DRAFT MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #206
Monday, April 6, 2015
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)	NEWBERRY, Rainer (15)
ALLMAN, Elizabeth (16)	PETERSON, Rorik (15)
BARNES, Bill (15)	RADENBAUGH, Todd (15) – Google hangout
BERGE, Anna (15)	RICE, Sunny (16) – **Brian Himelbloom** (G. h.)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (15)	SHALLCROSS, Leslie (15) – Google hangout
CASCIO, Julie (16) – Google hangout	SKYA, Walter (16)
COFFMAN, Christine (15)	VALENTINE, Dave (16)
CONDE, Mark (15) SABBATICAL	WEBER, Jane (16)
COOK, Brian (16)	WILDFEUER, Sandra (16)
DEHN, Jonathan (15)	WINFREE, Cathy (15) - audio
DISTEFANO, Diana (16)	
DUKE, Rob (15) - audio	
FALLEN, Chris (15)	Members Absent:
HANKS, Cathy (16)	CHERRY, Jessica (15)
HARDY, Sarah (15)	GIBSON, Georgina (16)
HARTMAN, Chris (16)	LAN, Ping (15)
HEALY, Joanne (15)	MCDONNELL, Andrew (16)
HORNIG, Joan (16)	
HORSTMANN, Lara (15)	Others Present:
JOHNSON, Galen (15)	Chancellor Rogers, Provost Henrichs
JOLY, Julie (15) – audio / Google hangout	Dean Paul Layer, Alex Fitts
LARDON, Cécile (15)	Libby Eddy, Cindy Hardy, Chris Beks
LAWLOR, Orion (16)	Joy Morrison, Leah Berman, Falk Huettmann
LOVECRAFT, Amy (15)	Sine Anahita, Anita Hartmann, Holly Sherouse
MAHONEY, Andrew (16)	Karen Jensen, Olga Skinner
MAXWELL, David (16)	Guest speaker: Marsha Sousa
MCCARTNEY, Leslie (15)	
MEYER, Franz (15)	
MISRA, Debu (15)	
MOSER, Dennis (16)	

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #205

Minutes for Meeting #205 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 amend the Department Chair Policy
2. Motion to approve IARC Unit Criteria
3. Motion to approve a new Minor in Aerospace Engineering

B. Motions Pending: *None*

III A. President's Remarks – Cécile Lardon

Cécile noted that progress has been made on the GERs alignment across the three universities. There are some fundamental and philosophical differences between the universities. David, Debu and she met recently with Brian Cook and Leah Berman and talked about making progress. One part of the discussion between the campuses is whether history should be considered a humanities or a social science. There is also discussion about how art courses (theory vs. studio courses) fit into the GERs.

Rainer commented that university regulation states that (for the purpose of GERs) history is a humanities. Cécile pointed out the university president is willing to change university regulation as needed in this regard; however, all three universities must come to agreement.

Math course alignment is just about finished. English alignment is still being worked on and making slow progress. In the end, the solutions developed also need to provide a means of assessment for accreditation purposes.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Debu Misra

Debu reiterated Cécile's comments about progress to date on the common GERs. They're not sure what the status of progress will be by the end of this academic year. They will need to finish by December of 2016 and make a report to the Board of Regents, so the work will be ongoing in the next academic year.

He noted the budget is on everyone's minds. The legislature should vote on the budget on April 19. In spite of these uncertainties with budget and programs, steady progress must still be made on the GERs. He noted that Cécile will continue next year as chair of the Faculty Alliance, which will help with continuity of these efforts. Regarding assessment processes for the GERs, Debu's focus will be on keeping it manageable and effective in terms of the time faculty will have to spend on it.

He noted that David V. has worked on the flow of communication between Faculty Alliance and the universities, and thanked him for his efforts. Debu will place a priority on keeping UAF Faculty Senate informed about the work of Faculty Alliance next year when he is president.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers recapped the current status of the budget process at the legislature. The House has passed the budget. The Senate had passed the budget, but then held their operating budget for reconsideration. The differences between the two are significant. The House took a $25 million reduction at the system level; the Senate took a $22 million reduction, plus $9 million from pay, as well

as not funding any of pay increases for both bargaining and non-bargaining units at the university and state. The budget will next go into conference committee after the Senate finishes their operating budget. The lack of funding for pay increases is a huge issue for the university, and decisions are on hold until they know the outcome at the Legislature.

Notable changes at the system level include change of employee notice periods for layoffs; change in staff eligibility for ORP, limiting cash-in of leave, and doing away with cell phone allowances. Depending upon how the legislature passes the budget, the UA president will make a recommendation to the Board of Regents, proportionately implementing cuts to the three universities, with the system office taking the highest proportion of cuts.

At the UAF Cabinet level, they have been trying to follow the recommendations of the Planning and Budget Committee and the special program reviews as closely as possible. By late this month they should be able to put together a package of where they're headed with those decisions.

The state needs to ultimately look at the revenue side of the budget picture. It cannot cut its way to a balanced budget. The budget deficit would not be covered even if every state and university employee were laid off. The three universities have let the governor and lt. governor know that their campuses may be used as venues for discussion of these important matters.

Jane W. asked if the state senate has looked at the legality of cutting the pay raises. The Chancellor obviously cannot speak for the state senate, but he commented that most bargaining agreements do have a funding out clause where the legislature can refuse to appropriate funds, and that in the past the legislature has turned down bargained pay raises. He's also seen periods where the legislature has allowed raises but offered no funding for them. With regard to staff who have no bargaining agreement, it will come down to the language used by the legislature in the budget act.

The Chancellor noted other agency budgets that have significant impact on the university, as well. For example, the senate budget defunds public broadcasting which would affect KUAC FM and television; and defunding of early childhood education will have long-term effects down the road in ten to fifteen years when students are underprepared for college. He mentioned other similar types of agency budget cuts that will affect the university both in the short- and long-term.

Todd R. asked if there has been any discussion at the state legislature about President Gamble's published article about the Land Grant appropriation to the university and actually providing the land that was promised. The Chancellor said there has been some discussion this year about an alternative plan. He also noted that land grant legislation has been passed three times in the last 30 years (vetoed twice and lost in court once). He thinks the likelihood of a land grant bill that passes constitutional muster and gives the university full flexibility to use the revenue from the lands is low. The President has been talking about an alternative that would create a fund with certain state land revenues from future state land development which could possibly pass constitutional muster. It's unfortunate that statehood extinguished the university's land grant that was un-surveyed as of 1959, as it comprised most of that land grant.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

The Provost remarked that she has just finished up with the promotion and tenure files and post-tenure review files. There were 54 files this year, and as always, she finds it an enjoyable task to go over them. She reminded everyone that the appeals process has changed, and her decision can be appealed before a file moves on to the Chancellor's review. If there are appeals this year, it may delay her report back to the Senate when the process is fully completed.

Special academic program reviews will be finalized before the end of the academic year. Chancellor's Cabinet has been reviewing the recommendations of the review committees and will soon be make their decisions. Other program reviews have been completed, including Marketing and Communications, and large animal farms. Those decisions will be forthcoming very soon, as well.

The Board of Regents will be meeting in Bethel at end of this week. Budget issues will be the main item of concern as well as discussion for them, along with strategies to reduce expenditures. To that end, each of the three universities has been tasked with giving a presentation about that topic.

At each BOR meeting there is a regular topic concerning the Shaping Alaska's Future initiatives. At this meeting it will be about public and private partnerships (mutually beneficial relationships the universities have developed either with private business and industry, state agencies, or with tribal organizations or other entities). The Provost has prepared the report which includes information for all three universities, and noted that great work has been done by the universities and their partnerships.

David V. asked if the recommendations by the various committees concerning special program review are embargoed until the Chancellor's Cabinet has made its decisions. The Provost said that a majority of the recommendations by various review committees are available publically already, but it's not yet known which of those recommendations will be implemented by Cabinet, or how they might be implemented.

Debu commented that he's heard some programs have already received a letter. The Provost responded that no letters have been sent out to any programs. She has spoken verbally to some deans to let them know about some actions that appear likely so that they won't be taken by surprise.

C. Interim VC for Research – Larry Hinzman

The vice chancellor was traveling and no report was available.

V Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Chris Beks

Chris mentioned recent response by the Staff Alliance concerning the furlough regulations. The final version of the revised regulations excluded a section that the task force had worked on and submitted, about limiting furloughs. Staff have never heard why that exclusion was made, and so have sent a memo to ask administration why it was omitted. As it stands, there is no limit to the number of furlough days staff might have to take. Adding this uncertainty on top of the legislature's announcement of no funding for pay increases, has staff very concerned. Staff will take a very big hit under these conditions.

He also talked about the recent "emergency" changes to the layoff regulations. While staff understand the need to reduce layoff notice to exempt employees from six to three months in these budget conditions, other changes made to the regulation did not fall under an emergency category. For example, the process for grieving a layoff decision has been replaced by a review process in which the only recourse is likely to be to the same person who made the decision in the first place. Staff Council and Staff Alliance would like to have more say and discussion in that type of matter. To this end, they have unanimously passed a resolution asking for those decisions to be reviewed by governance groups before being put into effect.

He mentioned the new premiums for health care for next year. They are 30-40% higher than this year. Combine that hit to staff with furlough and no pay increase and the likelihood of layoffs. Staff and

faculty employees are going to be taking a major brunt of the hit in regard to the financial decisions. Chris noted that the Chancellor has said that if there are no pay increases, he does not want there to be any furloughs either. But, Chris noted, these decisions may be made at the level of the President's Cabinet.

Debu commented that he encourages all the governance groups to work together in promoting a positive environment and ensure the quality of the core mission of teaching, research and public service.

Chancellor Rogers noted that decisions regarding furloughs can be made at either the system or university level. However, a decision at the system level by the President can affect the university in spite of how the Chancellor wants it to be. Personally, he is opposed to furloughs if there are no salary increases.

B. ASUAF – Mathew Carrick

No report was available from ASUAF.

C. UNAC – Tim Wilson [Sine Anahita]
UAFT – Jane Weber

Sine A. announced that Tim has left UAF for a position at another university, and she has been asked to step in to provide the reports from UNAC. She noted that the union leaders are asking faculty to contact their legislators. Debu, in his capacity as org VP for the union, will send out sample text that can be used when contacting legislators. Ask for raises to be restored and for their contracts to be honored. Please also copy the United Academics office on those communications.

Sine reported that some of the Representative Assembly members of UAF met with Cindy West and Abel Bult-Ito to discuss concerns about the faculty annual review process. They're working to determine what type of agreement can be crafted to smooth next year's process and meet the intentions of the CBA.

They also talked about Faculty 180; but because it was the decision of Faculty Senate they are not able to do anything about it. There is a feedback form on the Provost's web site. Vice Provost Alex Fitts has assured them they are addressing all concerns that they know about.

Finally, Sine mentioned the upcoming election that includes a new org VP, and Representative Assembly members. Members will receive email from "Votenet" for electronic voting. The voting period is April 9 to midnight on April 19. Nominations are now closed.

Jane W. provided an update on the Joint Health Care Committee (JHCC). She reiterated Chris Beks' comments about higher premiums next year. Factors playing into this are that health care costs are up, and there is a decrease in the total number of employees. The new rates have not been publicized yet, but it should happen very soon. She reminded everyone of the Healthyroads incentive program for the $600 rebate (the deadline is April 30 to complete the requirements).

D. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

No report was available from athletics.

VI New Business

A. Motion to approve Unit Criteria for the Journalism Department, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 206/1)

Chris C. introduced the motion, explaining that the Journalism Department's additions to the standard unit criteria template provide clarification about the ways that Journalism publication and other forms of creative activity are in a somewhat different form than the traditional peer-reviewed scholarly assay that most faculty are familiar with. Creative activity, for example, may include work as broadcasters, commentators, program talent and other relevant media content producers. She also noted that forms of peer review that are relevant to Journalism which are included in the criteria additions.

The motion to approve Journalism Department Unit Criteria passed unanimously with no objections.

B. Resolution on the Student Code of Conduct,
submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment #206/2)

Chris F. introduced the resolution, noting that Faculty Alliance requested UAF to review and endorse it. UAA has reviewed it extensively and endorsed it. UAS has also endorsed it. The Student Code of Conduct has been updated with regard to the use of electronic devices. There is no weakening of the code; it has been brought more up to date.

Debu M. asked if any changes were made to the resolution. Chris noted that the word "OTHERS" was added to item #5 in the code.

The resolution was passed unanimously with a friendly correction noted by Vice Provost Fitts (to replace an instance of the words "*without or without*" with the correction "*with or without*").

