DRAFT MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #202
Monday, November 3, 2014
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Cécile Lardon

A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (16)	MEYER, Franz (15)
ALLMAN, Elizabeth (16)	MISRA, Debu (15)
BARNES, Bill (15)	MOSER, Dennis (16)
BERGE, Anna (15) – **Patrick Plattet**	NEWBERRY, Rainer (15)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (15)	PETERSON, Rorik (15)
CASCIO, Julie (16) - audio	RICE, Sunny (16) - audio
COFFMAN, Christine (15)	SKYA, Walter (16)
CONDE, Mark (15) - sabbatical	VALENTINE, Dave (16)
COOK, Brian (16)	WEBER, Jane (16)
DEHN, Jonathan (15)	WILDFEUER, Sandra (16)
DISTEFANO, Diana (16)	WINFREE, Cathy (15) - audio
DUKE, Rob (15) - audio	Members Absent:
FALLEN, Chris (15)	CHERRY, Jessica (15)
GIBSON, Georgina (16)	JOLY, Julie (15)
HANKS, Cathy (16)	RADENBAUGH, Todd (15)
HARDY, Sarah (15) - audio	SHALLCROSS, Leslie (15)
HARTMAN, Chris (16)	
HEALY, Joanne (15)	Others Present:
HORNIG, Joan (16)	Provost Henrichs
HORSTMANN, Lara (15)	Dean Paul Layer
JOHNSON, Galen (15)	Alex Fitts
LAN, Ping (15)	Libby Eddy
LARDON, Cécile (15)	Cindy Hardy
LAWLOR, Orion (16)	Tim Wilson
LOVECRAFT, Amy (15) - audio	Chris Beks
MAHONEY, Andrew (16)	Dani Sheppard, Carol Gering, Wendy Croskrey
MAXWELL, David (16)	Mae Marsh (guest speaker); Ana Richards
MCCARTNEY, Leslie (15)	Keith Mallard, Linda Hapsmith, Kevin Calderara
MCDONNELL, Andrew (16)	Siri Slater, Kelly Houlton, Sine Anahita, students.

B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #201

Minutes for Meeting #201 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:
   1. Motion to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Marine Advisory Program
   2. Motion to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Department of Mathematics

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – Cécile Lardon

Cécile reported that a committee formed by Faculty Alliance to address the common academic calendar and class schedule for the UA system has started to meet. The committee includes the three registrars, as well as students, faculty and staff from all three universities. Once they have a draft created, the Faculty Senates will get to comment on it.

She also reported that two of the Faculty Senate executive (administrative) committees have kicked back the draft motion for establishing common minimum baccalaureate admission standards. Both UAF and UAA have sent the draft back to the Faculty Alliance. UAF feels the standards are not stringent enough; UAA feels they are too stringent. There was also not enough clarity in the draft about each university retaining the right to set its own additional admission standards.

The General Education Requirements (GERs) and related issues are the big topic in FA right now. Math and English faculty from the three universities are working on their common education requirements. The Alliance will be working on the rest of it in the coming months.

Cécile noted that each Faculty Senate is working in a very different environment this year and probably into the future. Senates are used to talking about issues and academic policies as they pertain to their own university, but that has changed drastically. Because of a number of issues that have to be decided on a statewide level, agreement is needed between the entire faculties among the three universities. That means that the work of each Faculty Senate is more complicated. More patience is required in the process – GERC is a good example of this, having worked several years to revise the UAF core curriculum, but now having to wait on statewide decisions in order to implement changes. She appealed to the senators to tolerate more ambiguity than they're used to, and to be patient since there are more layers of governance that have to be involved in communicating and reaching workable solutions.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Debu Misra

Debu remarked that we are in a tough situation. There are many complexities with the issues being addressed in Faculty Alliance and how they affect the three universities. He seconded Cécile's appeal for patience so that things will be worked out for everyone's benefit.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

The Chancellor was traveling and therefore not available to provide remarks.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs noted that the Board of Regents will consider the UA system's proposed budget request to the legislature at the upcoming meeting. The current draft budget request is similar to the one that was put forward in September. The Board's reaction had been somewhat mixed in September; but, it was decided in subsequent discussions with university administration to go forward with the same request. The request is substantial. It asks for not only fixed cost increases: 50% of salary and benefit increases, some building operating costs and certain other fixed cost increases; but, it also asks for some program related increments for new and existing programs. It's an ambitious request in the fiscal climate the state is facing. They're hoping the BOR will adopt it and give the university a chance to advocate for its needs before the legislature. The Board, however, is very concerned over the reductions in state revenue and the fact that the state is spending more than it takes in. That necessarily creates pressure for the legislature to reduce spending.

The Board has made a number of suggestions to the three universities about possible ways to reduce spending. The potential for merging the two schools and one college across the system into one large School of Education is one of those suggestions which has received a lot of attention. This idea is not something supported by the three provosts and chancellors. They have prepared documents they believe make a convincing case that such a merger would not be in the best interests of the state. The BOR meeting has been extended by a day in order to discuss this matter. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee will meet with the deans of education and the provosts to consider the issue and how best to manage teacher preparation programs going forward.

The Provost mentioned the series of program reviews that are both ongoing and just getting started. These reviews are the outcome of the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) and Budget Options Group (BOG) work last spring to identify ways to increase revenues and reduce expenditures. The special program reviews will include some academic programs which are in the process of being identified now. Programs should be notified in about two weeks that they will be under review. There is a new committee being set up right now to look at ways of increasing revenue in order to offset the need for further spending reductions.

Rainer asked the Provost if there was actually the intention to close down some programs. She said yes, that is the case. She's not sure how many programs it will be necessary to shut down because a lot depends upon what funding the legislature provides this year and the following year. The other issue is whether the Regents will approve a tuition increase. The Chancellor has given her office a tentative reduction of $3 million for next year. Rainer asked if this means that there will be a list of a dozen or so programs that are up for elimination. The Provost said yes, but noted there will be due process first. The PBC is making up an initial list of programs to undergo special program review, and then there will be the opportunity for those programs to respond. The enrollment statistics, along with the program's response, will go to the Program Review Committee and undergo the normal three-step process.

Cécile asked if the programs identified for special program review would have to put together the normal program review file. The Provost responded that what they would submit would be similar to the normal program file, but it would be recognized that due to the compressed time frame there would not be time for the usual full response (e.g., the full summary of student learning outcomes assessment). Programs could turn in the most current information they have; but, their focus should be on the issue of how critical they are to carrying out the university's mission.

The Provost was asked if there were a process for this special program review, and how programs would respond to it. She explained that program identification is still underway at the PBC. They are doing the initial screening. But, when that is finished, the identified programs will receive specific instructions on how to respond and what will happen as the process moves forward. The special program reviews of academic programs will be accomplished by the same committees which do regular program review (and are comprised of faculty). The timeline is quite compressed. The Chancellor wishes to have the results by early January before the legislative session begins.

Jon D. asked what other spending reduction means are being considered. The Provost explained there are a whole series of reviews underway which include Athletics, Marketing and Communications, Summer Sessions, KUAC, eLearning, and animal care facilities, among others. Vice Chancellor Pitney instituted a process improvement team over a year ago, to work with administrative units to streamline processes and reduce the number of staff at administrative levels. There has been a significant reduction in staffing already from that effort.

Cécile urged senators to volunteer to serve on the special program review committees, and talk to their constituents, also, about the opportunity to serve. Elizabeth A. commented that the word needs to get out more uniformly.

David V. reminded everyone that a key part of a senator's role is to communicate back to their constituents. In some cases, broader communication may be needed, but senators still need to take the information back to their units.

The Provost mentioned that the Office of Management and Budget's web site contains a lot of information. The link is: http://www.uaf.edu/finserv/omb/

V Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Chris Beks

Chris commented on the Faculty Senate resolution in today's agenda about the proposed smoking and tobacco ban. It supports Staff Council's earlier resolution, which is appreciated. Staff Council's resolution was in response to a request from the Chancellor for input from staff about their concerns. David V. commented that the Board of Regents will consider the topic of the ban at their December meeting.

Chris also mentioned there is Staff Council representation on the Planning and Budget Committee. There are also two staff helping to drafting regulations for the furlough policy.

B. ASUAF – Mathew Carrick

No report was available from ASUAF.

C. Athletics – Daní Sheppard

Daní introduced herself as the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR). The FAR position is appointed by the Chancellor to serve as a liaison between academics and athletics. One of her primary roles is to serve as a resource for faculty and students to help balance athletics with academics, keeping academics as the priority. She shared about recent successful nation-wide efforts of FARs to increase standards for the path to graduation, including increasing standards for new incoming freshman and transfer students

in terms of GPAs, test scores and transferred core courses, as well as increasing the number of credits that are required of students on annual basis to move successfully toward graduation in four years.

