

Draft Minutes for Meeting #219

Monday, December 05, 2016

1:00 – 2:50 PM - Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order - Orion Lawlor

A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Members Present - continued
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (18)	MATWEYOU, Julie (18) – via Zoom
AGGARWAL, Srijan (18)	MAXWELL, David (18)
AGUILAR-ISLAS, Ana (18)	MAY, Jeff (18)
ANAHITA, Sine (18)	MEYER, Franz (17)
ARNDT, Kathy (17)	NEWBERRY, Rainer (17)
BACSUJLAKY, Mara (18)	QUICK, Kate (18)
BARNES, Bill (18)	REMBER, Rob (17)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (17)	TILBURY, Jennifer (17)
CARROLL, Jennie (17) – Andy Anger via Zoom	TOPKOK, Sean (18)
COLLINS, Eric (17)	TUTTLE, Siri (17)
CROSKREY, Wendy (18)	WILDFEUER, Sandra (18)
CUNDIFF, Nicole (17)	ZHANG, Mingchu (18)
DIERENFIELD, Candi (17) – Art Nash	
FALLEN, Chris (18)	Members absent:
FARMER, Daryl (17)	BENOWITZ, Jeff (18) – no alt available
GIFFORD, Valerie (17)	BOLTON, Bob (18)
HAMPTON, Don (17)	PETERSON, Rorik (17)
HARDY, Sarah (17) – Melissa Good via Zoom	
HARNEY, Eileen (17)	Others Present:
HARRIS, Norm (17) – via Zoom	Dana Thomas, Susan Henrichs
HIRSCH, Alex (18) – Jamie Clark	FAC Chair: Andreas Anger
HUNT, Steve (18)	RAC Chair: Jamie Clark (sub for A. Hirsch)
ICKERT-BOND, Stefanie (18)	Mark Herrmann, SOM Dean
LAWLOR, Orion (17)	Chris Coffman, Mike Earnest;
LILJEDAHN, Anna (18)	Faye Gallant; Colby Freel; Carol Gering
LUNN, Lisa (17)	Ginny Kinne; Olga Skinner;
MAIER, Jak (17)	Karina Gonzales; Martha Mason (Zoom)
MAKAREVICH, Roman (18)	Carla Browning (Zoom), Nicole Dufour

B. Approval of [Minutes for Meeting #218](#) (linked)

The minutes were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

Motions approved:

A. [Motion to amend the attendance policy](#)

B. [Motion to authorize Office of the Registrar to change "DF" grade to "Pass" for F698 courses \(excludes letter graded courses\)](#)

Motions pending: None

III A. President's Remarks - Orion Lawlor

In the spirit of the season, Orion remarked on the dedicated efforts to address the budget situation the university is facing, noting that while it's easy to draw the lines between administration and faculty, or between faculty (e.g., hard sciences vs. social sciences, teaching vs. research) or between the campuses, everyone is in the same boat. He was struck by the fact that everyone is trying to make this work, but from their respective roles and perspectives. He encouraged everyone to see beyond the lines and work together on the common goals of keeping the university, and the state, vibrant and viable. And, on a bright note, he noted that OPEC cut oil production, and oil prices have been rising, though it remains to be seen how long this will continue and how much it helps the state budget.

B. President-Elect's Remarks - Chris Fallen

Chris remarked on the program review process motion. While it may not be perfect and has been revised up to the last minute, it does provide for more shared governance throughout the program review process rather than simply at the end. He stated his hope that the motion would be passed, even with modifications if necessary, so that changes could be incorporated for the spring semester reviews.

He noted the ongoing discussions regarding Strategic Pathways. Some, like him, see it as a generally useful process that provides a seat at the table to develop options for dealing with the difficult challenges the university is facing. Others see it, perhaps with some justification, as a bypass of the governance process, where the input seems to be disregarded by the President and the Summit Team who ultimately have to make the tough decisions; and where SP might just be a cover for some ulterior plan (which is not necessarily his perception).

The Phase II options were supposed to be presented this week, but were delayed until January due to travel problems. They are seeking volunteers for Phase III teams that will be looking at

Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences, on the academic side. On the administrative side, teams will be looking at risk management, land management, and facilities. Please let Orion and Chris know of any interested faculty so they can submit names for consideration.

Chris noted that Abel Bult-Ito will be speaking to the UAA Faculty Senate on *A New Vision for the University of Alaska*. He is double-billed with President Johnsen at that meeting. Dr. Bult-Ito is scheduled to present at the February UAF Faculty Senate meeting.

