,000)	
TVEP or Other (specify):	\$-0-	(These are costs in addition to the annual costs, above.)	
Restricted		Year 1	\$-0-
Federal Receipts	\$-0-	Year 2	\$-0-
TVEP or Other (specify):	\$-0-	Year 3	\$-0-
TOTAL REVENUES	\$-0-	Year 4	\$-0-
Page # of attached summary where the budget is discussed, including initial phase-in: 30			
7. Budget Status. Items a., b., and c. indicate the source(s) of the General Fund revenue specified in item 6. If any grants or contracts will supply revenue needed by the program, indicate amount anticipated and expiration date, if applicable.			
Revenue source	Continuing	One-time	
a. In current legislative budget request	\$-0-	\$-0-	
b. Additional appropriation required	\$-0-	\$-0-	
c. Funded through new internal MAU redistribution	\$-0-	\$-0-	
d. Funds already committed to the program by the MAU ¹	\$-0-	\$-0-	
e. Funded all or in part by external funds, expiration date	\$-0-	\$-0-	
f. Other funding source Specify Type:	\$-0-	\$-0-	
8. Facilities: New or substantially (>\$25,000 cost) renovated facilities will be required. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes x <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, discuss the extent, probable cost, and anticipated funding source(s), in addition to those listed in sections 6 and 7 above.			

¹Sometimes the courses required by a new degree or certificate program are already being taught by an MAU, e.g., as a minor requirement. Similarly, other program needs like equipment may already be owned. 100% of the value is indicated even though the course or other resource may be shared.

9. Projected enrollments (headcount of majors). If this is a program deletion request, project the teach out enrollments.

Year 1: 15	Year 2: 15	Year 3: 20	Year 4: 20
------------	------------	------------	------------

Page number of attached summary where demand for this program is discussed: **17**

10. Number* of new TA or faculty hires anticipated (or number of positions eliminated if a program deletion):

Graduate TA	None
Adjunct	None
Term	None
Tenure track	None

11. Number* of TAs or faculty to be reassigned:

Graduate TA	None
Adjunct	None
Term	None
Tenure track	None

Former assignment of any reassigned faculty:
For more information see page _____ of the attached summary.

12. Other programs affected by the proposed action, including those at other MAUs (please list):

Program Affected	Anticipated Effect	Program Affected	Anticipated Effect
Teacher education programs at other MAU's.	Some students may be attracted to the Fairbanks campus because of the offering, however the impact to other campuses is likely to be minimal. It is anticipated that the highest number of recruitments will be from rural areas currently served by UAF.	Departments at UAF that offer content majors suitable for teaching (math, English, sciences, history)	Departments may see an increase in enrollment if students choose UAF becau of the baccalaureate degree leading to a degree and teacher license.

Page number of attached summary where effects on other programs are discussed: 20, 22

13. Specialized accreditation or other external program certification needed or anticipated. List all that apply or 'none':

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

(As of January 1, 2013, NCATE will be called Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

14. Aligns with University or campus mission, goals, core themes, and objectives (list):

Educate undergraduate students.

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

Page in attached summary where alignment is discussed: 1, 2, 14, 15, 25, 26

15. State needs met by this program (list):

The Institute for Social and Economic Research 2011 report "Alaska's University for Alaska's Schools," indicates that 28% of all teachers statewide are prepared in the UA system. Research shows that teachers trained in Alaska stay longer, which means better continuity, especially in the rural areas. More continuity means higher achievement. The need for secondary teachers is significantly more pronounced than that for elementary teachers.

Page in the attached summary where the state needs to be met are discussed: **page 18, 19, 25**

16. Program is initially planned to be: (check all that apply)

☐ Available to students attending classes at campus(es).

☐ Available to students via e-learning. **All EDSC courses available by e-learning.**

☒ Partially available students via e-learning. **Not all content degree courses are available by e-learning.**

Page # in attached summary where e-learning is discussed: **25**

Submitted by the University of Alaska Fairbanks with the concurrence of its Faculty Senate.

*Net FTE (full-time equivalents). For example, if a faculty member will be reassigned from another program, but his/her original program will hire a replacement, there is one net new faculty member. Use fractions if appropriate. Graduate TAs are normally 0.5 FTE. The numbers should be consistent with the revenue/expenditure information provided.

☐ Summary of Degree or Certificate Program Proposal☐ Other (optional)

RESOLUTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends that the process of post-tenure performance review of UNAC-represented faculty be modified to eliminate levels of review above that of the dean in cases where both the unit peer committee and the dean have judged the performance to be satisfactory. Review by a university-wide committee and by the Provost should be required if either the unit peer committee or the dean rates performance as unsatisfactory in two of the three areas (teaching, research, service), or if either rates performance as unsatisfactory in one area if that area is the main part of the faculty member's workload.

RATIONALE: According to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University of Alaska and United Academics, in effect between January 01, 2011 - December 31, 2013: "The post-tenure review process is generally intended to be a formative rather than a summative process of faculty evaluation, focused on faculty development. It is not intended to be the equivalent of the probationary evaluation of tenure track faculty. At the same time the process should review and encourage progress toward promotion where applicable, ongoing development, scholarship and productivity." The post-tenure reviews also serve to identify faculty whose performance is unsatisfactory. The CBA states that "Unit members who receive an unsatisfactory comprehensive post-tenure review shall be ineligible for market and merit salary adjustments until they receive a satisfactory outcome in a subsequent post-tenure review."

The current system of full university-wide review of post-tenure files by a committee of full professors is costly in terms of effort, yet for several reasons these university-wide reviews are useful in only a small number of cases. First, approximately 35 post-tenure reviews are conducted each year at UAF and typically just 0-3 are rated unsatisfactory overall. This low number is expected in light of the fact that tenured faculty have already undergone rigorous review for tenure and promotion, and nearly all continue a high level of performance after tenure. Second, for the stated purpose of faculty development, the portions of the post-tenure reviews that are most useful to the faculty are the reviews at unit peer and dean levels. Third, the need for a university-wide review committee composed of full professors draws experienced faculty away from the university-wide committees on 4th Year Reviews and Promotion & Tenure, where their advice would be more effective.

To fulfill the purpose of post-tenure review, in most cases review by a unit peer committee and the dean will be sufficient. Review by a university-wide committee and the Provost can be reserved for cases in which the results at those levels indicate a possible unsatisfactory rating overall, without compromising the goal of post-tenure review. Results at the unit peer and dean rankings can be used to identify these files. The recommended trigger of an unsatisfactory rating in two of three areas (teaching, research, service) or an unsatisfactory rating in the main area of the faculty member's workload, by either the unit peer committee or the dean, is based on UAF experience. Focusing on these files would be a more productive use of university resources and would not compromise the purpose of post-tenure review.