C. Motion to clarify DF grade, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 206/3)

Brian C. introduced the motion, noting that only undergraduate DF (deferred) grades would be affected, not graduate-level DF grades. He recapped the purpose of the DF grade, and described how it's been used at the undergraduate level. He provided the example of a CRCD program in which students take a two-year-long course for which a grade cannot be given until the two years are completed; therefore, a DF grade is assigned after each semester until the course is completed. Students cannot graduate with a DF on their transcript. The Office of Admissions and Records (OAR) has 462 outstanding DF grades just from the last five years. In some cases, these cannot be resolved because the instructor has left the university.

The motion would set a deadline of two years, after which the automatic default to a "W" (for "withdrawn") would occur. The "W" was chosen because it does not penalize students, nor will it prevent graduation if a student has met their program requirements.

Cécile noted the differences between an "I" (incomplete) grade and "DF". A DF grade is outside the students' sphere of influence (e.g., length of a course), while "I" is within the student's sphere (such as ill health, family emergency, etc.).

Provost Henrichs reiterated that this motion would only affect the undergraduate grade of DF, not the graduate level use of DF.

Discussion followed about the purpose and use of "DF" vs. "I" grades, and what might prevent misuse by an instructor. Brian noted that CAC had discussed requiring a form to assign a DF, but there isn't a way in Banner to require that form before a grade is assigned. The majority of the DF grades are occurring at one particular college, so this motion may help solve a major part of the problem.

Provost Henrichs stated that she has asked Vice Provost Alex Fitts to monitor the use of DF grades, and if a problem is recognized, the appropriate school or college administrator will be contacted.

One of the senators noted that, years ago, a DF grade impacted his immigration status as a grad student. Faculty need to be educated about those possible implications, as well.

Cécile mentioned that the NB (no basis) grade also needs to be addressed. She hopes CAC will look into that next year.

The motion to clarify DF grading was passed with no objections.

D. Motion to revise Faculty Senate Policy on Credit Hours, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 206/4)

Brian C. asked Rainer to address the motion as he chaired the CAC subcommittee which developed it.

Rainer explained that the heart of the requested change concerns the university regulation that specified 800 minutes *of lecture* per credit hour – it had addressed only *lecture* as a mode of instruction. However, the university regulations were changed last August, removing this strict definition. The change in Faculty Senate policy will bring UAF in line with the system change and legalize other types of instruction beyond simply lecture.

Elizabeth A. asked about synchronous online participation with regard to what takes place in Math e-learning courses. It was decided to approve a friendly amendment replacing the word "intended" with "restricted" in the motion (as highlighted below):
"STRUCTURED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES" IS NOT ~~INTENDED~~ RESTRICTED TO MEAN SYNCHRONOUS INTERACTION WITH AN INSTRUCTOR, BUT RATHER FACULTY-DESIGNED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY INTENDED TO FACILITATE STUDENT LEARNING.

Chris C. confirmed with Rainer that seminar-style instruction and classroom-based group activities, for example, would fall under the rubric of "other instructional activities."

Donie B. asked Rainer if what constitutes a credit might be in danger of being watered down by this policy change. How will this new and broad definition keep this from happening? Rainer responded that the only practical means is by reviewing the course syllabus for documentation of instructional activities. The change gives the committees the freedom to interpret instructional activities in a much broader, if not more effective, range beyond simple lecture delivery.

Sandra W. noticed that semesters were defined as both 14 and 15 weeks. Rainer responded that the range is approximate, and is defined in university regulation which is out of the realm of what Faculty Senate can change. Provost Henrichs commented that university regulations consider finals week as part of the semester. A normal semester is 14 weeks long (or, approximately 15 weeks).

There was a brief discussion about the differences of credit hour alignment between the three universities. UAF is following policy and regulation more closely, however, than UAA. There was also brief discussion about modes of instruction and faculty workloads.

The vote was taken on the motion to revise academic credit policy. It passed with two abstentions.

[The break was taken at this time.]

E. Motion to confirm the Outstanding Senator of the Year, submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee (Attachment 206/5)

Two nominations were received and reviewed by the committee. The selection committee put forth the nomination of Brian Cook.

Kelly Houlton was also nominated. Discussion followed about including her nomination as she is not a senator, but is one of the committee members working behind the scenes. Guidelines for the award include nominations for members of standing and permanent committees. She has been serving on a subcommittee of FDAI. Franz proposed amending the motion to include Kelly for the award, and there is precedent for the award going to more than one individual.

A brief discussion followed about award eligibility. An objection was raised over a non-senator being nominated. A second award for providing outstanding service to the Faculty Senate was proposed and discussed to handle future similar situations. The possibility of doing a resolution of recognition was mentioned, as well.

Rainer proposed that a resolution be prepared for the May Faculty Senate meeting for person or persons who have performed special service for the Faculty Senate (who are not senators). Franz said he would accept that idea and retract his proposal to amend the current motion.

Brian Cook was formally recognized as the Outstanding Senator of the Year.

F. Election of 2015-16 President-Elect (Attachment 206/6)*

Orion Lawlor remained the only candidate who declared. Orion himself invited others to step forward, but no one did. By vote of acclamation, Orion was declared 2015-16 president-elect.

G. Results of UAF Faculty Senate Elections (Attachment 206/7)

Election results for the units were provided for informational purposes.

VIII Discussion Item

A. Proposed Motion for Changing the O/W Requirement, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 206/8)

Brian C. spoke very briefly about the draft proposed motion, asking senators to review the proposed plan. There is a link on page 20 of the agenda to GERC's web site. Feedback is gathered on the web page, also.

He and Leah will set up a public forum for discussion. [Faculty Forum scheduled for Thursday, April 23, 1:00 – 2:00 PM at the Media Classroom in the Library.]

IX Guest Speaker

A. Marsha Sousa
Topic: Faculty 180

Marsha described the handout she brought and the information contained in it. (A copy is posted on the Faculty Senate Meetings page.) Michelle Strickland works with the program behind the scenes. She has been working with deans and directors most recently to help make the report form interface consistent for all those viewing reports. The Provost's web site has videos and a navigation guide posted.

She mentioned there is a feedback mechanism built in to Faculty 180 and it has a quick response time. She had used it recently to report a printing problem, and received the answer back in 20 minutes.

Recent fixes have been implemented for problems they were having with team-taught courses, variable credit courses, and courses with various sections that had different names.

Marsha noted that data from Banner must be downloaded and reformatted before being uploaded into Faculty 180. This is done at the end of the semester to get the most accurate data. After contracts go out, then faculty pages will be refreshed.

They're working with Ian Olson (PAIR) right now on how to upload sponsored projects and research grants. Melba, the contact person from Faculty 180, has announced they will roll out a new interface in July.

Jane W. noted that UAFT faculty workloads will be 30 units under their new CBA. Marsha said that will be easier to deal with in Faculty 180.

She reminded faculty to use text boxes in their reports to explain in more detail what they're doing, where possible.

Debu mentioned that course buy-outs do not show in Faculty 180. Also, it hasn't been possible to go in and out a comprehensive report. Marsha said there are several ways to do it and she will work with him. He also asked about how to report a paper which was accepted last year which this year is in print. Marsha described using the clone button and adding a new date. He also asked about changing entries, and Marsha mentioned use of the pencil icon.

One of the research faculty expressed their frustration that Banner information isn't loaded into Faculty 180 concerning grants, and they have 12 grants. Marsha responded that Ian Olson is working on how to get that data out of Banner and into a format that can be uploaded into Faculty 180.

Donie B. commented that inputting data on co-authored papers (with many authors) is very time consuming. She also commented on papers published online and the confusion that results with knowing what publication dates to associate with them. Marsha acknowledged the problem, noting it's one that faculty have noted at other universities as well. It is being worked on by the company.

David V. noted problems with comprehensive reporting. The Provost commented that earlier reports (before the use of Faculty 180) will require hand-entry; but over time cumulative reports become easier to assemble.

Marsha announced two training sessions coming up on April 21 and 24. She invited faculty to feel free to contact her with questions.

X Public Comment**

Karen Jensen shared information from the Library about the use e-books as textbooks. If an e-book needs to be used as a textbook, faculty should let the Library know so they can purchase the book outright. This will save them a lot of money. Otherwise, they are charged per use, and that is not a sustainable cost for the Library. She also let everyone know that with rising vendor costs for e-books, the program will not be sustainable in the long term. E-books are only offered at UAF, and not at UAA and UAS. She provided a handout (which has been posted on the Senate meetings web page).

XI Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

Jane W. announced the annual promotion and tenure workshop coming up on April 24. She also asked about the status of the CLA Faculty Senate elections. Cécile noted the college has been short-staffed, and is desperately trying to catch up.

B. Committee Chair Comments

Curricular Affairs – Brian Cook, Chair (Attachment 206/9)
Faculty Affairs – Chris Fallen, Chair (Attachment 206/10)
Unit Criteria – Chris Coffman, Chair (Attachment 206/11)
Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 206/12)
Core Review Committee – Leah Berman, Chair (Attachment 206/13)
Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair (Attachment 206/14)
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair (Attachment 206/15)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair (Attachment 206/16)
Research Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair
Information Technology Committee – Rorik Peterson, Convener

XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at: 3:11 PM.

*Election results will be announced following the break if additional candidate(s) step forward and ballot voting occurs.

**Comments from the public are welcomed. Any subsequent assignment of an issue arising from public comment to a Senate committee is made by the Faculty Senate President.

ATTACHMENT 206/1
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for the Journalism Department (CLA).

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The Unit Criteria Committee reviewed the unit criteria which were submitted from the Journalism Department. With minor revisions, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

****

UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY AND *JOURNALISM* UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND INDICES

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS' CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, PRE-TENURE REVIEW, POST-TENURE REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY ADAPTED FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE FACULTY OF THE JOURNALISM DEPARTMENT/S. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS.

CHAPTER I

Purview

The University of Alaska Fairbanks document, "Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," supplements the Board of Regents (BOR) policies and describes the purpose, conditions, eligibility, and other specifications relating to the evaluation of faculty at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). Contained herein are regulations and procedures to guide the evaluation processes and to identify the bodies of review appropriate for the university.

The university, through the UAF Faculty Senate, may change or amend these regulations and procedures from time to time and will provide adequate notice in making changes and amendments.

These regulations shall apply to all of the units within the University of Alaska Fairbanks, except in so far as extant collective bargaining agreements apply otherwise.

The provost is responsible for coordination and implementation of matters relating to procedures stated herein.

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment

Minimum degree, experience and performance requirements are set forth in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," Chapter IV. Exceptions to these requirements for initial placement in academic rank or special academic rank positions shall be submitted to the chancellor or chancellor's designee for approval prior to a final selection decision.

B. Academic Titles

Academic titles must reflect the discipline in which the faculty are appointed.

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank

Deans of schools and colleges, and directors when appropriate, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit, shall observe procedures for advertisement, review, and selection of candidates to fill any vacant faculty position. These procedures are set by UAF Human Resources and the Campus Diversity and Compliance (AA/EEO) office and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators as a unit.

D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

Deans and/or directors, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit, shall establish procedures for advertisement, review, and selection of candidates to fill any faculty positions as they become available. Such procedures shall be consistent with the university's stated AA/EEO policies and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators in the unit.

E. Following the Selection Process

The dean or director shall appoint the new faculty member and advise him/her of the conditions, benefits, and obligations of the position. If the appointment is to be at the professor level, the dean/director must first obtain the concurrence of the chancellor or chancellor's designee.

F. Letter of Appointment

The initial letter of appointment shall specify the nature of the assignment, the percentage emphasis that is to be placed on each of the parts of the faculty responsibility, mandatory year of tenure review, and any special conditions relating to the appointment.

This letter of appointment establishes the nature of the position and, while the percentage of emphasis for each part may vary with each workload distribution as specified in the annual workload agreement document, the part(s) defining the position may not.

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," Chapter IV, evaluators may consider, but shall not be limited to, whichever of the following are appropriate to the faculty member's professional obligation: mastery of subject matter; effectiveness in teaching; achievement in research, scholarly, and creative activity; effectiveness of public service; effectiveness of university service; demonstration of professional development and quality of total contribution to the university.

For purposes of evaluation at UAF, the total contribution to the university and activity in the areas outlined above will be defined by relevant activity and demonstrated competence from the following areas: 1) effectiveness in teaching; 2) achievement in scholarly activity ***AND/OR PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISM, OR RELEVANT CREATIVE MEDIA***; and 3) effectiveness of service.

Bipartite Faculty

Bipartite faculty are regular academic rank faculty who fill positions that are designated as performing two of the three parts of the university's tripartite responsibility.

The dean or director of the relevant college/school shall determine which of the criteria defined above apply to these faculty.

Bipartite faculty may voluntarily engage in a tripartite function, but they will not be required to do so as a condition for evaluation, promotion, or tenure.

