**Minutes**
**UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #210**
Monday, November 9, 2015 – 1:00 - 3:00 PM
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I. Call to Order – Debu Misra

A. Roll Call

| Faculty Senate Members Present: | Present – continued: |
|---|---|
| ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (16) | RICE, Sunny (16) – via Zoom |
| ALLMAN, Elizabeth (16) | SKYA, Walter (16) |
| BARNES, Bill (16) | TILBURY, Jennifer (17) |
| BOLTON, Bob (17) | TUTTLE, Siri (17) |
| BRET-HARTE, Donie (17) | WEBER, Jane (16) |
| CARROLL, Jennie (17) | WILDFEUER, Sandra (16) |
| CASCIO, Julie (16) - via Zoom | YARIE, John (16) |
| CLARK, Jamie (16) | |
| COLLINS, Eric (17) | Members Absent: |
| CUNDIFF, Nicole (17) | CHERRY, Jessica (17) |
| DIERENFIELD, Candi (17) – **M. Bacsujlaky** | GIFFORD, Valerie (17) |
| DISTEFANO, Diana (16) | HORNIG, Joan (16) |
| FARMER, Daryl (17) | LIU, Jenny (16) |
| HAMPTON, Don (17) | LUNN, Lisa (17) |
| HANKS, Cathy (16) | |
| HARDY, Sarah (17) – via Zoom | Others Present: |
| HARNEY, Eileen (17) | Chancellor Powers; Provost Henrichs, |
| HARTMAN, Chris (16) | Dean Paul Layer; Alex Fitts; Andrea Ferrante; |
| JOLY, Julie (17) – via Zoom | Interim Vice Chancellor Larry Hinzman; |
| LAWLOR, Orion (16) | Chris Coffman; Holly Sherouse; |
| MAHONEY, Andrew (16) | Anita Hartmann; Olga Skinner; Ginny Kinne; |
| MAIER, Jak (17) – **Cindy Hardy** | Sine Anahita; Martha Mason; Shanea Patterson |
| MAXWELL, David (16) – **Falk Huettmann** | Casey Byrne; Kim Swisher; Jake Roselius |
| MCCARTNEY, Leslie (17) | |
| MCDONNELL, Andrew (16) | |
| MEYER, Franz (17) | |
| MISRA, Debu (16) | |
| MOSER, Dennis (16) | |
| NEWBERRY, Rainer (17) | |
| PETERSON, Rorik (17) | |

B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #209

The meeting minutes for #209 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved: *None*
B. Motions Pending: *None*

III A. President's Remarks – Debu Misra

Debu encouraged efforts to keep the campus clean, and reported he is following the Provost's good example by doing some "trashercize" himself.

He congratulated Chancellor Powers for demonstrating national leadership concerning the Title IX issues, as well as assuming responsibility and beginning a process of reform and control. He noted Keith Mallard will be speaking today with regard to a reform process.

He also thanked Chancellor Powers for including faculty, staff and student representation on the Chancellor's Cabinet, beginning in December. He noted that it's a step forward in ensuring shared governance.

Debu also mentioned that he and Orion will serve on the Planning and Budget Committee in spring 2016.

At his last monthly meeting with President Johnsen, they discussed the budget scenario and how to generate revenue. Four priority areas were mentioned, including: increasing tuition; increasing research productivity, alumni fundraising (noting that corporate donations may become critical), and student recruitment. He encouraged the sharing of ideas for generating revenue. Also discussed were the enhancement of graduate education and interdisciplinary research.

He described the workflow spreadsheet that has been put online for the committee chairs. They are populating the spreadsheet with items which will be tracked for progress during the year. He also wants to see updated PDF versions of it posted each month on the Faculty Senate web site for all interested faculty to view.

Regarding the Chancellor search, Debu reported they have developed a final profile for the position. Senator Donie Bret-Harte is also on the search committee.

Faculty Alliance met with VPAAR Dan White. They talked about the Tiger Teams which have been set up to address the GERs, Teacher's Ed, Developmental Ed, and eLearning. Cecile Lardon, Diane Hirshberg, Tara Smith and Maren Haavin are serving on those teams from the Faculty Alliance.

Brief updates were provided on the topics of the Common Calendar, and the Blackboard Learning Management System.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Orion Lawlor

Orion has been thinking about internal communications and a Faculty Senate analog to the flipped classroom. He would like to see more of the meeting time spent in two-way discussion of issues. It would mean that a lot of information would have to be compacted and sent out in advance of the meeting for members to read and prepare for discussion. Conceivably, some discussion could be moved to online electronic means. He invited feedback on these ideas.

IV A. Interim Chancellor's Remarks – Mike Powers

Title IX issues have been time-consuming the past two months, largely related to the review by the Office of Civil Rights and related reporting requirements. A key factor involved five cases between 2011 and 2014 where major sanctions were not utilized. The university reported about this publicly which very few other universities have done although this problem is nation-wide in scope. Considerable interest has been generated among the students. Following the showing of the documentary, *The Hunting Ground*, a town hall meeting was held. About 100 students, community members, faculty and staff attended. They later met with 16 key stakeholders and began mapping out a strategy for the coming year while the chancellor is in office, as well as identifying longer-term goals. They will talk more about creating a culture of safety and support, and will be engaging more with students to accomplish this. He'll update everyone at the next Senate meeting.

The Employee Engagement survey is wrapping up soon, and they'll be meeting with the third-party vendor to talk about the results.

The Arctic Science Summit Week will occur over spring break, from March 12-20, bringing in roughly a thousand international scientists and leaders on Arctic issues. Campus-wide support for those efforts will be needed (e.g., to help with registration, note-taking, technical support). It's wonderful opportunity to showcase the university. In that breath, the UA Scholars reception was held this past week and received wonderful support. He thanked the many faculty who were involved.

The week after Thanksgiving there will be general leadership / town hall forum focused on general issues. The budget will likely be a focus of discussion. [Fri., Dec. 4, 3-4:30 PM at 109 Butrovich]

He reminded everyone that when the Regents are in town it's an opportune time to showcase UAF to them. During their lunch hours is when these types of presentations are typically shared. He would like to see showcases done on such topics as advising, arctic initiatives and the upcoming summit. Faculty have key perspectives that would be very useful to the Board. He shared some helpful rules of communication to follow, including to practice before speaking to the Board, speak for two to three minutes max, and if a complaint is brought before them, be sure to include potential solutions. He noted respectful challenge of the issues is healthy.

The university is looking at a $26 million budget gap. The FY16 budget gap was $20 million, and the FY15 gap was $14 million. It's going to be rough sledding on the budget. The Regents wanted to know why we're asking for what we want when we know we're not going to get it. But, they were told by the Governor's Office that the university needs to put forth the amount that is actually needed in order to keep operating. There was much discussion on planning contingency budgets in anticipation of the changes to the overall budget as it goes through the legislative process.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

The Provost spoke about the budget process that will take place this year. She reiterated that the budget gap is likely to be $26 million, and that it's going to be difficult to find funds for what needs to be

funded. The BOR did vote to approve the level-funding budget request from the university, though it is pretty unlikely that the legislature will fund it as submitted. The state has yet to devise plans to increase state revenues, oil prices have declined, and the state savings accounts being used now are rapidly dwindling. Thus, there is the need to plan for a contingency budget estimated upon what the university will most likely receive. They've heard that the Governor plans to make a 4.5% across-the-board cut to base funding for the university, so that information is being used as a planning point.