He noted a meeting with Tara Smith (Faculty Alliance), Andy Anger (Faculty Affairs Committee) and himself, and Tanya Hollis, director of the Statewide Office of Cost Analysis, to discuss the faculty overload benefit rates. The issue they are trying to resolve concerns the fact that full-time faculty who are given overload assignments for teaching are charged a much higher benefit rate than is necessary since they don't see any additional benefits. The accounting quirk behind it turns an academic decision about who is best qualified to teach a class into an accounting decision. They had a useful discussion that has started the dialog with statewide, and are planning to meet again.

He reminded everyone of the Usibelli awards event which follows the meeting.

IV A. Interim Chancellor's Remarks - Dana Thomas

Chancellor Thomas shared some announcements regarding the Usibelli Awards event and the UAF Holiday Gathering event. He also noted that two nomination periods have opened: one for the Staff Make Students Count Award, and the other for the Chancellor's Cornerstone Award. He also mentioned there is a planned goodbye on Dec. 14 for Vice Chancellor of University and Student Advancement Mike Sfraga. Mike has been at the University of Alaska for 31 years, and recently took a position at the prestigious Woodrow Wilson Center.

President Johnsen announced at the Leadership Summit that a search will be conducted for a permanent UAF chancellor. The intent is to fill the position by next July. Chancellor Thomas has reached out to previous committee of 17 individuals, and all but three have agreed to serve again. A chair for committee is still needed as Dr. Paul Reichardt was unavailable to serve.

A search committee is close to being identified for the vice chancellor of student affairs position. They did examine whether or not to keep the position, and input is also being taken on changes to the position. Chancellor Thomas met with student affairs directors and received their input. While it is time to look at administrator positions, having a key person to lead the effort to grow enrollment is necessary, and someone needs to lead the student safety and Title IX aspects of the position. Three other elements that have reported to the vice chancellor (KUAC, University Relations and Marketing, and Development and Alumni Relations) are now reporting directly to the chancellor for the time being. He welcomes input on that front. He noted Dr. Anahita's letter to the News-Miner expressing her views. Also, he is filling the director of diversity and equal

opportunity. There are 18-19 applicants thus far. The intent is to hire the position before the end of the semester.

Chancellor Thomas talked about the December 14 meeting to consider the consolidation of the Schools of Education. He also mentioned the filling of seats on teams for the Phase III of Strategic Pathways.

Regarding the university budget, Chancellor Thomas noted that the Governor's budget usually is shared around December 15. He reminded the senate of the \$341 million budget passed by the UA Board of Regents. He plans to share about what the budget numbers mean for UAF once the Governor's budget is released. Then, he'll meet with the deans and directors to get their feedback on how to possibly meet that budget. They are meeting on budget strategies in the meantime. Proposals will be shared with the campus later in January for input.

A fair amount of deferred maintenance work is planned, some of which will be disruptive in the summer time. The ceiling in the Great Hall (with asbestos) will be replaced, and the roof on Wood Center is being replaced.

Chancellor Thomas has written back to many individuals who gave their input and ideas for revenue sharing. He thanked everyone for their efforts.

Anna L. had a question with regard to communication with the legislators in Juneau. She wanted to know if the same approach as last year will be used. Chancellor Thomas responded that he's been meeting with the interior delegation and other rural legislators. They must walk a fine line as they don't want to discourage potential new students with the budget woes. President Johnsen has also told the chancellors that he will let them know if they should go to Juneau and speak with legislators or not. So, currently there is no plan for Chancellor Thomas to go to Juneau during the legislative session at this time. Anna asked about help and involvement from the various community entities. Chancellor Thomas noted he serves on the Chamber of Commerce Board and has given presentations to the Chamber and other local entities. It's on the state Chamber's agenda to support the university.

B. Provost's Remarks - Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs followed up on Anna's question. The meeting held in Anchorage last week was a UA-wide leadership summit. The President emphasized that he has established a goal for the University which has been shortened to "65 by 2025" meaning that 65% of Alaskans will have a postsecondary credential (not necessarily a baccalaureate degree, but perhaps along the lines of a certificate) by the year 2025. Since the current number is about half of that, it is an extremely ambitious goal. Relating back to Anna's question, this goal is going to be a central part of the President's message to the Legislature this year. He has shown the Board his approximation model, available in the Board of Regents meeting minutes, illustrating that by substantially increasing UA's enrollments, we can increase revenue from tuition and fees, thus reducing over time the amount of financial support needed by the university from the State of

Alaska. She feels the model is still in its early stages of development, and needs substantial refinement. In particular, while the university can accommodate some additional students without large investments in faculty and facilities, it's probably not true that a large number of additional students can be accommodated without some investments from the Legislature. Similarly, the model includes relatively modest tuition increases over time. It's probably not possible for the university to contain tuition at the relatively low levels that we have now through time ahead. We're already well below the national average for baccalaureate programs in terms of tuition levels.

