

DRAFT MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #179
Monday, December 5, 2011
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
501 Akasofu Building (IARC)

I Call to Order – Catherine Cahill

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Abramowicz, Ken (audio)
Baek, Junggho
Baker, Carrie
Barboza, Perry
Bret-Harte, Donie
Brown, Stephen – **Leif Albertson**
Cahill, Cathy
Davis, Mike (audio)
Fallen, Chris
George-Bettisworth, Retchenda (audio)
Golux, Stephan
Gustafson, Karen
Healy, Joanne
Henry, David
Himelbloom, Brian (audio)
Horstmann, Lara – **Alex Oliveira**
Jensen, Karen
Johnston, Duff
Jones, Debra (audio)
Lardon, Cecile (audio)
Lawlor, Orion
Mathis, Jeremy (audio)
Meyer, Franz – **Gerhard Kramm**
Moses, Debra
Nadin, Elisabeth
Newberry, Rainer
Ng, Chung-Sang – **Brian Rasley**
Radenbaugh, Todd (audio)
Renes, Sue
Reynolds, Jennifer
Short, Margaret
Valentine, David

Members Present (cont'd):

Weber, Jane
Winfree, Cathy

Members Absent:
Alexeev, Vladimir
Arendt, Anthony
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar
Joly, Julie
McEachern, Diane
Metzger, Andrew
Zhang, Xiong

Others Present:

Eric Madsen

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Susan Henrichs
Dana Thomas
Mike Earnest (audio)
Jordan Titus

Guest Speaker:

Barbara Taylor (URSA)

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #178

The minutes 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 – Cathy Cahill

Cathy described the recent Strategic Direction listening sessions she attended for Interior Aleutians Campus and UAF CTC. Each session has varied in the amount of stakeholder input vs. UAF input. Internal listening sessions, however, are scheduled for the spring semester. There is also an online survey to gather feedback. More information and the online survey are available at: <http://www.alaska.edu/shapingalaskasfuture/>

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer has also been attending the Strategic Direction listening sessions. The session for the Northwest Campus is coming up soon. Internal sessions will begin in January, and run through the spring semester. Faculty, staff and students will have separate sessions. All the sessions are being recorded and newsletters are posted on the web site. The seven questions being asked are very general, about what we are doing well and how we can improve.

Committees within each MAU will look at the results next spring, sorting them into themes. The Chancellor will be setting up committees for UAF and the Senate will have input on membership to those. Two faculty members for each committee are planned. Dana T. commented that the President wants to identify a handful of targets to work toward over the next five years. (Note added to the minutes: These statements about committees are not clear because the speakers did not distinguish between committees for UA Strategic Directions and committees for UAF's Strategic Planning.)

IV A. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

The Chancellor is traveling, and at his request Susan talked about the UAF strategic plan. The *UAF 2010* strategic plan had been written about six years ago when Steve Jones was chancellor. *Vision 2017* updated the plan since then, but it was more of a visioning exercise. Elements of it will be part of a newer plan that more fits with the current context of our accreditation process. We need a mission statement, core themes, and objectives and indicators (which we have from the recent accreditation process) and we need a strategic plan that aligns with those elements.

A central steering committee will put the pieces together and organize the effort. There will be six subcommittees: five will be oriented around the core themes, and the sixth committee will be for resources and capacity. The chancellor will make appointments for these committees, and the Senate leadership will be consulted about faculty representation on those.

The fact that Statewide is also currently developing their plan presents a difficulty because the plan for UAF should be responsive to that plan; however, UAF must also respond to the requests of the

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. Therefore, the Chancellor will ask the forbearance of the NWCCU in finalizing UAF's plan after that of statewide. In the meantime, a working document will be communicated to the Commission.

The seven year accreditation process is comprised of four reports total; so at each stage other parts of earlier documents can be updated, including the year one plan.

B. Vice Provost's Remarks – Dana Thomas

Dana spoke about the Accreditation Steering Committee which has been supportive of keeping the five core themes. One or two small revisions have been suggested to the core themes (Educate, Discover, Prepare, Connect, and Engage). The final accreditation report is not out yet, but a draft was received to which they responded with two pages addressing errors of fact. One of the concerns mentioned by the accreditation team was the need to clarify the difference between the two themes of Connect and Engage.

Wording of the Discover core theme has been recently debated, and there is a proposal to replace it with the keyword "Research" instead:

CURRENT THEME = *Discover: Through research, scholarship and creative activity including an emphasis on the North and its peoples.*

PROPOSED REPLACEMENT THEME = *Research: Create and disseminate new knowledge, insight, technology, artistic and scholarly works, with an emphasis on the north and its peoples.*

That proposal is now posted online at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#179>

He encouraged the senate to check out the Accreditation home page, and talk to the steering committee members or to him with their comments and feedback.