The estimation of fixed costs increases is easier to know. One example of those fixed cost increases will include buying water from College Utilities, which will cost roughly $900,000 annually. The university is not able to continue using treated well water because it can't treat it affordably to meet federal requirements. Fixed costs for which they'll need to find funding will amount to about $7 million. Our share of the anticipated across-the-board cut by the Governor amounts to about $7 million, as well. The biggest challenge for next year's budget, however, is the contractually obligated salary and benefit increases. Last year they received only one-time funding from the legislature to help cover the salary and benefit increases. And, there is a significant benefit rate increase next year. Rolled together, it about doubles the size of the budget gap to the figure of $26 million.

They are not planning to use strictly across-the-board reductions to all units. They will use the process based on the Planning and Budget Committee. There will first be an initial step: each of the vice chancellors will distribute to their direct reports the amounts expected to be identified by each unit in reductions. Each VC will work with those direct reports to identify those cuts specific to their units. By early January, the vice chancellors will have gathered the plans to meet the targeted reductions for their units. The results will be reported to the Planning and Budget Committee (which includes faculty and staff representatives). The PBC will assess these plans for their broader impacts. They will consider what the broader impacts of cuts might be; e.g., to the community, to the ability to generate revenue and draw in students. They will make their recommendations relative to what the vice chancellors have submitted. The results will go to the Chancellor's Cabinet for review after each of the vice chancellors has had a chance to respond to what the PBC proposes. At that point during vice chancellor comment, there will be an opportunity for comments from the broader university community.

In April 2016, by which time they hope to have a good idea of the university's funding from the legislature, the Chancellor's Core Cabinet will look at all the information it has received and will make the final decisions. There will probably be some across-the-board cuts, but there will also likely be some vertical cuts to services.

Donie B. asked about the reduction amounts the vice chancellors have been instructed to find. Have each been given the same amount, or are the amounts adjusted to their respective units? The Provost said the targeted amounts are evenly distributed across the units. One area of central fixed costs (debt service and fuel costs, for example) is being held harmless across the units. At the PBC stage, recommendations can be made to lessen the impact to particular units for consideration at Chancellor's Cabinet.

C. Interim VC for Research – Larry Hinzman

VC Hinzman recapped the plans and goals for the Arctic Science Summit to be held in March 2016. He encouraged faculty participation, and asked everyone to think about what they want to see come out of this conference which will have worldwide representation and involvement.

There is a need for the creation of coordinated Arctic strategic initiatives. The reasons for doing so include taking advantage of the Arctic Science Summit week, as well as taking better advantage of the visiting VIPs. They will be meeting over the coming weeks to identify top priorities for these initiatives. Faculty input was invited.

He noted that President Obama wants his each of his cabinet secretaries to visit the Arctic, and to keep the focus on climate change out of Washington, D.C. UAF should plan for these important visits.

The call for white papers for EPSCoR produced 54 papers. An external firm will review them for likelihood of success. UAA and UAS are included. He was pleased with the high quality and ingenuity of the ideas turned in. The proposal is due in a year, so the turnaround should be fairly quick.

There is a lot of pressure on research right now to take advantage of finding ways to increase revenues. The university can do this by improving its grantsmanship, and it can also set the agenda and define those opportunities. An example of this is NASA's decadal survey. NASA is asking for nominations of researchers to serve on the decadal survey. Doing so provides the opportunity to identify and prioritize research areas for years to come.

Andrew Mahoney asked if students might be able to get reduced tuition for being involved in the Arctic Summit Week. Larry said they're still working on a plan, but it might be a possibility.

D. Members' Questions/Comments

Elizabeth A. commented about the poor quality of PAIR data that departments are getting from which to write their reports. Her department has requested she ask if the data quality can be improved. She stressed that it's not the people at PAIR. They have been able to work with the PAIR staff to tease out the correct data for program reports they are seeking, but the problem of poor data has been long standing. Elizabeth suggested that having someone from PAIR come to departments and talk about what types of report data needed and what kind of scripts are run in Banner. The Provost responded that it's very complicated to extract data from Banner. There are many issues that result from situations such as department moves and reorganizations. An enormous amount of time and effort must go into cleaning up inconsistencies. Her best advice is to contact PAIR or her office to follow up on data problems.

V Public Comment

No public comments were made.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Faye Gallant

Faye reported about the request from the RISE Board for staff to match the sustainability fee that students pay. Staff Council decided it was not appropriate to endorse any particular giving initiative over another, but agreed to share information about it with staff. They won't be passing any specific resolution of endorsement.

They have been paying attention to the Board of Regents' discussion about the budget, particularly the compensation adjustments which include a 2.5% pay increase for non-represented staff, and the tuition increase. They are concerned about the impact of the 5% vs. 9% tuition increase and what that means in terms of program support. Without additional revenue, there have to be budget cuts. She mentioned they were very impressed with UAF student testimony advocating program support and the 9% tuition increase at the Regents' meeting.

Chief Mallard spoke to Staff Council that morning about the Green Dot program. They anticipate with much interest the opportunity for more training.

Staff Council is watching the next steps of the UA Transformation Team. They are paying attention to the possibility of statewide duties and services being transferred to the universities. They are concerned that such transfer of duties to UAF staff will be appropriately resourced. They have passed a resolution supporting the spirit in which the transformation report was produced, its content, and to reinforce the need for appropriate resources in going forward.

Staff Council bylaws were changed to create an at-large seat. This helps them handle situations where reps transfer to other units in the middle of their terms. An update was provided on the Staff Council fall election.

B. ASUAF – Mathew Carrick

No report was available from ASUAF.

C. UNAC – Chris Coffman
UAFT – Jane Weber
UNAD – Katie Boylan

Chris C. reported that UNAC is preparing for the next round of contract negotiations. The current contract expires in December of 2016. A survey will go out soon to gather feedback from UNAC faculty about priorities for negotiations. A faculty training meeting was announced, which will cover the current bargaining agreement (to be held on December 7).

Jane W. noted that there will be a Joint Health Care Committee meeting this week to talk with Premera Blue Cross, so there will be a report about that at the next Senate meeting.

Katie B. was not available to report for UNAD.

D. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

No report was available.

VII Guest Speaker: Keith Mallard, Chief of Police
Topic: Campus Safety and Green Dot Program

Kim Swisher and Anita Hartmann accompanied Chief Mallard for the presentation about Green Dot. He described it as an interactive training program designed to equip bystanders with knowledge and skills to recognize when risky things are happening or about to happen, so that they know how to safely react. In essence, it helps to establish a culture on campus that says power-based interpersonal violence is not tolerated; and, as part of the UAF community, everyone has a part to play in preventing violence. He stressed the involvement of everyone from the Chancellor on down, not just one particular group, in order to truly change the norms on campus and create a culture of safety.

The Green Dot training is six hours. It's been narrowed down to a full four hours for students. The intention is to create a 90-minute training for staff and faculty.

Jane W. asked when training will be available. They hope to start offering it in January. Right now there are only three trainers, and lots of demand. There will be a train-the-trainers meeting in February to help spread out the workload to meet the demand.

Debu asked how faculty can be integrated into the Green Dot program. Chief Mallard responded that there is lots of opportunity in that regard. They're putting together tool kits for individuals, and will

endeavor to meet the needs of people where they're at in terms of comfort level. They welcome whatever level of involvement people are willing to have in changing the campus culture.

Chancellor Powers noted that CNN will do an interview with him before the film showing later in the month. After the film showing a national panel of experts will discuss it. Higher education across the nation has not seemed to respond to the need for this dialogue. He asked about the level of interest in training and there was a large response from the senate members.

Cathy H. asked what significant policy changes will be put forward to address the need for changes that have been presented. The Chancellor said policies have been in place but were not being followed. Cathy noted that most faculty do not know what their role in the process is and they need clarification on what happens administratively in many kinds of situations. Individually, they don't know how to respond when a situation involving students arises.