Daní also shared that last year UAF students in Rifle and Cross-Country Skiing brought home two prestigious Elite 89 awards (NCAA - Division II). All the students in UAF's Athletics program last year had GPAs at 3.0 and above.

D. UNAC – Tim Wilson

Tim reported that the UNAC Representative Assembly met in Anchorage recently. They discussed the common academic calendar and faculty concerns. They also expressed concern over the somewhat strained climate between the Board of Regents and faculty. It was noted that four of the 11 regent terms will be ending soon and new appointments will be made by the next governor. Who is elected governor tomorrow will be very important in this regard.

Tim mentioned that the unit peer review process is now almost over. He urged faculty to talk to faculty in their departments or with United Academics if they need help with their responses or the process.

David V. asked Tim if UNAC will recommend any names for potential new regents to the governor, and who could faculty communicate their recommendations to if they have any. Tim responded that faculty can speak to anyone at UNAC (mentioning himself, Debu, or Abel, as examples).

Provost Henrichs noted that there is an application process to the Governor's Office. Faculty can urge folks to apply and can write letters of support for candidates.

Debu added that anyone can submit an application – there is no process directly associated with the Union. Nominees are screened and then added to the governor's list. More information is available at the State of Alaska Boards and Commissions web site:
http://gov.alaska.gov/parnell/services/boards-commissions/boards-commissions-process.html

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane reported that UAFT is still in negotiations. The Joint Health Care Committee will be meeting today at 3:00 PM.

VI Guest Speaker

A. Mae Marsh Director of Diversity and Equal Opportunity
Topic: Title IX Mandatory Reporting

PowerPoint briefing slides are posted online at:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2014-15-fs-meetings/#202

Cécile welcomed Mae Marsh and acknowledged the presence of staff who work closely with her on Title IX matters, including Ana Richards, Chief Keith Mallard, Don Foley, and Anita Hartmann.

Mae shared about Title IX training she attended last January and the gaps which were identified for the university. These included the need for unified procedures to address sexual misconduct, identification of "responsible employees" and "mandated reports", staffing needs, database tracking system, and training and awareness, among others. She and her staff have been attempting to close these gaps since then with the support of university administration.

She shared the timeline of their efforts and accomplishments, and the audit of the entire UA system by the Office of Civil Rights. They received much positive written and verbal feedback overall from the OCR auditors, though the final report will not be finalized for several more months. The only negative feedback they received so far is that policies across the UA System are not harmonized.

The UAF taskforce has developed some interim procedures and have been testing those. They developed templates so that everyone knows what their rights and responsibilities are when they go through the system. And, they've been working on UA System collaboration. Updates to the Board of Regents' Policy are still pending. They're seeking a designated attorney in General Counsel as they often need a quick turnaround response time on matters.

Mae talked about the staff appointments that have been made for Title IX. She and Ana Richards are the UAF Title IX Coordinators. She introduced Siri Slater and Kevin Calderara who are new investigators. She also introduced Jamie Napolski and Andrea Schmidt, along with Anita Hartmann and Don Foley, who are Deputy Title IX coordinators. Keith Mallard heads up the Bystander Training.

UAF does not have a unified tracking system, yet. She described some of the systems that are presently being used at the three universities. Research is being done at the UA system level to help identify a unified tracking system.

Mae described the extensive information campaign that has been going on for the UAF campus. Training has been provided for Title IX staff, and for faculty, staff and students. They participated in student orientation, but are still working on the gaps in getting the word out to students. They've also been doing a lot of community outreach to school districts, organizations, magistrates and the State Troopers and building collaborations that way. A climate survey from UA institutional research will be coming out this month to help in producing an action plan. MOUs which have been accomplished along with those that are pending were listed. This networking helps to provide access to training materials, grant money, and services.

With regard to mandatory reporting, Mae clarified the distinction between disclosure and mandatory reporting. Disclosure is when the victim tells what happened; they are always in control of the disclosure which often can take upwards of six months. Resources were described for confidential disclosure, including Health and Counseling on campus, and various network agencies. They are working on getting a victim advocate on campus from the Interior Alaska Center for Non-violent Living as another resource for confidential disclosure. Victims can always request confidentiality even when disclosing to Title IX staff. And, they can report to Alaska law enforcement.

Mandatory reporting is required by the State of Alaska if a minor is involved or is at risk of harming oneself or others, or if a vulnerable adult is involved who cannot make their own decisions. Confidential employees have statutory coverage and are licensed professionals (such as those at Health and Counseling). OCR allows for the designation of other employees, but UAF has not done that at this time because if there is a legal case, their records can be subpoenaed (they are not protected by statute).

Title IX coordinators are required to keep all reports and complaints in repository in order to be able to capture patterns and be able to create early intervention. OCR identifies responsible employees as those who have the authority to take action to redress harassment and who have the duty to report to appropriate school officials. They are also defined as individuals who a student could reasonably believe have this authority or responsibility. University regulation R04.02.022 states that supervisors and faculty will promptly respond to complaints of sexual harassment.

When a school is put on notice about an incident, they must take immediate action to stop the harassment, remedy the victim, and make sure it does not reoccur, and investigate the matter. Simultaneous investigations would ensue if a victim chooses to go through the Title IX process and law enforcement. Mae provided examples of what OCR considers direct notice to Title IX, as well as examples of indirect notice. What needs to reported in terms of reporting details was covered.

Mae stressed that a victim's request for confidentiality is taken very seriously and all reasonable steps are taken to honor such requests. There are situations where confidentiality must be overridden and Mae described the nature of those situations which mainly involve a risk to the larger community because the perpetrator is repeating or threatening more violence. The age of the victim is also a factor, and whether or not violence was perpetrated with a weapon. Regarding the concern about students disclosing information in the course of writing a paper for a class, Mae noted that OCR guidance says responsible employees should inform students prior to such actions about their obligation to report. Students should be informed about what confidential resources are available to them and about the fact that they can request confidentiality.

Rainer asked why the University of Alaska was chosen for an audit. Mae said that no reason was given to them even when they asked that question directly. Her office looked at it as an opportunity to improve their processes and ask for guidance.

Chris C. asked about definitions of mandatory reporters vs. responsible employees and which applies to faculty. Mae clarified that her position is not a mandatory reporter, nor are faculty. They fall under the category of responsible employees. Chris noted there is a lot of ambiguity in what is expected of responsible employees in terms of reporting, and Mae agreed. Mae noted that additional guidance from OCR came in April of 2014 and policy has not yet been updated; and, in fact it has been out of date for several years. Chris noted the guidance does not make it clear that all employees of the university would be responsible employees. Mae agreed.

Amy L. asked about a specific type of situation where a student might speak, for example, about being harassed in her presence and whether or not she had to report it. The short answer was yes. Discussion ensued regarding the language of OCR guidance and UA policy and University regulation and its interpretation by the university. OCR guidance tells the university when it's on notice, but our policy is not clear about that. Mae confirmed that students should not have the expectation of confidentiality in a classroom setting or between faculty and student. Language for syllabi has been suggested so that students are informed of that before they speak in class or write about incidents in papers. Amy asked about a situation where a faculty and student change roles outside the classroom into friend and confidant in a non-university setting. Mae said that falls under what Health and Counseling defines as role confusion, and described the negative effects that could happen for the student in the classroom.

Chris C. asked again about the faculty being defined as responsible employees, particularly if there is language they should include on their syllabi. Mae reiterated that UAF faculty and supervisors have a responsibility to respond to reports of sexual harassment and violence. They should coordinate with Title IX coordinator's office. There is an obligation to respond and coordinate with her office. Chris asked about what constitutes a response. Mae responded that calling her office so they can assist would be appropriate. They can keep confidentiality at the system level, if requested. Mae provided the example of someone coming to talk to Ana about being assaulted, and then another individual talks to Keith about being assaulted. Because of that coordination in reporting, her office could be able to determine if the same perpetrator is responsible for the two incidents. The system has to try to capture these facts, and why cooperation is necessary to make that possible.

Chris C. asked further about students disclosing incidents in papers. Students may not read the syllabus or think about it when they're writing. This would put faculty in the position of violating the student's right to privacy and confidentiality if they take it to the reporting level. She didn't think that the interpretation of the guidance documents took student privacy rights and academic freedom of faculty and students into account. She also expressed that the role of shared governance was lacking in these matters pertaining to faculty roles.

Provost Henrichs emphasized that these interpretations were not Mae's decisions. These decisions were made by UA administration for the UA System, including General Counsel and President Gamble. Mae is not empowered to change the current guidance. The Provost has heard these faculty concerns and they will be discussed with Legal, but there are limits to what the university can do because ultimately the law is the law. While the Provost agrees that some of the documents are not worded as clearly as they might be, the law and its interpretation are an evolving process. Right now, however, Mae is reporting our best effort to comply with the law.