Modification of the post-tenure review process will require a change in the CBA because the current CBA requires that comprehensive post-tenure review must include review by MAU Peer Review Committees (at UAF, the university-wide review committees).

The Faculty Senate resolution will be forwarded to the UAF administration and to United Academics. We will request that Labor Relations negotiate an MOA to permit this change under the current CBA, and also request that the change be incorporated into the next CBA.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve establishment of a central online collection of expanded course descriptions for all UAF courses, using the template provided below. Any changes to the template must be approved by the UAF Faculty Senate. Access to the online collection of expanded course descriptions shall be restricted to the University of Alaska community through a UA login.

This motion supersedes the Faculty Senate motion of October 12, 2009 (Meeting #161) to establish a single website containing sample syllabi for UAF courses.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately.

RATIONALE: Course descriptions in the official UAF catalog are limited to 50 words or less, and there are legal and logistical impediments to longer catalog entries. A centralized online collection of expanded course descriptions will assist students and advisors with course selection based on academic considerations by providing easy access to more detailed information. Discussions in the Faculty Senate and a faculty-wide survey in February 2013 have indicated strong support for this. The survey also indicated a clear preference for posting expanded course descriptions rather than syllabi, and for a restricted-access site.

The template makes use of required elements in a UAF course syllabus, so that most of it can be filled in by simple cut-and-paste from a syllabus. Several additional entries require interpretation of the syllabus or reference to the catalog, but are simple enough that including them should not pose a problem. It should be quick and straightforward to create and update expanded course descriptions using a current syllabus. Some courses are taught by several instructors, but only one expanded course description would be needed because the elements in it should be consistent among instructors.

Template elements directly from the syllabus: Course Title, Course Number, Credits, Prerequisites, Course Description, Course Goals, Student Learning Outcomes.

Additional elements, all entered using dropdown menus: Designator, Course Format, Lab, Grading.

The following three examples of expanded course descriptions are based on sample syllabi posted on the Faculty Senate web site.

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course-degree-procedures-/uaf-syllabus-requirements/syllabus-examples/>

TEMPLATE for Expanded Course Descriptions

Course Title: *from syllabus*

Course Number: *from syllabus (cross-listed and stacked courses have several numbers)*

Designator: *dropdown menus (none, O, W)*

Credits: *from syllabus*

Course Format: *several dropdown menus to allow for classes with multiple formats (face-to-face, videoconference, audioconference, online)*

Lab: *dropdown menu (yes, no)*

Prerequisites: *from syllabus*

Course Description: *from syllabus*

Course Goals: *from syllabus*

Student Learning Outcomes: *from syllabus*

Grading: *dropdown menu (pass/fail, letter grade)*

Date of Entry: *(can be automatically entered by the computer system)*

EXAMPLE #1

Course Title: Omlet Design and Fabrication

Course Number: EGG F637

Designator: none

Credits: 3

Course Format: face-to-face

Lab: no

Prerequisites: EGG 601 (Molecular Gastronomy) and CHEM 451 (Biochemistry--Metabolism)

Course Description:

This is a graduate level course in the design, analysis, and synthesis of the beaten-egg cooked foodstuff known variously as an omelet or omelette. This is a required core course in the Master of Egg degree program, but can be taken as an elective by interested graduate students in related fields. In addition to basic cooking knowledge, a detailed understanding of molecular gastronomy (EGG 601) and metabolic foodstuff processing (CHEM 451) is required to understand the relationships between chemical transformations and crispiness.

Course Goals:

Generally, we will cover the detailed molecular transformations obtained in beating and frying eggs, primarily the effect of anhydrous heat on eggs and yolk, and the determination of the optimal trade-off in cooking times, from blackened Cajun style through tepid and runny.

Student Learning Outcomes:

After completing this course, students will be able to:

- Explain how heat denatures protein chains in egg yolk and whites.
- Explain the effect of glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase on ingested lipids.
- Use this knowledge to cook a truly spectacular omelet.

Grading: letter grade

Date of Entry: February 26, 2013

EXAMPLE #2

Course Title: History of Earth and Life

Course Number: GEOS F112

Designator: none

Credits: 4

Course Format: face-to-face

Lab: yes

Prerequisites: GEOS 101 or GE 261

Course Description:

Historical geology is about evolution. This course will explore the evolution of planet Earth and the degree to which geological and biological processes have influenced each other throughout the history of our planet. This is a subject that is deeply concerned with time - large amounts of time. Geological events are typically measured in millions or billions of years. This time scale, *geologic time*, vastly transcends human experience. Events that are exceedingly rare during a human lifetime may be frequent and inevitable at geological time scales. If you take this course seriously, it will change your frame of reference to incorporate a sense of geologic time, a concept that will transform your understanding of the landscape, the biota, and your place in history.

Course Goals:

The primary mission of this course is to provide you with the tools and skills necessary to reconstruct physical and biological events that occurred deep in Earth's past. To meet this goal, there are three primary course objectives: 1) Explore the ways in which plate tectonics, erosion, and climate change modify the size and topography of continents, using North America as the prime example. 2) Examine the sequence of organic evolution, from the triumphant trilobite to the mighty mammoth. 3) Understand the interrelationships between physical and biological processes and events

Student Learning Outcomes:

Ultimately, you will learn to think like a historical scientist. Labs will allow you to practice interpreting geological data (rocks and fossils) and using basic tools (maps and microscopes), while class discussions and homework assignments will encourage you to think critically. Upon completing this course, you will be able to:

- Use sedimentary rocks to reconstruct past climates and environments
- Identify fossil organisms and use them to reconstruct past habitats
- Reconstruct the tectonic and climatic history of a region based on a geologic map
- Explain the origin of the major physiographic features of North America
- Outline major "breakthroughs" in the history of life on Earth
- Evaluate historical data in terms of quality, reliability, and interpretation
- Investigate a geological topic and display your findings on a poster

Grading: letter grade

Date of Entry: February 26, 2013

EXAMPLE #3

Course Title: Fundamentals of Media Design and Web Tools 2.0
Course Number: ED F432
Designators: none
Credits: 3
Course Format: online
Lab: no
Prerequisites: GEOS F101 or GE F261

Course Description:

Create and publish materials with proper media design for use in teaching and learning. Topics include photo and graphics formatting, video production, video podcast production, SMART technologies, static screen capture, motion screen capture, and analyze for educational content. These productions will be included on the students' MITI eportfolios. This course is a prerequisite for subsequent MITI courses and should be taken after or concurrently with ED 431 Web 2.0 Fundamentals: Participate, Produce, Publish. It is expected that this course will take 135+ hours to complete.