2:00 BREAK

VIII New Business

A. Motion to amend the Faculty Senate Constitution, ART IV - Officers, Sect. 2, concerning eligibility for office of president-elect, submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 210/1)

Chris F. provided the second reading of the motion to amend the Faculty Senate Constitution. It was passed with the necessary two-thirds majority vote. There was one nay vote.

B. Motion to replace O and W requirements with Communication Plans, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachments 210/2)

Jennie C. noted the revisions to the motion that were made since the last discussion. Elizabeth A. asked about the procedure that will be used to review communication plans. Jennie explained that plans can be updated separately from the SLOAs, but the process will be rolled into the SLOA timeline. Alex F. noted that if a plan is concise, it can be incorporated into SLOA plans. Rainer N. commented that the process is purposely not more specific so there is some flexibility for departments. But, the plans will have continuous review with SLOAs.

Andrew M. asked if this affects the program minors. Jennie said no, and Rainer concurred. Eric C. noted that there were possible ramifications with one department using a particular course to fulfill its plan that other departments do not accept. Jennie clarified that communication plans will replace the current O and W types of designations. A department could use one or more courses, or a series of assignments built in to the coursework, or they could use another department's courses to fulfill their requirements. Petitions could be used where appropriate, if they were needed.

It was noted that there may always be unforeseen 'hiccups' with this new process when it's actually put into place. Deans have been notified to inform their departments.

The motion was voted upon and was passed by majority, with one abstention.

C. Motion to develop course classification lists, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachments 210/3)

Jennie reminded the Senate of the similar resolution that passed last spring. This motion gives the Curricular Affairs Committee the ability to carry out the intent of that resolution in time for it to go into effect in fall of 2016. They are now in the process of determining the courses which will populate the

classification lists, or "buckets." Ethics, as part of the Perspectives on the Human Condition (PHC) has been set aside for the moment, as it falls outside the university regulations and is typically fulfilled by upper division courses. Nicole C. asked about that exclusion, not wanting that requirement to disappear.

Jennie explained the free-floating three credits required by the PHC, which UAF specifies as an Ethics course. UA regulations require 15 credits, but Ethics is not a required category. UAF has required 18 credits, and specifies those extra three credits must be in Ethics. Exactly how UAF will address an Ethics requirement will be determined in the future, but it technically falls outside the current UA regulations which this motion is intended to address.

Rainer explained in more detail how the Ethics credits which UAF requires fall outside the UA general education requirements. UAA, for example, folds Ethics into their capstone requirements (outside the GERs). Cindy H. recapped the efforts of the General Education Revitalization Committee (GERC) as put forth through CAC's motions before the Senate today. At the system-wide committee level, faculty tried to propose changes to the UA regulations, but these efforts stalled out. UAF has continued to work on system-wide alignment of the GERs as the BOR has requested. The current motion is part of that effort. She noted that Ethics would be more appropriately addressed as part of the "decorations" GERC had proposed. These "decorations" have been put off for now because their discussion is beyond the scope of addressing the current UA regulations and system alignment.

Several iterations of amendments to the language of the motion were proposed by senators and discussed at length. Ken A. pointed out that the motion language (as submitted in the agenda) specified changes to replace the PHC, thus technically removing the Ethics requirement. Cindy proposed an amendment such that the unintended removal of Ethics would not occur. Ken proposed specific language to the rationale of the motion, to note the Senate's intent that Ethics be retained as a requirement. The amendments were voted upon and passed.

(Falk H. wanted to add language to the effect that the Ethics requirement be further improved; but, such language was beyond the scope of this motion. He was asked by Debu to email Jennie to request discussion at CAC.)

With these amendments, the motion was voted upon and passed with no objections.

IX Invited Discussion Item

Andrea Ferrante, Chair, Electronic Course Assessment Implementation (ECAI)
Topic: eXplorance Blue electronic student course evaluations

A copy of Dr. Ferrante's presentation is posted online:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2015-16-fs-meetings/#210

Dr. Ferrante summarized the current status of the eXplorance Blue project. Implementation has been ongoing since October under the supervision of the Electronic Course Assessment Implementation (ECAI) committee (a subcommittee of FDAI), the Provost's Office, and OIT.

Any questions about Blue should be directed to the ECAI committee. There is much information posted online at the main page for Blue which may be found online: https://www.uaf.edu/provost/blue
Dr. Ferrante recognized the diligent work of Sally Skrip and Vice Provost Alex Fitts to get the new system up and running.

The two main aspects which were addressed included implications of moving to Blue, and what can be done to improve confidence in the surveys for each class. Both an inter-system comparison of Blue with IAS, and an intra-system comparison within Blue were provided. Aspects of consistency over time, and

quality were described for the comparison of Blue with IAS, while aspects of representativeness, accuracy, and quality were described with respect to an intra-system comparison of Blue.

Dr. Ferrante stressed the fact that more time must be spent actually using Blue in order for a true comparison with IAS to be possible. There is no straight conversion of data between the two different survey instruments. This also means that a revision of the unit criteria for the tenure and promotion process may be needed by those units which utilize numeric markers of performance from IAS results (e.g., Biology and Wildlife / Natural Sciences unit criteria). He addressed the perception that only students who are strongly negative about a course or its instructor will be likely to complete the online evaluation. Class size (small vs. large) effects on survey results were also discussed. Response rate and non-response bias were discussed with regard to the intra-system comparison of Blue. Once a full round of using Blue campus-wide is completed, they will perform a response rate analysis. The results will be shared with everyone. Ways confidence in the system can be increased for both faculty and students were described.

Ken A. commented that the studies were older ones from the early 2000s. Andrea responded that there are more recent studies from 2011-2012 (a Canadian study was mentioned) which he has also considered. Being able to use many types of new electronic devices should increase responses by students.

Falk H. talked about change of the survey media from paper to online. He also commented about conceptual issues he has with the survey process and how it's used to evaluate teaching.

Chris C. asked what plans there are to report about results from various types of courses (e.g., graduate, core, etc.). Dr. Ferrante responded the committee does wish to address these course types from the response bias aspect, but he noted they are facing technical limitations with Banner. Due to time constraints, Debu asked for discussion of this aspect to continue online or with the committee.

X Public Comment

No public comments were made.

XI Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

Falk H. requested that the discussion continue at the next meeting. Mara B. commented that she would like to see more time for these types of discussions and less time spent on listening (such as during the first hour of the meeting). She suggested that others could submit reports so that there is more time for discussion of the issues.

B. Committee Chair Comments

Curricular Affairs – Jennifer Carroll, Chair (Attachment 210/4)
Faculty Affairs – Chris Fallen, Chair (Attachment 210/5)
Unit Criteria – Mara Bacsujlaky, Chair (Attachment 210/6)
Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 210/7)
Core Review – Andy Seitz, Chair
Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry, Chair
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Sandra Wildfeuer, Chair
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair (Attachment 210/8)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair (Attachment 210/9)

Research Advisory Committee – Jessica Cherry, Chair
Information Technology Committee – Julie Cascio, Chair
(Attachment 210/10)

XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 3:10 PM.

ATTACHMENT 210/1
UAF Faculty Senate #210, November 9, 2015
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

***SECOND READING***

**MOTION**:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate Constitution, Article IV: Officers, Section 2, as shown below.

**EFFECTIVE:** AY 2015-2016

**RATIONALE:** Allowing a broad set of nominees improves the senate's chances of finding effective, willing leaders. The current narrower pool does not allow alternates to be nominated. Any member who has recently won their school or college election, or chaired a committee, has demonstrated leadership potential and should be eligible for nomination here.

**********

***Bold Italics*** = Addition
~~**Strikethrough**~~ = Deletion

ARTICLE IV – Officers, *changes to Sect. 2*

*Sect. 1* The two officers of the Senate shall be the President and the President-Elect.