Last year's message from the President to the Legislature emphasized ways in which the university was under-performing in terms of the number of graduates and the proportion of Alaskans attaining postsecondary credentials. In that respect, this message is more positive and forward looking and presents a way the university can improve and serve the needs of Alaskans in a more complete way. However, the message needs to be couched very carefully and be refined, or there might be too much of an expectation raised that we can do all of this for no additional money, and for much less money from the Legislature (extrapolated out to 2025 in the current model).

Provost Henrichs noted that UAF has also set some relatively ambitious goals for raising enrollment. They are related more specifically to our capacity for additional students -- to fill our capacity but not exceed it. These enrollment goals are important for UAF's future and will improve its position in the state. The plan is to work on both the retention side as well as the recruiting side. They'll work on baccalaureate programs, graduate programs and associate level programs. There are six committees of faculty, staff and administration being constituted to devise more specific plans and strategies. Any ideas for recruitment and retention are welcomed.

Chancellor Thomas mentioned some programs with remarkable growth, including the Justice program, and the Emergency Management program. His intention is to reach out to those units and have them present how they pulled off that remarkable growth. It's something we could all learn from.

C. Senate Members' Questions / Comments

No additional questions or comments were made.

V Public Comment

No public comments were made.

VI Governance Reports

A. Research Report - VC Hinzman

No report was available.

B. Staff Council - Faye Gallant

Faye, soon to go on maternity leave, announced that Nate Bauer will be SC president for the remainder of the academic year. Samara Taber (Office of Admissions and the Registrar) was elected at today's SC meeting to fill the role of the vice president.

Other newly elected SC members will start their terms in January. Two resolutions passed this morning include one about a UAF volunteer day, and another one concerning furlough and leave accrual which will go to Staff Alliance.

She urged nominations for the Staff Make Students Count award and the Chancellor's Cornerstone award, and reiterated the deadlines.

C. ASUAF - Colby Freel

Colby remarked on the resolution that the student senate passed recently. It expresses support for some form of course to address Title IX issues, alcohol consumption, campus safety, and financial literacy. It also calls for a change in the implementation piece associated with Haven training, removing the \$150 fine and replacing that with a non-monetary penalty, e.g., a registration hold.

He thanked the Curricular Affairs Committee and Chair Eileen Harney for the opportunity to contribute to their work on the Academic Misconduct policy. Sharing both the student and faculty perspectives on this policy was valuable and worthwhile. With regard to faculty utilizing student input and feedback such as occurred at CAC, he felt there is generally ample room to increase such opportunities for students. He will work with President Lawlor on this.

He mentioned the loss of a student to suicide, recently. He requested that faculty talk about suicide and reach out to their students. It is a real problem in Alaska, and needs to be openly talked about with students. He emphasized the difference faculty can make with individual students, and shared the starfish story as an illustration of that fact.

D. UNAC - Chris Coffman

Chris C. remarked on the status of the UNAC negotiations with university administration. She noted her most recent communications to the faculty which are posted online at unitedacademics.net. She mentioned the tentative agreements on various articles, and work continuing on other articles. She announced that on Friday there will be a luncheon with Tony Rickard, chief negotiator. All were invited to attend.

UNAD Report - Katie Boylan

No report was available.

UAFT - Kate Quick ([Report](#) linked)

Kate talked about the resolution they passed recently concerning Strategic Pathways, calling for a pause in the SP process to obtain a cost benefit analysis of proposed actions and cuts. She noted they will send a delegation down to Juneau in mid-February to talk to legislators. She invited suggestions from Senate members on topics to bring up in Juneau.

E. Athletics - Dani Sheppard

No report was available.

F. [Faculty Alliance Report](#) (linked)

Orion mentioned the linked FA report. He noted that a retreat is planned in January where Alliance members hope to be able to talk with the Board of Regents.

G. Senate Members' Questions / Comments

There were no questions or comments from senators.

VII New Business

A. [Motion to approve a new Minor in Tribal Management](#),
submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

Rainer described the motion as harmless, with no costs to creating it. All the courses exist, and it gives students more options for a minor.

The motion to approve the new minor was passed with no objections.

B. [Motion to amend Academic Program Review Process](#), submitted
by the Curricular Affairs and Faculty Affairs Committees

Orion introduced the motion to amend the academic program review process, explaining the changes occurring recently and the rush to get it out before spring semester. He emphasized the big change in the process is to connect Faculty Senate throughout the process, not just at the end of it following Chancellor's Cabinet decisions.

Sine A. commented on the motion, thanking everyone who worked on it. She noted it's stronger than it was, and that it's been a series of compromises. She suggested one final revision: that the program has an opportunity to respond after the Faculty Senate President and Faculty Senate has had their opportunities to respond. Orion clarified that her suggestion was for Step 1 in the process. The change would add the following line at the end of Step 1: "The program

under review also has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks.” The amendment was approved unanimously.