B. Criteria for Instruction

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities. ***OTHER AREAS INCLUDE DEVELOPING INTERNSHIP OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS AND ASSISTANCE FINDING EMPLOYMENT OR ADVANCING PROFESSIONAL CAREERS.***

1. Effectiveness in Teaching

Evidence of excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, evidence of the various characteristics that define effective teachers. Effective teachers

a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for students;

b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject;

c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are sensitive to student diversity;

d. emphasize regular feedback to students and reward student learning success;

e. demonstrate content mastery, discuss current information and divergent points of view, relate topics to other disciplines, deliver material at the appropriate level;

f. regularly develop new courses, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design; ***INCLUDING CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLICATION OF CLASS EFFORTS OR INDIVIDUAL STUDENT WORKS IN PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISM PUBLICATIONS AND RELEVANT MEDIA OUTLETS.***

g. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching ***AND ADVISING OR ASSISTANCE AND ENCOURAGEMENT PLACING STUDENT WORK IN RELEVANT MEDIA.***

2. Components of Evaluation

Effectiveness in teaching will be evaluated through information on formal and informal teaching, course and curriculum material, recruiting and advising, training/guiding graduate students, etc., provided by:

a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms,

and at least two of the following:

b. narrative self-evaluation,

c. peer/department chair classroom observation(s),

d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials.

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars ***OR PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS, WHICH INCLUDES WORK AS BROADCASTERS, COMMENTATORS, PROGRAM TALENT AND OTHER RELEVANT MEDIA CONTENT PRODUCERS.*** Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere. ***RECOGNITION OF CREATIVE EXCELLENCE IN JOURNALISM MAY TAKE THE FORM OF PROFESSIONAL AWARDS, EDITORIAL SELECTIONS FOR PUBLICATION, SCREENINGS, INCLUDING FESTIVALS, RELEVANT MEDIA SHOWS AND PRODUCTION CREDITS***.

1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Whatever the contribution, research, scholarly or creative activities must have one or more of the following characteristics:

a. They must occur in a public forum.

b. They must be evaluated by appropriate peers. ***THIS INCLUDES PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS AND/OR RELEVANT MEDIA PRODUCERS.***

c. They must be evaluated by peers external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.

d. They must be judged to make a contribution.

2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Evidence of excellence in research, scholarly, and creative activity may be demonstrated through, but not limited to:

a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline.

b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas, these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.

c. Presentation of research papers before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.

d. Exhibitions of art work at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics.

e. Performances in recitals or productions, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.

f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.

g. Citations of research in scholarly publications.

h. Published abstracts of research papers ***OR BYLINES, PRODUCTION CREDITS, CONTRACTS, ACCEPTANCE LETTERS AND OTHER ACKNOWLEDGEMTS OF REPORTING, RESEARCHING, PHOTOGRAPHING, EDITING OR OTHERWISE PRODUCING RELEVANT MEDIA.***

i. Reprints or quotations of publications, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline.

j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.

k. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.

l. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.

m. ***CONTRIBUTING TO THE PRODUCTION OF RELEVANT MEDIA CONTENT, INCLUDING NON-FICTION BOOKS, ARTICLES, AUDIO REPORTS, DOCUMENTARIES, FILMS, PODCASTS, NEWS PROGRAMS, VIDEOS, WEBSITES OR EMERGING MOBILE AND ALTERNATIVE INFORMATION-DELIVERY PLATFORMS***.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is a fundamental part of the university's obligation to the people of its state. In this tradition, faculty providing their professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge, is identified as "public service." The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assumes a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service."

1. Public Service

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. It includes all activities which extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing, programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, professional contributions to the community or to one's discipline, or other activities in furtherance of the goals and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis. Examples include, but are not limited to:

a. Providing information services to adults or youth.

b. Service on or to government or public committees.

c. Service on accrediting bodies.

d. Active participation in professional organizations.

e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

f. Consulting.

g. Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.

h. Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.

i. Training and facilitating.

j. Radio and TV programs, newspaper articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media.

k. Judging and similar educational assistance at science fairs, state fairs, and speech, drama, literary, and similar competitions.

2. University Service

University service includes those activities involving faculty members in the governance, administration, and other internal affairs of the university, its colleges, schools, and institutes. It includes non-instructional work with students and their organizations. Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

a. Service on university, college, school, institute, or departmental committees or governing bodies.

b. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance for specific projects.

c. Service as department chair or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college/school.

d. Participation in accreditation reviews.

e. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.

f. Service in support of student organizations and activities.

g. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.

h. Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.

i. Mentoring.

j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

3. Professional Service

a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.

b. Active participation in professional organizations.

c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.

e. Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings.

f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

4. Evaluation of Service

Each individual faculty member's proportionate responsibility in service shall be reflected in annual workload agreements. In formulating criteria, standards and indices for evaluation, promotion, and tenure, individual units should include examples of service activities and measures for evaluation appropriate for that unit. Excellence in public and university service may be demonstrated through, e.g., appropriate letters of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

ATTACHMENT 206/2
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Senate has reviewed Board of Regents Policy and University Regulations concerning the Student Code of Conduct; and

WHEREAS, the University of Alaska Anchorage Faculty Senate has recommended a series of clarifications and other changes to the Student Code of Conduct as specified in University Regulation R09.02.020 **subsection A** to address various shortcomings in existing university regulations; and

WHEREAS, the UA Faculty Alliance has requested that the Faculty Senates at the University of Alaska Fairbanks and the University of Alaska Southeast endorse the recommended changes to R09.02.020 **subsection A**; and

WHEREAS, the UAF Faculty Senate Faculty Affairs Committee has favorably reviewed the proposed changes; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the UAF Faculty Senate endorses the changes as shown below to R09.02.020 subsection A.

UNIVERSITY REGULATION
PART IX – STUDENT AFFAIRS
Chapter 09.02 - Student Rights and Responsibilities

R09.02.010. General Statement: Student Rights and Responsibilities

The purpose of this regulation is to further define the University of Alaska's Student Code of Conduct, or Code, and to establish a framework for the enforcement of the Code. These procedures, and their elaboration in MAU rules and procedures, will allow for fact-finding and decision-making in the context of an educational community, encourage students to accept responsibility for their actions, and provide procedural safeguards to protect the rights of students and the interests of the university. These procedures are applicable to all students and student organizations.

(11-20-98)

R09.02.020. Student Code of Conduct

Disciplinary action may be initiated by the university and disciplinary sanctions imposed against any student or student organization found responsible for committing, attempting to commit, or intentionally assisting in the commission of any of the following categories of conduct prohibited by the Code.

The examples provided in this section of actions constituting forms of conduct prohibited by the Code are not intended to define prohibited conduct in exhaustive terms, but rather to set forth examples to serve as guidelines for acceptable and unacceptable behavior.

A. Cheating, Plagiarism, or Other Forms of Academic Dishonesty**; ACADEMIC DISHONESTY APPLIES TO EXAMINATIONS, ASSIGNMENTS, LABORATORY REPORTS, FIELDWORK, PRACTICUMS, CREATIVE PROJECTS, OR OTHER ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES.** Examples include:

1. using [[material]] sources **(INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO TEXT, IMAGES, COMPUTER CODE, AND AUDIO/VIDEO FILES)** not authorized by the faculty member[[during an examination or assignment]];
2. utilizing devices [[that are]] not authorized by the faculty member[[during an examination or assignment]];
3. providing assistance **WITHOUT THE FACULTY MEMBER'S PERMISSION** to another student or receiving assistance **NOT AUTHORIZED BY THE FACULTY MEMBER** from **ANYONE (WITHOUT OR WITHOUT THEIR KNOWLEDGE)** [[another student during an examination or assignment in a manner not authorized by the faculty member]];
4. **SUBMITTING WORK DONE FOR ACADEMIC CREDIT IN PREVIOUS CLASSES, WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE AND ADVANCE PERMISSION OF THE FACULTY MEMBER;**
5. [[4.]] presenting as their own the ideas or works of **OTHERS** [[another person]] without proper **CITATION** [[acknowledgment]] of sources;
   [[5. knowingly permitting their works to be submitted by another person without the faculty member's permission;]]
6. acting as a substitute or utilizing a substitute[[in any examination or assignment]];
7. **DECEIVING FACULTY MEMBERS OR OTHER REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNIVERSITY TO AFFECT A GRADE OR TO GAIN ADMISSION TO A PROGRAM OR COURSE;**
8. [[7.]] fabricating **OR MISREPRESENTING** data[[in support of laboratory or field work]];
9. [[8.]] possessing, buying, selling, obtaining, or using a copy of any material intended to be used as an instrument of **ASSESSMENT** [[examination or in an assignment]] in advance of its administration;
10. [[9.]] altering grade records of their own or another student's work; or
11. [[10.]] offering a monetary payment or other remuneration in exchange for a grade;
12. **VIOLATING THE ETHICAL GUIDELINES OR PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS OF A GIVEN PROGRAM.**

ATTACHMENT 206/3
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to revise wording in the Course Catalog to specify the time limit of 2 years for the temporary grade "DF" (Deferred) in undergraduate courses, after which time the final grade recorded will change to a "W" (Withdrawn).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2015

RATIONALE: The DF grade is a temporary grade assignment, not a final designation. Currently, the Registrar's office is faced with a significant number of DF grades which have not been finalized, many of them considerably older than 2 years. This motion provides for the automatic conversion of all future DF grade designations in undergraduate courses after two years unless action is taken to either enter a final grade designation or request an extension from the Registrar.

****

This motion will make the following changes to the Course Catalog, page 46:

BOLD: Additions

DF Deferred — This designation is used for courses such as theses and special projects, which require more than one semester to complete. It indicates that course requirements cannot be completed or when institutional equipment breakdown resulted in noncompletion by the end of the semester. Credit may be withheld without penalty until the course requirements are met within an approved time. **FOR UNDERGRADUATE COURSES, THE GRADE WILL AUTOMATICALLY CHANGE TO A W (WITHDRAWN) AFTER TWO YEARS UNLESS AN EXTENSION IS REQUESTED AND GRANTED BY THE REGISTRAR.**

ATTACHMENT 206/4
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to update its policy on academic credit to reflect the updated University Regulations (R10.04.090.F.2) enacted in August 2014.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2015

RATIONALE: The updated policy is a more inclusive statement about the various types of course credit offered by UAF. It also reflects more accurately the current university regulations:

R10.04.090.F.2 A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than: 1) one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or 2) at least an equivalent amount of work for other academic activities as established by the institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours. Equivalencies to this standard may be approved by the chief academic officer of the university or community college.

****

The following is proposed to replace the current policy from http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course-degree-procedures-/guidelines-for-computing-/

Proposed UAF Faculty Senate Policy on Academic Credit
[[ ]] = existing, but to be removed;
BOLD = to be added.

A CREDIT HOUR REPRESENTS AN AMOUNT OF WORK THAT REASONABLY APPROXIMATES NOT LESS THAN:

1. **ONE HOUR OF CLASSROOM OR OTHER FACULTY INSTRUCTION AND A MINIMUM OF TWO HOURS OF OUT-OF-CLASS STUDENT WORK EACH WEEK FOR APPROXIMATELY FIFTEEN WEEKS, OR THE EQUIVALENT AMOUNT OF WORK OVER A DIFFERENT AMOUNT OF TIME; OR**
2. **AT LEAST AN EQUIVALENT AMOUNT OF WORK FOR OTHER ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING LABORATORY WORK, INTERNSHIPS, PRACTICE, STUDIO WORK, AND OTHER ACADEMIC WORK.**

[[One academic credit hour of non-laboratory instruction at UAF will consist of a minimum of 800 minutes of instruction. It is understood that an average student will be expected to spend 1600 minutes

of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.**]]**

The following standards establish the minimum requirements for one academic unit of credit for the course formats commonly used at UAF:

1. 800 minutes of lecture **OR EQUIVALENT INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES** plus 1600 minutes of student work outside of class.
2. 1600 minutes of laboratory (or studio or other similar activity) plus 800 minutes of student work outside of class.
3. 2400 minutes of laboratory (or studio or other similar activity)
4. 2400 - 4800 minutes of supervised practicum
5. 2400 - 8000 minutes of internship (or externship, clinical)
6. 2400 - 4800 minutes of supervised scholarly activity

Credit hours may not be divided, except one-half credit hours may be granted at the appropriate rate.