<http://www.uaf.edu/accreditation/>

Dana read the current UAF Mission Statement, and then shared a popular revised statement:

Current Mission Statement:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks, the nation's northernmost Land, Sea and Space Grant university and international research center, advances and disseminates knowledge through teaching, research and public service with an emphasis on Alaska, the circumpolar North and their diverse peoples. UAF--America's arctic university--promotes academic excellence, student success and lifelong learning.

One proposed revision of the Mission Statement:

UAF emphasizes the circumpolar North and its diverse peoples in striving for excellence in teaching, research, community engagement, and preparing students for careers and leading roles in improving their villages, towns and cities.

The major difference he noted is that the current statement focuses on who we are, while the revised statement is about what we do and why we're doing it. Comments and feedback are welcomed.

V New Business

- A. Motion to approve a Certificate in Baking and Pastry Arts, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 179/1)

Rainer N. explained why the certificate is not essentially a new program. It used to be an option in the existing Culinary Arts certificate, but students would like to be able to earn it separately as a degree, and perhaps return to earn another certificate in other areas. The certificates articulate with the A.A.S. degree, also.

The certificate in Baking and Pastry Arts was voted upon and approved unanimously.

- B. Motion to amend the title of the General Education Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes Motion of May 2, 2011, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 179/2)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor and explained the need to correct the title of the motion which had been formally passed last spring. The motion to amend the title was voted upon and unanimously passed.

- C. Motion to revise the Curricular Affairs Committee Membership in the Faculty Senate Bylaws, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 179/3)

Rainer explained the need for updating the membership bylaws for Curricular Affairs Committee; particularly on behalf of future committees and helping to further their business. The motion to revise the bylaws pertaining to CAC membership was passed unanimously.

VI Discussion Items

- A. Program Review Outcomes – Susan Henrichs

Susan summarized the overall results of program review, explaining that she wasn't going to read off the list of programs recommended for deletion since units are still responding to the recommendations.

There were over 200 programs reviewed. There were about 45 programs with low enrollment and degree production (most of those had 10 or fewer graduates over the last five years, and correspondingly low enrollment over the duration of the program). Fifteen programs were recommended for discontinuance at the Chancellor's Cabinet level; seven recommended for merger; 14 for probationary status and subsequent review in about three years; and seven were recommended for no action because they are unique to Alaska. The process will continue for the affected programs through the spring semester, and programs not affected by these results will be notified before the holiday break.

Jordan T. asked if the Provost knew how many faculty will be affected by the program review actions. Susan said no tenured or tenure-line faculty will be impacted. Reassignments may be made. There may be some adjunct or term faculty affected at CRCO, but that is still being discussed.

Dana T. commented about working to revise the program review process. A sample program review will be put online. Elements of the current discussion include points for which they were criticized during accreditation: program engagement with the library, and program contributions as they relate to the individual core themes. If anyone has comments or suggestions, he'd like to hear them. Coming up next fall is the start of the new cycle of program review which will involve one-fifth of UAF programs.

Jennifer R. commented that the process for program review will come back before the Senate in the spring semester.

Jane W. asked who determines which programs will be reviewed. Dana responded that it's under discussion with the Deans. Some units want all programs reviewed in one cycle, while others want to stagger reviews over the five years. Every unit wants something that fits specific programs; for example, a review that is timed with their specialized accreditation cycle. The conversation is ongoing in Dean's Council at this time.

B. Moldy Courses – Susan Henrichs

Assessment of the moldy course review has been completed. About 940 courses were included on the moldy course list. Of those, 346 have been identified by deans and departments as being OK to drop completely; and 315 will be retained in Banner but not published in the catalog. There were 280 courses identified as not having been taught in three years, but departments wish to keep them in the catalog (about half from CRCO and half from the Fairbanks campus). Susan will be following up with departments or programs that haven't provided a good rationale for keeping those courses. The Faculty Senate Office will receive a list to double-check and deletion paperwork will go to the Senate curriculum committees. Faculty and departments are encouraged to have a continuous review process.

C. Master's Degree Awards Ceremony – All

Cathy reported the results of the survey sent to all Faculty Senate members about adding a separate hooding ceremony for master's degree recipients. There was a good response to the survey with an overwhelming consensus not to split commencement, but to keep the ceremonies together and do a hooding off the stage. Only four survey respondents preferred having a separate master's hooding ceremony. Some mentioned they wouldn't mind splitting the ceremony into undergraduate and graduate degrees and then have two ceremonies which were held the same day.

Jennifer asked Cathy about the results to the question regarding faculty attendance at one or two ceremonies. Cathy reported that responses varied greatly to that question, but faculty generally responded that if they didn't have a student graduating at the master's ceremony, they didn't want to go to an additional ceremony and would attend only the main ceremony. The reverse of that was also stated – that if they had a master's student graduating they would attend the special hooding ceremony and not the main commencement. There were only a few responses indicating faculty would attend both ceremonies. Jennifer noted that regardless of how the graduate students feel about the matter, it's a bust if faculty won't attend. Cathy summarized that the attendance factor came down to whether or not a faculty member had a master's student graduating or not.