Course Goals:

This course supports the UAF School of Education's mission by providing students with the skills necessary to design thoughtful individualized instructional environments utilizing technologies and strategies appropriate to all learners. Students will acquire skills in the management and implementation of technology that will enhance their professional qualifications based on ISTE and Alaska teacher standards for technology and instructional design.

Student Learning Outcomes:

Students in the course will:

- Capture and manipulate photos in proper format for print, computer display and web publication.
- Create and publish video productions with multiple elements and in correct format.
- Create, publish and video podcasts for educational content.
- Create and publish SMART presentations and incorporate available presentations
- Create, publish, and print tutorials using static screen captures and analyze for educational content.
- Create, publish, and analyze video tutorials using motion screen captures.

Grading: letter grade

Date of Entry: February 26, 2013

Assessment of Electronic Course Evaluation Options for UAF

A Short Summary by the Core Evaluation Team

Authors: Franz J Meyer (CNSM), Eric Madsen (SoEd), Chris Beks (OIT), Andrea Ferrante (CNSM), Kelly Houlton (CRCD/Dev Ed), Brenda Konar (SFOS), Michael Koskey (DANRD), Sally Skrip (Provost's Office), Nathan Zierfuss (OIT)

Task and main research activities

In October 2012, the Faculty Senate was approached by Provost Susan Henrichs to evaluate a potential implementation of an electronic course evaluation system at UAF. As a consequence, the Faculty Development, Assessment, and Improvement (FDAI) committee together with Dr. Eric Madsen, School of Education, were entrusted with studying the following two main questions associated with electronic course evaluations:

- 1. Is it advisable for UAF to move to an electronic course evaluation model?**
- 2. If so, what would be the necessary steps towards adopting an electronic course evaluation system?**

In addition to these main goals, the activities performed are also aimed at reviving the discussion about electronic course evaluations (ECEs) by surveying their current state of the art and by gauging the sentiment towards ECEs on campus. To respond to the task at hand, a work program was developed by Dr. Eric Madsen and members of the FDAI that has been carried out since November 2012. This work program includes the following tasks:

- Develop a comprehensive set of evaluation criteria to be used in the evaluation of existing electronic course evaluation systems and for assessing their fit to UAF's needs
- Compile a list of electronic course evaluation systems through an extensive internet research
- Downselect this list to a set of vendors that showed sufficient focus on higher education
- Schedule weekly one-hour demos with the selected vendors to assess the main capabilities and limitations of their systems
- Write a report summarizing the main findings from this exercise and formulating the next steps in the evaluation process

The report at hand is intended to provide the Faculty Senate with a short summary of the conducted activities as a basis for discussion. Senators are specifically asked to read through and assess the list of evaluation criteria that were used by the evaluation team. A full report will be submitted and attached to the documentation of the Faculty Senate meeting in May 2013.

Composition of team

Announcements for the weekly demos were distributed over every campus listserv and all faculty, staff, and students were invited to participate in the evaluation process. Widely spread announcements were important to provide a representative evaluation of analyzed electronic course evaluation systems. During the evaluation period, a core evaluation team emerged that includes faculty from both Fairbanks and rural campuses, as well as representation from the Provost's office and representation from the Office of Information Technology. This core evaluation group included the following members:

- Chris Beks, OIT
- Andrea Ferrante, CNSM
- Kelly Houlton, CRCD / Dev Ed
- Brenda Konar, SFOS
- Michael Koskey, DANRD
- Eric Madsen, SoEd
- Franz Meyer, CNSM
- Sally Skrip, Provost's Office
- Nathan Zierfuss, OIT

Main evaluation criteria

While working towards answering the two main questions of this study, a set of technical evaluation criteria developed that were used in assessing electronic course evaluation options. These technical evaluation criteria are listed in the following, structured by their relationship to the two core questions of this study. The left column of the following table contains general requirements that an ECE must fulfill to be relevant to UAF. These general requirements are translated into corresponding technical evaluation criteria that are listed on the right side of the table. Please provide feedback to the evaluation team (fjmeyer@alaska.edu or ecmadsen@alaska.edu) to propose additions and/or changes to this list.

Evaluation Criteria Related to Goal 1: Advisability of ECEs for UAF	
General Requirements	Related Technical Evaluation Criteria
Do ECEs provide sufficient student response rates?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are actual response rates at other universities using a specific ECE system? • Does the system include strategies for improving / sustaining response rates?
Will the faculty accept and promote move to ECE?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of use (user friendliness) of the system for faculty and students • How early after the semester ends can reports be released? • Usefulness of output to students, faculty, UAF
Will students accept move to ECE?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is student anonymity guaranteed? • Can results be easily shared with students? • Does ECE Interface with Banner/Blackboard? • Does the company provide implementation on smart devices?
Is moving to ECE financially efficient?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the ECE system's cost structure? • What are the immediate and short term costs related with adoption, conversion, implementation? • What are potential ongoing costs associated with hardware, software, system operation, and system management?
Can continuity with legacy system be achieved (in case we want this to be an option)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What latitude does UAF have to determine or modify "standard" (cross-campus) questions? • Can legacy data be easily imported into the ECE? • Can review reports be fully customized?

Is data security guaranteed? Who owns the data and who has access to original survey information?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where do the data reside (inside/outside UAF)? • Is privacy for instructors guaranteed? • How is anonymity of students provided? • What is the privacy policy of the service provider? • How will UAF be able to retrieve/retain data if we decided to change the provider?
Do ECEs meet the unique needs of the UAF system (dispersed campuses; field classes; rural campuses with limited internet access; ...)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the system flexible to merge online and paper-and-pencil reviews if necessary? • Can different schools / faculty add customized questions?
What are the training and maintenance efforts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of support and training • Are support hours user-friendly for Alaska?
Evaluation Criteria Related to Goal 2: Necessary Steps Towards Adopting an ECE	
Abstract Evaluation Criteria	Related Technical Evaluation Criteria
Which ECE is the best fit for UAF's needs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the ECE providing a service (data hosted and processed by vendor) or a product (hosted and executed at UAF)? • Experience of vendor and popularity of system • Does the ECE provide online and offline access? • Does the ECE interface with other management software at UAF and is it flexible enough to respond to changes in software preference?
How can ECE be phased in at UAF?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does ECE offer free or low cost pilot studies?
How will survey formats, data access permissions, and report content be defined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who manages assessment deployment, data collection/analysis, distribution of results to faculty? • Can detailed and layered access structures be implemented?
How can questionnaires and review results be made more useful to both faculty and students?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are data analysis tools provided within the system? If so, what are they like? • If not, what is the export process (to what packages, who handles...)? • Can questions be customized to better fit UAFs specific needs? • Is an archive of typical (unbiased) questions available as a guideline and as an archive to pick from?
How can student responses be improved both in quantity and quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What recommendations do the ECEs have for improving the student evaluation process on campus? • Are the ECE providers actively assisting their customers in improving quality and quantity of student feedback?