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

Given the above information the formula used for computing credit/contact hours is 800 minutes (13.3 hrs) per credit. This equates to approximately 1 hour of lecture per week for a normal 14 week semester**. FOR COURSES THAT DO NOT EMPLOY LECTURES, BUT THAT ARE INTENDED TO ACHIEVE LEARNING OUTCOMES EQUIVALENT TO THOSE OF A LECTURE COURSE (E.G., SOME ELEARNING CLASSES), 800 MINUTES OF STRUCTURED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES ARE EXPECTED PER CREDIT, IN ADDITION TO AT LEAST 1600 MINUTES/CREDIT OF OTHER WORK THAT THE STUDENT COMPLETES INDEPENDENTLY. "STRUCTURED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES" IS NOT INTENDED TO MEAN SYNCHRONOUS INTERACTION WITH AN INSTRUCTOR, BUT RATHER FACULTY-DESIGNED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY INTENDED TO FACILITATE STUDENT LEARNING.**

Proposed statement for UAF Catalog:
A credit represents an amount of work that reasonably approximates not less than:
1. one hour of classroom or **OTHER** faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or
2. at least an equivalent amount of work for other academic activities, including laboratory work, internships, practice, studio work, and other academic work.

[[One credit represents satisfactory completion of 800 minutes of lecture or 1600 or 2400 minutes of laboratory (or studio or other similar activity), whichever is appropriate. (It is understood that an average student will be expected to spend 1600 minutes of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.) **]]**

ATTACHMENT 206/5
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the nomination of Brian E.G. Cook for the 2014-2015 Outstanding Senator of the Year.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The selection committee has carefully reviewed the nominations according to the award criteria, and forwards the nomination of Brian E.G. Cook 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.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate affirms by acclamation the election of Dr. Orion Lawlor as the Faculty Senate President-Elect for 2015-2016.

> EFFECTIVE: Term of office begins at the May 2015 meeting when the 2015-16 Faculty Senate is convened.
>
> RATIONALE: A single eligible nomination has been accepted for the President-Elect position. Unless further nominations are made and accepted, a secret ballot election need not be held. Acclamation of the single nominee's election will suffice.

****

PERSONAL STATEMENT: DR. ORION LAWLOR

By clearly articulating the faculty's voice and working constructively with the administration, regents, and state legislature, the faculty senate has the ability to transform our state budget cuts from a crisis into an opportunity to improve our university. This is our chance to renew our focus on our tripartite mission, to free both students and faculty by removing the unnecessary barriers to what we all love about the university: discovering and sharing knowledge.

During these challenging budget years, it is tempting to operate defensively, doing things the way we've always done them, and leave the hard decisions to the administration. But shared governance means the faculty senate should not force our administrators to make these difficult choices without our advice, just as they should not make them without our consent.

Since I first set foot on the UAF campus for a high school summer program in 1992, while earning two bachelor's degrees as an undergraduate from 1995 to 1999, and since returning as a faculty member in 2005, I've continued to be amazed by this institution's drive, innovation, and openness. I would be honored to help the faculty senate shape UAF into a vibrant and engaged arctic university!

Professional Preparation
U. Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Computer Science, PhD, 2005
U. Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Computer Science, MS, 2001
U. Alaska Fairbanks, Computer Science, BS, 1999
U. Alaska Fairbanks, Mathematics, BS, 1999

Appointments
Associate Professor, Computer Science, U. Alaska Fairbanks, 2012–present.
Assistant Professor, Computer Science, U. Alaska Fairbanks, January 2005–2012.

2015 FS Election Results as of 3/31/2015

College of Liberal Arts *Results expected by April 3*

Representatives	Alternates
Arts & Communication – **Brian Cook (16)**	Arts & Communication – Karl Knapp (15)
English & Humanities – Chris Coffman (15)	English & Humanities – Vacant (16)
Language & Culture – Anna Berge (15)	Language & Culture – **Patrick Plattet (16)**
Social Sciences – Amy Lovecraft (15)	Social Sciences – Chanda Meek (15)
Applied & Distance Program – J. Rob Duke (15)	Applied & Distance Programs – Vacancy
At large – **Diana Di Stefano (16)**	At large – Wendy Croskrey (15)
At large – **Walter Skya (16)**	

Libraries

Representatives	Alternate
Leslie McCartney (17)	~~**Kathy Arndt (15)**~~
	Steven Hunt (17)
Dennis Moser (16)	

College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics

Representatives	Alternates
Elizabeth Allman (16)	~~**Ataur Chowdhury (15)**~~
	Bernie Coakley (17)
Donie Bret-Harte (17)	Falk Huettmann (16)
Cathy Hanks (16)	~~**Brian Rasley (15)**~~
	Larry Duffy (17)
David Maxwell (16)	
Franz Meyer (17)	
Rainer Newberry (17)	
~~**Mark Conde (15)** Sabbatical~~	
Lisa Lunn (17)	

College of Rural & Community Development

Representatives	Alternates
Bill Barnes (16) – UAF CTC	~~**Diane McEachern (15) – KUC**~~
	Andy Anger (17) – UAF CTC
~~**Galen Johnson (15) – UAF CTC**~~	~~Joshua Peter (16) – UAF CTC~~
Jennifer Carroll (17) – CRCD	(No longer eligible – non-represented)
~~**Todd Radenbaugh (15) – BBC**~~	**Cindy Hardy (17) – CRCD**
Julie (Jak) Maier (17) - CRCD	**Galen Johnson (17) – UAF CTC**
Jane Weber (16) – CRCD	
Sandra Wildfeuer (16) - CRCD	
~~**Cathy Winfree (15) – UAF CTC**~~	
Jennifer Tilbury (17) – UAF CTC	

College of Engineering & Mines

Representatives	Alternates
Chris Hartman (16)*	Jenny Liu (16)
Orion Lawlor (16)	**Dejan Raskovic (17)**
Rorik Peterson (17)	

School of Natural Resources & Agriculture

Representatives	Alternate(s)
~~Julie L. Joly (15)~~	John Yarie (16)
Joshua Greenberg (17)	
David Valentine (16)	

Cooperative Extension Service

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Julie Cascio (16)	Mara Bacsujlaky (16)
~~Leslie Shallcross (15)~~	
Candi Dierenfield (17)	

*Reference Bylaws, Sect. 1 (Article III Membership) subsection E.

School of Education

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Joan Hornig (16)	~~Phil Patterson (15)~~
	Carie Green (17)
~~Joanne Healy (15)~~	
Valerie Gifford (17)	

School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences

Representatives	Alternates
Sarah Hardy (17)	~~Ana Aguilar-Islas (15)~~
	Gay Sheffield (17)
~~Lara Horstmann (15)~~	Brian Himelbloom (16)
Eric Collins (17)	
Andrew McDonnell (16)	
Sunny Rice (16)	

School of Management

Representatives	Alternates
Ken Abramowicz (16)	~~Charlie Sparks (15)~~
	Thomas Xiyu Zhou (17)
~~Ping Lan (15)~~	
Nicole Cundiff (17)	

Geophysical Institute

Representatives	Alternate(s)
~~**Jonathan Dehn (15)**~~	**Chris Fallen (17)**
Don Hampton (17)	
Andrew Mahoney (16)	

Int'l Arctic Research Center

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Jessica Cherry (17)	**Bob Bolton (17)**
Georgina Gibson (16)	

ATTACHMENT 206/8
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

DRAFT Motion to Replace the O and W Requirements:

The Faculty Senate moves to replace the upper division Oral (O) and Written (W) requirement with the requirement that each degree program must satisfy the following Communications Learning Outcomes within the degree program:

UAF undergraduates will demonstrate effective communication when they are able to:

1. *Explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication.*
2. *Communicate to audiences in the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions.*
3. *Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities.*
4. *Integrate feedback from others to enhance or revise communication.*

Each baccalaureate degree program must submit a Communications Plan that demonstrates how students will achieve each of the learning outcomes as part of the requirements of the major or degree program. Not all courses or requirements need to support every outcome; however, all the outcomes must be met by the completion of the degree.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2016

RATIONALE: The GERC committee and Curricular Affairs, as part of their work to revise UAF's core requirements, propose replacing the current W/O designators with a requirement that students achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes that is integrated into each baccalaureate degree program and major.

1. The responsibility for ensuring that students achieve these Communications Learning Outcomes is being moved from the University level (via specific O and W courses) to the departments (via the requirements of the degree programs), and from a specific degree requirement (taking two Ws and one O) to a requirement that is transparent to the student and is achieved simply by the student completing the degree requirements associated with their program.
2. To ensure student achievement of these Communications Learning Outcomes, each department will demonstrate how they address these learning outcomes by developing a Communications Plan that integrates communication at the lower- and upper-level into each degree or program, typically via a collection of courses and/or non-curricular degree requirements chosen to meet the needs of the particular program, in such a way that all the outcomes are met somewhere in the collection of courses. The Communications Plan for each degree will describe the collection of courses (possibly, both in and out of the department) and other requirements (if any) and how they contribute to meeting these outcomes.
3. Departments will submit the Communications Plan for each degree program as part of their SLOA plans, and subsequently, by submitting a short summary report addressing how the plan is working (and revising the plan as necessary). Once a department has submitted a plan, which will include a required path/collection of paths through the degree wherein students will achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes, then all students in that degree will achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes by virtue of satisfying the degree requirements of that program.
4. To facilitate implementation, GERC recommends an ad hoc committee be formed to review the initial Communications Plans. They suggest the addition of an additional checkbox on Major/Minor course change forms asking "does this change affect Communications Outcomes Plans?", so that departments

are aware of potential changes.

5. EXISTING O AND W DESIGNATORS WILL REMAIN IN PLACE (IF APPROPRIATE) FOR A PERIOD OF 2 YEARS FROM FALL 2016 TO FACILITATE STUDENTS UNDER CATALOGS WITH O/W REQUIREMENTS.
6. Departments should submit as part of their Communications Plans a clarification for how they will handle the transition away from O/W designators for students who fall under a catalog prior to Fall 2016.
7. Faculty Senate should determine how best to assess how well departments and majors are achieving the Communications outcomes as implemented in the Communications plan associated with each program and degree. GERC recommend a long-term committee that can serve as a resource for communications-related courses, as well as to assess the long-term efficacy of Communications plans.
8. Finally, GERC recommends a web page (similar to the SLOA) where communications plans are collected and disseminated across the university.

To offer additional feedback or comments, please go to:
https://gerc.community.uaf.edu/communication-2015-proposal/

ATTACHMENT 206/9
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee
Minutes for February 9, 2015

Present: Brian Cook, Chair; Ken Abramowicz; Casey Byrne; Rob Duke; Alex Fitts; Linda Hapsmith (audio); Cindy Hardy; Jayne Harvie; Joan Hornig; Stacey Howdeshell; Dennis Moser; Rainer Newberry; Caty Oehring

I. Approve minutes from January 26 meeting (attached)

Minutes were approved as submitted for January 26.

II. <u>Old business</u>

A. GERC and "C" –

- Current plan (motion is in development):
  - **Departments will demonstrate how they address communications learning outcomes (see next bullet) by submitting a communications plan as part of their SLOA plans, and subsequently, by submitting a short summary report addressing how the plan is working (and revising the plan as necessary).**
  - **Each baccalaureate degree program must include, as part of its degree plan, integration of communication at the lower---and upper---division level, as evidenced by baccalaureate graduates' abilities to address the following four communications---related Learning Outcomes:**
  - **UAF undergraduates will demonstrate effective communication when they are able to:**
    - **Explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication.**
    - **Communicate to audiences in the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions.**
    - **Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities.**
    - **Integrate feedback from others to enhance or revise communication.**
- How this is tracked: GERC is proposing a committee that would review these programs every 2 years (basically they'd look at each department's regularly-submitted SLOA reports). Minus the committee, this is similar to how the capstone will be assessed and tracked; however, it may make record-keeping complicated on how individual students are completing these Baccalaureate requirements.
  - If all required communications courses exist within the same department or degree program, this seems like less of an issue. However, if some communications outcomes are being addressed through courses offered by other departments, this seems more complicated.
- Should a C designator still exist – would that assist in tracking this? For instance, if a department identifies 5 courses across its curriculum that provides a given student with communications skills (based on the above outcomes), should each of those have a C designator?

GERC is discussing making the Communication plan part of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA). See the four square bullet points indented and highlighted above.

Reports are already done yearly and submitted every two years. Ken asked about following the 5-year review cycle instead. Alex pointed out the 5-year cycle is different from the SLOA cycle. She and the Provost look at the SLOA now, but want more eyes on it.

The committee discussed how to find out what Communication plans are accomplishing.Rainer thought it would be more manageable to for that to occur at the unit level. Ken noted SOM has its own assessment committee – other units could also do likewise.

Brian will share these ideas with GERC.

The implications of removing the Oral-intensive and Written-intensive designators was discussed. Embedding Communication content throughout programs was discussed, but difficulties in making this auditable were acknowledged. Giving required courses a designator would still be needed.