*Sect. 2* The ~~**President and**~~ President-Elect shall be elected by the ~~**elected representatives**~~ ***Faculty Senators*** of the Senate for ***a*** one-year term~~**s**~~. Eligible nominees for the office~~**s**~~ of ~~**President and**~~ President-Elect shall ***include any currently elected members of the senate including alternates and chairs of standing and permanent committees of the Senate.*** ~~be elected representatives and/or chairs of standing and permanent committees of the Senate.~~

*Sect. 3* The President-Elect, after serving for one year in this position, subject to Sections 4 and 5, will automatically become President for one year.

**…**

ATTACHMENT 210/2
UAF Faculty Senate #210, November 9, 2015
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

**MOTION**:

The Faculty Senate moves to replace the upper division Oral (O) and Written (W) requirement with the requirement that each baccalaureate 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, including oral and written communication.
- Communicate to audiences in the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions.
- Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline as appropriate, 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.

Implementation timeline for transition:

1. Communication Plans will be reviewed and initially approved by the College or School's Curricular Review Committee, Academic Council, or other committee as appropriate and then continuously reviewed as part of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan review process.
2. Each baccalaureate degree program will submit an initial Communications Plan to the Provost's office by April 15, 2016.
3. During AY 2016/17 Departments will make any necessary changes to implement their plan.
4. Plans will be in place and implemented by Fall 2017.
5. Existing O and W designators will remain in place (if appropriate) for a period of 2 years from Fall 2017 to facilitate students under catalogs with O/W requirements.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2017

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 are 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 department level (via the requirements of the degree programs), and from a specific degree requirement (taking two Ws and one O) to a requirement that is achieved by the student completing the degree requirements associated with their program.

**********

ATTACHMENT 210/3
UAF Faculty Senate #210, November 9, 2015
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

**MOTION**:

The Faculty Senate moves to adopt a classification list system to meet general education requirements in humanities and social sciences in lieu of the currently mandated Perspectives on the Human Condition (PHC) courses. To meet humanities and social sciences requirements, students must take fifteen credits of general education courses that meet the following University Regulations:

- At least 3 credits in the arts
- At least 3 credits in general humanities
- At least 6 credits in social sciences (from 2 different disciplines)

The UAF Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee will develop an initial list of courses to fulfill these course requirements by January 2016.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2016

RATIONALE: The UA Board of Regents adopted a resolution at its April 3-4, 2014 meeting charging the faculty across the UA system to develop and adopt common general education requirements.

The Faculty Senate adopted a resolution at its May 7, 2015 meeting calling for the adoption of a classification list system that will meet general education requirements in arts, humanities, and social sciences.

The UAF Faculty Senate desires to widen student choice related to general education.

**********

ATTACHMENT 210/4
UAF Faculty Senate #210, November 9, 2015
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

**Curricular Affairs Committee**
**Meeting Minutes of September 16, 2015**, 1-2 pm at 145 Bunnell

Present: Ken Abramowicz, Jennie Carroll, Mike Earnest, Alex Fitts, Doug Goering, Carol Gering, Catherine Hanks, Cindy Hardy, Eileen Harney, Jayne Harvie, Ginny Kinne, Jenny Liu, Lisa Lunn (via Zoom), Rainer Newberry, Caty Oehring, Patrick Plattet, Holly Sherouse
Absent: Eric Collins, Joan Hornig, Casey Byrne

1. Approval/Amendment of Agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. Old Business
    a. O/W Motion (FS 9/14/15 discussion notes attached)

The committee discussed the notes from the 9/14/2015 Faculty Senate meeting. For the 9/30/2015 CAC meeting it was agreed that a revised motion would be first on the agenda. Some straw plans for implementation and for departmental Communication plans would be included.
A straw plan for implementation would address which academic year changes would take effect. The existing Os and Ws would go away in the Catalog. However, the designation could be left in Banner if need be (per Holly). Rainer asked everyone to make a straw Communication plan for their respective departments.
CAC agreed they will work on getting a motion through the Senate; address an implementation plan; and, address course curriculum.

3. New Business
    a. CAC Goals AY 15/16 (Draft goals list attached)

The list was reviewed by the committee. Ken A. suggested adding an item concerning the lack of notice from the Athletics Program about the absences of student athletes from class. Cindy H. suggested that an item to discuss the remaining GERC attributes or "decorations" be added to the list. Jennie requested that items be emailed to her for the next meeting.

    b. Selection of CAC representative on Assessment Team (due to Alex Sept. 18)

Cathy Hanks agreed to be the CAC representative on the Assessment team.

    c. PHC to Bucket plan
        i. Subcommittee vs. Committee of the whole?
        ii. If Subcommittee:
            1. CAC gives subcommittee direction/general guidelines (potential issues for direction/general guidelines attached)
            2. CAC gives no direction/general guidelines (Subcommittee decides on guidelines themselves)

CAC chose to form a Subcommittee comprised of the following CAC members: Ken A.; Cindy H.; Jennie C.; Rainer N.; Eileen H.; and Holly S.
It was agreed that this group does not require further direction / guidelines from CAC since they are current members.
The process for course selection to fill buckets was discussed. Rainer has a list from last spring that he will provide to the subcommittee. The need for future oversight was brought up by Alex F., and the need to meet catalog deadlines for next fall was stressed.

---

The following remaining items were postponed until the next meeting (9/30/2015).

d. Math and Science GER alignment (Rainer)
e. Student Code of Conduct revision (proposal submitted by Catherine Hanks attached) – *Not attached to these minutes since topic is postponed to 9/30/2015*
f. Probation actions based on summer performance (Doug)

ATTACHMENTS TO MINUTES:

O/W Discussion notes for CAC

The O/W proposal (to replace O/W requirement with department communication plans) was discussed in September 14 Faculty Senate meeting. I have requested that faculty send any e-mail comments to me and will share them when/if they come. The following comments were made at the meeting:

1. Math Department is opposed.
    a. The O/W system works great.
    b. It is impossible to translate math outside of the discipline (don't like bullet three).
    c. Don't want to create/manage another plan.
    d. We want writing and oral communication covered
2. SOM is ready for a new communication plan/like the change.
3. Biology has mixed feelings about the plan.
4. Other ideas raised:
    a. Choice is between a university wide requirement or individually tailored department requirements
    b. Communication should be broader than just O/W.
    c. Assessment on O/W has not been done/done well. Assessment is becoming more important to the university and accreditation.
    d. Concerned about establishing criteria and oversight.
    e. Would like to see example communication plans
5. Rainer suggested the following amendments and actions for bringing the motion back next meeting. The majority of faculty senators appeared to be in agreement if these items were addressed:
    a. Add "oral" and "written" in bullet one ("Explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication, including oral and written communication" or something…)
    b. Add "as appropriate" to bullet three ("Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline as appropriate" or something…)
    c. Provide Example Plans

---

Curricular Affairs Committee
AY 15/16 Draft Goals

| Goal | Action to Date |
|---|---|
| Resolution of GERC proposals | |
| • Replacement of O/W requirement with department designed communications plans | Discussed at September 14 FS Meeting |
| | On Agenda for September 16 CAC Meeting for amendment |
| | |
| • Replace Perspectives on the Human Condition with "bucket" system | FS Resolution to head in this direction passed (5/4/15) |
| | On Agenda for September 16 CAC Meeting |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | |
| • Math and Science GER Alignment | On Agenda for September 16 CAC Meeting |
| | |
| Other | |
| • Student Code of Conduct Revision? | On Agenda for September 16 CAC Meeting |
| | |
| • Address issues from probation actions based on summer sessions | On Agenda for September 16 CAC Meeting |
| | |
| Vice Provost Fitts requests (additional info. forthcoming) | |
| | |
| • Foreign language option change | |
| | |
| • Double counting of courses between minor and major | |
| | |
| • Oversight of capstone requirement | |
| | |
| • Academic disqualification policy change | |

---

**Curricular Affairs Committee**
**Meeting Minutes of September 30, 2015,** 1-2 pm at 131 Bunnell (eLearning Conf. Rm.)

Present: Ken Abramowicz, Casey Byrne, Jennie Carroll, Mike Earnest (audio), Alex Fitts, Doug Goering, Cindy Hardy (audio), Eileen Harney, Jayne Harvie, Ginny Kinne, Rainer Newberry

Absent: Eric Collins, Carol Gering, Catherine Hanks, Joan Hornig, Jenny Liu, Lisa Lunn, Caty Oehring, Patrick Plattet, Holly Sherouse

1. Approval/Amendment of Agenda

A quorum was not possible due to the effects of the winter storm closure and power outages. Some members were able to attend in person; and a couple were able to phone in via audio conference.