D. "I" – Incomplete Grading Policy – Rainer Newberry

Rainer reported on the ongoing discussions about how to increase the completion rate of incomplete grades. Proposed ideas have included the need for educating faculty about how shortening allowed completion time frames (from a full year to three or six months instead) increases the chances for students to complete the work, thereby reducing the number of incompletes that turn into F. He asked faculty senators to urge their faculty and departments to both discourage unnecessary use of the incomplete grade except under dire circumstances, and when incompletes are used to work out the shortest acceptable time frame with the student for completing the "I".

BREAK

VII Public Comments/Questions

Dana T. commented about the fact that each degree program is required to include in their catalog statement the intended learning outcomes for that particular program. Making sure this is done may require a degree revision to be done that states what students are learning in a program. The Provost added that a formal request will go out to the deans and department chairs about this requirement which had been noted by the accreditors in their recent report.

Lael Oldmixon announced that the United Way Campaign is wrapping up and it's not too late to make a pledge.

VIII Guest Speaker

- A. Barbara Taylor, Director - URSA
Topic: Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Activity

A handout for Barbara Taylor's presentation is posted online at the Faculty Senate meetings web page: <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#179>

Dr. Barbara Taylor was introduced, and she described the committee process which created the Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Activities office, its mission, and the need for it at UAF. She emphasized that undergraduate research has been happening here for a long time already, but they want to promote it more and see it increase. Students are asking for more undergraduate research opportunities and there is funding available for it.

Dr. Taylor described the three broad recommendations that were made by the Undergraduate Research Committee and how these are being implemented and developed. She also described the current effort to make revisions to the Faculty Annual Activities Report so that faculty efforts in student mentoring become more readily recognized. (That effort is currently being discussed in the Faculty Affairs Committee.) Proposed curriculum was also described which will augment existing courses that support undergraduate research efforts.

Donie B.-H. commented about how useful it is to make such resources available to undergraduate students. Donie asked for better advertising of the resource competitions, notably adding the information to the web site in addition to the email notifications.

Dave V. commented that the Center for Global Change also has funding for both graduate and undergraduate students, and that the two offices could leverage off each other to help get the word out. Dave also expressed a concern about how the tuition revenue is credited (distributed to which department) for URSA courses. Barbara responded that ideally every department will have these courses in their own departments one day and the need for URSA-designated courses will cease. But, if departments already have them, her office directs students in those areas to those courses. The URSA courses are available to students whose departments don't yet have x88 types of research courses. So, in that case, tuition revenue does go to URSA and is used to help develop the program.

Stephan G. asked about course numbers and the difference between x88 and x98 courses. Courses numbered as x98 are individual study only; while those numbered x88 are not individual study (the students meet together as a group several times over a semester) and so these can be entered in the printed catalog. Stephan also asked about creative activity occurring in these courses – is it meshed with research? Barbara responded that right now creative activity and research are together. The courses culminate in participating in Research Day, which includes creative activities. But, she would like to see that expand and become something that includes performances. She invited input and suggestions.

Jennifer R. asked how it's been working for students to be able to enroll in an x88 courses without a mentor lined up. Barbara said it's been working out well. If they don't have a mentor already, her office will help them find one. She's helped some fine arts students find mentors already for next semester.

Dana T. talked about sources of grant funding. URSA functions as a clearinghouse for students to find pots of money available in their areas of interest. Connecting students to mentors is also a major piece of what URSA does. Barbara commented on the many interdisciplinary research possibilities that are available to students and how her office can assist them.

IX Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Pips Veazey

A report by Staff Council was made available online.

http://www.uaf.edu/files/uafgov/11-12_Meeting-179_Staff-Council-Report.pdf

B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag, Robert Kinnard

A report from ASUAF was not available.

C. UNAC – Jordan Titus

Jordan announced that Melanie Arthur (who will be substituting next semester for Vice President Debu Misra while he's away on sabbatical) will be taking over in spring to provide reports at Faculty Senate meetings.

D. UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane provided news from the Joint Health Care Committee. They met last week with Blue Cross, and with an advocacy program that helps people navigate the health care system and resolve billing issues and claims. This service could possibly be added to the health care plan next year.

X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. Announcements

No announcements were made.

B. Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 179/4)

Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Chair

Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair

Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair
(Attachment 179/5)

Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

Faculty Appeals & Oversight

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowka, Chair
(Attachment 179/6)

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair
(Attachment 179/7)

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
(Attachment 179/8)

Research Advisory Committee – Peter Webley, Orion Lawlor, Co-chairs
(Attachment 179/9)

Orion mentioned a GAAC item about graduate students not necessarily being required to attach a degree completion plan to their annual advisory committee research progress report. Feedback and comments were invited.

Orion also commented on faculty annual activities reports and the issue of mining data out of them for other purposes. He's able to take and convert ".doc" files to HTML and parse them into a machine-readable format, and talked about sensible and reasonable data collection by such a means that might allow activities reports to serve dual purposes while protecting personal information.