With no objections the motion was passed as amended on the floor. The Provost commented that she believes she can work with these changes, though she does not want to speak for the Chancellor, of course. She noted the new additions will add more transparency to the process, and though they do add more time, it’s a reasonable compromise.

2:00 BREAK

VIII Discussion and Information Items

A. [GER Alignment of English across UA System](#) and [Summary of SLOA for Writing Program](#) (PDF linked)

CAC Chair Eileen H. recapped the changes which have been made to English courses in order to accomplish the statewide GER alignment. The courses will have a new course subject code: WRTG. Two new courses to be added are WRTG 212 and 214. Currently, the English Department recognizes that WRTG 212 (Writing Across the Professions) is a really attractive option for many students, but they do not have the expertise to teach it regularly right now. WRTG 211 and 213 will be offered via UAF online. WRTG 214 will be offered regularly.

Kate Q. asked if Sarah Stanley will come and speak directly to Faculty Senate in future. Eileen noted that she was not available to attend today, and urged faculty to email Sarah in the meantime. They will invite her again to a future meeting. Eileen urged senators to share this information, which will be in place for the next academic year, with their respective departments. The ENGL courses still count as they have in the past even though the designator will change.

Jeff M. asked if the English Department wants to teach the WRTG 212 course option. Eileen responded that they do wish to teach it and are supportive of it; but they do not have the faculty resources at this time.

Orion asked if the curriculum alignment with UAA meant UAF has to teach the same courses that UAA offers. Cindy Hardy, who was on the committee, described the year-long effort made to align the English and Developmental English courses with UAA and UAS. The new WRTG course designator helps accomplish that by linking all the various departments across the system, making it less of an obstacle for students to take courses and fulfill GERs across campuses. The WRTG courses will share the same titles, numbers and outcomes.

Orion commented on the disparate curriculum review processes across the system, which also makes it difficult to align courses as well. Jamie C. commented that different faculty have different areas of expertise, making it less sensible to try and align courses across the system. Kate Q. noted this effort is just for Core courses, however.

Ken A. noted that Sarah's email stated we're being told to align, and wanted to know who was telling them to align and how does that go along with shared governance. The Provost responded that the instruction to align came from the Board of Regents. But, that did not mean that any particular campus was "anointed" as the one to be aligned with; the process to align was intended to be faculty driven. Ken asked if UAS was told to create all the same English courses that UAF has. Cindy noted that all three universities will adopt the WRTG courses for their English GERs. Currently all three universities have ENGL 111 and 211. She spoke about the great effort it took to reach agreement between the campuses about what courses would be aligned and how.

Orion acknowledged the difficulties of aligning across the three universities and the great efforts undertaken by faculty volunteers to accomplish the task. He noted the opportunities to cross pollinate between the campuses, as Cindy had described with the changes to DEVE 104 which became WRTG 090.

Eileen noted that Sarah S. is willing to be a resource for faculty, and Eileen is happy to pass comments along. Rainer noted part of the effort of having the discussion today was to be sure Faculty Senate wasn't the last to hear about these changes.

Cindy shared how part of the process goes back several years to when the cut scores for course placement into English courses were aligned. They're back to work now on whether or not they want to continue using Accuplacer. The effort has helped the faculty at each of the campuses to get to know each other and work together.

Jamie C. spoke about the bucket lists created last year and wanted to know about the process to add or change the GER course lists. Rainer noted the process still goes through the Core Review Committee. Sandra W. commented on the SADA Committee's efforts last year on Developmental English courses.

B. Discussion: [Faculty Senate Response to Strategic Pathways](#)

Orion noted the links in the agenda to their resolution, and to Abel Bult-Ito's *New Vision for UA*. Abel will be guest speaking at the February Faculty Senate meeting. Right now names of faculty are being collected for Phase III. More faculty seats are available for the academic review areas than before due to their feedback having been taken into consideration. One issue with the resolution is how confrontational they wish to be, and whether that would be effective. Providing concrete suggestions may be more productive.

Sine A. commented that Faculty Senate should not make any decisions until a cost benefit analysis has been made available. Orion commented about his experience on the team reviewing engineering programs. They wanted to know the numbers, too; e.g., how tuition numbers would be changed, how salaries would change, how administration would change. They realized it would be hard to provide a cost benefit analysis when most of the key numbers did not exist yet.