2. Approval of minutes from August 21 and 26, 2015

There was consensus to approve the August minutes as submitted.

3. Old Business
    a. Revised O/W Motion for discussion (attached)
        i. Departmental Communications plan examples

The members present focused on making further revisions to the proposed motion. It was agreed that the motion was not ready to vote upon at Faculty Senate, but there was consensus that a revised draft motion should be a discussion item at the October Faculty Senate meeting.

The effective date for the motion was discussed, with Fall 2017 seen as the most workable, providing adequate time for departments to formulate Communication Plans, and the new University Assessment Committee to get underway.

A long discussion took place about the emphasis of the motion – is its intent to modify the SLOA process (incorporating Communication into existing SLOAs), or is the intent to separately create processes for developing department Communication Plans? The current motion is confusing because it unclearly addresses both of these points, or can be construed to imply creation of a separate Communication SLOA.

Parts of the motion that actually belong in a more-detailed department Communication Plan were differentiated from parts that addressed a department SLOA. It was agreed that there should be one SLOA plan that incorporates Communication assessment within that SLOA; rather than a separate Communication SLOA all by itself. The new University Assessment Committee will look at the SLOA outcomes. The Communication Plans which lay out the processes departments will use to achieve student learning outcomes, will be developed individually by each department for their degree programs (and these will need a separate vetting process).

The motion will be edited to clarify the confusing references, particularly in the numbered sections (1-8). Section #3 and #4 will be edited, and the numbered sections moved around / changed to differentiate between what belongs in the motion's rationale, and what belongs in the motion itself or that can be left out for the University Assessment Committee to address later.

Whether or not to do any combining of the four bulleted items near the top of the motion was discussed. It was decided they should remain as they are. However, it was agreed that they mention processes that are outside of a SLOA plan.

A comment was made about the possible use of Capstone course plans to address the Communication Plan.

It was suggested that Sarah Stanley and a Communication faculty be invited to the October meeting. Sarah offered to assist departments at the September meeting of Faculty Senate.

Jennie and Rainer will work on revising the proposed motion again. The goal is to have it included in the Administrative Committee agenda for approval as a discussion item at the October Senate meeting.

The rest of the agenda items were deferred to the next CAC meeting.

b. CAC Goals AY 15/16 (anything to add?)

4. New Business
    a. CAC GER Subcommittee Report
    b. Math and Science GER alignment (Rainer)
    c. Student Code of Conduct revision (proposal submitted by Catherine Hanks)
    d. Probation actions based on summer performance (Doug)

**Revised O/W Proposal for 9-30-15 CAC meeting**

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:

• Explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication, including oral and written communication.

• Communicate to audiences in the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions.

• Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline as appropriate, 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 2017

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 are 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 department level (via the requirements of the degree programs), and from a specific degree requirement (taking two Ws and one O) to a requirement that is achieved 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 their program addresses these learning outcomes by developing a Communications Plan that integrates communication into each degree or program, typically via a collection of lower and/or upper level courses and/or non-curricular degree requirements chosen to meet the needs of the particular program. This should be done in such a way that all the outcomes are met somewhere in the courses required for the completion of a degree. The Communications Plan for each degree will describe the collection of courses (both in and possibly 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, submit 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. Committees will be formed within each school or college (and made up of at least 1 member) to regularly review communications plans submitted by programs.

   Comment: Suggested for removal (Elizabeth Allman)
   Comment: Is this a one-time thing to have the plans reviewed before implementation? (JC)

5. An additional checkbox will be added to Major/Minor course change forms asking "Does this change affect Communications Outcomes Plans?", so that departments are aware of the impact of potential changes.

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 2017.
   Comment: Suggested for removal (EA).

7. A web page (similar to the SLOA) will be established where communications plans are collected and disseminated across the university.

8. Implementation timeline for this transition:

    a. Department's will submit Communications Plans as part of their Student Learning Outcomes Plans submitted April 2016. Comment: 2, 3 (JC)
    b. Plans will be reviewed by the College or School's Academic Council. Comment: 4 (JC)
    c. During AY 2016/17 Departments will make any necessary changes to implement their plan. Comment: 6 (JC)
    d. Plans will be in place and implemented by Fall 2017.
    e. Existing O and W designators will remain in place (if appropriate) for a period of 2 years from Fall 2017 to facilitate students under catalogs with O/W requirements.

---

**Curricular Affairs Committee**
**Meeting Minutes of October 14, 2015,** 1-2 pm at 131 Bunnell (eLearning Conf. Rm.)

Present: Ken Abramowicz, Casey Byrne, Jennie Carroll, Alex Fitts, Doug Goering, Catherine Hanks, Cindy Hardy (audio), Eileen Harney, Jayne Harvie, Joan Hornig, Ginny Kinne, Lisa Lunn, Rainer Newberry, Patrick Plattet, Holly Sherouse

Absent: Carol Gering, Jenny Liu, Caty Oehring,

4. Approval/Amendment of Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

5. Approval of minutes from September 16 and September 30, 2015

The minutes for Sept. 16 and 30 were approved as submitted.

6. Old Business

    a. Revised O/W Motion for discussion (attached)
        i. SOM Draft Communications plan examples (attached)
        ii. Composition Committee of the English Department online questionnaire (https://write.alaska.edu/university-writing-questionnaire/)

Revisions to the motion were discussed and agreed to by the committee. Communication plans will be reviewed by an appropriate committee at each school and college, typically a curriculum review or academic council committee, depending upon the unit. The Communication Plan would accompany the Student Learning Outcomes Plans submitted in April 2016, and Plans would be implemented in fall 2017.

The committee reviewed the draft plan from SOM. It was fairly long (7 pages), and the committee decided not to include it as an example.

Jennie mentioned the brief survey from Sarah Stanley / English Department. Alex agreed to bring it to the deans for distribution, and she will follow up with the Composition Committee.

b. CAC Goals AY 15/16 update (attached)

i. Process – anything that can be introduced and then go to online discussion?

The committee agreed to meet for an hour-and-a-half at future meetings. That will facilitate being able to address the long list of items on the goals list.

7. New Business

a. CAC GER Subcommittee Report from October 7 (attached)

Jennie reported that the subcommittee discussed social sciences course "bucket." They developed guidelines (details included in the CAC GER Implementation Subcommittee Meeting Report, distributed with the agenda). The guidelines should help keep the list of qualifying courses relatively short (to a couple of dozen courses in length rather than 100).

The committee discussed what will be done with the list when it's finalized. It should be shared with all departments – before the end of this semester. With the relatively short timeline to accomplish the changes, it was suggested that a list of the qualifying courses be given to the Registrar's Office (as opposed to going through the much longer process of filling out curriculum forms for every single course).

With more courses available for students to take, the possible lowering of enrollment in various courses was mentioned.

Ginny K. brought up a question concerning the BA degrees which require additional (s)- and (h)-designated courses along with the PHC (or "X") courses. How would these courses be distinguished from each other in the future to prevent double-counting? Holly noted that DegreeWorks currently is able to take care of this.