Dana T. noted his efforts with Eric Madsen and the Faculty Affairs Committee currently, to discuss how to get info out the AARs for reporting purposes. They want to avoid double-duty for faculty by collecting information once from them. It's an ongoing conversation.

C. Other Comments

Cathy and Jennifer announced the guest speaker, Dr. Claudia Lampman, for the February Senate meeting. Dr. Lampman will also provide a separate seminar following the Senate meeting on the topic of student aggression and bullying. The Chancellor's reception for Senate members will be held that same evening. Those attending from out of town are encouraged to stay for the seminar and reception.

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at about 2:55 PM.

ATTACHMENT 179/1
UAF Faculty Senate #179, December 5, 2011
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Certificate in Baking and Pastry Arts.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012
 Upon Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: See the full program proposal #53-UNP from the Fall 2011 review cycle on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

A minimum of 30 credits required comprised of 6-9 credits of general certificate requirements, 15 credits of required CAH courses, and 6-9 CAH elective credits

Brief Statement of Proposed Program:

This certificate program is designed to allow the beginning student to obtain the knowledge and skills to meet the standards of the American Culinary Federation in Baking and Pastry and to successfully gain employment in the culinary and hospitality industry. The certificate transitions easily and directly into the AAS in Culinary Arts. For the past seventeen years, the Culinary Arts and Hospitality program has offered a single certificate in Culinary Arts with three concentrations: culinary arts, baking and pastry, and cooking. In the spring of 2009, the Faculty Senate approved a major change to the program eliminating the three concentrations. Thus, the existing certificate is in Culinary Arts. We propose this separate certificate to replace the Baking and Pastry concentration in the Culinary Arts Certificate. We will no longer offer a Cooking concentration under the Culinary Arts Certificate nor a separate Certificate in Cooking.

Program Goals:

For the past several years the Culinary Arts and Hospitality Department has offered a single Certificate in Culinary Arts with three concentrations: culinary arts, baking and pastry, and cooking. Last year we submitted paperwork to eliminate the cooking concentration and create two distinct certificates: culinary arts, and baking and pastry. The University accepted the culinary arts certificate as modifications to the existing certificate and asked that we forward a new Certificate in Baking and Pastry Arts.

Our goal in developing this certificate is to create a clear pathway for entry level culinarians to develop their skills in baking and pastry with the potential to gain employment. For those students wishing more advanced training, the certificate articulates with the AAS in culinary arts. We anticipate that streamlining this certificate and focusing it specifically in baking and pastry will increase the number of students who can successfully complete the certificate in a reasonable time (generally two semesters). Further, other changes to courses, which were approved last year, have eliminated any pass/fail courses from the degree and aligned the remaining new or revised courses with a curriculum which is based on

industry standards and competencies set forth by the American Culinary Federation Education Foundation Accrediting Commission (ACFEFAC). We plan to apply for programmatic accreditation with the ACFEFAC within the next two years.

Proposed Catalog Layout:

Culinary Arts & Hospitality

UAF Community and Technical College
College of Rural and Community Development
907-455-2800
www.ctc.uaf.edu

Certificate

Minimum Requirements for Certificate: 30 credits

The culinary arts program prepares students for a career in this expanding field. Graduates can seek employment in food production or in management of restaurants, bakeries, hotels, hospitals, camps or any other facility that requires food service as part of its operation. This department offers both an associate degree and a certificate.

Certificate Program: Baking and Pastry Arts

1. Complete the [general university requirements](#).

COMMUNICATIONS (2-3)

2. Complete the certificate requirements.

COMPUTATION (2-3) or

CAH 256 Restaurant & Hospitality Cost Management (2 credits)

HUMAN RELATIONS (2-3) or

CAH 255 Human Resource & Supervision in Hospitality (3 credits)

3. Complete the following courses:

CAH F101 – Introduction to the Culinary Field.....	1 cr
CAH F140 – Culinary I – Principles and Techniques.....	4 cr
CAH F146 – Introduction to Baking & Pastry	4 cr
CAH F150 – Food Service Sanitation	2 cr
CAH F248 – Intermediate Baking & Pastry.....	4 cr

Choose 6-9 credits from the following:

CAH F117 – Art in Cake Icing.....	2 cr
CAH F154 – Food and Beverage Service.....	2 cr
CAH F160 – Culinary Nutrition	2 cr

CAH F161 – Pastry Tube Art..... 1.5 cr
 CAH F171 – Gourmet Baking..... 2 cr
 CAH F230 – Menu Planning.....1 cr