B. GER Buckets to replace PHC

- GERC Chair Leah Berman attended CLA's Chair Council meeting on Friday to ask departments to submit suggestions for courses that could fulfill the GE requirements. She is also going to reach out to other colleges (especially ANS and School of Management – both already offer current PHC courses). The idea is to begin to solicit options for courses and to have an idea of what the buckets might look like so that, when common GERs are established between UAF, UAA and UAS by the statewide committee, a significant amount of work towards creating the buckets has already been done.
- Obviously, vetting the lists and approval of the change from PHC into buckets in committees and Faculty Senate would still need to happen after we know what the GERs are.
- The other benefit is that instead of saying "there will be buckets," as we go through the approval process, specific classes in the buckets will be part of the proposal.
- The process for approving the individual courses populating each bucket has not yet been decided.

Current General Education University Regulations:

- Written Communication Skills — 6 credits minimum
- Oral Communication Skills — 3 credits minimum
- Humanities/Social Sciences — 15 credits minimum [3 unspecified]
  - At least 3 credits in the arts
  - At least 3 credits in general humanities
  - At least 6 credits in the social sciences, from 2 different disciplines
- Quantitative Skills/Natural Sciences — 10 credits minimum [3 unspecified]
  - At least 3 credits in mathematics
  - At least 4 credits in the natural sciences, including a laboratory

TOTAL — 34 credits minimum

Perspectives on the Human Condition	Current University Regulations
HIST F100X--Modern World History	"broad survey courses which provide the student with exposure to the theory, methods and data of the social sciences"
ECON/PS F100X--Political Economy	
ANTH/SOC F100X--Individual, Society and Culture	
ENGL/FL F200X--World Literatures	"courses that introduce the student to the humanistic fields of language, arts, literature, history, and philosophy within the context of their traditions"
ART/MUS/THR F200X, HUM F201X, ANS F202X--Aesthetic Appreciation	"an introduction to the visual arts and performing arts as academic disciplines as opposed to those that emphasize acquisition of skills"
ETHICS (BA F323X, COMM F300X, JUST F300X, NRM F303X, PS F300X, PHIL F322X)	[UAF-specific requirement]

The committee talked about the Ethics requirement disappearing if it is not part of the requirements. Departments have been asked what courses they consider to fulfill the GERs.

C. Statewide Gen Ed committee updates –Rainer can fill us in on any updates he has about the committee or its process.

Rainer has communicated with the members by email, but hasn't heard back from anyone yet. They are supposed to have a report due back in April.

D. Probation/disqualification policy – still on hold.

E. Aerospace engineering minor update – Michael Hatfield has amended the proposal to remove the sentence about a future new program, and to correct the error about the minimum passing grade (should be C-). This minor will be on the agenda for the Ad Comm meeting this month for consideration for the March Senate meeting. Michael is prepared to be in attendance at the Senate meeting to address questions, assuming the motion is brought forward for consideration.

AE Minor is on the March Faculty Senate agenda.

III. New business

A. Core Class Compression in Wintermester and Maymester (Referred from Core Review)

1. Core Review Committee has considered a course compression proposal for SOC 100X, which generated a lot of debate.
2. From email from Leah Berman, Core Review Chair: "We had a long discussion in Core Review about the wisdom of trying to compress SOC 100X into 10 days as a wintermester course. In the final analysis, Core Review did vote to approve the compression—in large part because ANTH 100X had already been approved for such a compression (!) in the past. However, there was significant concern as to whether it is

really, truly possible to complete a semester's worth of intellectual engagement in 10 days; while it is technically possible to complete the in-class minutes, it is not possible to complete the typical "two-hours-out-of-class-per hour-in-class" outside work.

3. The current Maymester schedule offers the following Core courses: ANTH 100X, ART 200X, MUS 200X, JUST 300X, PHIL 322X, PS F100X, which means all of these courses have previously been approved for course compression. They are also PHC-fulfilling courses.
4. The issue is one of precedent: since previous committees have approved the compression of these courses, in the case of SOC 100X, Core Review saw fit to approve the compression proposed.
5. This becomes relevant again as the PHC courses are to be replaced with bucket lists to fulfill GE requirements. A change does not NEED to be made, but it seems a good time to discuss the issue Core Review raises to see if CAC/the Senate feel any change or clarifications should be developed/implemented alongside new GE requirements.
6. It is important to note that a significant percentage of 2015's Wintermester and Maymester offerings were/are compressed Core courses.

One of the main problems with compressed courses is the accreditation issue concerning the requirement of 2 hours of outside work that is required for every 1 hour in the classroom.

It was acknowledged that the instructors who are teaching 'Mester courses seem happy with the outcome. It seems to work well for some types of courses. The students seem to be stronger, as do the instructors, but the numbers are too low for a true sample.

The bucket list scenario will open up the compression issue; Core Review Committee wants guidelines.

Seemed to be general consensus for letting instructors self-select how they will teach a course in a compressed environment.

Rainer provided a copy of 2 documents created the last time the issues was raised; one is a report from an instructor of a Maymester course, the other a chart of success rates from Wintermester 2012 classes. These are attached.*

***NOTE:** For the attachments, please see the 2/9/2015 Minutes for CAC posted online at:

http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/14-15-cac/

Curricular Affairs Committee
Minutes for February 23, 2015

Present: Brian Cook, Chair; Ken Abramowicz (audio); Rob Duke (audio); Libby Eddy (audio); Doug Goering (audio); Cathy Hanks; Cindy Hardy (audio); Jayne Harvie (audio); Stacey Howdeshell (audio); Dennis Moser (audio); Rainer Newberry; Caty Oehring (audio); Todd Radenbaugh (remote).

I. Approve minutes from Feb. 9 meeting

Minutes for February 9 were approved as submitted.

II. New business

A. Allowing Double Concentrations (Recommended by Registrar Libby Eddy)

Page 129 of the 2014-15 Course Catalog states:

Concentrations

A concentration is an area of emphasis including the major core courses within a student's degree program. Some programs at UAF require a concentration, others do not. A student may only earn one degree in a specific discipline once. Using different concentrations within a degree program to count as different degrees is not allowed. Double concentrations may be permitted but must be petitioned through the standard undergraduate petition process.

Libby recommends changing the last sentence to: "Double concentrations may be permitted with department approval."

Justification: currently a student can get multiple minors under one Bachelor degree without petitioning. As long as a student meets the requirements for the additional concentrations and is willing to take those additional credits, we should allow them to graduate with two concentrations. This would be reflected on their transcript as well which would be beneficial for those students who are needing to document knowledge in that content area for jobs, raises, graduate school applications, etc.

[NOTE: the student would still only receive ONE degree, they'd just have the additional experience that taking extra courses to achieve multiple concentrations would provide. This is currently allowed via petition; changing the wording would remove the need for petitions.]

Libby explained that currently petitions are used to approve and document that a student has done two concentrations within a degree program. Rainer suggested changing "may be" to "are" and this was adopted. Changing this process to one where the approval is completed at the department level was approved by the majority of the committee.

II. Old business

A. O/W Change to Communications requirement

- Current motion (forwarded from GERC – edit/notes are mine)
  - See also attached copy of the draft Communications plan form, created by GERC for use by departments

- One issue emerges: Core Review currently deals with multiple petitions for O/W courses; is there anything that should be done to stem a possible tidal wave of petitions across the next year

between approval and the change taking effect in the catalog? It won't be advantageous to every student to change their catalog year to avoid taking specific O and W courses.

Draft MOTION:
==========
The General Education Revitalization Committee and the Curricular Affairs Committee recommend that the Faculty Senate move to replace the upper division Oral (O) and Written (W) designators with the requirement that each degree program must satisfy the following Communications Learning Outcomes within the degree program:
UAF undergraduates will demonstrate effective communication when they are able to:

- Explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication.
- Communicate to audiences in the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions.
- Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities.
- Integrate feedback from others to enhance or revise communication.

Each baccalaureate degree program must submit a Communications Plan that demonstrates how students will achieve each of the learning outcomes as part of the requirements of the major or degree program. Not all courses or requirements need to support every outcome; however, all the outcomes must be met by the completion of the degree.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2016

RATIONALE: The GERC committee and Curricular Affairs, as part of ~~its~~ THEIR work to revise UAF's core requirements in response to the Faculty Senate adoption of the LEAP outcomes, propose replacing the current W/O designators with a requirement that students achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes that is integrated into each baccalaureate degree program and major.

The responsibility for ensuring that students achieve these Communications Learning Outcomes is being moved from the University level (via specific O and W courses) to the departments (via the requirements of the degree programs), and from a specific degree requirement (taking two Ws and one O) to a requirement that is transparent to the student and is achieved simply by the student completing the degree requirements associated with their program.

To ensure student achievement of these Communications Learning Outcomes, each department will demonstrate how they address these learning outcomes by developing a Communications Plan that integrates communication at the lower- and upper-level into each degree or program, typically via a collection of courses and/or non-curricular degree requirements chosen to meet the needs of the particular program, in such a way that all the outcomes are met somewhere in the collection of courses. The Communications Plan for each degree will describe the collection of courses (possibly, both in and out of the department) and other requirements (if any) and how they contribute to meeting these outcomes.

Departments will submit the Communications Plan for each degree program as part of their SLOA plans, and subsequently, by submitting a short summary report addressing how the plan

is working (and revising the plan as necessary). Once a department has submitted a plan, which will include a required path/collection of paths through the degree wherein students will achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes, then all students in that degree will achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes by virtue of satisfying the degree requirements of that program.

To facilitate implementation, GERC recommends an ad hoc committee be formed to review the initial Communications Plans. They suggest the addition of an additional checkbox on Major/Minor course change forms asking "does this change affect Communications Outcomes Plans?", so that departments are aware of potential changes.

[NOTE: This ad hoc committee could also be tasked with approving the bucket list courses?]

Faculty Senate should determine how best to assess how well departments and majors are achieving the Communications outcomes as implemented in the Communications plan associated with each program and degree. GERC recommend a long-term committee that can serve as a resource for communications-related courses, as well as to assess the long-term efficacy of Communications plans.

[NOTE: We discussed at our last CAC meeting about college/school-level committees, which I did mention to GERC. They are still recommending a university-wide committee.]

Finally, GERC recommends a web page (similar to the SLOA) where communications plans are collected and disseminated across the university.

****

CAPS = additions
[[ ]] = deletions

This motion will delete the following statements from the ~~2014-15~~ [2016-17?] UAF Catalog:

Page 132, Course Recommendations for the Baccalaureate Core, fourth sentence:

[[Courses meeting the upper division writing-intensive and oral communication-intensive requirements for the baccalaureate core are identified in the course description of the catalog with the following designators:

O—oral communication intensive course

W—writing intensive course

Two courses designated O/2 are required to complete the oral intensive requirement.]]

And page 133, final section of the listing under "Baccalaureate Core":

[[Upper-Division Writing and Oral
Communication

Complete the following at the upper-division level:

Two writing intensive courses designated (W) and one oral communication intensive course designated (O), or two oral communication intensive courses designated (O/2) (see degree and/or major requirements)]]

And page 136-7, text in boxes across top row of chart:

[[2 designated upper-division writing-intensive (W) and either 1 designated upper-division oral- intensive (O) course or 2 upper-division oral-intensive courses designated O/2]]

And page 248, Special or Reserved Numbers, first paragraph, second sentence:

[[Courses with suffixes O or W meet upper division writing intensive or oral communication intensive course requirements for the baccalaureate core.]]

And page 249, under Course Credits:

[[O—Oral Communication Intensive Course W—
Writing Intensive Course
Courses meeting upper-division writing and oral communication intensive requirements for the baccalaureate core are identified in the course description section of the catalog with the suffixes O and W.
Two courses designated O/2 are required to complete the oral communication intensive requirement.]]

The committee discussed the merits of keeping O and W designators with courses vs. removing them entirely. GERC does not wish there to be any designator, not even "C" for Communication. Instead, they would like to see all Communication requirements embedded within the coursework required by each program.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA) at each department would be used to track and assess the communication requirements. This would remove any review of requirements from DegreeWorks. It accommodates specialized accreditation requirements and processes at some of those units having specialized accreditation.

Transfer credit determinations would be made by the departments.

Keeping the O and W designations attached to courses was discussed. This might be confusing to students, and over time there would not be a clear process to assign new courses with designators or to change those designations to courses.

Two ideas for reviewing SLOA plans from GERC are: 1.) a Faculty Senate committee would review all SLOA plans, and 2.) each department would

establish its own review committee. Brian asked what assessment committees exist now to review SLOA at departments.

Ex officio member Doug Goering was asked to bring this question up at the next Dean's Council meeting. He noted that SLOA review happens at the department level at CEM. Rainer asked about setting up reviews at the College or School level – what level is appropriate for these types of reviews? Dean Goering will share the Upper Division Communication Implementation Plan draft with his department chairs at their next meeting.