Chris described the difficulty in generating useful numbers for comparisons between the universities. He noted these sorts of analyses are important, but very difficult and time-consuming to produce. He served on the Research Administration review team, and the point was made in their discussions that UAA brings in more grants than UAF. While that's technically true, they're different types of grants and are smaller ones. UAF brings in 10 times the dollar amounts in grant funding than UAA. Yet, both universities have same number of grant administrators involved, at least on paper. The numbers were misleading because many UAF grant administrators are buried at the institute level, and not at the university level where the numbers were taken for the spreadsheet that was used. There's a tension of generating options and shooting from the hip, and then trusting those evaluating the options to make sound judgments based on that process. He urged those with concerns about the process to volunteer for Phase III groups. Names are needed before December 9.

Wendy C. commented that better decisions would be based on cost analyses. Chris noted the teams do not make decisions. The teams generate options based on hypothetical scenarios and then identify pros and cons and affected groups associated with the various options. Orion commented that what he liked about the idea of cost benefit analyses is, in order to actually produce them, you first have to understand what change you are proposing and what the implications will be. There are definitely times when they aren't able to fully consider those things in the current process. It's really challenging to do a cost benefit analysis in a reasonable way; and if you want political cover for decisions already made, it's pretty easy to come up with a spreadsheet that justifies actions.

Donie B. served on the team looking at research administration. She recalled being told, after they were presented with their list of options, that a cost benefit analysis would be done. It's not clear to her that it was ever actually done, but it seems like it needs to be done at some point. Orion noted it's definitely a missing piece. When they served on Phase I teams during the summer, they were pretty much told to do their work in secret and not discuss it outside the groups. That meant they couldn't ask questions of knowledgeable people outside their groups. They sent in a resolution noting several aspects of the process that were poorly architected, and changes were made, e.g., now they can talk outside of their teams and have more open discussions. The theory is the options teams present their lists to the Summit Team who pick the leading options which go to the implementation teams. The implementation teams go over the options and decide what those options would really change. Finally, there is the implementation of the changes.

Provost Henrichs clarified that in Phase I, the Summit Team was informed of the options put forward by the options committee, but only the President made the decisions on what would actually happen from Phase I and what recommendations went forward to the Board of Regents who have the final say. The Phase II and III processes have yet to be laid out for everyone. In terms of the cost benefit analyses, the President intended to have the analyses done, but it proved to be a more challenging task than anyone imagined and they didn't do it. In terms of

the School of Management cost benefit analysis, the UAF SOM in conjunction with PAIR produced it and it proved very helpful to inform the President's decision.

Orion asked Dean Mark Herrmann to speak about the cost benefit analysis they produced at the School of Management (see link to document, below). Dean Herrmann provided background on the situation that resulted in the cost benefit analysis report from SOM. There was disagreement at the BOR level about one vs. two business schools, and the Regents requested a cost benefit analysis. He took the initiative to write an analysis and shared it with UAA to add their information. He was able to show there would be very little savings by moving administration for a single school down to UAA. UAF staffing is already very lean and their associate dean makes a faculty salary, doing the associate dean duties on the side along with teaching and research. He was able to document huge tuition and enrollment growths over the last six to seven years, all of which would be put at great risk and possibly be greatly reduced if they lost faculty and students over the move. They also wrote a detailed analysis of what a two business schools model would look like and what they would do. As the dean of SOM, he used his knowledge of tuition revenues and enrollments, illustrating some what-if scenarios to show the potential losses and the lack of gains if the schools were consolidated. To a large degree, they had to force the conversation and take the initiative, but it was a worthwhile effort and helpful for the decision-making process.

[http://www.boarddocs.com/ak/alaska/Board.nsf/files/AFE2H9023AAA/\\$file/Management%20One%20Dean-One%20School%20Memo_10%2031%2016_VP%20White%20to%20BOR.pdf](http://www.boarddocs.com/ak/alaska/Board.nsf/files/AFE2H9023AAA/$file/Management%20One%20Dean-One%20School%20Memo_10%2031%2016_VP%20White%20to%20BOR.pdf)

Jak M. commented about how cost benefit analyses are necessary to inform decisions about reducing costs and making big changes. We should support the Faculty Alliance position that we expect these analyses to be done.

Jamie C. commented about the timeline being potentially flexible enough to work in cost benefit analyses before decisions are made. Orion noted the ease of providing historical analyses of data such as enrollments or tuition revenues versus the difficulty of making projections for the future based upon assumptions.

Sandra W. commented that if we're going to be trying to double the number of graduates over the next ten years, a cost benefit analysis would be very useful. Chris F. reiterated the invitation to participate on the Phase III teams, and Orion invited ideas for a resolution for the February meeting.

Sine A. volunteered herself and Jak M. to write a draft resolution.

IX Public Comments

No comments were made from the public.