Minimum credits required..... 30 cr

RESOURCE COMMITMENT TO THE
 PROPOSED DEGREE PROGRAM
 Rev. 11/30/2011

Resources	Existing	New		Total
	College/School	College/School	Others (Specify)	
Regular Faculty (FTE's & dollars)	\$85,800 1.0 FTE	\$0		\$85,800 1.0 FTE
Adjunct Faculty (FTE's & dollars)	\$40,000	\$0		\$40,000
Teaching Assistants (Headcount)	\$17,250 (0.5 FTE)	\$0		\$17,250 (0.5 FTE)
Instructional Facilities (in dollars and/or sq. footage)	2,149 sq. ft.	\$0		2,149 sq. ft.
Office Space (Sq. footage)	418 sq. ft.	\$0		418 sq. ft.
Lab Space (Sq. Footage)	3,647 sq. ft.	\$0		3,647 sq. ft.
Computer & Networking (in dollars)	\$12,320	\$0		\$12,320
Research/ Instructional/ office Equipment (in dollars)	\$0	\$0		\$0
Support Staff (FTE's & dollars)	\$34,100 (0.5 FTE)	\$0		\$34,100 (0.5 FTE)
Supplies (in dollars)	\$51,250	\$0		\$51,250
Travel (in dollars)	\$2,500	\$0		\$2,500



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

1a. Major Academic Unit (choose one) UAF	1b. School or College CTC	1c. Department CAH
---	------------------------------	-----------------------

2. Complete Program Title Culinary Arts & Hospitality

3. Type of Program

Undergraduate Certificate
 AA/AAS
 Baccalaureate
 Post-Baccalaureate Certificate
 Master's
 Graduate Certificate
 Doctorate

4. Type of Action <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add <input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> Delete	5. Implementation date (semester, year) Fall, 2012
--	---

6. Projected Revenue and Expenditure Summary. Not Required if the requested action is deletion. (Provide information for the 5th year after program or program change approval if a baccalaureate or doctoral degree program; for the 3rd year after program approval if a master's or associate degree program; and for the 2nd year after program approval if a graduate or undergraduate certificate. If information is provided for another year, specify (1st) and explain in the program summary attached). Note that Revenues and Expenditures are not always entirely new; some may be current (see 7d.)

Projected Annual Revenues in FY		Projected Annual Expenditures in FY 14	
Unrestricted		Salaries & benefits (faculty and staff)	\$120,300
General Fund	\$	Other (commodities, services, etc.)	\$55,000
Student Tuition & Fees	\$94,000	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$175,300
Indirect Cost Recovery	\$	One-time Expenditures to Initiate Program (if >\$250,000)	
TVEP or Other (specify):	\$	(These are costs in addition to the annual costs, above.)	
Restricted		Year 1	\$
Federal Receipts	\$	Year 2	\$
TVEP or Other (specify):	\$	Year 3	\$
TOTAL REVENUES	\$94,000	Year 4	\$

Page # of attached summary where the budget is discussed, including initial phase-in:

7. Budget Status. Items a., b., and c. indicate the source(s) of the General Fund revenue specified in item 6. If any grants or contracts will supply revenue needed by the program, indicate amount anticipated and expiration date, if applicable.

Revenue source	Continuing	One-time
a. In current legislative budget request	\$	\$
b. Additional appropriation required	\$	\$
c. Funded through new internal MAU redistribution	\$	\$
d. Funds already committed to the program by the MAU ¹	\$94,000	\$
e. Funded all or in part by external funds, expiration date	\$	\$
f. Other funding source Specify Type:	\$	\$

8. Facilities: New or substantially (>\$25,000 cost) renovated facilities will be required. Yes No

If yes, discuss the extent, probable cost, and anticipated funding source(s), in addition to those listed in sections 6 and 7 above.

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

Year 1: 5-10	Year 2: 7-12	Year 3: 7-12	Year 4: 7-12
--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

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

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

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

11. Number* of TAs or faculty to be reassigned:	
Graduate TA	
Adjunct	
Term	
Tenure track	

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

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

Program Affected	Anticipated Effect	Program Affected	Anticipated Effect
None			

Page number of attached summary where effects on other programs are discussed: _____

13. Specialized accreditation or other external program certification needed or anticipated. List all that apply or 'none': None	14. Aligns with University or campus mission, goals, core themes, and objectives (list):

Page in attached summary where alignment is discussed: _____

15. State needs met by this program (list): Page in the attached summary where the state needs to be met are discussed:	16. Program is initially planned to be: (check all that apply) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Available to students attending classes at UAF campus(es). <input type="checkbox"/> Available to students via e-learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Partially available students via e-learning. Page # in attached summary where e-learning is discussed: _____
--	--

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

_____ / _____	_____ / _____
Provost	Chancellor
Date	Date

<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Approval	_____ / _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Disapproval	_____ / _____
	UA Vice President for Academic Affairs on behalf of _____ Date
	the Statewide Academic Council

<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Approval	_____ / _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Disapproval	_____ / _____
	Chair, Academic and Student Affairs Committee _____ Date

<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Approval	_____ / _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Disapproval	_____ / _____
	UA President _____ Date

<input type="checkbox"/> Approved	_____ / _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved	_____ / _____
	Chair, Board of Regents _____ Date

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

Attachments: Summary of Degree or Certificate Program Proposal Other (optional)

ATTACHMENT 179/2
UAF Faculty Senate #179, December 5, 2011
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the title of the general education objectives and student learning outcomes adopted by the UAF Faculty Senate at Meeting #175 on May 2, 2011 to clarify the undergraduate degrees to which the objectives and learning outcomes apply.