In addition to these technical criteria, there are further questions that need to be addressed when discussing the advisability and procedure of moving towards an electronic course evaluation option. These include (1) "What is the purpose of course evaluation at UAF?" (our answer to this question has bearings on both the advisability and the implementation of change) and (2) "What are valid uses of the produced data?". These and other related questions will be discussed in the full report that will be submitted to the Faculty Senate in May 2013.

Content of the full report to be submitted to the Faculty Senate in May 2013

In May 2013 findings of this initial study will be published in form of a final report. This report will contain the following information:

1. A more extensive description of the task at hand.
2. An explanation of the concept that was applied to assess advisability, implications, and procedures related to a change in course evaluation methodology.
3. A list of studied ECE systems together with an assessment of their capabilities and their fit to UAF's needs.
4. The result of a down-selection procedure to identify a limited group of ECE finalists for further research.
5. A list of recommendations and future steps.
6. A summary of general findings and "lessons learned".

Curricular Affairs Committee

11 Febr 2013 MINUTES 9-10 am Reichardt 301

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

Non-voting members: Donald Crocker (phone); Libby Eddy; Lillian Misel; Carol Gering (phone); Alex Fitts, Jayne Harvie.

Absent: Doug Goering.

1. APPROVE MINUTES OF 28 Jan

2. Report on GERC from Cindy Hardy

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. C-/C business

Motion: The minimum acceptable grade that baccalaureate students may receive in courses in the major, the minor, core, and courses used as prerequisites shall be a C-.

Justification: consistency

1. With the past. Before \pm grades a 'C-' was acceptable because a 'C-' was simply a version of C
2. With faculty who do not use +/- grades. A student who receives a 'C-' from a faculty member who does not use \pm is ok because that grade gets recorded as a 'C'. Same course, different teacher, this one does use \pm and the grade is not acceptable.
3. With BOR policies. BOR defines a C as an acceptable grade. Clearly a 'C-', which is a version of C, also should be acceptable.
4. With transfer policies: a course with a grade of C- transfers. However, currently it only transfers as 'credit' for a course in one's major or minor. In order to satisfy the requirement for the major or minor the course would need to be re-taken and a grade of C or higher received.
5. A grade of C- is the minimum acceptable for a 'core' course. This is confusing for students, who recognize that sometimes a C- is good enough, and sometimes not.
6. Many faculty have privately told or emailed me that they give grades of D+, D, D-, A+, A-, A, B+....but never C- because it means the student will need to re-take the course. They would award the grade that the student actually deserved (C-) if such a grade didn't require re-taking the course. Why not be honest???? Given this phenomena, allowing C- to 'count' would result in grade deflation.

Note that the proposed change wouldn't change the fact that a student's overall gpa and gpa in the major must be a minimum of 2.0.

After considerable and heated discussion, this motion passed

B. Grading System and Grade Point Average Computation --current

"All course grades are letter grades unless otherwise specified in the class schedule. The method of grading (letter or pass/fail) is an integral part of the course structure and is included in the course description. Instructors are expected to state their grading policies in writing at the beginning of each course. Grades appearing on academic records are:

A An honor grade, indicates originality and independent work, a thorough mastery of the subject and the satisfactory completion of more work than is regularly required.

B Indicates outstanding ability above the average level of performance.

C Indicates a satisfactory or average level of performance.

D The lowest passing grade, indicates work of below-average quality and performance.

F Indicates failure. All F grades, including those earned in pass/fail courses, are included in the GPA calculations."

CHANGE TO?:

- B** Indicates an ability well above the minimum level of accomplishment
- C** Indicates a satisfactory level of accomplishment
- D** The lowest passing grade, indicates minimum level of accomplishment

AFTER HEATED DISCUSSION WE AGREED TO SEND THIS ON TO SADA FOR THEIR COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

4. New Business

As part of the grades and grading controversy, we took up the question of whether acceptable grades for 'core' classes should be re-lowered from the current C- to the 'anything goes'. More heated discussion. SPLIT VOTE. Cindy agreed to take this to SADA and Rainer agreed to take it to Fac Senate Adcomm.

Curricular Affairs Committee

25 Febr 2013 Minutes 9-10 am Reichardt 301

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

Non-voting members: Brendon (for Linda); Libby Eddy; Lillian Misel; Carol Gering (phone); Alex Fitts; Doug Goering (phone); Jayne Harvie (MVP)

1. We approved the amended MINUTES OF 14 Febr & agreed to meet again Monday > spring brk

2. Report on GERC from J Rosenberg: report will be coming soon!!!

3. NEW BUSINESS #1 – PROPOSED NEW BA IN Secondary Education

We came up with the following questions:

(a) how precisely is this better than the current bacc degree + 5th year license? [We came up with possibilities like 'allows student to integrate knowledge in one's major with education courses; likely better retention by grouping students interested in 2ndary ED as a cohort for mutual support...'] Would like to see the document beefed up with such statements (assuming that they're true) + any others that would be useful in making the pitch.

(b) It's an extremely heavy course load--well in excess of typical here--to get through in 4 years.

1. Suggest putting an '*' next to courses that could conceivably be taken in a 'mester' or summer class to reduce the credits during a regular academic semester

2. Suggest creating a '5-year plan' as well with more 'normal' course loads

(c) basically to get through in 4 years one needs to start fall semester of one's freshman year knowing 'I want to be a high school physics (or whatever) teacher'. Which seems highly unrealistic. Would it be better in such a case to go for the existing 'bacc degree + 1' program?

We agreed that we'd have Gary Jacobsen, SOE, at our next meeting for discussion

4. OLD BUSINESS

We agreed to the following revised grade definitions and agreed to make further changes as needed through emails over the next couple of days

"A" (including A+ and A-) indicates a thorough mastery of course content and outstanding performance in completion of all course requirements.