Cécile commented about the fact that federal law is changing relationships between faculty and students in many ways that require faculty to be more mindful about the nature of their relationships with their students. The laws have made it more complicated. Faculty are struggling with how they talk to their students and what they invite their students to talk about because of the laws.

Mae thanked Provost for her comments regarding the constraints of the law they must work under. Just as the posted speed limit may be 55 which puts the driver on notice, the driver may still take a risk and drive beyond the limit and suffer the consequences. The legal guidance for UAF says we must respond when we are put on notice. If a faculty is told about sexual harassment or violence, they are put on notice to respond properly. The purpose of the federal effort at all universities across the nation is to set up another system for helping to stop sexual assault on campuses. We've always had the confidential reporting and the ability to go to law enforcement, but this is an administrative process at universities that works by the standard of the preponderance of the evidence. This process works more quickly.

Keith Mallard commented that we have an opportunity here, as we're addressing the BOR policy, to provide further clarification that is so needed. That clarification effort will go through the governance process.

BREAK

VII Old Business

A. Motion to Require Baccalaureate Degree Programs include a Capstone Experience, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 202/1)

Rainer N. requested that, if passed, notification be distributed to all the deans (possibly by the Provost) asking them to find out which of their programs already have a capstone and which don't. For those that don't have a capstone in place, those programs need to know they should develop one by Fall of 2016 and have it on file with their dean.

Dennis M. commented that the Rasmuson Library is the institutional repository for any capstone projects that need long-term storage.

The motion to require a capstone experience be included with baccalaureate degree programs was passed with no objections.

VIII New Business

A. Motion to Approve Deletion of the Bachelor of Arts and Sciences Degree Program, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 202/2)

Rainer provided some history on how the BAS first was developed, as well as how the need for the degree has been changing so that it's no longer necessary. Senators from the School of Education spoke in favor of the motion. The motion to approve deletion of the BAS was passed unanimously.

B. Resolution concerning Smoking and Tobacco Use at UAF, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 202/3)

Cécile mentioned past discussions in the Faculty Senate about this topic, and noted the resolution which Staff Council (SC) passed recently. [A copy of the SC resolution is posted on the Faculty Senate meeting page under the heading for today's meeting.] The consensus among the members of the Administrative Committee is that a flat-out ban on smoking and tobacco use on campus would be very difficult to enforce. The Senate's resolution is a softer version than a full ban. Another part of the question is whether university policy and regulation should include chewing tobacco and evaporative cigarettes.

Amy L. asked if the resolution should include marijuana, in case Ballot Measure 2 is passed and marijuana is regulated.

Debu notes there is no formal tobacco or smoking policy yet. They're anticipating that it will come up at the December Board of Regents' meeting. Cécile reiterated that this resolution is simply to provide input to the Board.

Rainer asked if the intended routing of the resolution was to the Faculty Alliance, and if FA was also collecting feedback from the other two universities. David V. responded that the BOR has made it clear they want to hear information via the Faculty Alliance. Faculty Alliance would report any input from the three universities to the BOR. Cécile mentioned some of the practical implications of the input from the universities, especially in terms of geography. At UAA they simply have to cross the street to be off university property, and it's not that simple at UAF.

Ken A. asked for clarification on what the resolution is requesting – a full ban except in designated areas? Rainer commented that is not a full ban. Cécile commented that they are trying to move away from smokers "can't smoke here" to smokers "can smoke here." Ken asked how this would apply out on the ski trail and whether there would be designated areas out there. Ken then asked what the problem is that is being addressed by this resolution and the BOR action. Cécile reiterated how a UAA student-led effort brought this before the BOR, and the Board is now determined to have policy on this issue. Ken commented that he sees this as advocating for a politically correct move, not necessarily a real solution.

Provost Henrichs commented on two reasons why the Board of Regents is likely to pass policy about this issue. One is the student advocacy which is based on health effects to smokers, and to others due to second-hand smoke. The other has to do with research about how employee productivity is affected and the costs associated with lost productivity. The regents have bought into these rationales. The impact of these resolutions might be to potentially modify or temper the Board's actions to make them less complete and sweeping. David V. shared his observation that at the last several BOR meetings, there

has been a steady stream of public testimony about negative health effects from smoking. At the last meeting, Regent Wickersham said he had heard enough and asked for a motion on the table in December to address this issue. Ken noted his concern about the impact on personal rights.

Elizabeth A. commented about the syntax in the resolution which says all tobacco cessation resources will be located outdoors. She also was concerned about calling the smoking areas "quit areas," and she felt if there was not a time issue, that she would like to see the outcome of the marijuana vote. Lara H. commented about the issue of medical use of marijuana.

Cécile acknowledged that it's not possible to address all the possible scenarios. The geography of our campus makes it easier to tell people where they can smoke rather than where they cannot. A caller observed that the current prohibition of smoking 50-feet away from buildings does not solve the problem of people smoking – 50-feet away from building entrances may still be in areas where it affects a lot of other people who have to walk through second-hand smoke.

Rainer reiterated that what we are essentially asking is that a complete ban not be put in place. Orion L. agreed that a complete ban is absolutely a poor policy that would result in people smoking in bathrooms and trash cans catching on fire and other negative consequences. They are hoping to temper a complete ban and nothing in the resolution advocates for a complete ban.

Lara H. commented about the fact that other forms of tobacco use are not mentioned (chew and e-cigs). Cécile noted the resolution had been limited to smoking. Lara stated that she would prefer more clear language about other forms of tobacco, as well. Cécile asked for a friendly amendment to the resolution and discussion followed. Elizabeth A. proposed amendments in the last section of the resolution (section copied below):

> THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED
> The UAF Faculty Senate holds that campuses should maintain the ability to designate outdoor ~~"quit areas"~~ AREAS in which smokers can have safe access to ashtrays and TO OFFER tobacco cessation resources.

Rainer asked if it were fair to say that there are different two issues here, one of which is the precise wording of this resolution, and the other is communicating to Faculty Alliance that we oppose a total ban on either tobacco use or smoking. Cécile responded that it's not going to be particularly helpful if we vote on a resolution that says "we oppose…" because that's not going to get a good response from the Board. Rainer felt that, however Faculty Alliance wished to phrase it to the Board, he had the sense that UAF Faculty Senate is opposed to a total ban on smoking and tobacco use. There was discussion on whether or not the resolution communicated that message, and consensus was that it implied the message rather than stated it outright.

David V. commented that with the current wording the resolution could be interpreted to mean we're on board with the idea to get rid of tobacco, but we see the need for a transition period because people will need time to quit smoking. It does not say we think it is wrong to ban tobacco use on campuses. The regents have been hearing that a number of other universities across the country have gone tobacco-free and this is the model being held up to them at meetings during public testimony. Amy L. commented that the resolution does accomplish what David described. However, she suggested taking out "quit" areas, and just keeping the word "areas." Elizabeth supported that idea, also. With no objections, the amendments to the resolution were passed.

Lara H. commented that she thought the resolution should include tobacco use, not just smoking. Some discussion followed, with Debu noting that the FS resolution supports the SC resolution which mentions

tobacco use as well as smoking. Ken A. proposed working on the resolution further. Donie B. commented about the work that already went into the resolution at Administrative Committee, and supported Debu's comment about the SC resolution ours is supporting which already includes tobacco use. Rainer commented that FA members David, Cécile and Debu know now what the Faculty Senate members want and called the resolution to a vote. The resolution was passed by a majority vote.

IX DISCUSSION ITEM POSTPONED TO NEXT MEETING

A. Common General Education Requirements, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee – Rainer Newberry (Attachment 202/4)

X Public Comment*

Brian Cook (Theatre and Film) made several announcements about current theatre productions which are advertised on their web site. He announced that the Collaborative Arts Council is funding faculty, staff and/or student collaborative art projects which are interdisciplinary. They will make grant awards for projects up to $2000. The deadline for applications is November 21. http://www.uaf.edu/theatrefilm/

Andrew McConnell commented that the Board of Regents has been pushing issues requiring all three universities to work together. Faculty Alliance is taking on more responsibility and workload as a result. He asked what the long-term vision is for governance, and if we're going to be shifting more toward the Faculty Alliance as the decision-making body. What is the goal? Cecile responded that it was an important question. Her opening remarks addressed the fact that there has been a shift in terms of how we need to come to decisions and how much autonomy we have. It needs to be a discussion item for Faculty Senate. David V. added that he doesn't see FA taking on more decision-making power; rather, FA is a communication channel to the BOR for a coherent voice from the three universities. The BOR doesn't want to hear from just one Faculty Senate, which means the process of communicating will be more drawn out with the Board. But, FA doesn't substitute for the Faculty Senates who are the individual decision-making bodies for faculty at each university. Joint decisions are being asked from all three of the senates from time to time, however.