What role the Faculty Senate plays in approving the changes was discussed. Senate does not normally get into the nitty-gritty details. What CAC is doing with the course buckets could be shared as an information item at the Senate, letting them know what criteria have been developed, what courses have been selected, and informing them about consultations with departments. Senate could approve the timeline, and the procedures used. Rainer asked Ken to draft up something that gives CAC permission from Faculty Senate to make the proposed changes. It was agreed it could be something similar to the resolution last spring. Ken will start drafting this. The preface should reiterate that the philosophy behind these efforts is two-fold: a.) to satisfy current regulations; and, b.) to make a list that's relatively short.

b. Student Code of Conduct revision (proposal submitted by Catherine Hanks attached)

Cathy noted that in order to try to get a complete picture regarding the student code of conduct, one has to go to the Catalog, to the Board of Regents' site, and to the UAF police web site. Information is not consolidated. Information in the Catalog only covers academic issues of misconduct, and she would like to see more information there about where to obtain further information on non-academic issues of misconduct.

Cathy has contacted the Provost and Mae Marsh with her questions about what faculty should do in various situations when one of their students becomes embroiled in a legal situation and is, for example, trespassed from campus. There are no clear guidelines.

The committee discussed adding information (from the BOR and the UAF police site) about the student code of conduct to the Catalog. With general support for that idea, the committee agreed to request that the Registrar's Office add more information from the BOR web site and bring a draft of that to the next meeting. Holly agreed to do so.

c. Math and Science GER alignment (Rainer)

Discussion of this item was postponed to a future meeting.

d. Probation actions based on summer performance (Doug)

e.

Dean Goering described the problem they're experiencing of their students getting stuck on probation following poor summer performance. It was agreed that Doug and Alex will discuss this further and bring their suggestions for a solution back to the committee.

The remainder of the meeting time was used to discuss prioritization of issues the committee needs to address. Items discussed included:

- the implementation of the Capstone requirement;
- formulating a motion to address the foreign language option which can replace a minor in the Bachelor of Arts (to get rid of that option – the foreign language department supports such action);
- how many credits can be double-counted for minors and majors? The issue comes up at the Registrar's Office from time to time. It can be an issue with interdisciplinary programs where there is no clear language addressing the issue. There are BA degrees which have the minor 'built in' (e.g., BA in Education). There is no stated rule anywhere that prohibits one's minor from being in the same program as their major.
-

The meeting was adjourned with much jubilation.

ATTACHMENT 210/5
UAF Faculty Senate #210, November 9, 2015
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

**Faculty Affairs Committee**
**Meeting Minutes for Wednesday, September 23, 2015**

4::00 PM, Conference Room (130), Murie Building, UAF

**Present:** Elizabeth Allman, Andreas Anger, Nicole Cundiff, Chris Fallen, Valerie Gifford, John Heaton, Julie Maier, Leslie McCartney, Walter Skya

**Absent:** John Eichelberger (Ex-Officio)

Meeting called to order at 4:00 PM by Chris Fallen

Minutes from August 26, 2015 approved.

Today's agenda approved.

***Old Business:***
It was agreed to keep the FAC by-laws as they are.

Nicole Cundiff made a motion to keep the Department Chair policy as is; 2nd by John Heaton, passed.

***New Business:***
Draft motion regarding expanding the pool for Faculty Senate President and President-Elect. Andreas Anger moved that we accept Revision 1, but strike out the sentence fragment 'or any of the above from the senate of the preceding academic year'; striking out the colon after include, and striking out the comment in the rationale section. 2nd by Walter Skya, approved.

The following items are to be tabled for the next meeting or by electronic communication:
1. Subcommittees for proposed projects
2. Staff benefit rates

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 210/6
UAF Faculty Senate #210, November 9, 2015
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

**Unit Criteria Committee**
**Meeting Minutes for Wednesday Oct 21, 2015**

An audio recording was made of today's discussion regarding Joint Appointments. Present were Deans Paul Layer and Doug Goering, and members of the Unit Criteria Committee including Jennifer Tilbury, Chris Hartman, Sarah Hardy, Bob Bolton, and Sunny Rice (via Zoom).

No chair was present at the meeting since Mara was out of town. Deans Paul Layer and Doug Goering were asked to attend this meeting to weigh in on the joint primacy issue.

Dean Layer reports that CNSM has 110 faculty holding joint appointments. Two thirds have an appointment with an external research institute such as IARC or the museum. Dean Layer says that tenure resides in the college, not in the research institute. He emphasized that the promise of tenure is important for recruiting. Institute faculty have a voice in writing unit criteria. Dean Layer stressed that faculty shouldn't have two sets of criteria; currently this criteria derives from the locus of tenure. There is a lack of clarity, however, about the expectation of external funding brought in by faculty members for their research institute. For faculty salary, what is committed by the college and what is committed by the institute? This situation is often handled in different ways. When faculty are evaluated, the dean and director both evaluate based on the criteria.

Dean Goering reports that he also has many faculty with joint appointments, but has less than Dean Layer. There is sometimes tension regarding workloads. Dean Goering urges that appointments should have clear structures and workloads that are established upon hire. Deans and directors should qualify external funds: i.e. Where does it come from? How much is expected? What is an acceptable level of grant support for the research institute? They should also clarify publication expectations. Currently, department and academic unit criteria don't address funding at all, so if faculty become tenured, the relationship with the research institute could get "shaky."

Dean Goering and Dean Layer favor joint appointments where 50% of the appointment is tenure track (4 ½ months salary is covered by the college and 4 ½ months is covered by external funds), but these aren't always as attractive to faculty.

Dean Goering also mentioned that sometimes the appointment agreement "trades" as the faculty member evolves (some begin to teach more, others conduct research more). Dean Goering stressed that the ideal unit criteria for 50/50 appointments should include language about funding, including any expectations of successful grants and contracts. This should be built into the unit criteria for tenure and promotion.

Concerns arise about what happens in any unit when a faculty member ceases being productive? A suggestion to address this is to strengthen the post-tenure review process.

Dean Goering discussed the evaluation process for 50/50 appointments: directors and deans each write an evaluation and then both meet with the untenured faculty member together. Deans and directors send one message of unified expectations. We don't want two sets of criteria for one faculty member. The deans stressed that the unit criteria need to reflect the ideas, and process, that are already in place. An issue, however, is discerning which unit peer committee to go through. There is a need for research unit peer review.

Group Discussion: It appears this committee's task is to revise the blue book and ensure that unit criteria address joint appointments. It seems most faculty understand their roles, but there are some holes to clarify. Sunny wondered if the research directors felt that they had enough say regarding joint appointment expectations. We decided it would be helpful to hear from some directors. We also would like clarification on how many total faculty members hold joint appointments.

Adjourned

ATTACHMENT 210/7
UAF Faculty Senate #210, November 9, 2015
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

**Committee on the Status of Women**
**Meeting Minutes for Friday, October 16, 2015**

Members Present: Jane Weber, Ellen Lopez, Alex Fitz
Members absent: Derek Sikes, Mary Ehrlander, Diana Di Stefano, Erin Pettit, Megan McPhee
Guest: Sine Anihita

**1. Women Faculty Luncheon, Recap**
We were $400 over budget (paid via Faculty Senate Budget). Jane and Ellen will meet with Jayne and Mike Sfraga to see what is ear-marked for next year.

- Attendees: Not sure. About 80
- Comments from participants. People loved Alex' talk! They also liked the food (already made sandwiches).
- Suggested we start the talk earlier next year.
- Should "dignitaries" sit at all tables, or have their own table. Depends on purpose of luncheon – to meet dignitaries and/or just network with other faculty.
- Thank you cards/gifts given to Jane, Sally, Nicole.