"B" (including B+ and B-) indicates a high level of acquired knowledge and performance in completion of course requirements.

“C” (including C+ and C-) indicates a satisfactory level of acquired knowledge and performance in completion of course requirements.

“D” (including D+ and D-) indicates a minimal level of acquired knowledge and minimal performance in completion of course requirements. This grade is acceptable for elective courses, but does not satisfy requirements for courses in the major, minor, core, or graduate programs.

“F” indicates failure to meet a minimal level of understanding of course content and (or) performance in completion of course requirements. All F grades, including those earned in pass/fail courses, are included in the GPA calculations

The meeting ended at 10:15 am. Rainer expressed gratitude to all.

ATTACHMENT 190/9
UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women

Minutes Friday, February 22, 2013; 10:30-11:30 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Megan McPhee, Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Diana Di Stefano, Shawn Russell, Ellen Lopez, Jenny Liu, Nilima Hullavarad,

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Derek Sikes (on sabbatical)

1. April 26th 10:00 am - 12:00 pm. Strategically Planning Workshop

Confirmed panelists: Roxie Dinstel (CRCD), Sine Anahita (CLA) Paul Layer (Dean CSM), Joan Braddock (retired full professor, former Dean CSM), Ellen Lopez (in process of fourth year review, CLA). Mary will ask Todd Sherman Dean of CLA. List of women full professors attached for further consideration – other suggestions? Will be broadcast and recorded eLive. Jane will order the food. Room is still being discussed.

2. Conversation Cafes –

First one was held Friday, Feb 15. Mentoring was the topic. For next year: could we do a more formal discussion on mentoring? Send invitations? Provide informal lunch, or coffee/ tea/ cookies for mentoring discussion. Maybe 12-2pm Tues/Thursday time frame.

For next year: At the fall women's luncheon maybe each table could brainstorm topics for the conversation cafés. Promote conversation café's at the luncheon.

Next scheduled for Thursday, Feb 28th 3:45-4:45pm – flyer attached, please post
Additional Conversation Cafes scheduled for the following times March 21st 3:45-4:45pm;
March 29th 10:30-11:30am; April 12th 10:30-11:30am; April 18th 3:45-4:45pm
topic requests/ideas. Send ideas to Kayt.

New faculty orientation: a flyer in their packet might get lost in the overwhelming amount of information. Maybe we reach out to new faculty after they have been here a few months. Call / email to invite them to conversation cafés.

3. Women's Center Advisory Board

Meeting again: March 8, 10:30 to 12:00

4. Fall 2013 Luncheon

Speaker suggestions:

- a. Cheryl Frye, INBrE Director and Professor of Neuroscience. Her email is: cafrye@alaska.edu her phone 474-5492. Some background <http://www.uaf.edu/chem/faculty/cfrye/>
- b. Director of Women's Center in Maine.
- c. Someone who has done research in mentoring.
- d. Dr. Claudia Lampan from UAA. Psychology. Ellen will look into this.
- e. URSA : Barbara Taylor: working with undergraduates

f. Denise Thorsen: Electrical Engineer, Associate Professor, Ph.D., Electrical and Computer Engineering

What about several shorter presentations? Choosing local women has many benefits.

5. CSW elections are not needed this year. All expiring seats are interested in continuing.

6. Rational for a part-time faculty/ administrative position focusing on the issues of women faculty - Still on the table. We need to be very prepared. What is the evidence of inequity? Show these problems are affecting women faculty at UAF. We need data.

Upcoming CSW meeting: March 22/10:30-11:30/Gruening 718

Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

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

**Committee on the Status of Women,
Meeting Minutes Friday, March 22, 2012; 10:30-11:30 pm, Gruening 718**

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

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Derek Sikes (on sabbatical), Shawn Russell

1. April 26th 10:00 am - 12:00 pm. Strategically Planning Workshop, BOR Conference Room

Panelists: Roxie Dinstel, Sine Anahita, Paul Layer, Ellen Lopez, Joan Braddock, Todd Sherman. Flyer is done. Jayne Harvie will send it out. Please post it. Jane ordered refreshments. Todd Sherman has also agreed. Kayt will moderate. We need help with Illuminate Live. We'll ask people to focus on their experience. Kayt will tell the panelists that the focus is on strategy.

2. Conversation Cafes –

Future Cafes: April 12 10:30-11:30. Topic: Leadership. Challenges and rewards of taking on leadership roles. Kayt may use some of the LeanIn organization. They provide information and guidance on creating/ promoting women in leadership roles.

3. Women's Center Advisory Board
Meeting again: Monday, March 22, 2013

4. Fall 2013 Luncheon
Can we do more? Paper invitations. Can we help Jayne more? Put that on our radar for end of September on a Tuesday. We need to choose a speaker or panel. Sheryl Frye? Claudia Lampman from UAA?

Upcoming CSW meeting: May 3, /10:30-11:30/Gruening 718

Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

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

ATTACHMENT 190/10

UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for Jan. 24, 2013**

Attending: Dana Greci, Cindy Hardy, Andrea Schmitt, Joe Mason, Sandra Wildfeuer, David Maxwell, Gabrielle Russell

November minutes: Approved

Updates:

Brown Bags—Andrea reported that nothing has been done for this semester as advisors have switched positions, so have not been able to address this.

She asked if we want the format to be a brown bag discussion or a luncheon. We agreed to use the less formal brown bag format. She noted that the advising center has ideas, but wants some guidance. We discussed some issues where student and faculty intersect and noted that what was exciting about the Veterans Brown Bag was that students, faculty, and staff talked to each other without distinguishing who is who. Cindy and Andréa will get together to talk more about ideas.

Learning Commons --Suzanne Hahn put up a note board in the library for students to put up suggestions on what they would like to see in the library. Dana noted that currently there are two floors worth of comfortable seating where students can study and talk and that the library is opening up more space, following a nationwide trend to bring more people to the library.

OIT is housed in the library but further coordination of services hasn't happened yet, though departments may take the initiative if they want to use the space. Right now there is no coordinator for these spaces, but there is a sign-up sheet. Dana will send out a letter to departments about the library space available and she will ask Suzan about outreach on the Learning Commons to the rural campuses.

Statewide Course Alignment—This is actively going on between English and DEVE on the statewide level. There is interest from Dana Thomas that placement scores in English and Math be consistent across MAU's. David Maxwell noted that the Math department is already doing Accuplacer data analysis to see where students are placed on the first day of class. They are not using this to move students out of classes, unless they also have not otherwise met prerequisites. He also noted that the Math Department thought mandatory placement would fix the problem of students signing up for wrong class, but it still happens. Students register for a higher math than they are placed in because their advisor overrides the placement, or students sign up before end of semester, and didn't earn a passing grade.