XI Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

B. Committee Chair Comments

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 202/5)
Faculty Affairs – Chris Fallen, Chair (Attachment 202/6)
Unit Criteria – Chris Coffman, Chair
Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 202/7)
Core Review Committee – Leah Berman, Chair (Attachment 202/8)
Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair (Attachment 202/9)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair
Research Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair (Attachment 202/10)
Information Technology Committee – Rorik Peterson, Convener

XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:01 PM.

ATTACHMENT 202/1
UAF Faculty Senate #202, November 3, 2014
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to change the UAF baccalaureate requirements so that each student must complete a capstone experience in the student's major or program, as broadly described below. It will be the responsibility of each Department, Program, and (or) College/School to create, deliver, evaluate, and assess their capstone experience. Each Dean's office will have a copy of the capstone requirements for all programs in the College/School on file.

RATIONALE: This change is proposed in support of satisfying UAF's Learning outcome #4: *"Integrate and apply learning, including synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies, adapting them to new settings, questions, and responsibilities, and forming a foundation for lifelong learning. Preparation will be demonstrated through production of a creative or scholarly project that requires broad knowledge, appropriate technical proficiency, information collection, synthesis, interpretation, presentation, and reflection.*"

Many UAF Departments and Programs currently have baccalaureate capstone experience requirements; the purpose of this change is to create a UAF-wide requirement. We envision this proposed change as not adding a significant burden to most UAF faculty and students.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2016 (AY2016-17)

****

General Suggestions for Capstone Experience

The Capstone experience should demonstrate students' ability to integrate a wide range of learning. Students should make connections among ideas, skills, and bodies of knowledge, and will synthesize and transfer their learning to new, complex areas of inquiry, products, or situations within or beyond conventional coursework. Specifically, the Capstone should:

- Require that students demonstrate the appropriate skill levels in communication and (as appropriate) quantitative and (or) qualitative analysis.
- Integrate learning from major requirements.
- Guide students through a project or experience relevant to their educational goals.
- Provide a basis for evaluating student performance.
- Be suitable as a potential means for assessing the major requirements.

Suggested General Instructional Objectives

- The student should integrate and apply learning from multiple disciplines and skill sets.
- The student should demonstrate an ability to contribute to existing knowledge, work in professional settings, and (or) create products relevant to the student's further educational, career and life goals.
- The experience should demonstrate the student possesses intellectual and practical capabilities at a level expected of one receiving a baccalaureate degree from a major

university.
- The student should complete the experience or work as a culmination of the student's baccalaureate education.

Course examples:

NORS 484 W/O Seminar in Northern Studies: An interdisciplinary seminar focusing on topics relating to the North with emphasis on the physical sciences, the peoples, and the socioeconomic and political aspects of the area. Specialists in the various fields will assign readings and conduct discussions. Prerequisites: ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213X; junior standing; or permission of instructor. (3+0)

PS F499 W Senior Thesis: Thesis will draw from the literature in at least two sub-fields of political science (U.S. government/politics, political theory, public law, comparative politics, international relations) in its analysis. Prerequisites: ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213X; PS F101; PS F222; senior standing; permission of instructor. (1.5+0+7.5)

Non-course examples:

- Portfolio
- Internship
- Performance / Exhibition
- Participation in competition
- Professional publication
- Student teaching

ATTACHMENT 202/2
UAF Faculty Senate #202, November 3, 2014
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate agrees to the discontinuation of the Bachelor of Arts and Sciences degree program (housed in the School of Education).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2015

RATIONALE: The need for the BAS degree decreased significantly after the BOR approval of the BA in Elementary Education in the early 2000s. The BAS was kept on a trial basis thereafter. With the availability of the Interdisciplinary General Studies degree options, need and demand for the BAS has further decreased and elimination of the program is now timely.

Background and Information:

The original reason for developing the degree no longer exists. The BAS was designed to serve as the undergraduate degree appropriate for students who planned to be elementary teachers but no longer had the option to pursue this degree as an undergraduate student — only through a post-baccalaureate "5th year" option when the UA Board of Regents made the decision to eliminate the undergraduate route for seeking a degree and license in elementary education in 1999. This decision was reversed by the Regents the following year. Many students were caught in the middle of the B.Ed. or BAS degree when the changes occurred. We kept the degree option open primarily for a very few number of student athletes who knew they wanted to be elementary teachers but who could not do this as an undergraduate because of their athletic training and travel schedules. They planned to complete their licensure requirements as a post-baccalaureate student- but usually at another institution.

There is no discernable or consequential effect of the program deletion. Students who are interested in becoming elementary teachers, but who are not able to complete the internship year requirements because of participation in a varsity level sport, are now able to complete all of the same content courses, along with an education minor, as a student in the General Studies Interdisciplinary degree. No one will be disadvantaged because of the deletion of this degree since there is an appropriate substitute degree available.

There were minimal costs associated with offering this degree because of the small number of students in the degree and because only there was only one required course that wasn't offered as a required course for students in other programs (i.e. ., there was only one required course that was designed specifically for this degree). No impact to the School of Education budget is expected.

Since there is now a good alternative for students seeking an interdisciplinary degree (i.e., the General Studies Interdisciplinary degree) and since there has been a marked decrease in the numbers of students pursuing this degree, deletion of the program is timely. The two students who are currently declared BAS majors will be able to successfully complete their degree requirements.

ATTACHMENT 202/3
UAF Faculty Senate #202, November 3, 2014
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

RESOLUTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate agrees with most of the concerns expressed in Staff Council Resolution 2014- 254-1 and offers the following additional suggestions:

WHEREAS
Smoking has been proven to be addictive both mentally and physically; therefore, it will take time for habitual smokers and users to change their habits;

WHEREAS
Rates of tobacco use in the form of smoking vary widely across society, and are higher in some groups the university is seeking to serve;

WHEREAS
The existing policy of limiting smoking to at least 50 feet away from building entrances and fresh air intakes helps considerably in keeping the populated areas of the campus free of toxins;

AND WHEREAS
Under a complete ban we expect illicit smoking would harm indoor air quality and present a fire danger;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED
The UAF Faculty Senate holds that campuses should maintain the ability to designate outdoor "quit areas" in which smokers can have safe access to ashtrays and tobacco cessation resources.

ATTACHMENT 202/4
UAF Faculty Senate #202, November 3, 2014
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Discussion item #1:

In order to move UAF General Education Requirements so that they more closely resemble those of UAA and UAS, UAF will almost certainly need to change its GERS to a scheme similar to that below by Fall 2016. UAA and UAS take the 'bucket list" approach for the liberal arts GERs. UAF has specific course requirements ('the core'). It's easier for UAF to change to the UAS-UAA system than vice-versa. Given that, we might as well go ahead and plan to do so. The specific size and shape of the buckets will need to be negotiated. **A comparison of UAA, UAS and current UAF GERs is on the next page.**

Current Requirement	**Possible change to resemble UAA/UAS**
HIST F100X--Modern World History ECON/PS F100X--Political Economy ANTH/SOC F100X—Individual, Society and Culture	Two Introductory courses in two different social sciences
ENGL/FL F200X--World Literatures	An introductory course in the humanities (which could be a foreign language course)
ART/MUS/THR F200X, HUMS F201X, ANS F202X--Aesthetic Appreciation	an introductory course in the arts (the nature of which is under discussion)
BA F323X, COMM F300X, JUST F300X, NRM F303X, PHIL F322X, PS F300X--Ethics	An additional social science, humanities, or Arts course
1 Math + 2 lab natural science lab courses	1 Math + 1 Nat Sci lab course + an additional Math or Nat science course