EFFECTIVE: Spring 2012

RATIONALE: In May 2011, the General Education Revitalization Committee proposed a new set of objectives and student learning outcomes intended to be used for all of UAF's baccalaureate degrees and two of UAF's associate degrees. These were adopted by the UAF Faculty Senate at meeting #175, held May 2, 2011, for the purposes of developing the next general education strategy and the strategies to be used in assessing it. Through unintentional oversight, only BA and BS degrees were listed, omitting the six other baccalaureate degrees offered at UAF. The proposed amendment brings the wording in line with the intended scope of the general education objectives and student learning outcomes.

See the full motion at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#175>

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

General education objectives and learning outcomes for the undergraduate students seeking **[[BA, BS,]] BACCALAUREATE**, AA, and AS degrees at the University of Alaska Fairbanks.

ATTACHMENT 179/3
UAF Faculty Senate #179, December 5, 2011
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Section 3 (Art. V: Committees) at subsection E.1, addressing ex officio membership of the Curricular Affairs Committee

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The Curricular Affairs Committee recognizes that it may be productive and helpful in furthering the committee's business to add non-voting ex officio members serving short terms on an as-needed basis.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Section 3 (ART V: Committees), subsection E.1:

The Curricular Affairs Committee will deal with curricular and academic policy changes on all levels except the graduate level.

IN ADDITION TO THE NON-VOTING EX OFFICIO MEMBER(S) APPOINTED BY THE PROVOST, THE COMMITTEE MAY ADD NON-VOTING EX OFFICIO MEMBERS FOR ONE-YEAR TERMS AS DEEMED NECESSARY.

ATTACHMENT 179/4

UAF Faculty Senate #179, December 5, 2011

Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

Minutes: Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting

Nov. 9, 2011 3:30-4:30 pm Kayak

Voting Members present:

Rainer Newberry (chair); Anthony Arendt; Junggho Baek; Brian Himelbloom (audio); Diane McEachern (audio); Todd Radenbaugh (audio); Debbie Moses; Retchenda George-Bettisworth;

Voting Members absent: Carrie Baker

Ex officio members present:

Libby Eddy for Mike Earnest (audio); Linda Hapsmith (audio); Carol Gering.

Ex officio members absent:

Doug Goering; Dana Thomas

- **OLD Business**

- **Approval of October meetings minutes**

- October 12 and 26 minutes were approved as submitted.

- **Recent GERC issues report**

- Dave V. noted that Carrie (who couldn't make it today) had the meeting notes. Report postponed.

- **Stacked courses report**

- Anthony reported that they just obtained all the mailing lists from Colleen Abrams. He'll contact Dana Thomas about using SurveyMonkey. It was agreed that the deadline for surveys should occur at the end of the semester.

- **'I' issues (see new business)**

- Rainer gave a quick recap of the latest discussion ideas for this topic. Serious consideration is being given to reducing the completion time to a semester, with further extensions agreed to in writing beyond that time frame. More discussion occurred later as BOR policies were reviewed. The matter is also being discussed on the faculty senate discussion group.

- **Proposed motion:**

- The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered** wholly or in part by **ASYNCHRONOUS** distance delivery, and all existing courses adapted or converted to **ASYNCHRONOUS** distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the Faculty Senate -- continue sitting on this puppy??? In lieu of...

Discussion of this issue was postponed.

- **New business: Review of BOR policies attached and sent out Monday, Nov. 7)**

- Items for discussion:**

- UAF Faculty Senate policy states that "One academic credit hour of non-laboratory instruction at UAF will consist of a minimum of 800 minutes of instruction" (FS meeting #3, March 25, 1988). It is understood that an average student will be expected to spend 1600 minutes of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.

Given the above information the formula used for computing credit/contact hours is 800 minutes (13.3 hrs) per credit. This equates to approximately 1 hour of lecture per week for a normal 14 week semester. The number of minutes required for one credit of laboratory (1600 or 2400) **depends on the amount of instruction given during the lab**. For typical science and engineering labs where students work with teaching assistant guidance performing preset exercises, 2400 minutes (3 hours/week/credit for a 14 week semester) is used. For labs in which a faculty member interacts with students and provides feedback throughout the laboratory period (clinical labs, art studio, automotive technical labs) 1600 minutes (2 hours/week/credit for a 14 week semester) is used. A course submission with a lab component should include a justification for the number of minutes of lab per credit employed.

Note difference between this and the BOR policy, which is simply 3 hours of lab/wk = 1 credit

1. Lab credit hour distribution --we're not in compliance! R10.04.090 F.2

BOR policy defines a credit hour as one class-hour of lecture plus two hours of study or three class-hours of laboratory. UAF policy makes a distinction between art and studio labs (two class-hours per week), and science and engineering labs (three class-hours per week). In practice, it's nearly impossible to force a standard. One semester a lab may be taught by an instructor, but the next semester it's taught by a TA. Pitching our definition to statewide would probably not go over very well.