Cindy suggested that Math coordinate with DEVM faculty looking at DEVM data because MATH 107 and 103 are entry points from DEVM courses. Jane Weber and Greg Owens are doing DEVM data analysis now.

A Statewide English/DEVE group met in the fall, and is planning another audio meeting. As a result of this meeting, English is in the process of passing a higher Accuplacer placement score. If this passes, UAF's placement will go up by 10 points and UAA's will be lowered by 5 points, so both MAUs will have the same placement level on Accuplacer. UAF's DEVE 109 will slot into the score range opened

up between ENGL 111X placement and DEVE 070. This will be a Major change, so it will go through the steps of approval by Faculty Senate. DEVE is waiting for the change to English 111X to be approved, then will change the placement on DEVE 109. We discussed how the MAUs agreed to the changes (lowering or raising cut score) and noted that Compass was linked to SAT, and Accuplacer to ACT. DEVE and English faculty will be meeting at the Pacific Rim Conference to talk more about each MAU's progress on this

Another piece of this is renumbering the DEVE courses so that DEVE 060 becomes DEVE 100 and DEVE 070 becomes DEVE 104. These changes will need to be approved in the CRCD Academic Council, then will end up in SADA for approval before being approved by the Senate.

Gabby asked if we can have DEVE and ENGL and DEVM and MATH listed together in UAOnline. Currently, they are listed separately by course designator. We noted that DEV ED has talked about changing the department name, but changing the designator is problematic. UAA offers Developmental math through their Math department, but their developmental English has a separate designator (PRPE).

GERC update--Cindy and Sandra reported on the statewide meeting of GERC and AACU to discuss LEAP themes and alignment across MAUS. UAF has been working on the core revision process for a year, but UAA and UAS are just beginning to work on theirs.

We discussed how the general education revision process began. Dana Thomas led the process, noting that some faculty was unhappy with the core; now he is the position to do something about it. One of the issues raised at the Anchorage meeting was that of students "MAU-shopping" or looking for online classes that meet the core at one MAU and not the other. The weekend also introduced some ideas of curriculum reform that AACU felt were effective, especially those using VALUE rubrics and "high-impact practices." Cindy agreed to send around a list of these from the AACU website.

Accuplacer motion— We had discussed writing a motion requesting non-renewal of Accuplacer; however, there is not a groundswell of support for this action. We will leave this alone for now although we did discuss some of the issues raised by placement. In the English department and Developmental English, there has been talk about using multiple measures for placement, including writing samples. We acknowledge that Accuplacer costs money; however, for Math ACT and Accuplacer scores are pretty well aligned, and Accuplacer seems to be doing a better job of placing students than the self-placement method used before. We also noted that Accuplacer was chosen, in part, because it's easier to set up proctor for rural sites.

Question about the C grade: The Curricular Affairs committee has been discussing whether to change the minimum grades for major and minor courses changed from a C to a C-. This would make the acceptable grade requirement for both major, minor, and core classes the same. After much discussion about the value of a C grade, the fact that students getting C- currently need to retake courses, the tendency to give only C or C+ grades to avoid a student retaking a class, and the impacts on financial aid, the committee agreed to recommend the following to CAC:

"A C- is passing for Core and major/minor requirements; however "good standing" remains at 2.0 and good standing for major courses remains at 2.0."

Cindy will relay this to Rainer.

Committee membership definition: We agreed that any changes to the committee definition are major changes and would have to go through Faculty Senate. We agreed to leave the definition as it stands for now, especially since those committee members who are elected have already indicated their willingness to serve again. We will revisit this and pass some definition changes before the end of the semester

Meeting times for spring: We agreed to stick with the third Thursdays of the month 3 – 4:30.

Adjourned at 4:20pm.

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013

Attending: Joe Mason, Sarah Stanley, Andrea Schmidt, Sandra Wildfeuer, Dana Greci, Cindy hardy, Alan Morotti, Gabrielle Russell, Curt Szuberla, David Maxwell

Minutes of the previous meeting were not available, but we reviewed table notes.

C/C- grades: Curricular Affairs asked for our input on three motions relating to this issue:

1. To make C- acceptable minimum grade for major, minor, and core classes. This maintains the 2.0 cumulative requirement for majors and for good standing.

The committee voted 8-1 in favor.

2. To revise the current catalog descriptions of letter grades to eliminate the words “average” and “performance.”

The committee voted unanimously against this motion, stating that we thought the grade definitions should be left alone, and expressing concerns that wordsmithing in this way would lead to a need for further definitions for the +/- grades and could represent an attempt to avoid grade inflation by redefinition.

(A second draft of this motion, using language from BOR policy, was subsequently circulated to the committee and met with 6-1 approval).

3. To strike out the minimum requirement of C- for core classes, reverting to a D- as acceptable for core classes.

The committee voted unanimously against this motion, stating that we thought that having a D- as an acceptable grade for the core set students up for failure.

GERC Update: Sandra reports that the GERC committee is nearly ready to move forward and show what they’ve developed to the departments. However, at a statewide meeting in the past few days, it became apparent that UAA and UAS are in very different places with this process.

Sandra noted that the committee has five working groups addressing different aspects of General Education requirements (drawn from the LEAP outcomes):

Civic Engagement
Quantitative Literacy
Diversity

Communication (included written and oral)

Alaska

She reported that the committees have looked at what a class would have to do to be in each category, and that it's the committee's general feeling that courses in different departments could fit into these categories. We discussed the history of the current core, in place since 1989, and the role this core revision process has in the move toward statewide GER alignment. Sarah S. noted that the LEAP outcomes were accepted by all three MAUs, but that different courses would work within that framework for each campus. We also noted that UAF is ahead of the other two MAUs in this process, and that there has been a push from Statewide for UAF to cut the number of credits required in the core to better match UAA and UAS. We noted that deans are now being told to keep degree requirements to 120 credits, though our faculty survey suggested that faculty want to keep the number of credits to degree the same.

We will continue to get updates on the progress of the GERC committee, since three SADA members now serve on the committee.

Student Learning Commons: Dana G. has drafted a letter to encourage faculty/departments to tutor in the library study rooms. Suzan Hahn has written to say that the library is not yet ready to call the space a learning commons, but is willing to invite people to use the space for tutoring and other similar activities. Dana noted that there needs to be a coordinator of the spaces for the area to function as a learning commons.