Cindy suggested a transition period to provide consideration for students who already have completed the required O and W courses. It was also confirmed that this change affects only baccalaureate programs, not those at the associates level.

The conversation was tabled for the time-being until more feedback from the deans is made available. Brian charged the faculty members to talk about these ideas with their colleagues.

B. GER Buckets to replace PHC – Discussion on next steps

- GERC Chair Leah Berman has asked CLA department chairs and other colleges to send suggestions for bucket list courses in arts, humanities, and social science categories to her by early March. She told me that she has multiple suggestions already, and most have identified courses that could be "decorated" with the A (Alaska/Arctic), D (Diversity), E (Civic Engagement).
- Should we put forward a motion to Faculty Senate officially making the change from the current Perspectives on the Human Condition courses to "bucket lists" of arts, humanities, and social science courses from which students would choose courses that match their interests to fulfill their general education requirements?
    - The motion could/should indicate the process for approving the lists of courses and a timeline for when the change would take effect [ideally Fall 2016].
- The process for approving the individual courses populating each bucket has not yet been decided. As far as process goes: should an ad hoc committee be assembled to do the initial approvals of the bucket list courses. After the initial approvals, should future proposals for courses to fulfill GE requirements be approved by the "Core" Review Committee or another committee?
    - If an ad hoc committee is assembled, how should it be composed?
- Assuming the buckets are based upon statewide university regulations (which may change with the work of the "GELO II" committee), should a rubric be established for the committee to use to assess courses?

<u>Current General Education University Regulations:</u>

- Written Communication Skills 6 credits minimum
- Oral Communication Skills 3 credits minimum
- Humanities/Social Sciences 15 credits minimum [3 unspecified]
    - At least 3 credits in the arts
    - At least 3 credits in general humanities
    - At least 6 credits in the social sciences, from 2 different disciplines
- Quantitative Skills/Natural Sciences 10 credits minimum [3 unspecified]
    - At least 3 credits in mathematics

- At least 4 credits in the natural sciences, including a laboratory

TOTAL 34 credits minimum

Perspectives on the Human Condition	Current University Regulations
HIST F100X--Modern World History	"broad survey courses which provide the student with exposure to the theory, methods and data of the social sciences"
ECON/PS F100X--Political Economy	
ANTH/SOC F100X--Individual, Society and Culture	
ENGL/FL F200X--World Literatures	"courses that introduce the student to the humanistic fields of language, arts, literature, history, and philosophy within the context of their traditions"
ART/MUS/THR F200X, HUM F201X, ANS F202X--Aesthetic Appreciation	"an introduction to the visual arts and performing arts as academic disciplines as opposed to those that emphasize acquisition of skills"
ETHICS (BA F323X, COMM F300X, JUST F300X, NRM F303X, PS F300X, PHIL F322X)	[UAF-specific requirement]

Brian talked to the committee about a potential Faculty Senate motion to officially change over to the bucket lists system. There was general support for this idea. He will work on a draft motion for the next meeting on March 9.

The committee considered a question about what process might be used to approve new courses to go into the bucket lists in the future. One idea is to use a transition committee whose sole purpose is to weather the transition. Later on, then, the Core Review Committee would pick up the task of approving course additions. Broader representation on the committee was endorsed. "How it will happen" is the logical next question to be considered.

C. Statewide Gen Ed committee update – Rainer Newberry

Rainer reported the new committee has had one (audio) meeting and has been communicating electronically. The nine-member group is supportive of changing the GERs contained in the UA regulations. He reiterated their goal is to work on a plan of GERs alignment for presentation to the BOR in Fall of 2016. At their next meeting, the committee will consider the GELO-recommended changes to the GERs.

D. Probation/disqualification policy – still on hold.

E. Aerospace engineering minor update – This minor will be on the agenda for the March Senate meeting. Michael Hatfield will be in attendance and will offer a short presentation on the rationale and importance of the minor.

This proposal was approved by the Faculty Senate on 3/2/2015.

B.[A./S.] in [Program]:
Upper Division Communication
Implementation Plan

Each baccalaureate degree program must include, as part of its degree plan, integration of communication at the upper-division level, as evidenced by baccalaureate graduates' abilities to address the following four communications-related Learning Outcomes:

UAF undergraduates demonstrate effective communication when they are able to:

1. *Explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication.*
2. *Communicate to audiences in the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions.*
3. *Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities.*
4. *Integrate feedback from others to enhance or revise communication.*

Address the following questions:

1. What kinds of communication-related products does your department need students to be able to produce? Are there particular modes of communication graduates should be expert in? (E.g., in biology, students need to be able to produce lab reports and present work via posters and in talks; in theatre, students need to be able to write synopses of plays and characters; in environmental engineering, students need to write reports and accessibly present technical ideas.)

   [type your response here]

2. How will students in your program learn to explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication? In particular:
   a. How/where will your students develop written communication skills, specifically?
   b. How/where will your students develop oral communication skills, specifically?
   c. How/where will your students develop other forms of communication, specifically? (e.g. visual, non-verbal, graphical, aural)

   [type your response here]

3. How will students in your program learn to communicate to people within the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions? In particular:
   a. How/where will your students learn the disciplinary conventions related to written communication?
   b. How/where will your students learn the disciplinary conventions related to oral communication? (e.g., is the convention to give presentations with slides? Read scholarly articles?)

   [type your response here]

4. How will students in your program learn to translate disciplinary content to people outside the discipline, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities? In particular:

a. How/where will your students learn to communicate disciplinary ideas to non-expert audiences?
b. How/where will students acquire practice at communicating in the discipline, via writing or oral presentations or other modes (e.g., poster presentations), to a variety of audiences?

[type your response here]

5. How will students in your program learn to integrate feedback from others to enhance or revise communication?
    a. How/where will your students have recurring opportunities for students to practice disciplinary communication with feedback from instructor and peers?
    b. How/where will students learn to integrate that feedback? [type your response here]

6. How will this plan accommodate students who declare their major late? Transfer students?

    [type your response here]

ATTACHMENT 206/10
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes for Thursday, February 12, 2015

3:40 PM, IAB Library, Room 311-C Irving Building, UAF

Present: Dean John Eichelberger (Ex officio), Chris Fallen, Leslie McCartney, Walter Skya, David Valentine

Absent: Elizabeth Allman, Galen Johnson

Meeting called to order.

Minutes of January 22, 2015 approved and accepted.
Agenda approved. Welcome Dean John Eichelberger.

By-Law Revisions:
We need to review our by-laws. Strike the final sentence in number 4 (Duties of the Chair) procedures for voting. This will allow the Chair to vote if s/he chooses. Chris to amend and bring to the next AdCom meeting.

Department Chair Policy:
Amend and weaken language in III c to say *may be reviewed by the faculty senate* …
In rationale delete everything after 'Beyond minor …'
Chris to take this policy back to AdCom committee and put to a vote. We authorized Chris to make any changes at the AdCom committee meeting.

Student Code of Conduct:
David volunteered to draft a resolution to be brought to AdCom committee.

Joint Appointments:
Homework for all: Review the report of the ad hoc Joint Appointments (JA) committee for the purpose of suggesting language that will incorporate the report suggestions into the next version of the Blue Book. Discuss at next meeting.

Adjourn.

ATTACHMENT 206/11
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes for January 27, 2015 Chancellor's Conference Room, 330 Signers' Hall

Members in attendance: Chris Coffman, Chris Hartman, Steve Sparrow, Ping Lan, Sunny Rice (by phone), Sarah Hardy (by phone)

I. Housekeeping

A. Agenda approved

B. Tuesdays 2:15 PM biweekly as standard meeting time?

Request that time be changed to 2:30 moving forward. Chris will send out a query via email to check that the new time is ok for all.

Only two more departments will submit criteria this semester so things should be pretty quiet…

II. IARC Proposed Unit Criteria
(The committee discussed these criteria in 2013-2014, on 10/28/14, and on 11/25/14.)

No objections to the changes.
The Provost had asked that the definition of "business service" be deleted and this change has been made

Motion carried to approve IARC unit criteria.

UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes for February 24, 2015 Chancellor's Conference Room, 330 Signers' Hall

Members in attendance: Chris Coffman, Chris Hartman, David Maxwell (for 15 minutes), Steve Sparrow, Ping Lan (by phone), Sarah Hardy (by phone)

III. Housekeeping

C. Chris Hartman will take notes and write the minutes
D. Agenda approved unanimously
E. Minutes from 1/20/16 approved unanimously with correction "(Correction from Chris to my comments on 1/20: IARC deleted "business service" from its special unit criteria in response to a request from the Provost's Office to define the term.)"

F. Chris needs a sub to attend the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee meeting on Friday, March 27, 1-3 PM

Chris H. and Ping have classes, Sarah has a graduate student committee meeting. David Maxwell has volunteered, subject to checking a couple of things on his schedule.

IV. Journalism Proposed Unit Criteria

Discussion. David noted that the changes mostly amount to adding or substituting professional journalism activities as scholarly activity. Chris H. commented that adding "and/or …" sometimes […] the rule of only adding to the Provost's Template. Chris C. clarified that units may add to but not alter the template.

Perhaps it would be good to look at what is done in other departments around the country?

We looked at the current journalism unit criteria to see what had been changed. It is very similar to what it was.

Brian arrived and explained. Some departments at other institutions **do** require scholarly research and academic activity, while others like ours concentrate on practical journalism, such that professional activities should count.

The changes they have made pertain mostly to updating language to make it stay relevant even after another five years passes, etc.

Chris C. will give Brian a couple of unimportant formatting things to clean up.

Motion to approve was passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned.

ATTACHMENT 206/12
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Minutes from Meeting 11 March 2015, Eielson 304C, 2:15-3:15p

Present:
Erin Pettit (phone), Ellen Lopez, Diana Di Stefano, Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Megan McPhee

1. Conversation Café Recap
The conversation café focused on mentoring.

Erin mentioned two formal courses on mentoring at UAF that she knew of:
Mentoring in Sciences (2 credit course taught by Erin Pettit, offered last fall, considering offering again next fall) – generally grad students in sciences who take it, particularly those in scientific teaching and outreach certificate program (new program - 12 cr of teaching, outreach, mentoring in addition to regular graduate program).

Sarah Hayes also teaches course about mentoring undergrads through a research project (primarily a chem lab class)

Conv Café and recent conversation about peer mentoring groups at UW. Erin mentioned a colleague at UW who mentioned peer mentoring among women faculty there as part of their ADVANCE program, based loosely on the book "Every Other Thursday" http://www.amazon.com/Every-Other-Thursday-Strategies-Successful/dp/0300510845

- keep small – 8 individuals about right
- meet regularly (every other week or so)
- UW ADVANCE program kick-started the peer mentoring activity at UW

For Fall Conversation Café: focus on peer mentoring as a topic, advertise far in advance to gain interest.
Attractive aspects of peer mentoring: collaborative, cross-disciplinary, formal 'bridge building'

2. P&T Workshop
Flyer: Kayt's working on it

Details to include:
Apr 24, 10a-12p; 12p-1p for follow up discussion
Location: will be sure 30 days ahead (Board of Regents conference room reserved as of now)
Distance connection - TBA

Panelists:
Alex Fitts
Diana DiStefano – associate; history
Ellen Lopez – CLA; 4th year review
Diana Wolf - associate, sciences

Sandra Wildfeuer – associate; math/I-AC
Ginny Eckert – full, sciences
Mike West (research faculty) – will be invited by Diana

Program:
introductory comments:
Alex – 5 minutes
Others - 3 min
Followed by questions

*Mary Erlander volunteered to step off panel to keep the number lower, but she will be present to answer questions.

Jayne has food lined up; being paid for from Faculty Senate budget

General feeling that the panel will be different this year, given high levels of budget anxiety – make sure to leave lots of time for questions for Alex in particular.

Do we want to ask people to send questions ahead of time? But we're still trying to focus on planning strategically- maybe save the small/detailed questions for the extra hour at the end of the session. Alex can set the stage with the focus on planning strategically while acknowledging that people will have a lot of concerns this year. [Alex wasn't asked to stay for the extra hour; Mary will see if she's available for that]

Maybe have someone standing by to write down questions that are getting a bit off-topic for first part of workshop, to be brought up in the last hour.

3. CSW is co-sponsoring a book circle on "Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia" (co-sponsored with Rasmuson Library)
Apr 20, 5-6:30p in Kayak Room (Kayt is also arranging a distance connection)

Info on CSW Website, Faculty Senate website, Cornerstone, faculty email listserve
Kayt will send Jayne info about it to get it on listserve

4. Spousal Hires
Emerging issue – we are losing faculty (in a small department = major impact) due to this issue. More often affecting women faculty. Hard to deal with this issue in face of current budget crisis; we are facing loss of term faculty positions already in place.