**2. Conversation Cafes**

- Talk about at next meeting. Erin, would you be open to leading the planning on an event?
- Sine suggested hosting a discussion and focusing on essay or book (in that discussion, people were assigned responsibility to summarize chapter or essay for others)
- See discussion re: Tenure and Promotion Workshop – possible Convo Café Topics re: preparing for career success (e.g., Term Professors, faculty movement to administrative positions)

**3. Committee Membership**

- Host membership election during spring semester. No need to prepare for this during this semester.
- Will have Women's Center coordinator in near future

**4. Family Medical Leave**

- Discussed article (Newsminer article: DC Family Proposal "D.C.'s family leave proposal is generous and long overdue) which describes proposal to offer 16 weeks off for pregnancy, adoption, caring for sick relative, military deployment...
- At UAF, you can use Sick Leave pool for "serious health condition." – See: http://www.alaska.edu/benefits/leaves/leave-share-program/

*A leave share program has been established to allow employees to voluntarily transfer hours from their unused sick leave balance to the sick leave balance of an employee with a qualifying medical condition. To be eligible for leave share benefits, an employee must be eligible for Family Medical Leave for a serious health condition. The leave share program is limited to a maximum of 520 hours in a calendar year. Procedures for request and use of the leave share program are available through your regional Human Resources office.*

- Issue, especially important for new faculty members who find themselves without enough sick leave for "non-catastrophic" issues – such as childbirth, caring for a family member.
- Jane and Alex were part of a committee that looked into this issue in the past. Little resulted from this.
- *We discussed:*

- Would it be possible to expand eligibility to use leave share?
- Gather info:
  - Talk with Provost – to see to whom we should talk further about this
  - What have individuals negotiated – that might be good at UA level?
  - Talk with UA HR

**5. Promotion & Tenure Workshop – April 2016**

- Start discussing this
- Should workshop also focus on:
  - Associate to Full Professor?
  - Have speaker focused on Term Professors
  - Also, think about "Strategizing for Career Success" for Term Professors – who can be (but are not typically) promoted to Associate and Full. Such as how to complete evaluation process (Faculty 180), Discuss special issues they might face in classroom (e.g., Students who are not happy about taking classes from "temporary" people), Skill development/mentoring for negotiating multi-year contract.
  - Moving into administration appointments
- Might decide on separate meetings/workshops as this would be too much for 2-hour time-frame (possibly, some of these issues could be focus for Convo. Café)

**6. Encouraging administrators to support faculty who allow students to bring babies and (non-disruptive) children into classroom**

- Sine brought this up because has had students who didn't see bringing their babies to class as an option over dropping out of school
- Guidelines available at: http://www.alaska.edu/risksafety/download/MinorsOnCampus.pdf
- Sine will review existing guidelines and give ideas to discuss.

**7. Re: Wording – Encourage resolution to use gender-neutral language (e.g., Freshmen to 1st Year)**

- Discuss during next meeting.

**8. Next Meeting Dates**

- Friday, 6 November, 1-2:00
- Friday, 11 December, 1-2:00

Both in Gruening 718 (School of Ed)

Respectfully Submitted, Ellen D. S. Lopez
These minutes are archived on the CSW website:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/

ATTACHMENT 210/8
UAF Faculty Senate #210, November 9, 2015
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee**
**Meeting Minutes for October 27, 2015**

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

II. Roll call & Introduction of Committee members

Present: Gerri Brightwell, Mike Castellini, Andrea Ferrante, Brian Himelbloom, Kelly Houlton, Steve Hunt, Duff Johnston, Chris Lott, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Channon Price
Excused: Bernie Coakley, Candi Dierenfield, Diana DiStefano, Cindy Fabbri, Trina Mamoon

We were happy to welcome Mike Castellini back to our committee as our ex officio dean representative.

III. News on electronic Course Assessment Implementation Committee

Andrea reported that Blue has started for the courses ending in October. He recorded a You Tube video to show students how to use Blue to evaluate their courses. It will be linked to the Provost's page for Blue. Kelly asked if it could also be linked to Blackboard. Blue will open up on November 30 for two weeks for courses ending on December 14.

Andrea has presented on our switch to electronic course evaluations to the Faculty Senate and ASUAF. He has also asked Andrew Cassell to post the flier and You Tube video on Facebook and Twitter. This week's Cornerstone should have an article on Blue with links to the video and the Provost's webpage.

The ECAI Committee is trying to present information about Blue to all units and have most of them covered. Duff and Gerri will bring it up at the English Department meeting since it is a large department. Kelly presented to the Department of Developmental Education (another big department that includes a lot of rural-based faculty) at their department meeting on Tuesday. Franz will present it to Geosciences at their monthly meeting.

Andrea explained that two questions are being consistently asked: 1) what will the response rate be; and 2) how will the numbers compare to IAS for Tenure and Promotion? He stressed that we must make electronic evaluations as visible as possible to improve response rates. Faculty can urge their students to participate by explaining how important their feedback is and how it is used to improve courses. As for T and P, we cannot compare apples and oranges. Each professor's course will still be compared with the university as a whole, but the wording in some units' criteria will have to be changed. Since this is not a Faculty Senate issue, it will need to be handled unit by unit (i.e. those units which specify a specific number on IAS scores). Franz will bring this up at the next Administrative Committee meeting so the Unit Peer Committee can look into adjusting the numbers.

Andrea also stated that a sample paragraph regarding electronic evaluations that could be inserted into syllabi is being looked at by the Faculty Senate.

IV. Upcoming activities of the UAF Office of Faculty Development (report from Joy)

Joy reports that she has done a series of research-focused training on West Ridge. Next Tuesday from 1:00 – 2:00 pm will be some training for Blue in RASM 340 with her and Sally Skrip presenting. Andrea will also join them. There will be two sessions on using Faculty 180 this semester as well as two in the spring.

The Office of Grants and Contracts will offer training on Wednesday, November 11 from 9:30 to 10:30 am in the Vera Alexander room (O'Neill 201) on G-Create – a huge data base in which UAF has bought institutional membership. A user will put in a few keywords and in return get a list of all possible grant-funding sources. Joy has asked that they continue to offer this training on a regular basis.

Mike asked how taking faculty development to individual colleges/schools worked out. Joy explained that it worked very well for two colleges whose deans promoted and supported it, but did not work well enough for others for her to continue offering this tailor-made experience.

V. Upcoming activities by UAF eLearning & Distance Education

Chris asked us to refer to iteachu.uaf.edu/events to see the new consolidated calendar of faculty development offerings for OFD, eLearning and OIT. He also explained that eLearning is trying a new approach by offering workshops and open labs to get faculty started on exploring technology and other issues before they are teamed up with an Instructional Designer.

VI. Revisit and latest updates on UAF Faculty Senate bylaw modifications

We discussed our stance on voting committee members needing to be full-time faculty. What does it mean to be "full-time"? Suggestions included stating "tenured and tenure-track faculty" or simply "faculty".

Electronic voting and proxy voting were discussed next and a motion was proposed and seconded to leave out mention of electronic and proxy voting so individual committees can decide what works best for them.

Regarding the "conflict of interest" issue, we decided it is too vague and should be left out of the Faculty Senate bylaws. Specifying what constitutes a conflict of interest usually results in a huge document. A motion to have it struck was proposed and seconded.
We discussed our own committee's proposed bylaws document further and Franz suggested that how members are appointed is essentially contained in the Faculty Senate document although not word for word. We also have a two-thirds vote requirement to change our committee bylaws that is not reflected in the Faculty Senate bylaws. We decided to keep this in our own document, but we did not suggest adding it to the Faculty Senate document.

It was pointed out that there are still some questions printed in our proposed bylaws that will need to be taken out.