Statewide Alignment: This is still a work in progress. Some DEVE/ENGL faculty will meet with UAA/UAS colleagues in Anchorage at the Pacific Rim conference to update on this.

David M reported that Dana Thomas and the Faculty Alliance are both pushing for alignment in Math and English. He is the chair of a placement committee in Math, which is considering moving to ALEKS as a placement test. They will share this information with UAA, if it looks like it will work out. He noted that ALEKS, unlike Accuplacer, can place students into classes up to Math 201. DEVM is also looking at placement, reviewing demographic data on which students succeed in DEVM and Math.

DEVM 094: Sandra reported on a class she has developed, "Math Literacy," which combines material from DEVM 050 and 060 into a 5-credit accelerated class. She is also developing an asynchronous online course and will have a full-time math tutor to support the class. We discussed the various math pathways students take to Math 107 or 103. David noted that the Math department is rethinking the prerequisites for Math 103, and Dana G reminded us that Marji Illingworth had developed a Reading in the Mathematical Sciences class that had some success.

Designator Alignment: Gabby asked if we could ask the registrar how to list DEVE/English and DEVM/Math in the Course Finder so that a student looking for Math, for example, would also find listings for DEVM.

Next meeting: April 18, 3-4:30pm

ATTACHMENT 190/11

UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 26, 2013**

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 11:03 am.

II. Roll call:

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

Excused: Izetta Chambers, Amy Vinlove

III. Report from Joy

Joy called in from the Alaska Society for Technology in Education (ASTE) conference in Anchorage where their “K-21” focus is on all the newest uses for technology for teaching, in the classroom as well as for distance education. She reported that although the focus is primarily on K-12 teachers there are some UA faculty members and CDE staff present. UAF’s own CDE is presenting numerous sessions.

The faculty development for February (focus is on SFOS) is finishing up this Thursday with a presentation on best practices for online learning. Joy noted her appreciation for Mike’s active role in promoting and encouraging his faculty to attend OFD’s offered sessions. Mike noted that his estimate of SFOS faculty attendance is between 12 – 15% and asked how that compared to Joy’s statistics. Joy reported that compared to some other colleges, this was an impressive amount. She is collecting data on how this experiment of bringing faculty development straight to each college for a month is working. She will share her results with the committee so we can help determine if this approach is successful enough to continue next year. Franz asked how the email reminders were handled for SFOS this month. Joy explained that she and Mike shared the process since she must be sensitive regarding the number of emails the OFD sends out. Joy sends emails campus-wide whereas Mike was very active in sending out reminder to his faculty encouraging them to attend. Having support from college deans with regards to emailing faculty has been very helpful. Mike noted that SFOS is working on a survey to determine what would be a reasonable number of emails.

Planning for the group of faculty members traveling to the Lilly West conference is going well. The conference is March 14 – 17th in Pomona, CA. Joy also informed us that Linda Hapsmith of the Academic Advising Center has 50 one-way railroad tickets for faculty and advisors to travel to a big regional advising conference being held in Anchorage in early May. Linda will also be awarding \$750 travel grants for this conference to 25 faculty and/or advisors.

Joy pointed out that the department chair training session has been postponed to Thursday, April 11 from 3:00 – 6:00 pm due to medical issues for presenter Walt Gmelch. The session is intended for newer department chairs, or those considering becoming department chairs, and focuses on managing challenging personalities in a leadership position. The session is titled “Mending the Cracks in the Ivory Tower”.

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

Franz noted that the demos are continuing with good attendance from our committee and OIT. Sally Scrip from the Provost's Office has also attended most of the demos, and we had one student attend a demo. The demos are pretty consistent but we have learned some interesting differences in the last week or so: some vendors offer a lot more statistical analysis and reporting capabilities, and some vendors offer a complete hybrid of electronic and paper-and-pencil evaluations simultaneously. The next demo is scheduled for this Friday, with the last demo slated for March 29.

The core committee members who have been attending each demo (Franz, Eric, Andrea, Kelly) are discussing how we will evaluate the process and write a recommendation/report for Faculty Senate. Eric has proposed that the core group work on the report rather than having the whole FDAI committee involved. We will share the report with the committee when it is finished. Eric reminded us that this is just the first step of a very long process, and that the Provost is hoping to gain insight into the campus climate regarding the feasibility of using electronic course evaluations at UAF.

Franz and Eric will be meeting with the Faculty Senate President and President-elect to discuss their expectations regarding the information in our report and what the timeline should be.

We once again discussed the issue of low response rates with electronic evaluations. The core group has learned about strategies that other institutions are using (usually from recommendations from their respective vendors) to increase response rates. These include making the evaluation process as visible as possible (i.e. getting university Presidents, Chancellors, Provosts, Deans, faculty, and advisors to talk about it with students at every opportunity), multiple email reminders for students who have not yet completed their evaluations, offering incentives (i.e. early access to grades, free iPads, coupons, etc.), explaining to your students why it is important (i.e. how you have made changes to the structure of your courses based on students' responses), and sharing results with students in an easy-to-find way. We agreed that some of the "side issues" we have been considering should definitely be part of our report to Faculty Senate.

V. Research speed dating event discussion: Shall we attempt it or not?

After a short discussion in which we determined the name should be changed so as not to include the "speed dating" descriptor, the committee agreed that this will be a good idea to pursue. While attendance might be lower for the first event, it has the potential to grow in the future. Trina mentioned that getting deans involved will be key in spreading the word to their research faculty to get them involved. Joy has set up the details with Gary Bender of OIT for May 2 at lunch time in Bunnell 319. The one-hour session will have computers set up with Skype to facilitate 5-minute connections between researchers to quickly explain their research and discover people they may collaborate with. Face-to-face meetings will also occur with researchers who are able to come in person. Joy has asked us to think about a new title that would better express the intent of the session.

VI. Other Business: Discussion on potential subscription to Faculty Development Resource "Magna Commons"

Joy explained that a one-year subscription allows all faculty access to Magna Commons' archive of seminars and presentations. There are about 150 available to choose from with each lasting 60 to 90 minutes. She pointed out that if we started the subscription now, faculty could take advantage of the offerings over this summer. She also notes that there is money available for the subscription now whereas it may disappear by fall. Mike suggested that it could be promoted during the remainder of the OFD's monthly faculty development presentations. Andrea asked if it was possible to try a free sample, and David noted that there is a 7-day trial offer on Magna Commons' website. Joy also stated that she

has bought some of Magna Pubs' DVDs that faculty are welcome to check out. (Magna Commons is the online access group.)