UAA vs UAF vs UAS General Education Requirements

UAA Courses	UAF Courses	UAS Courses
Tier 1: Basic College-Level Skills		
Oral Communications Skills — 3 Credits		
COMM A111, A235, A237, A241	**COMM** F131X, F141X	**COMM** S111, S235, S237, S241
Quantitative Skills — 3 Credits		
MATH A107, A108, A109, A172, A200, A201, A272 • **STAT** A252, A253, A307	**MATH** F103X, F107X, F161X, F200X, F201X, F202X, F262X, F272X • **STAT** F200X	**MATH** S107 • **STAT** S107
Written Communication Skills — 6 Credits		
ENGL A111, A211, A212, A213, A214, A311, A312, A414	**ENGL** F111X, F211X, F213X	**ENGL** S111, S211, S212
Tier 2: Disciplinary Areas		
Fine Arts — 3 Credits		
AKNS A215 • **ART** A160, A261, A262, A360A, A360B • **DNCE** A170 • **MUS**, A121, A124, A215, A221, A222 • **THR** A111, A311, A312, A411, A412	**ANS** F202X • **ART** F200X • **HUM** F201X • **MUS** F200X • **THR** F200X	**ART** S160, S261, S262 • **MUS** S123 • **THR** S111, S211, S212
Humanities — 6 Credits Outside the Major		
AKNS A101A, A101B, A101C, A101E, A102A, A102B, A102C, A102E, A201 • **ART** A261, A262, A360A, A360B • **ASL** A101, A102, A201, A202 • **CHIN** A101, A102, A201, A202 • **ENGL** A121, A201, A202, A301, A302, A305, A306, A307, A310, A383, A445 • **FREN** A101, A102, A201, A202, A301, A302 • **GER** A101, A102, A201, A202, A301, A302 • **HIST** A101, A102, A121, A122, A131, A132, A341 • **HNRS** A192 • **HUM** A211, A212 • **JPN** A101, A102, A201, A202, A301, A302 • **LING** A101 • **MUS** A221, A222 • **PHIL** A101, A201, A211, A212, A301, A313, A314 • **PS** A331, A332, A333 • **RUSS** A101, A102, A201, A202, A301, A302 • **SPAN** A101, A102, A201, A202, A301, A302 • **THR** A311, 312, A411, A412	**BA** F323X • **COMM** F300X • **ENGL** F200X • **FL** F200X • **HIST** F100X • **JUST** F300X • **NRM** F303X • **PHIL** F322X	**AKL** S105, S106, S107, S108 • **ASL** S101, S102 • **ENGL** S215, S223, S224, S225, S226, S261 • **HIST** S105, S106, S131, S132 • **HUM** S120 • **JOUR** S101 • **PHIL** S101, S201, S301 • **RUSS** S101, S102 • **SPAN** S101, S102
Natural Sciences — 7 Credits Including One Laboratory Course		
Laboratory Courses		
ASTR A103/L, A104/L • **BIOL** A102/A103, A111, A112, A115, A116, A178/A179 • **CHEM** A103/L, A104/L, A105/L, A106/L • **ENVI** A211/L • **GEOL** A111, A115/L, A178/A179, A221 • **LSIS** A102, A201, A202 • **PHYS** A123/L, A124/L, A211/L, A212/L	**ATM** F101X • **BIOL** F100X, F103X, F104X, F111X, F112X, F115X, F116X • **CHEM** F100X, F103X, F104X, F105X, F106X • **GEOG** F111X • **GEOS** F100X, F101X, F106X F112X, F120X, F125X • **MSL** F111X • **PHYS** F102X, F103X, F104X, F115X, F116X, F175X, F211X, F212X, F213X	**BIOL** S103, S104, S105, S106, S111, S112 • **CHEM** S103, S105, S106 • **ENVS** S101 • **GEOL** S104 • **PHYS** S102, S103, S104, S211, S212
Non-Laboratory Courses		
ASTR A103, A104 • **BIOL** A102, A178, A200 • **CHEM** A103, A104, A105, A106 • **CPLX** A200 • **ENVI** A211 • **GEOG** A111 • **GEOL** A115, A178 • **LSIS** A101 • **PHYS** A101, A123, A124, A211, A212	**ANTH** F211X	**ANTH** S205 • **ASTR** S225 • **CHEM** S100 • **GEOG** S205 • **GEOL** S105 • **OCN** S101 • **PHIL** S206
Social Sciences — 6 Credits Outside the Major and From Two Different Disciplines		
ANTH A101, A200, A202, A250 • **BA** A151 • **CEL** A292 • **ECON** A123, A201, A202, A210 • **ENVI** A212 • **GEOG** A101 • **HNRS** A292 • **HS** A220 • **HUMS** A106 • **INTL** A101 • **JPC** A101 • **JUST** A110, A251, A330, A375 • **LEGL** A101 • **LSSS** A111 • **PS** A101, A102, A311, A351 • **PSY** A111, A150 • **SOC** A101, A110, A201, A202, A251, A342, A351 • **SWK** A106, A243 • **WS** A200	**ANTH** F100X • **ECON** F100X • **PS** F100X, F300X • **SOC** F100X	**ANTH** S101, S202, S211 • **ECON** S100, S201, S202 • **GEOG** S101 • **HIST** S105, S106, S131, S132 • **PSY** S101, S250 • **SOC** S101, S201

ATTACHMENT 202/5
UAF Faculty Senate #202, November 3, 2014
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee
Minutes for 17 Sept 2014 3-4 pm Reich 300

Present: Brian Cook, Catherine Hanks, Cindy Hardy, Dennis Moser (remote), Joan Hornig, Ken Abramowicz, Rainer Newberry, Rob Duke (remote), Todd Radenbaugh (remote), Doug Goering (remote), Jayne Harvie, Casey Byrne, Holly Sherouse, Libby Eddy (remote), Linda Hapsmith (remote), and Stacey Howdeshell (remote)

I. Minutes of Sept 3 meeting approved as revised Sept 17

II. Old business

A. proposed changes in Univ Regs RE General Education

David Valentine (pres, fac alliance) felt these should not go forward to various fac senates until each proposed change has a justification and an explanation. However, Fac Alliance has yet to take up the proposed changes, but is likely to do so at its next meeting. Fac Alliance is sending a letter to AAUP asking their opinion concerning the BOR 'charge' of last April. Depending on how that turns out, Fac Senates may be asked to send a resolution to BOR asking for reconsideration of their 'charge' to the faculty. In the meanwhile, Fac Alliance is setting up committees to look into (a) common GE Math courses, (b) common GE English courses, and (c) common UA academic calendar.

B. Revised Capstone Motion to be submitted to AdComm as discussion item for October fac senate meeting.

Motion was approved as amended (BELOW). Doug Goering agreed to bring up at Dean's Council the question of 'what are various programs doing for a capstone requirement' in order to better assess the extent to which capstone requirements are already in place. Holly brought up the question 'will this requirement be something degreeworks will need to deal with?' to which the answer is: it will depend on the individual program. Adding 'C' (= capstone) designators is not envisioned by the motion. Considerable discussion about the practical implications of the motion. All faculty members present endorsed the concept, with hesitations about the mystery program that doesn't have a capstone and for which having one would be a burden. The plan: both pursue getting more information about the capstones that programs currently employ and get feedback from Faculty Senators on the motion.

C. Progress Report from O/W/C subcommittee

Problems with current O/W: no consistent outcomes assessments
W regulations are relatively complicated and subject to interpretation; O regulations are more flexible but very complicated (2+ pages to cover a variety of possibilities)

Look for more discussion on this topic in 2 weeks!!

MOTION proposed Capstone Requirement Effective Fall 2016

The Curricular Affairs Committee moves that the Faculty Senate make the following changes to the UAF baccalaureate requirements:

Each student must complete a capstone experience in the student's major or program, as described below. It will be the responsibility of each Department, Program, and (or) College/School to create, deliver, evaluate, and assess their capstone experience. Each Dean's office will have a copy of the capstone requirements for all programs in the school/college on file.

Rationale: This change is proposed in support of satisfying UAF's Learning outcome #4:

"Integrate and apply learning, including synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies, adapting them to new settings, questions, and responsibilities, and forming a foundation for lifelong learning. Preparation will be demonstrated through production of a creative or scholarly project

that requires broad knowledge, appropriate technical proficiency, information collection, synthesis, interpretation, presentation, and reflection."

Many UAF Departments and Programs currently have baccalaureate capstone experience requirements; the purpose of this change is to create a UAF-wide requirement. Hence, we envision this proposed change as not adding a significant burden to UAF faculty and students.

Proposed criteria for Capstone Experience

The Capstone experience will demonstrate students' ability to integrate a wide range of learning. Students will make connections among ideas, skills, and bodies of knowledge, and will synthesize and transfer their learning to new, complex areas of inquiry, products, or situations within or beyond conventional coursework. Specifically, the Capstone will:

- Require that students demonstrate the appropriate skill levels in communication and (as appropriate) quantification.
- Integrate learning from major requirements.
- Guide students through a project or experience relevant to their educational goals
- Provide a basis for evaluating student performance
- Be suitable as a potential means for assessing the major requirements

Proposed Instructional Objectives

The student will integrate and apply learning from multiple disciplines and skill sets.

The student will demonstrate an ability to contribute to existing bodies of knowledge, work in professional settings, and (or) create products relevant to the student's further educational, career and life goals.

The experience will demonstrate the student possesses intellectual and practical capabilities at a level expected of one receiving a baccalaureate degree from a major university.