Do we have information about trailing spouses? How many, gender ratio, etc. We can also learn from specific cases – those that seemed to work, those that didn't.

Next meeting: 8 Apr 2015 2:15-3:15p; 304C Eielson

ATTACHMENT 206/13
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Core Review Committee

Core Review Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 5, 2015 4:00 - 5:00 PM Chancellor's Conference Room

Discussed Mike Harris' concerns about his attempts to assign a W to various individual studies. He said he'd done this successfully previously, using the same syllabi as were submitted. The committee declined to overturn the specific student's previously rejected W petition, but suggested he was welcome to talk to the provost.

Discussion of upcoming pending Individual and Directed Study petitions. The chair had expected that these would all have been submitted by the beginning of the semester. Apparently that's not how it works in practice. Therefore, the extra line on teh new forms will work less
well---we will still be in the position of being asked to accept or deny W or O status after the student has paid money and done work.

Petition: to substitute ANTH 101 for ANTH 100. Tabled for further information. It's unclear why the student took ANTH 101. Possibly a failure of advising?

Petition: To approve a W for a student exchange course in Botswana. Very similar to one approved last week. Approved.

Petition: To approve an O for the same student for different course in the same student exchange program. Again similar to one approved last week. Approved.

Note that the scheduled Feb 19 meeting was cancelled due to not having enough stuff to talk about.

Core Review Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 5, 2015, 4-5 PM

In attendance: CLA:
Jennifer Schell, English (15)
Brian Kassof, Social Sciences (16) Kevin Sager, Communication (CLA 16)
CNSM:
Leah Berman, Math (16) - Chair Larry Duffy, Science (16)
LIBRARY:
Tyson Rinio (LIB 15)
At-Large:
Andrew Seitz, SFOS
Unit Core Assessment: Tony Rickard, CNSM Kevin Berry, SOM
Ex Officio:
OAR: Holly Sherouse
Academic Advising Ctr.: Ginny Kinne Rural Student Services: Gabrielle Russell

Meeting began with an update from the chair discussing proposed upcoming changes to the core; in particular, she mentioned the development of "buckets" for the lower-division "general education" requirements, and the proposal from GERC to CAC to remove the O and W requirement from the baccalaureate requirements and replace them with a degree-based "communications plan". It is possible that Core Review may be involved with the approval and assessment of communications plans in the future; details have not been straightened out.

Ginny mentioned that there needs to be a plan for students pursuing the General Studies and Interdisciplinary majors. She and Leah agreed to have a meeting soon.

It was pointed out that the next meeting is during spring break. Folks agreed to have the next meeting on April 2 instead.

Lots of petitions.

1. Student requested to have LS 101 waived, since she's only able to take courses via distance. She's been taking courses for a long time and had many opportunities to take the course/test. Committee pointed out she can take LS 101 by distance or by test (and students in the past have arranged to have the test proctored outside of Fairbanks). **Denied.**

2. Student requested to have the O requirement waived, on the grounds that he's been (and is currently) working as a professional in a field (politics) that requires lots of oral communication. Committee discussed the possibility of credit for prior learning, although there didn't appear to be a class that his experience would transfer as that also had an O. There are a few O courses via distance; it's not clear whether the student had the necessary prerequisites. **Denied.**

3. Student wanted to use AA in place of LS 101. **Denied**.

4. Another student who works in a communications-related field and wanted her O waived due to life experience. No course with an O seems to match her experience (thus "credit for proper learning" is not a viable option). JRN 371O is offered distance in the fall but requires art prerequisites. **Denied.** It was suggested that the student could petition again if there are no O courses available in the fall, but that that was not the grounds under which she was petitioning at this time.

5. Revisited the student petition to substitute ANTH 101 for ANTH 100X. Her advisor had been contacted, and online advising records were looked at, and there didn't seem to be evidence that the student had been mis-advised; rather, it appeared that the student changed a bunch of courses after she had met with her advisor. **Denied**.

6. Student took an undergrad/grad stacked course at the graduate level, where the undergraduate course had a W, and wanted to use the graduate version for his undergraduate transcript and get the W. **Approved**.

7. Student wanted to use HONR F293 (music appreciation) for ART/MUS/THEA 200X. Apparently this has been approved in the past by this committee. **Approved for everyone in that CRN for that semester.**

8. Student submitted an individual study request for a course on manuscript preparation in biology for a W. **Approved.**

9. Revisited a petition from the fall for a student who took a liberal studies seminar (great- books-type seminar with a few oral presentations) in 1997 at Montana State and wanted it to count for COMM 131. We had tabled the petition because the syllabus that had been submitted was from 2014. We recently heard from someone there that the course was basically unchanged in 1997 (and no contemporaneous syllabus was available). **Denied**.

Course proposal: ANS 478W — senior thesis. **Approved for W**. Committee noted that the catalog copy must require ENGL 211/213 as an explicit prerequisite.

ATTACHMENT 206/14
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 22, 2015

Attending: Colleen Angiak, Joe Mason, Ben Kuntz, Cindy Hardy, Gordon Williams, Eileen Harney, Bobbi Jensen, Sandra Wildfeuer, Jennifer Tilbury, Libby Eddy

Minutes: We officially approved the minutes of the previous meeting.

Meeting times: We discussed setting meeting times for the Spring semester. We agreed to start meetings at 1:30 on Thursdays to maximize attendance, understanding that this will mean that some committee members will need to come late and some will leave early—but we hope for enough overlap. While we initially agreed on 1:30 pm on the 3rd Thursday of each month, it became clear that there was a conflict with other meetings for the February meeting and with Spring Break for the March meeting, so this was changed to the fourth Thursday of the month.

We noted that we meet after the monthly administrative committee meeting, so if we have something that we need to have approved by that committee, we may need to juggle the schedule.

Placement: We revisited the motion to amend writing placement language in the catalog, submitted by Developmental Education. While the added language was intended to clarify a point in the placement process, the committee agreed that this was best done through the placement definitions in the course description and through continuing communication with advisors.

We discussed the process of DEVE course placement. Cindy reported that DEVE instructors are encouraging students in DEVE 060 and 104 to retest in Accuplacer at the end of the semester. They are finding that some students retest into DEVE 109 or English 111x. The faculty want to clarify that this is a pathway students can take as a form of acceleration. We noted that students can take Accuplacer on their own—there's no permission needed to retake the placement test. Bobbi agreed to bring this up at the next advisor roundtable because it may not be filtering out to the faculty advisors. Ben noted that the precision on this issue is complicated by the fact that ENGL 111 does not list prerequisite classes in the catalogue. Cindy noted that it is best to hold on this as we wait for DEVE/ENGL statewide course alignment.

Math alignment: We discussed the status of Math/DEVM course alignment. Currently all DEVM course numbers are aligned with UAA and UAS. We had anticipated a set of major course changes, but Libby was able to make the changes as minor changes, so they did not need to come to us. UAF is still using the DEVM course designator, however, unlike UAA and UAS, who use math. UAF's math department wants the MATH designator to delineate math courses that count for the BA/BS. We noted that the current DEVM counts as a math requirement for AAS programs. We also noted the Math department's concern about a possible confusion between Developmental Ed and Math departments if the designator is the same. John Rhodes is working on the alignment for the Math department.

English alignment: At the time of this meeting, the English alignment group had not yet met. They were planning a phone meeting. The alignment group includes department chairs from all campuses, developmental coordinators, and composition or writing directors from all three campuses, a total of nine faculty.

Some issues on the table: DEVE is developing a combined reading and writing course model. This may be a model that all three universities can agree to.

The group will be discussing designators, given that there are currently three designators in use: PRPE, DEVE, ENGL. Cindy suggests that they look for a new designator that encompasses all three, such as WRTG (Writing).

They will also be working on aligning course descriptions but not all not learning outcomes.

The first telephone meeting is Saturday, January 31.

Gen Ed alignment: The committee addressing the general education alignment will be formed by next week. This group will include three people from each university. They will start by addressing the proposed changes to University Policy on General Education courses. For this alignment, UAF has the most to change, although e proposal the committee will be addressing comes from the UAF GERC committee.
We noted that budget cuts overshadow everything.

Committee Definition: Cécile Lardon, Faculty Senate President, wants to rework all Faculty Senate committee definitions so that they are consistent. We are a Permanent committee, not a Standing committee, and there are different rules for different committees. One question she has raised is whether all committees need to be chaired by a current faculty senator. We noted that our committee includes
rural faculty from small campuses so that some of our members are appointed from those campuses. We also have a number of advisors on our committee, so our definition will vary from other committees.

Some questions to be addressed:

Co-chairs: we have had one from Fairbanks campus and one from a rural campus, with an attempt to balance math and English representation.

Is there a benefit to having the senator chair the committee? If so, how would that person be chosen?

Student Success survey: We discussed developing a survey to study obstacles to student success that are not currently tracked. Sine Anahita is interested in helping us develop this and will be meeting with Cindy to discuss how to proceed. She has asked the committee to come up with some questions that we might want to address.

We discussed how we might contact students to gather data for this. One suggestion was to contact all students with I/F/W/NB on their semester's transcript and send them a note asking

what's up and including survey questions. We discussed whether the academic recovery process would also be a good place to reach out to students. We also discussed framing this positively as what led to success or lack thereof? Alex noted that retention rates are low for students with academic difficulties and we could address the question of what can we do before they drop out?

We noted that some groups have already collected some relevant data—RSS, SSS, IAC through their life coaching program, and the campus Non-Traditional Student Club. Ben noted that the Bethel Student Services person is collecting data through the Emerging Scholars Program and exit interviews. Cindy noted that the AAC was collecting data on their green intake sheets before they switched to Degree works. Some of the data may still exist.

We came up with the following questions:

What do students know about available resources?
What do they know about the number of credits taken and success?

Why would a student choose to work at a job that conflicts with a class?

What was a student's school experience before college? What advising did they get? How did they select a college? What is their perception of college?

Was there a gap between HS and college? Are they first generation?

What do students know about how to study? What are their study habits?

How do they deal with hardship? How do they define hardship? Alex noted that two predictors of student success are resilience and belonging.

What university-related extracurricular activities do they participate in? Are they working on campus?

For rural students and for CTC students do they feel a disconnect from "real" college?

We also discussed looking at the NSSE National Student engagement Experience survey, and Ben noted an article in the NY Times that describes how students bring college experience in a narrative that increases their chances for success.

Next meeting: February 26, 1:30-3pm

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 26, 2015

Attending: Joe Mason, Sandra Wildfeuer, Gordon Williams, Colleen Angiak, Alexandra Fitts, Cindy Hardy, Ben Kuntz, Libby Eddy, Eileen Harney

Student Persistence Survey:
Cindy reported on Sine Anahita's e-mail about doing this project. She is excited about it, and suggests holding focus groups to gather data on why students persist in college. She would like to run focus groups with 5-8 people, and suggests having about 80 students—and provide pizza. We agreed that we want to do a survey, not focus groups, and that we are interested in looking at those who don't persist.

We discussed other pockets of data on this question that we know of. The campus Non-Traditional Student Club sent out a survey to those on its e-mail list. Brian Jarret, the club faculty advisor, may have some data from this. Colleen noted that
RSS is gathering data on student persistence and what gets in the way. They do a student satisfaction survey of their students. They have added an attribute in Banner for RSS students so they can track them as a cohort. She also noted that Sue McHenry was looking at graduation lists to put together a list of Native graduates, but that was having difficulty finding students from self-reported ethnicity.

The Office of Admissions has sent out a survey called "We Miss You" to students who don't come back to find out why. We also noted that there has been some information gathered in the Advising Center on the paper forms used before Degreeworks was used.

Ben noted that they are putting together a different focus group of on campus students in Bethel. Bethel has some data about student success rates, and Ben will check the Emerging Scholars program.

We agreed that we need to have a clear idea about what problem we are addressing in order to try and research this. We discussed a sample poll of entry level freshman or a survey of students when they have a W, I, NB on their transcript. We speculated that students with real problems are less likely to respond

We agreed that we also want to survey distance students and to address needs of rural students.

MATH DEVM alignment:
This is basically a done deal. The numbering system has been agreed upon, with the changes taking effect Fall 2015 . Sandra noted that some course numbers have not yet been changed on the Fall schedule, especially for distance delivered classes. Gold stars to the DEVM and Math folks who got this done!

DEVE ENGL alignment:
They have met once and are meeting again. The radical change they have discussed is a move from DEVE/PRPE/ENGL designators to WRTG. This would clarify the link between developmental writing classes and the current ENGL 111/211/213 sequence.

In developmental classes, both UAF and UAA are integrating reading and writing classes into a combined 4-credit model. This may be an approach that is agreed to in alignment.