X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements
A. General Comments / Announcements

Franz M. commented on the student evaluations occurring right now. He encouraged faculty to engage with their students to encourage responses. He advised them to be proactive and monitor their response rates which can be seen online in the Blue system. If there are questions, the web page on the Provost's site is useful, or contact Franz and he will work with Alex to find answers. Chris F. commented that sharing the "why" of student evaluations with his students and informing them of how they're used is helpful in motivating students, too. Orion added that he tells his students about the changes made to his courses based on their comments.

B. Committee Chair Comments

(An active link is added if minutes are submitted.)

Standing Committees:

1. Administrative Committee - Chris Fallen ([Minutes for 10/28/2016](#) linked)
2. Curricular Affairs Committee - Eileen Harney ([Minutes for 10/31/2016](#) linked)
3. Faculty Affairs Committee - Andy Anger ([Minutes for 10/12/2016](#) linked)
4. Unit Criteria Committee - Mara Bacsujlaky

Permanent Committees:

5. Committee on the Status of Women - Ellen Lopez, Diana DiStefano ([Minutes for 10/13/2016](#) linked)
6. Core Review Committee - Andy Seitz ([Minutes for 10/05/2016](#) linked)
7. Curriculum Review Committee - Rainer Newberry
8. Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee - Franz Meyer (Minutes for [09/01/2016](#) and [10/11/2016](#) and [11/15/2016](#) linked)
9. Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee - Donie Bret-Harte, Sean Topkok ([Minutes for 10/21/2016](#) linked)
10. Information Technology Committee - Siri Tuttle ([Minutes for 10/26/2016](#) linked)
11. Research Advisory Committee - Jamie Clark, Gordon Williams ([Minutes for 10/21/2016](#) linked)
12. Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee - Sandra Wildfeuer, Jennifer Tilbury
13. Faculty Administrator Review Committee (No Group A reviews in 2016-17)

XI Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 PM.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new minor in Tribal Management, housed in the College of Rural and Community Development (Interior Alaska Campus).

Effective: Fall 2017

Rationale: The [program proposal #56-UNP](#) is on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Overview:

The proposed minor in Tribal Management will provide students with the opportunity to acquire skills to work within tribal and local governments and other organizations in rural Alaska. The required courses will give students a foundation for applying the knowledge gained in their majors to rural and tribal management contexts. The minor will be especially helpful for Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development rural based students completing their bachelor's degree as few minors are available by distance.

Relationship to Purposes of the University:

The Tribal Management minor supports the University's mission to emphasize the circumpolar North and its diverse peoples and to educate students for active citizenship and prepare them for lifelong learning and careers. It addresses the UAF core themes of Educate, Prepare, and Connect.

The Alaska Native Studies (ANS) B.A. and Rural Development (RD) B.A. are both offered to students by distance. Currently there are only a few minors available by distance, including the minors in ANS and RD, which can make it difficult for these students to fulfill the minor requirement for graduation. This additional minor will give rural students another minor option and is closely related to their interests and careers. The Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development requested the development of this minor and is in full support.

Proposed Catalog Layout:

Tribal Management

The minor in Tribal Management will provide students with the skills to work within tribal and local governments and other organizations in rural Alaska. The curriculum will give students a

foundation to apply the knowledge gained in their majors to rural and tribal management contexts.

Complete the following:

TM F101 - Introduction to Tribal Government in Alaska - 3 credits

TM F105 - Introduction to Managing Tribal Governments - 3 credits

TM F201 - Tribal Government in Alaska II - 3 credits

TM F205- Managing Tribal Governments II - 3 credits

Tribal Management electives - 3 credits

Minimum credits required: 15 credits

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve an updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regents Policy and UA Regulations (10.06).

Effective: Spring 2017

Rationale: The existing process was modified at Meeting #181 (March 5, 2012) to accommodate a five year review cycle. The revisions below are intended to ensure faculty input, and clarify the role of the Faculty Senate in program eliminations. The Program Review Template as well as the BOR Policy for 10.06 have also changed since the last Faculty Senate motion in 2012, and current versions are included.

Additions: ***bold italics***

Deletions: **~~bold strikethrough~~**

The program review process ~~will~~ **shall** be completed as follows:

1. An initial ~~brief~~ review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit ~~supplied -provided two-page brief~~ narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere in UA, and any special circumstances that explain features of the centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary (see attached program review template for more details). The information reviewed meets the Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; ~~attached current PDF posted with motion~~). A single Faculty Program Review Committee **shall be** comprised of one ~~tenured~~ faculty representative from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus ~~five CRCD representatives~~ **one representative from CRCD and one representative from CTC. The Faculty Program Review Committee shall be nominated by the Provost in consultation with the deans and directors, and, once formed, the list of committee members shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate for comment, and finalized by the Chancellor. The Faculty Program Review Committee will shall** review the materials and make one of the following recommendations:

- Continue program
- Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
- Continue program but improve other specific areas
- **Modify program through consolidation with another program or other significant re-organization**
- **Suspend admissions to program or**
- Discontinue program

The Faculty Program Review Committee shall allow up to two representatives from the program under review to attend the meeting and to answer questions. The Faculty Program Review Committee will shall provide a brief narrative justifying their

recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review. **A summary of the recommendation shall be shared with the program under review and the Faculty Senate President, who may request a copy of the full narrative. The Faculty Senate President, in consultation with members of the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee, then has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks.** **Friendly amendment made on the floor during the meeting: “The program under review also has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks.”**

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and ~~4~~ **four** administrative representatives from CRCD ~~will~~ **shall** review the recommendations of the **Faculty** Program Review Committee, may request additional information from ~~about~~ the program, and ~~will~~ **shall** state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee’s recommendation.

3. The Provost, in consultation with the Chancellor’s Cabinet, ~~will~~ **shall** review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee, **the Faculty Senate President**, and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:

- a) Program continuation is confirmed ~~until the next review cycle.~~
- b) Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by the next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.
- c) Other actions, such as a major program restructuring. An action plan shall be required by the end of the next regular academic semester after a request for restructuring or similar action is made.**
- d) Recommend to discontinue program. ~~Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, w~~ When appropriate, admissions may be suspended pending action.

4. Faculty Senate reviews the recommendations to discontinue or suspend programs and states their collective agreement or disagreement with the Chancellor’s Cabinet’s recommendation. If the Faculty Senate disagrees, it shall provide an alternate recommendation by the end of the semester in which the Chancellor’s Cabinet’s recommendation is made.

5. The Chancellor reviews all levels of recommendations and decides whether to recommend program discontinuation to the Board of Regents.

Link to [current Instructional Program Review Template](#)

Link to [BOR Policy and UA Regulation 10.06](#)

See [detailed discussion of recent changes](#) to this policy

Information re GER Alignment of English across the UA System:

Faculty Senate--

This message is from Sarah Stanley who directs University Writing, a position that works with an English Department committee to oversee the required GER writing courses. Current capacity in the English Department includes 21 TAs who teach the majority of GER writing course offerings, with adjunct faculty teaching online and a few face-to-face sections each semester. In addition, a handful of English Department faculty also teach a section or two of 111x, 211x, or 213x. UAF currently supports one Writing Studies faculty member (Stanley) who has been the supervisor of these graduate students for 6+ years, and Stanley currently is working at max capacity. Stanley directs a program which operates in a transparent and open manner--and all lesson plans, outcomes, and assessment reports can be found at write.alaska.edu. Evidence of undergraduate writing showing signs of every assessable criteria over the course of our programmatic writing sequence is attached to this email. The Vice Provost has used our assessment procedures as an exemplar for Northwest Accreditors.

Yet, two years ago, we found ourselves in a situation where we were mandated to align with UAA and UAS regarding our GER writing courses. To some on faculty senate, I believe the assumption was that course names and titles and outcomes should not cause much harm and is one way to appease mandated changes which may threaten distinct campus cultures.

In our 2-year alignment process, we quickly discovered just how different the institutions are, and these differences are clearest in regard to the responsibility of writing courses. UAA relies on term, tenure track, and adjunct faculty to teach the majority of their GER courses; and while they do have a small cohort of teaching assistants every year--it is 20% of what we have at UAF. UAS does not have a graduate program and so no graduate teachers.

The 212 course has long been offered at UAA as a GER and we were being told to create mirror images of another campus' course offerings. As a system wide effort we found agreement by creating horizontal and vertical alignment. UAA was enthusiastic about a "writing in the disciplines" model for these 200-level courses, a vision that maintains the 211, 212, and 213 offerings in number but changes their focus entirely. These are no longer "about" courses; they are "and" courses. Some in the alignment discussions wanted to discard the 214 Persuasive Writing course. However, Rich, Cindy, and Sarah all pointed out that while "on paper" fewer courses appear to be a good idea; it is not possible given our current resources--the 214 persuasive writing course seemed to fit the needs and resources of our campus quite well. We asked:

- How are we to ensure expert training in three distinct disciplines with our current program capacity?
- How will graduate students looking to study literature or hone their craft in creative writing know how to help undergraduates write and think in the genres of disciplines?
- Is this kind of apprentice level attention to writing the English Department's job?
- What about the recently passed communication outcomes in UAF faculty senate?