Carol G. noted that for purposes of financial aid, the federal government defines a contact hour as one hour of lecture and two hours of study, but labs are counted hour to hour.

Dave V. asked what other institutions do with art labs. Some discussion followed regarding labs and student effort vs. seat time. The regulation language uses "e.g." (*for example*) in the description of one credit hour equaling three class-hours of lab rather than "i.e." (*that is*).

Carol G. suggested adding lab "homework." Rainer noted that would require clarification in the course syllabus. Whether the difference in 2 – 3 hours was worth pursuing was discussed. Art labs might be more intensive in terms of instructor interaction with students, while some science labs may be more about student interaction with an instructor "hovering" in the background.

Everyone agreed this topic was a potential land mine in terms of the BOR review assignment.

2. Incomplete policies

The committee discussed changing the length of approved time to complete the coursework from one year to one semester. Extensions of one-semester increments would have to be approved in writing. This language would be reflected on the Incomplete form. It was suggested that it require more signatures (such as the dean's) to extend the original incomplete agreement. Reasons for extensions must be serious, such as military deployment or medical situations.

Rainer asked for feedback on shortening the timeframe from the rural representatives. [Todd Radenbaugh has since reported to the CAC google discussion group that faculty feedback from Dillingham indicates support for a shorter time frame and for the I turning to an F grade.]

Libby E. mentioned an email by Mike Earnest proposing some language changes to the form and the timeline. [That email has been forwarded to the CAC google discussion group.]

Everyone was encouraged to talk among their departments. Rainer will take the topic back to Administrative Committee.

3. **Transfer policies -- not in compliance?**

Agenda item number 5 (general education) was also discussed with this item.

R10.04.060 says “maximum recognition of courses satisfactorily completed will be granted to transfer students toward satisfying requirements...” However, credit is not necessarily being transferred easily to UAF from the other MAUs. What does maximum recognition mean?

Our core and the general education requirements that are still being developed go beyond the UA regulations. Do we back-peddle or maintain what we see as valuable to our students which is 34 credits plus learning objectives and outcomes. Should we recommend more be added to the UA regulations? How do we harmonize the requirements across the MAUs? More discussion will take place about this at the next meeting.

Suggestion made to change language at R10.04.040 B: Credit Distribution for the Common Core of the General Education Requirements... Remove the phrase “the Common Core of” from the first sentence. Doing so would allow each MAU more flexibility to define their general education requirements.

Discussion on this topic will continue at the next meeting.

4. **A+???**

Rainer recommended for fairness’ sake assigning a value of 4.3 to the A+ grade. Dave V. reminded everyone that this same proposal had gone over like a lead balloon at the Administrative Committee last year. Rainer thought it was worth pursuing again at this time, noting that a student (ASUAF President Mari Freitag) had raised the topic of plus/minus grades at the Faculty Senate meeting. Recommending a change would go far toward appeasing the students who are unhappy with plus/minus grading already.

Linda H. mentioned that Oregon and Arizona State have the A+ = 4.3. Anthony A. asked about instructors who grade on a curve. Some discussion followed on what a plus grade actually means, and its potential abuse.

Rainer will bring the issue back to the Administrative Committee again.

5. **GERC? As in general education--**

See notes above at B. 3. – Transfer policies.

C. Create a motion to add representative from CDE as permanent non-voting member?

All present voted to add Carol Gering as an ex officio member to represent CDE in Curricular Affairs. The bylaws will be examined to see if a formal motion needs to go before the senate.

[The CAC bylaws do not address ex officio membership.]

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes

Oct 26 2011 3:30-4:30 pm Kayak

Voting members present:

Rainer Newberry, Chair; Anthony Arendt; Carrie Baker; Dave Valentine; Debra Moses; Jungho Baek; Todd Radenbaugh (audio).

Voting members absent:

Brian Himelbloom; Diane McEachern; Retchenda George-Bettisworth.

Non-voting members present:

Dana Thomas; Linda Hapsmith; Libby Eddy, Doug Goering, Donald Crocker

Guest: Carol Gering

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

A. OLD Business

1. Recent GERK issues (chairperson, etc) —comments by Dave/Carrie

The committee meets this Friday, October 28, so nothing new to report at this time. Chair Alex Fitts is reviewing previous work of the committee, Dana noted to explain the delay for the meeting.

2. ‘Stacked’ courses -- comments by Tony

Tony mentioned that they now had lists of both faculty and students who’ve taught/taken stacked courses. They’ll be using this info to distribute their surveys over the next several weeks.

Rainer asked about a deadline for responses, but Tony noted that one hadn’t yet been set.

3. Incompletes....cont.

A. Presentation by Carol Gering RE steps CDE is taking to reduce I’s and F’s

Carol provided hand-outs (copies attached) for Online, semester-based courses vs. Paper-based, semester-based courses, depicting the percentages of Incompletes given by academic years 2006-07 through 2010-11 by semester, along with the percentages of Incompletes that became Fs.