Each student will complete a body of work as the culmination of the student's baccalaureate education

Course examples

NORS 484 W/O Seminar in Northern Studies: An interdisciplinary seminar focusing on topics relating to the North with emphasis on the physical sciences, the peoples, and the socioeconomic and political aspects of the area. Specialists in the various fields will assign readings and conduct discussions. Prerequisites: ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213X; junior standing; or permission of instructor. (3+0)

PS F499 W Senior Thesis: Thesis will draw from the literature in at least two sub-fields of political science (U.S. government/politics, political theory, public law, comparative politics, international relations) in its analysis. Prerequisites: ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213X; PS F101; PS F222; senior standing; permission of instructor. (1.5+0+7.5)

Non-course examples

Portfolio internship performance /exhibition participation in competition professional publication student teaching

---

Curricular Affairs Committee
Minutes for 1 October 2014 3-4 pm Reich 300

Present: Ken Abramowicz, Casey Byrne, Brian Cook, Rob Duke, , Alex Fitts, Doug Goering, Catherine Hanks, Linda Hapsmith, Cindy Hardy, , Joan Hornig, Rainer Newberry - Chair, Todd Radenbaugh (audio); Caty Oehring (audio), Holly Sherouse (audio); Jayne Harvie

III. Approved revised minutes of Sept 17 meeting

IV. Old business: what to do about C/O/W??

D. Progress Report from O/W/C subcommittee

Problems with current O/W: no consistent outcomes assessments
W regulations are relatively complicated and subject to interpretation; O regulations are more flexible but very complicated (2+ pages to cover a variety of possibilities)
Proposed C: only writing is assessed
Proposed C regulations are both complex and vague

The committee agreed to send GERC Chair Leah Berman a letter asking the committee to again take up the question of what to do with oral- and written-intensive requirements in light of the proposed 'C' for communication. Feedback and questions from Curricular Affairs Committee will be included.

From October 1 Agenda:

We met with several GERC members and discussed the O/W/C issues.

The GERC members attending agreed that 'C' proposal was left in an undeveloped state, and that it isn't ready to go forward as a motion to the faculty senate. We also discussed that the bulk of the C dealt with writing instruction and written outcomes assessment (the signature assignment). The regulations for 'C' classes are still quite nebulous relative to the existing W and O requirements. **However, it would appear that an existing 'W' class could quality for a 'C' designator with a small amount of tweaking**. Conversely, an existing 'O' class would need to be extensively modified to qualify as 'C'. One GERC member stated 'that wasn't what we had in mind!'.

We were unhappy with the proposed mechanism for assessment ('write an essay concerning your C class') because it (a) wasn't necessarily the best sort of essay to judge writing for all students in all majors and (b) writing about non-written communication doesn't assess non-written communication abilities. We agreed that assessment of writing ability could be of the sort proposed ('write an essay..') and agreed to ask Vice Provost Alex Fitts for her comments and suggestions.

We all agreed that the C is not ready to go forward as a motion to the Senate. If we do nothing, the W/O stand as they are. **At a minimum, however, we need to generate an assessment mechanism for student communication skills.** We present to CAC several options for moving forward:

1. Ask GERC to either propose modifications to the current W/O **or** to add detail to the C proposal to come up with a more fleshed-out version that can be considered for faculty senate action.
2. Do **something** by revising an updating the W/O to take out indefinite language ("instructors should" or "are encouraged to") and to add clear methods of assessment and "enforcement."
3. A learning community is supposedly discussing the W (and O?) requirements. Wait for that Learning Community to come up with something.

In both meetings, we all agreed that students need work on writing consistently throughout their degree programs. It's less clear that students need oral communication instruction beyond the 131/141 class, however. Our experience is that students in O classes do receive adequate training in oral communication, and indeed, the 'C' –as currently proposed--is essentially a glorified 'W' but with vague guidelines.

Courtesy would suggest that we ask GERC to take another look at the proposed C and to provide a clearer set of proposed regulations to replace the existing O and W OR to think about modifications in the existing O and W. Many of us on the COW subcommittee think that fixing the model that we're already using--recycling, as it were--is a more productive way to go than trying to reinvent upper division writing across the curriculum from scratch. If we go this route, we need to come up with some language as the request to GERC their further consideration of the O/W/C requirement.

A. General guidelines for 3-credit course with "W" designator

1. The lower-division writing sequence **will be** a prerequisite for all "W"- designated courses.
2. Instructors **are encouraged** to have students write an ungraded diagnostic composition on or near the first day of class to help assess writing ability and general competence in the discipline. [If diagnostic tests indicate that remedial work may be needed, teachers can set up specialized tutoring for their students with UAF Writing Center tutors.]
3. Teachers regularly evaluate students' writing and inform students of their progress. If a major written project (research project) is part of the course, the project **should be** supervised in stages. **If possible**, a writing activity should comprise a major portion of the final examination.
4. At least **one personal conference should be devoted** to the student's writing per term and drafts of papers should receive evaluation from the teacher and/or peers.
5. Written material **should** comprise a majority of the graded work in the course for it to be designated "intensive." "Written material" can consist of quizzes and exams with short answers or essay sections, journals, field notes, informal responses to reading or class lectures, structured essays, research projects, performance reviews, lab reports, or any forms suitable to the discipline being taught.

B. Guidelines for the "W" designator in Technical courses

6. In order to ensure that technical disciplines can meet the goals of the writing intensive requirements without compromising the technical quality of their courses, such disciplines may substitute longer courses or a series of courses (typically 1-credit labs) for each of the two necessary 3-credit writing intensive or "W"-designated courses. Courses meeting all the general guidelines will, of course, also be acceptable.
7. The longer course option allows the "W" designator for a 4- or 5-credit course in which written material comprises a portion of the grade equivalent to "a majority" of a 3-credit course. The course must also meet the other general guidelines.
8. The series option allows a student to replace one or both 3- credit "W" courses with a series of courses, each of which may be less than three credits--e.g., a series of 1-credit or 1-credit-equivalent laboratories. Each series, however, must sum to the equivalent of at least one 3-credit "W"- designated course. The initial course in the series will be designated **"W1**" and, while less than three credits, will fulfill all the other general requirements for a "W." The subsequent courses will base a majority of the grade on written material. Students must take the "W1" course before taking the other courses in the series.

Requirements for O and O/2 courses are two pages long. They include variations on public speaking vs. discussions and large class vs. small class

Syllabus Statement Regarding the Oral-Intensive (O) Requirement:

This statement, or a statement similar to it, MUST appear in the syllabus of each "O" or "O/2" course. Courses failing to provide this information jeopardize their continuing status as "O" or "O/2" courses.

This course is designated as Oral-Intensive (O). This designation means that the "O" or "O/2" is evident in the course number on the syllabus (e.g., Education F452 O). The designation applies to upper-division courses. ORAL ACTIVITIES IN THIS COURSE WILL FOLLOW THESE RULES:

- A minimum of 15 percent of the graded work in the O course (7.5 percent for "O/2") will be based on effectiveness of oral communications.
- Students will receive intermediate instructor assistance in developing presentational competency.
- Students will utilize their communication competency across the semester, not just in a final project.
- Students will receive instructor feedback on the success of their efforts at each stage of preparing their presentations.

Excerpts from the original GERC proposal regarding the "C" requirement:

Sample signature assignment guidelines for C courses:

A signature "C" assignment would be one that asks the student to reflect in writing on the choices behind a "C" paper, presentation, or project. The assignment should be a 750-1000 word reflective paper, written in edited U.S. English, that asks students to do one of the following:

- Select at least one moment in a critical or creative process where a decision was made and discuss its relevance to the final product (presentation, paper, or project).
- Imagine a different audience or medium for the paper, presentation, or project and ask students to discuss what they would change about it in order to make the paper, project, or presentation successful in this new situation.
- Compare two different papers, presentations or projects and explain how certain features of these examples reflect audience, purpose and context.

Instructional objectives for C courses

- Students will be able to revise written work in response to instructor and peer feedback. (**W**)
- Students will be able to write effectively for diverse audiences. (**W**)
- Students will be able to recognize and navigate the concepts, genres, and conventions of the course discipline. (what exactly does this mean?? **W**)
- Students will be able to select appropriate **writing** technologies to collaborate in personal, professional and civic relationships. (**W**)
- Students will be able to listen effectively and respond effectively to communication practices in the course. (**receive oral instructions (lectures); respond oral or W**)

Minimum criteria for course approval:

- Explicitly address at least three of the objectives listed above
- **At least 50% of the grade** must come from assignments utilizing the types of **writing** and combination of written and non-written forms of communication most appropriate to disciplinary needs and standards and course content.
- Provide guided and prompt feedback and opportunities for student revision

on student projects, presentations, and papers.