UAF argued successfully to maintain a 214 writing course with the intent to help this course grow and provide value to all UAF degrees. In fact, Stanley reached out to all "w" intensive faculty last year and shared with anyone who followed up with her, the vision behind this course. Stanley came to faculty senate to speak about the Communication Outcomes and shared how the 200-level writing courses were shifting their focus to support Outcome #3--Translate disciplinary content to audience outside the discipline, when appropriate. The Composition Committee last year worked hard to highlight the goals of UAF's writing program--and the excellent work that teachers behind the program are doing. Most of what we've been able to accomplish through the years is a result of allowing graduate students some flexibility to pitch theme-based writing

courses in areas of their own expertise, in areas where they can lead their students through an in-depth discussion about topics across disciplinary interest.

SUMMARY: Our current writing curricula and support of that curricula is optimal for our current resources. Neither Stanley **nor anyone she has met at UAF** has the expertise (a dissertation and scholarly interest) in the field of professional and technical writing. Without such a person, who would create a supportive structure for mentoring and developing the curricula for TAs to teach 212X with any kind of assurance on quality of instruction and assessable outcomes?

Given this situation, and the difference in our writing programs, the addition of 212 as an option for the 200-level course raises capacity concerns at UAF.

Stanley's Position

Given UAF's capacity issues, as programmatic leader, I see strategic growth in making more visible current practice--a 214 course focused on argument across contexts--a way of thinking I see undergraduates struggling with. We need to help them with refining and asserting their perspective in academic and public conversations surrounding "persuasive situations," from generalized to specific audiences. Moreover, the 214 course is aligned with recently passed baccalaureate communication outcomes.

In 2017-2018, we will be offering TA led 214 courses. These courses will continue to be excellent as they will reflect custom designed courses with a scaffolded curriculum--the courses are selected by the Composition Committee and each TA receives one-on-one coaching from an experienced faculty member. The 214 course number reflects what we were doing already in 211 and 213 courses; however, now because of alignment the previous 211 and 213 courses will not be offered by TAs. The scope and focus of these courses has now changed to reflect a writing in the disciplines model.

There will be online offerings of 211, 212, and 213. I imagine that other UAF campuses will begin to offer 212. The online offering will need to be approved by the Composition Committee and be aligned with the new course outcomes. Current courses will have to undergo a redesign. We will need to hire a tenure-track professional and technical faculty member to assist in the training and development of a 212 course because this course clearly will be in high demand at UAF for certain degree programs.

I believe that 214 is the strongest option given the resources and commitment of the people behind it. I'm excited to teach it myself and to inspire a legion of teachers to teach it as well. Join us in creating a culture of writing at UAF--join our committee, join in on the assessment, teach with us. All perspectives are welcome.

Thank you,

Sarah

Sarah Stanley, Ph.D
Director of University Writing
Assistant Professor of English
University of Alaska Fairbanks
812 Gruening sstanley2@alaska.edu

[Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary](#)

UAFT Governance Report from Kate Quick:

At their November 11, 2016 meeting, UAFT executive board passed a resolution calling for a halt to Strategic Pathways until Statewide's spending is reduced and a cost-benefit analysis of Strategic Pathways is conducted by an unbiased third party. The full resolution will be available soon on UAFT's website.

UAFT plans to send a small delegation to Juneau in February to lobby for sustainable university funding. Please send or discuss ideas/suggestions related to this to your UAFT campus representative.

Faculty senate response to strategic pathways

At our November meeting, Faculty Alliance unanimously passed [a resolution suggesting changes to Strategic Pathways](#).

Abel Bult-Ito suggested "[A New Vision for the University of Alaska](#)"; he'll be presenting at our February meeting.

Faculty Alliance is collecting suggested names of faculty to serve on the options teams for strategic pathways phase 3, which will begin in the spring, and tentatively cover these academic areas:

- Social Sciences
- Arts & Humanities
- Physical Sciences
- Mine Training

And these administrative areas:

- Finance
- Risk Management
- Land Management
- Facilities

As a summary, the notional plan for phase 1 was that option teams would brainstorm options, the summit team would pick leading options to be endorsed by the BOR, and implementation teams would prepare detailed plan for the endorsed changes, to be endorsed by the BOR and the implemented over several years by everybody.

An example cost-benefit analysis was prepared by Dean Hermann, and is available at the strategic pathways site.*

*Link provided by Dean Mark Herrmann, following Dec. 5 FS meeting:

[http://www.boarddocs.com/ak/alaska/Board.nsf/files/AFE2H9023AAA/\\$file/Management%20One%20Dean-One%20School%20Memo_10%2031%2016_VP%20White%20to%20BOR.pdf](http://www.boarddocs.com/ak/alaska/Board.nsf/files/AFE2H9023AAA/$file/Management%20One%20Dean-One%20School%20Memo_10%2031%2016_VP%20White%20to%20BOR.pdf)