For the current ENGL sequence, the numbers for WRTG would stay the same i.e.: WRTG111. The committee noted some differences in the 200-level sequence.
UAF uses 211 and 213; UAA has 211, 212, 213, and 214. UAS has 211. UAF may want to move one 200 level course WRTG 214.

One sticking point is the course numbering for the course equivalent to our DEVE 104. This course was recently changed from DEVE 070 and faculty have observed the change to be positive—more

motivating for students with less of a sigma and the ability to use the course for elective credit. UAA does not want to move their course to 100-level. Cindy reported that she will be working with Shannon Gramse from UAA to resolve this.

The committee still needs to discuss common course titles, outcomes, and course descriptions—or to decide at what level of detail on these things they need to align.

They are planning changes to be implemented Fall 2016. They are meeting again on March 8.

General Education Requirements Alignment:
Alex noted that the UAF members of the statewide GER committee are Leah Berman, Rainer Newberry, and Mary Erlander. So far they have met once. This committee is addressing a proposal went forward from GERC to Faculty Senate to change the University policy on Gen Ed requirements. This committee, appointed by the Faculty Alliance is charged with aligning the GER requirements across the UA system. At this point, the UAA rep doesn't go for the proposed changes.

The change would mean that UAF would change from a defined core to a list of courses that would apply to each area of the GER, similar to the system currently used at UAA. We noted that students statewide are taking a number of gen ed courses online from different campuses and the BOR has a concern about transferability.

Math Bridge:
Gordon reported on the Math Bridge program. He noted that it serves two functions: to help students on the cusp of being able to take Math 107 or 200, but who need a little extra help to get over the hump to get to calculus.
The program is designed so a student doesn't get stuck repeating 107 and 108. With targeted instruction through Math Bridge they can step over that gap.

This is taught through intense short courses over Wintermester and also through "just-in-time" versions of the course offered during the academic year. They are bringing the course online this fall. If a student fails Math 200 in the spring, and doesn't want to retake it, then option is to take the Math Bridge in a three-week session in August, or take the just-in-time version.

Gordon notes that they are looking for a location for this program to meet. Because they do semi individualized work, small group, individual tutoring, in addition to larger meetings, the class could range in size from 1-60 students. The Math Dept wants a dedicated space rather than a classroom.

Sandra notes that her class, Mathematical Literacy, will be coming to this committee for course approval, also.

Libby noted that she is working on a grid to help explain the Math changes. We discussed ways to get the word out.

Academic Recovery:
Alex reported on the group that is working on academic recovery for students on probation, and under disqualification.
This group is currently offering an academic recovery course, taught by Sarah Stanley, who welcomes guest speakers. It will be offered again in the fall as a late start class, right after early warning comes out.

The group is also working on some of communications to go out when students are put on academic disqualification. They will consider a course for rural students , a cross-regional course, once they see how the course goes on campus.

Registrar:
Libby noted that she is working on a registration guide for the upcoming year.
It will be a flip book, online. She also noted that catalogue changes are being input for the 2015-16 catalog.

Next meeting: Thursday, March 26, 1:30-3:00pm.

ATTACHMENT 206/15
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 23, 2015

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm. Note, due to the icy road conditions, the meeting was held as a phone conference rather than in-person.

II. Roll call

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

III. Report by the Office of Faculty Development (report from Joy)

Joy called in from the ASTE Conference in Anchorage when she had a short window of opportunity between sessions on instructional technology. She reported that 7-8 UAF faculty members were attending and/or presenting, and they will share what they learned with fellow faculty on March 3 and at the end of March. Joy informed us that the Lilly West Conference started last Friday, and also that Dan White, Interim Vice Chancellor for Research, will supply funding for Bob Lucas to come and present workshops on grant writing on Friday and Saturday, April 24 and 25.

IV. Report by UAF eLearning & Distance Education

Chris Lott was unable to call in.

V. News on Electronic Course Assessment Implementation Committee (ECAI)

Andrea reported that the ECAI Committee has been working with eXplorance Blue with a kickoff meeting to lay the groundwork for the next two months and an in-depth demonstration meeting to learn more about what Blue can do and what information they need from us to get the electronic evaluations up and running. Andrea has connected with the Provost, PAIR and Blue to determine how to mesh it with Black Board and Banner, as well as to begin identifying the pilot student co-hort. He has also been working with Alex Fitts on the technical aspects of what Blue needs.

Andrea explained that the committee now has a reasonably final set of questions for the pilot: nine core questions used for Promotion and Tenure, four student-specific questions for statistical purposes, and four open-answer questions that are similar to the current “yellow sheet”. The ECAI Committee posted the proposed questions on the Faculty Senate webpage for one week and garnered feedback from faculty. Franz noted that most comments were positive and that there were several good suggestions on rephrasing the proposed questions. Andrea stated that the committee will now work on a list of questions for the question bank for faculty and departments to choose from depending on their needs.

VI. Debrief of Discussion with Dr. Paul Reichardt

We all agreed that Dr. Reichardt's talk was very valuable. Franz wondered if faculty development offerings sufficiently cater to research faculty. Amy noted that there are not a lot of offerings on research methodologies, and that many faculty members are not strongly versed in quantitative, qualitative or mixed-methods research. Franz stated that faculty need to know that Joy's office is responsible for arranging the grant-writing workshops. Kelly brought up Paul's encouragement for having conference attendees present information to their fellow faculty members and how this is perhaps being done within departments already. Trina mentioned that her department has faculty members do a 15-minute presentation from their various travels during monthly faculty meetings. Joy noted that what her office hears consistently from faculty is "we want travel money". She is always interested in hearing what faculty members have learned from their conference participation and encourages them to share with their fellow faculty. Andrea suggested that we go through the literature on what has worked and what has not. What evidence-based research is out there regarding faculty development? We could then try to make this a possible list of activities for our committee to pursue.

VII. Other Business

a. News on Faculty 180 assessment

Franz informed us that a suggestion to collect feedback about Faculty 180 was brought by him to the Administrative Committee meeting. The suggestion was heard and it will be investigated to what extent feedback is already being collected and if further data collection is needed. It was discussed that feedback from both faculty and deans is needed to get a full picture of the suitability of the current implementation of Faculty 180 for faculty evaluation purposes. Franz reported that the Faculty Senate President and President-elect heard the concerns and are investigating.

VIII. Upcoming Events

a. Next FDAI meeting: 3-23-2015
b. Next Administrative Committee meeting: 3-27-2015
c. Next Faculty Senate meeting: 3-2-2015

IX. Adjourned at 4:56 pm (Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.)

ATTACHMENT 206/16
UAF Faculty Senate #206, April 6, 2015
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 3, 2015

Attending: Mike Daku, Jessie Cherry, Cheng-fu Chen, Laura Bender, Mike Castellini, Mitchell Reed, John Yarie, Donie

I. GAAC welcomed Mike Castellini, who is now representing the Dean of the Graduate School at GAAC.

II. Minutes from the GAAC meeting of 12/02/14 were passed.

III. GAAC members reviewed a proposed memo to Arleigh Reynolds of the Department of Veterinary Medicine regarding the possibility of cross-listing some Veterinary Medicine course with the Department of Biology and Wildlife and with the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences.

IV. GAAC passed several course proposals and changes:

11-GCCh.: Course Change: **ANTH F625 - Human Osteology**
32-GPCh. Program Change: **Master of Natural Resources Management and Geography (MNRMG**)
35-GCCh.: Course Change: **GEOS F482 / F682 - Geoscience Seminar**
38-GPCh.: Program Change: **MS - Wildlife Biology and Conservation**
39-GPCh.: Program Change: **Master of Business Administration**
41-GNC: New Course: **MBA F642 - Economics of Environmental and Business Sustainability** (pending renaming the learning outcomes, so that they are clear)

V. It was agreed that we will invite someone from the School of Education to brief committee members on the massive changes being proposed to the Master's of Education program.

VI. New items were assigned for review.

VII. GAAC will meet again Feb. 17, 2015.

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 17, 2015

Attending: Jessie Cherry, Laura Bender, Mitchell Reed, Mike Daku, Sean McGee, John Yarie, Donie Bret-Harte, Lara Horstmann (by phone), special guests: Ron Roehl, Ginny Eckert

I. Minutes from our meeting of 2/03/15 were passed.

II. GAAC heard from special guest Roy Roehl of the School of Education, who reviewed the reasons for the changes proposed to to the Master of Education. Most of the changes are proposed to meet the requirements of accreditation, which has new standards for Education programs. The new accrediting

body has reviewed the proposed changes, and believes that they will be adequate. There will be a visit of the Board of Examiners in 2016, so the School of Education needs to get changes approved and into the catalog in order to write their report for the new standards. UAF is one of 50 schools that will be the first ones to be accredited under new standards. One of the overall changes required is to replace 400-level required courses with 600-level courses. After a detailed discussion of the particular changes, GAAC passed the following changes to the Master of Education program:

- **44-GPCh.:** Program Change: **Master of Education**
- **45-GCCh.:** Course Change:**ED F650 - Current Issues in Technology**
- **46-GPCh.:** Program Change: **K-12 Art Licensure Program toward MEd**
- **47-GPCh.:** Program Change: **Special Education K-12 Postbaccalaureate Certificate of Completion**
- **48-GPCh.:** Program Change: **Secondary Post-Baccalaureate Licensure Program toward M.Ed. - Secondary Education**

III. GAAC heard from special guest Ginny Eckert regarding the proposal for a Certificate in Marine Sustainability. This certificate program was originally designed to accompany an IGERT program, but the grant for this program is now ending. The purpose of the certificate is to attract students with interdisciplinary interests and provide additional skills in management of marine resources. The certificate program is intended for existing graduate students or new students in state agencies, and will add value to their programs. Parts of it already exist, and are taught by existing faculty. The new parts will require additional work for existing faculty. GAAC urged Ginny to get the new dean of SFOS on board to support the program if it comes before the faculty senate. There is a disconnect between the description of the resources needed as described by Ginny and the budget paperwork at the end of the proposal, which appears to require substantial new resources. This is likely to be a tough sell in the current budget climate, and it will be important for the Dean to be prepared to speak to the financing and the potential of the program to generate new revenue. Ginny will revise and send paperwork to Jessie and Lara for review prior to a future GAAC meeting.

IV. GAAC passed the following course proposals/changes and program changes:

- **2-Trial: FISH / BIOL F694 - Physical Processes in Freshwater Ecosystems**
- **22-GCCh.:** Course Change: **NRM F641 - Natural Resource Applications of Remote Sensing**
- **30-GNC:** New Course: **REVISED Format 1 for HSEM F692 - Security and Disaster Management Seminar**
- **42-GNC:** New Course: **MBA F674 - New Venture Development**
- **50-GPCh.:** Program Change: **BS / MS - Computer Science**
- **51-GPCh.:** Program Change: **MS - Computer Science**
- **52-GNC:** New Course: **CS F600 - Professional Software Development**
- **53-GNC:** New Course: **CS F601 - Algorithms, Architecture and Languages**
- **54-GCCh.:** Course Change: **CE F424 / F624 - Introduction to Permafrost Engineering**
- **57-GCCh.:** Course Change:**ENVE F643 - Air Pollution Management**
- **58-GNC:** New Course: **MSL F633 - Integrative Oceanography**

V. Our next meeting will be on March 3, 2015

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 3, 2015

Attending: Laura Bender, Sean McGee, Mike Daku, Mike Castellini, Mitchell Reed, John Yarie, Donie Bret-Harte, Holly Sherouse (by phone), Jayne Harvie

I. At this meeting, there was insufficient attendance for quorum

II. GAAC discussed the Veterinary Medicine course numbering system and evaluation procedures with Mike Castellini, as some committee members have questioned whether a 500 designation for these courses might be better. The Department of Veterinary Medicine feels that the course numbers have to be the same to be accepted by CSU, which holds the accreditation for the program. Mike Castellini feels that the DVM courses are professional graduate courses, and are very similar to those offered in medical schools (which also grant doctoral degrees), in emphasizing memorization of a large amount of information, as opposed to doing research or synthesis. They are clearly very different from the usual UAF graduate courses. UAF does not currently have a medical school or other comparable professional school. He commented that comparing UAF's current research-based graduate programs to the Veterinary Medicine program is like comparing apples and oranges. Mike does not see a problem with using the 600/700 numbers for these courses.

III. Minutes of our meeting on 2/17/15 were passed by email after this meeting.

IV. The following course proposals were passed by email after this meeting:
4-GCCh.: Course Change: **BIOL F465 - Immunology**
40-GNC: New Course: **MBA F627 - Business Law and Ethics**
55-GNC: New Course: **FISH F682 - Field Course in Salmon Management**

V. Our next meeting will be held March 24, 2015.