- In addition to written and spoken communication, address other forms of communication in the course discipline, such as **reading and listening** and multimodal, digital, or visual communication. [WHAT **EXACTLY** DOES THIS **REQUIRE**??]
- Address and practice accurate and ethical referencing/citation practices of source material as it pertains to source authority, academic honesty, and personal credibility.
- **Faculty must have attended a training workshop, to be offered every semester. [How is this a criteria for Course APPROVAL?]**

ATTACHMENT 202/6
UAF Faculty Senate #202, November 3, 2014
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes: Monday, September 29, 2014
2:30 PM, IAB Library, Room 311-C Irving Building, UAF

Present: Elizabeth Allman, Chris Fallen, Bella Gerlich (Ex officio), Galen Johnson (by phone), Leslie McCartney, Walter Skya, David Valentine
Guests: Bill Bristow, Debu Misra

Minutes: September 2, 2014 Minutes approved.

Joint Appointments ad-hoc Committee:
Bill Bristow said this committee was formed two years ago. Their charge was to recommend policy to evaluate faculty with joint appointments. This policy will go into new Blue Book; the previous Blue Book does not contain much about joint appointments so there needs to be more about this in the regulations. All those on this Committee held joint appointments. Bill reviewed the different types of appointments and said that the policy that was written needed to be accepted by administration. The biggest issue was the desire to have the evaluation committee of a faculty member be representative of their appointment. Three new definitions were put forth in their final report and a new category put in the tenure track for joint appointments. Minimum academic appointment is 25% which equals 1 course to be taught per year. It is up to the Dean to negotiate between colleges and how the evaluation committee is to be made up. The policy also outlines evaluations and responsibilities.

Old Business:
The FAC by-laws need to be reviewed. The by-laws should separate out scope, voting procedures and who can be a member. If the following sentence is to be kept, 'The committee will act as a faculty advocate with legislators and candidates' the word candidates needs to be defined. The Committee's role should be to bring issues and possible solutions to Faculty Senate. Chris and Galen will look at the by-laws and propose revisions.

Faculty Alliance is trying to develop a relationship and enhance lines of communication with the Board of Regents. Several Regents will be stepping down in the near future. Faculty alliance is drafting a memo to Governor Sean Parnell and Bill Walker urging them to look for key characteristics in new Regent appointments.

New Business:
Everyone is to review the Joint Appointments Final Report. We will discuss this online and then give our recommendations to Cecile.

Revision of Department Chair Policy needs to be completed. Elizabeth is to contact the department chairs to get their input (sending the monochrome copy and existing policy so they can compare the two). Elizabeth will have their responses by our next meeting so we can complete this task.

Other Business:
The notion of a faculty regent is to be discussed at our next meeting.

Next Meeting:
Monday, October 20, 2014. A Doodle Poll will be send around to confirm the time.

ATTACHMENT 202/7
UAF Faculty Senate #202, November 3, 2014
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Minutes Wednesday, Oct 1, 2014; 10:30 - 11:30 am, Gruening 718

Members Present:, Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Ellen Lopez, Derek Sikes, Megan McPhee

Guest: Sine Anahita

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Diana Di Stefano, Erin Pettit,
Members on sabbatical: Amy Barnsley, Jenny Liu

1. Snapshot – UAF Faculty: Sine is working with Ian Olson, head of PAIR, to get latest data on salary, rank, and gender at UAF – should be available today. New dataset to analyze with some new variables (date of last rank movement, birthdate), useful since there are age differences in the data. The 2013 data had 1034 UAF faculty in the data (55% men, 45% women).

2. Title IX & mandatory reporting: Oct 2, meeting in 208 Gruening, 7pm, on this issue, in attendance will be general council, provost, students, and faculty. May be video or audio taped. The issue being - all UAF staff are mandatory reporters – all would be required to report any possible Title IX offense (incl. gender stereotyping, sexual harrassment, nonconsensual sex, etc) within 24h or face reprimands, including possible firing. This is a CSW issue because more women faculty are likely to end up in a situation of being reporters.

3. Women Faculty Luncheon: Was held September 16, Tuesday 12:30 pm to 2:00 pm, Wood Center Ballroom. There were 85 attendees and there was great feedback. Discussion on how to thank staff (Jayne, Ryan, et al.) and speakers for these sorts of events? No funds in CSW to pay for thank you gifts (e.g. Gulliver's gift cards traditionally paid for by a few CSW members).

4. Women's Center Advisory Board: Met with Chancellor Sep 19th one area of focus is retaining women faculty to Full professor. CSW, with data from Snapshot (see#1) will proceed. Possibly add new workshop, or extend current P&T ("Planning Strategically") workshop to add promotion of Associate to Full professor.

5. Expansion of Early Childhood program. CSW asked senate to endorse staff council resolution 2014-252-1 regarding the FY16 capital budget request "Expanding Early Childhood Program (Bunnell House)". The senate admin committee agreed and it will be on the Oct 6th Senate agenda.

6. Fall Conversation Café: moved to Nov 4th. Space TBD. Kayt will talk to Wood Center. Try to get Arctic Java, north end, or maybe Ballroom or nearby space. Attendees can get their own drinks etc. Topic: ~ Experiences, challenges, and strategies (final title TBD). Subcommittee meeting next Tues (Oct 7, 1:30) in Ellen's office.

Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes, These minutes are archived on the CSW website:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/14-15-csw/

ATTACHMENT 202/8
UAF Faculty Senate #202, November 3, 2014
Submitted by the Core Review Committee

Core Review Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 23, 2014 and October 8, 2014
This report covers two meetings of the committee.

Tuesday, September 23, 2014

Debu Misra graciously had agreed to convene the meeting in the absence of a chair. After some discussion, Leah Berman eventually volunteered to chair the committee and the rest of the committee agreed that would be fine.

Three petitions were discussed; two petitions were denied and one was approved.

Caty Oehring raised the issue of whether AP and CLEP scores should be treated similarly to transfer courses in terms of their substitution for Core requirements (specifically for the Perspectives on the Human Condition requirements). After discussion, the issue was tabled until the next meeting.

Tuesday, October 7, 2014

The committee discussed 5 petitions. Two petitions were denied.

The other three petitions were from students trying to complete degrees after a long hiatus. Two petitions wanted to use old courses (from the late 80s, prior to the current core) to satisfy W or O and one was simply a core waiver request (which is outside the mandate of the commit- tee). Although the petitions were denied, the committee recommended that the provost waive the W and O requirements the students were trying to petition in order to facilitate their degree completion.

We continued the discussion of AP and CLEP scores and how/whether they should substitute for PHC requirements. The discussion was tabled until the committee could discuss specific case studies.

Finally, the committee discussed the problem of students trying to use individual study courses to fulfill their W (or hypothetically, their O) requirements. In the past—and indeed, at this meeting— the committee has received petitions for courses that are either in progress or have already been completed. The committee feels that being asked to evaluate whether a course satisfies the W or O requirement at that time is inappropriate in general, and places the student in a bad position.

A form for individual study courses is already required. We are proposing the following modification of the form and approval process:

- Add a line to the form under course information which would say something like, “Is this a Writing or Oral Intensive Course?” Yes/No W or O (syllabus must be included already with the individual study request)
- Include a statement that W or O must be approved prior to the beginning of the individual study class.

- Add an additional signature line for the Core Review Committee. These would be submitted to the Office of Admissions and the Registrar (OAR) once the dean has signed them and a representative from the registrar's office who sits on Core Review would bring them to Core Review Committee for discussion and a final signature, if approved.

Discussions are underway to determine the appropriate procedure to determine whether this should be implemented and if so, what the process is.

Core Review Committee
Meeting Minutes for Tuesday 10/21/14

CLA:
Jennifer Schell, English (15)
Brian Kassof, Social Sciences (16)
Kevin Sager, Communication (CLA 16)

CNSM:
Leah Berman, Math (16) - Chair
LIBRARY:
Tyson Rinio (LIB 15)
At-Large:

Unit Core Assessment: Tony Rickard,
CNSM Kevin Berry, SOM
Ex Officio:
Dean's Council Rep - Allan Morotti OAR: Caty
Oehring, Holly Sherouse Academic Advising Ctr.:
Ginny Kinne
Rural Student Services: Gabrielle Russell

Meeting began at 4:03.

Petition #1: student under 13-14 catalog wanted to use a D in MATH 103 to satisfy a core requirement. Petition was denied.

New course proposals for Core:

1. A new course Math 110 (precalculus) has been submitted and wants to satisfy the math requirement for Core. This was **approved**.
2. Elementary Education wants to remove a W from ED 412 and put both a W and an O on ED 486 (Media Literacy).

   The committee has no problem removing the W from ED 412 but opted to wait until we've dealt with ED 486. **Tabled.**

The committee had concerns about the specific distribution of assessments in the ED 486 syllabus vis a vis the proportion of O and W material precisely, in conjunction with the O and W listed guidelines. Brian agreed to follow up. **Tabled.**

3. Alaska Native Studies proposed that ANS 101 receive an X designation. The form didn't explain why/what for/what category. Leah had emailed the faculty contact prior to the meeting, but apparently the faculty contact is no longer employed at UAF. (?) Tyson agreed to follow up. **Tabled.**

Meeting adjourned at 4:36.