VII. Upcoming events:

Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, March 4, 2013 from 1:00 – 3:00 pm in Wood Center

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

IX. Adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 190/12
UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for 2/06/13.**

Attending: Franz Mueter (by phone), Karen Jensen (by phone), Donie Bret-Harte, John Yarie, Jayne Harvie, Cheng fu Chen, John Eichelberger, Lillian Misel, Laura Bender, Chung-san Ng, Mike Daku, Vince Cee, Lara Horstmann, Tim Bartholomaus

GAAC discussed numerous courses and program changes, and passed the following:

3-Trial: [MSL F694 - Physical, Chemical, and Biological Interactions in the Oceans](#)

6-GPCh. Program Change: M.Ed. – concentration areas of language and literacy, cross cultural education, secondary education

10-GPCh. Program Change: B.S./M.S. Mechanical Engineering

17-GNC: New course: STO F601 – Communicating Science

22-GNC: New course: Phys F605 – Physics teaching seminar (pending correction of disabilities phone number)

27-GPCh.: Program Change: [M.S. and Ph.D. - Environmental Chemistry](#)

28-GPCh.: Program Change: [M.S. and Ph.D. - Geophysics](#)

Clarifications in a variety of other course proposals were requested. No other motions were considered.

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for 2/27/13**

Present: Lara Horstmann, Cheng-fu Chen, Tim Bartholomaus, John Yarie, Donie Bret-Harte, Elisabeth Nadin, Chung-san Ng, John Eichelberger, Jayne Harvie, Laura Bender, Stacy Howdeshell

Minutes from our meeting on 2/06/13 were approved.

GAAC discussed the use of electronic copies of graduate applications. In some departments, it appears that there is a delay because paper copies have to be scanned to produce electronic copies before they are made available to faculty members for review, which introduces delays. Upon discussion with Laura Bender, it appears that this may be a problem originating at the Department level, as the graduate school makes available electronic copies of all graduate applications that it receives. The Registrar for Admissions can be contacted to provide instructions on how to access them.

GAAC passed numerous course proposals and program changes, as listed below:

4-Trial: [GEOS F694 - Snow and Snow Cover](#)

4-GPCh Program change: M.Ed. – Elementary Education

5-GPCh. Program Change: Post Baccalaureate Licensure Program – Elementary Education (pending clarification of impacts, Elisabeth will contact)

7-GCCh. Course change STACKED: ED F478/F678 – Math methods and curriculum development

8-GCCh. Course change STACKED: ED F479/F688 Science Methods and Curriculum Development

9-GCCh. Course change STACKED: EDSE F422/F622 Curriculum and Strategies II: High Incidence

18-GNC: New course: STO F602 – Mentoring in the Sciences

20-GNC: New course: STO F604 – Science Teaching and Outreach internship (passed pending correction of credit distribution – John will contact)

21-GNC: New course: STO F692 – Current topics in Scientific Teaching

24-GNC: New Course: [ATM F673 - Introduction to Micrometeorology](#)

36-GCCh.: Course change STACKED EDSC F442/F642 – Technology Applications in Education

38-GPCh.: Program Change: M.S. Physics

41-GPCh.: Program Change: **MS in Marine Biology**

42-GPCh.: Program Change: **PhD in Marine Biology**

43-GPCh.: Program Change: **MS in Oceanography**

44-GPCh.: Program Change: **PhD in Oceanography**

In addition, **26-GCCh.:** Course Change: [CHEM F674 - Neurochemistry](#) and Program change **29-GPCh** were passed via email after the meeting.

RAC Minutes 18 January 2013

Jon Dehn, Peter Webley, Orion Lawlor, Joanne Healy, Claudia Koch, Barbara Taylor, John Eichelberger

1.) Thanks (particularly to Lawlor and Koch) for getting the FAC for faculty research out and up on the VCR's website. This should be a useful guide to faculty wanting to do research, or a good refresher for those who need to brush up on policies and procedures.

2.) Discussion on coordination of graduate student and undergraduate research. A model was proposed where graduate students would serve as mentors to undergraduates, involving them in the thesis projects.

Each proposal would be overseen by a faculty member, but the graduate students would have latitude in how to manage and mentor the undergrads. This provides valuable experience to the grad and encourages undergrads to go on to higher degrees.

Funding for this effort could be from many sources. One idea is to have the governance fee for the graduate students be managed by a graduate student council with assistance of the Dean of the Graduate School to evaluate and support research efforts. URSA and Prof. Taylor could assist to pair eager undergraduates with grad student mentors.

This was the start of the conversation and it is hoped that the Graduate School and URSA will continue looking into this.

3.) Role of the RAC, the committee expressed interest to have a more active role in providing advice to the VCR and being a sounding board for large programmatic research enterprises. Talks with the VCR suggest this would be a good avenue. The faculty would really like to help out here.

4.) Program review of research at UAF requested by the Chancellor. In response to recent efforts to engage the Board of Regents in the role of research at UA, they have asked for a review of the research program at UAF. In turn the Chancellor has approached the RAC to do this. Given the experiences with the vision 2017 document, the Chancellor's transition teams, the Academic Master plan and the early stages of the Strategic Direction Initiative, this is not as daunting a task as it may seem. The Chancellor is willing to support two retreats, likely in the form of a weekend day of the committee together, one early on to establish a work plan, and one near the end of the process to finalize a draft document for review and publication.

The whole process should be done this semester with the first retreat in March and finish at the end of the summer, the final retreat to take place just before classes start in the Fall. The target is to have a document for the Regents in their Fall meeting.

Overall much of the data is already available through the VCR's office, past documents and PAIR. Some data collection will have to happen and be done by the RAC, hopefully with some help from the colleges and business offices around campus.

There are clearly some charged issues that should be avoided by focusing on the tight integration of the teaching and research missions at UAF. With that in mind a basic structure for the document is as follows:

Intro and executive summary of the 5 components

1. Students in research, grad and undergrad, numbers, their roles in the state, how colleges and research institutions work together to drive one of the most success research enterprises in the world
2. The research income to the UAF, its role in the State's economy, how colleges and research institutions work together to drive one of the most success research enterprises in the world
3. How our research gets out, where are we active, what is a quantitative measure of our publications and creative activity
4. Our role in the State, unique as we provide many services normally reserved for State agencies, and how we add to the state's cultural and intellectual capital
5. Our recommendations for the future, investment into research ventures, seed funding and commercialization