VII. Discussion on status of the Faculty Mentoring Program

This item was tabled due to lack of time.

VIII. Other Business

a. Scheduling upcoming FDAI meetings

Franz will send out another Doodle Poll in order to determine the best meeting time for the spring semester. He will also try to find a different meeting date/time for our December meeting.

IX. Upcoming events

a. Next admin committee meeting: 10/30/15
b. Next FDAI meeting: 11/24/15, 2:00 – 3:00 pm

X. Adjourned at 3:04 pm. (Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.)

ATTACHMENT 210/9
UAF Faculty Senate #210, November 9, 2015
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee**
**Meeting Minutes for September 23, 2015**
Attending: John Yarie, Mitch Reed, Laura Bender, Jayne Harvie, Daryl Farmer, Mary van Mulken (guest), Larry Duffy (guest), Sean McGee (phone), Anne Beaudreau (phone), Holly Sherouse (phone), Mike Daku, Donie Bret-Harte

**I. Minutes** from our meeting of 9/09/15 were approved.

**II. Certificate Program in Resilience and Sustainability.** GAAC discussed the proposal for a certificate program in Resilience and Sustainability with guests Larry Duffy and Mary van Mulkin. Larry indicated that the proposal's intention is to provide students with a documentation of their efforts in area of sustainability. There is already an on-going interdisciplinary program in sustainability, but students are admitted to individual departments, so this certificate will demonstrate that they have taken courses in interdisciplinary research. In response to a first round of comments, the proposal has been changed to provide a menu of courses that cross disciplinary boundaries and are already offered, and to steer away from relying on special topics courses. Larry clarified that students can still get the certificate even if they do not complete the program in resilience and sustainability. GAAC would like clarification on the impacts (which Larry expects to be small), and the admissions policy (most will enroll in fall, but they can enroll in spring, also). GAAC suggested that the proposal needs to be revised to clearly articulate the objectives and who can enroll, and add information on expected enrollments and finances for the Board of Regents. Sean McGee will write up a list of smaller changes desired and send them to Larry and Mary. Holly requested that the possible elective courses be listed in the catalog description for the program, as that will reduce paperwork (otherwise, a separate memo detailing the approved electives is required for each student).

**III. Electronic signatures on graduate theses**. Laura Bender of the graduate school requested that GAAC members solicit feedback from their individual departments on whether electronic signatures for graduate theses would be acceptable. This was discussed with the Deans, and their opinions were split. Some liked having signatures attached, and felt that real signatures meant something. Others felt that electronic signatures would be fine. Some departments at other universities have a separate approval page, while UAA requires no signatures. GAAC members have already indicated that electronic signatures that are secure would be much better than no signatures. GAAC members agreed to poll their colleagues.

**IV. Update on current assignments**. GAAC passed the following course proposals, for which acceptable revisions were received:
**1-GNC:** New Course: **DVM F710 - Foundations of Veterinary Medicine III**
**2-GNC:** New Course: **DVM F714 - Preventative Veterinary Medicine**
**6-GNC:** New Course: **DVM F751 - Clinical Toxicology (pending correction of the title and prerequisites to agree between format 1 form and catalog description)**

**At the request of the proposer,** Carryforward: **34-GNP: Graduate Certificate in Sustainability of Marine Ecosystems** will be held for the spring semester, when a new Dean will be on board.

**V. No new assignments were made**, because no additional proposals were submitted as of this meeting.

**VI. GAAC's next meeting will be held October 14, 2015 at 3 pm.**

ATTACHMENT 210/10
UAF Faculty Senate #210, November 9, 2015
Submitted by the Information Technology Committee

**Information Technology Committee**
**Meeting Minutes for October 21, 2015** via Google Hangouts

Julie Cascio called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. ADT

Attendees:
Julie Cascio, Joanne Healy, Falk Huettmann, Rorik Peterson, Siri Tuttle, Martha Mason ex officio,
Not present: Bill Barnes, Eric Collins, Alba Ruth Prato, Chris Lott ex officio, Debra Kouda ex officio

Google group for this committee was created.
uaf-faculty-it-committee <uaf-faculty-it-committee@alaska.edu>
OIT Follow up report on phone connections – Martha Mason

- Phone lines have been removed from classrooms because each costs $260 per year. Phones such as Polycoms were brought from individual units for use in the classroom. Reichart, Gruening and Brooks had analog lines that were disconnected. CRCD reconnected four rooms in Brooks.
- A suggestion was made that OIT staff need to see what the problems are before trying to fix issues. This also helps them understand how technology is being used in the room.
- Use of the videoconferencing in classrooms, even just using it for the audio has been problematic. For example, Biology and Wildlife Tenure and Promotion Committee could not get the audio-conference to work. They ended up using their own laptops with Skype. For more details, Martha could talk with Kristine Mooder, as she has details about the difficulties experienced.
- Another option might be trying to understand the problematic rooms.
- A comment was made that use of Blackboard Collaborate with students around the state has been successful
- Martha will connect with Joanne to see about needs for connecting with Ethernet in classrooms.

OIT faculty engagement - Debra Kouda was not present

Faculty 180 - Alex Fitts and Michelle Strickland

- A faculty senate committee headed by Eric Madsen led the research into choosing a database system for faculty reporting. This committee reviewed several products, with opportunities for faculty input along the way.
- *Benefit of Faculty 180 system –*
  Archives the information,
  Reports can be run for specified periods of time. This will be beneficial eventually for doing comprehensive reports.
  - At the administrative level, deans may be able to access the information without having to go back to the faculty again and again to find it.

- *Limitations –*
  - There is an initial learning process that faculty need to get through to enter information.
  - Entering information into the Faculty 180 database takes time.
  - Another learning process is the general understanding of using a database vs. word processing document.
  - Drawback with the software itself, as it has some quirks. Several screens must be navigated to add data, to review, and to edit it.

- One frustration heard by the committee was that Teaching/Class information entered into the system was not accurate. Michelle said this info is extracted from Banner and uploaded manually. If the class is not correct in Faculty 180, then it is because the instructor in Banner is not correct. Accurate information in Banner will be more and more important including correct start and end dates, as this is also used for electronic evaluation. Correcting banner records are done through the Dean and Registrar. For Faculty 180 questions or corrections, contact Michelle Strickland or Alex Fitts.
- A frustration brought up at the faculty senate administrative committee meeting was that there was not a forum for feedback on the system. There are several ways. In addition to contacting Michelle or Alex, other options are to use the link at the Provosts website to submit a google form, use the link in Faculty 180 to contact the company, or submit a support ticket.
- A concern brought forward was with the safety of information put into the system. Everything on the internet is likely to be hacked at some time, including this database. Also, the university email is a google system, so that is available to others. Faculty evaluations do not currently go into the Faculty 180 system but when they do, privacy will be an issue. Martha talked about the firewalls in place.
- Dean should pull up the information for evaluation after the faculty member has submitted it.

Feedback on use of Zoom and google hangouts

- Overall comments were positive. Audio/visual seemed to work better with zoom than google hangouts for some. The internet connection for each participant will impact their experience. Having all mute their microphones except for the person speaking seems to help with the issue of echoes.

Items for next month's agenda

- Security report – Martha will request the chief security officer address the information on technology safety, where UAF stands on this issue, how many hacking events recently or currently, also include hacking into video conferencing system. Focus on safety of personal information such as is in Faculty 180.
- OIT feedback on videoconferencing – Martha
- OIT faculty engagement - Debra Kouda
- Roll of phone company when advising people or meetings at a distance. Falk will connect with some phone companies and ask them to give a brief report.

Next meeting November 18, 10 a.m. via Skype group – Rorik will facilitate
January 20, 10 a.m. meeting via Blackboard Collaborate, Joanne will facilitate
The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.