ATTACHMENT 202/9
UAF Faculty Senate #202, November 3, 2014
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 13, 2014

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

II. Roll call and Introduction of Committee Members

Present: Bill Barnes, Diana DiStefano, Cindy Fabbri, Andrea Ferrante, Mark Herrmann, Brian Himelbloom, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Chris Lott, Franz Meyer, Debu Misra (visiting), Channon Price, Leslie Shallcross, Amy Vinlove
Excused: Trina Mamoon, Joy Morrison

III. Welcome of Faculty Senate President-Elect Dr. Debu Misra

It was a real treat to welcome Debu to our meeting. He explained that he is trying to gauge where we stand as faculty and where we are going by visiting all standing and permanent Faculty Senate committees as well as some sub-committees. In particular, he is looking for where committees may be stalled and would like to assist them in moving forward. He meets with Provost Henrichs twice a month and will make sure that issues are heard.

IV. Summary of activities of the Office for Faculty Development

Since Joy is currently traveling for the Teaching Professor Technology conference, she sent a brief email regarding the three remaining events for October:

Oct 14 is the Fulbright folks visit. They will talk to both students and faculty interested in a teaching or research scholarship abroad. RASM 340, 1-2 pm

Oct 21 is the mentoring lunch for all new faculty and their mentors

Oct 28 Walter Crary, the new veterans' affairs officer, will talk about the needs of vets returning to university. We have so many that this new office was created.

Joy also states, "I am interested in finding teaching faculty to attend the Feb 20-22 Lilly West Teaching Conference. Because my budget for the year is already gone I am taking a month of Leave Without Pay next May and will put the savings back into the budget."

V. Report by UAF eLearning & Distance Education on recent faculty development activities

We happily welcomed new ex-officio member Chris Lott to our committee, and he shared a handout summarizing the eLearning and Distance Education's recent faculty development efforts. He articulated their top three challenges: 1) how to reach all faculty members; 2) how to inform them of faculty development opportunities; and 3) how to get faculty members to commit to the necessary timeframe for both short- and long-form development sessions. Franz stated that he believes the FDAI committee should determine how to support eLearning and Distance Ed in their faculty development efforts. Chris

added that they are trying to overcome the image that they are only providing development for e-learning and distance courses. Since eLearning and Distance Ed will be moving into the Bunnell building in May, their closer proximity will certainly help. Parking issues for students needing to test in a proctored setting will be an issue, so they are looking into what options may be available to students. Chris noted that one option is to move away from proctored exams.

Debu voiced concern that some faculty that have developed distance and/or online courses did not have their worked valued by deans or colleagues. The Provost has asked that faculty increase the amount of online offerings in the future. Chris noted that developing online courses is a considerable amount of work, and while it does not work for everyone or every course, the work that goes into such development should be recognized and valued for what it is.

Franz asked us to focus for the next few months on how we can support and promote eLearning's efforts regarding faculty development.

VI. News on the establishment of a sub-committee on Electronic Course Evaluations

A sub-committee of the FDAI committee will be formed to create new questions and formats for electronic course evaluations to pilot in spring 2015. The sub-committee will consist of volunteers from FDAI along with a few people outside our committee so that all types of course deliveries will be represented. This sub-committee will report to FDAI at our monthly meetings. Franz will send out an email to the FDAI committee to ask for more volunteers and to ask what types of courses each volunteer has experience in teaching. Volunteers so far include Duff Johnston, Kelly Houlton, Andrea Ferrante and Franz Meyer. The sub-committee will need to be chaired and will follow the same common guidelines as other Faculty Senate committees. The new vendor (eXplorance/Blue) will provide a sample of their forms and questions. In addition to developing new questions, the sub-committee will also look at how to implement the pilot in the spring and will look at any kinks that may arise and how to fix them.

Debu pointed out that "evaluation" should be associated with a faculty member's peers while "opinion" should be associated with students. There was some discussion on this as on the one hand, students are not qualified to evaluate their professors, while on the other, students' assessment of instruction are very helpful for faculty in revising their courses. We also discussed the issue of low response rates. Andrea pointed out the importance of creating an awareness of how helpful and important student assessment is and how it is used by faculty. Franz added that the new vendor was recommended in part because of their proactive process of helping institutions address low response rates.

VII. FDAI Committee mission and bylaws

Faculty Senate has asked that all committees develop or update their mission statements and bylaws and send them in for review so that identified bylaws common to all committees can be stated up front. Each committee will then list any specific bylaws under their particular section without having to restate all the common bylaws. In addition, common themes will be identified and separated among the committees accordingly. Franz will start an online discussion comparing our committee's mission statement and bylaws with the other committees so we can help identify any overlap. He will also be seeking input on such questions as: 1) who can vote; 2) what is a quorum; and 3) how are absences dealt with?

Debu added that we should gather faculty members' thoughts on Faculty 180. He also asked if our meetings were open, and if so, our agendas should be posted online. Franz will talk to Jayne Harvey about this.

VIII. Other Business

No other business was discussed.

IX. Upcoming Events

a. Next FDAI meeting: 11-10-14 at 3:00 pm
b. Next Administrative Committee meeting: 10-24-14
c. Next Faculty Senate meeting: 11-3-14

IX. Adjourned at 4:05 pm (Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.)

ATTACHMENT 202/10
UAF Faculty Senate #202, November 3, 2014
Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

Research Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 22, 2014

Present: Orion Lawlor, Kris Hundermark, Andrew McDonnell, Georgina Gibson, Anna Berge, and Andrew Mahoney

Actions:
Orion Lawlor was elected as chair.

The committee discussed the recent UAF Research Review effort, led by Dan White. One unexpected observation from the review was the wide variability in grant proposal submission rates at various units across campus. This has many possible causes, for example some unit peer and university-wide faculty review committees might not even consider "research" to include grant writing, and not all deans encourage external funding.

Regarding the purpose of future research reviews, Andrew Mahoney suggested collecting some information on "what research means" in various departments, since there is quite a bit of variation. Andrew McDonnell suggested "What can we do to promote research in this unit?" Georgina suggested "Steer them away from places to cut," since an explicit cost-saving goal would produce defensive reviews instead of productive improvements. One option is for RAC to interview faculty from various departments, and ask "How could we make you a more productive researcher?"

What does "research" mean in different units represented on the committee?

Kris Hundertmark: IAB Wildlife. The institute is 100% research funded, and faculty evaluation depends on money in and publications out. Typically Kris teaches two courses per year, so 53% research, 37% teaching, 10% service. A few faculty focus on teaching, and give up their research appointment. Overhead-bearing grants are prized, and there is lower overhead available for cooperative research grants.

Andrew Mahoney: GI. 10% service isn't listed on any grant proposals. He hasn't gotten a substantive annual review yet, in 4.5 years (how often **do** research faculty get reviewed?), and can't imagine finding the time to fill out a promotion packet (nobody is demanding it, it's just "add-on" stuff). Teaching appointments in the GI are often 25% or less, sometimes with no teaching portion. There is still administrative push-back if fund 1 exceeds 10%, for things like writing proposals.

Orion Lawlor: CEM Computer Science. As a tripartite academic unit, a typical teaching load of four courses per year, and all faculty do some research including publication, but funding varies widely. A few superstars have research buyouts, and bring in million-dollar grants, but some do not even write proposals. INE returns a portion of ICR to the PI, in a real account.

Georgina Gibson: IARC. In some institutions, some faculty haven't had a substantive review in 10 years. The director is very busy, if they're even in town; and with 50+ FTE reporting the workload for robust reviews would be substantial. IARC is having a difficult time because the Japanese government funding went away last year.

Andrew McDonnell: SFOS. Working on a research initiation grant, for equipment. The classic SFOS grant is a big, interdisciplinary research project, and typical funding is from NSF, NOAA, Sea

Grant, and some other agencies. An SFOS PI doesn't get any ICR recovery.

Anna Berge: Alaska Native Language Center within CLA. 75% research appointment, teaches two classes/year. Applies for grants with NSF, NIH, and some smaller agencies. ICR recovery is possible, if the PI knows to ask for it. School of Education grants with lower ICR have a difficult time getting back support. Some departments, such as foreign languages or history, have a difficult time finding large grant proposals.

Future topics for the committee to look at:

- Distribution of ICR back to the PI
- Type of support available while pursuing grants
- Post-award project management tools: business office support for hiring, budgeting
- The provost would like RAC to suggest a *process* for evaluation of research faculty, revising the blue book, since there are now many more research faculty.