She noted that for online, semester-based courses, the percentage of Incompletes decreased from 23% down to 8%, which is a significant improvement. She also noted that CDE is getting away from semester-long paper-based courses, but not from year-long paper-based courses which still serve students who are incarcerated. The goal is to have all semester-based courses online. In the meantime, semester-length paper-based courses are phased out when they come in for changes, and no new ones are being created. The exception is for high-demand courses which are still available as semester-based paper-based courses (until the online versions are created).

Rainer asked why the downward trend in percentages for Incompletes for online courses was occurring. Carol explained that they’ve instituted a number of improvements, working heavily on course design and pedagogy and learning theory for distance and online courses. About two years ago they switched direction and started paying attention to how the courses are being taught – instructor response time; seven principles of good education – rapid feedback and instructor presence; clear directions, welcome e-letter; if a student doesn’t do anything in the first two-weeks then instructors note that on a roster and CDE support staff call those students.

Rainer noted that Pete said only a number of courses have gone through this augmentation, Carol responded that all courses are undergoing quality improvement. Also, the payment model is changing. The practice has been to use paper-graders who are paid per lesson

graded . The new pay model is cohort based, emphasizing interaction between students and with the instructor. Rainer asked how they know that this is effective thus far. Carol said she could explore that further for the committee.

Linda asked what the percentage is of instructors under the new pay model, and Carol responded that about half of the online courses are under the new pay model. (Some instructors teach multiple courses.)

Rainer observed that the number of F grades hasn't dropped. Carol asked about a comparison between distance and classroom courses for this aspect. Rainer said it's 20% vs. 35-40% of distance courses. He would like to know how the F grades are being addressed when the data becomes available. The percentage of Incompletes turning to F has not improved and Rainer stressed that they want to see improvement in this area.

Rainer asked the committee if the Senate should shorten the time allowed to finish an Incomplete from a year to a semester. Carrie asked why it was a year in the first place, and Dana mentioned because of military deployments. Dave suggested a review of the Incompletes every three months, which was met with groans when the amount of time and paperwork was considered. Dana mentioned that many adjuncts teach courses and then disappear, leaving no one to follow up with any incompletes, to which Dave noted that a three-month review could help in such a situation by shortening the timeframe for follow-up. A model was discussed that would allow for an "I" to be completed by the end of the next semester for the vast bulk of students, but a year for the military-related reasons. Todd noted that catastrophic illness needs to be included in the longer extension.

Dana reiterated having semester-long extensions, with possible extensions to two semesters; however, this doesn't address distance delivery students.

Libby explained why the Registrar's Office would not want different forms for the various categories of extension. Rainer suggested changing the wording on just the one existing form.

Dave stressed that the goal should be to change the expectation for completion time to a semester instead of a year, unless there's good reason not to do so. Dana suggested that a simpler path might be to set the completion time to a semester and handle exceptions to it via the academic appeals process.

Rainer asked for data to back all of this up. They need to know when most incompletes are successfully finished (shortly after the granting of the I, or right before the deadline?). There are situations when the faculty is at fault to take into consideration. Dana is going to write to Mike Earnest and copy others, to ask for the data.

There was general agreement among all the committee members present that shortening the timeframe for completion of the Incomplete would be beneficial.

Carol mentioned the fact that sometimes staff are stuck in the middle, trying to ask a faculty if an Incomplete is being granted for a truly valid reason. Todd brought up the fact that adjuncts can give Incompletes, asking if this should be disallowed. But the fact that students would then know (and act on the fact) that certain faculty could or could not grant Incompletes would become the issue. Posting grade rosters for every adjunct was suggested, and this was a plausible task in terms of Banner and OnBase. Carol noted this similarly for grade-books in Blackboard.

Making changes to faculty contract letters was mentioned. For example, noting how Incompletes would be dealt with if an adjunct leaves and isn't there to follow up with the student.

Rainer stated that the data is needed before any steps are taken with regard to forms, contract letters, or changes to policy.

Currently, there is no notification whatsoever that goes out to students or faculty that the year-end deadline is approaching for an Incomplete. Doug G. suggested that a half-year report

on grades be done that faculty would use to then notify students. Getting a comparison of first half vs. latter half of the year in terms of the grades would be useful.

Everyone agreed on further discussion, getting more data, telling students what ideas are being considered, and pursuing some form of notification.

B. Suggestions by Mike E regarding Exceptions to I→F ???

Item B wasn't discussed as Mike was not present.

4. Proposed motion:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered wholly or in part by **ASYNCHRONOUS** distance delivery, and all existing courses adapted or converted to **ASYNCHRONOUS** distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the Faculty Senate

Effective: Spring 2012

Rationale: The Faculty Senate has primary authority to initiate, develop, review and approve academic criteria, regulation and policy (Faculty Senate Constitution, Article 1, Section 1). This includes curriculum review. Current policy is that all courses with 'major' changes must be re-approved. This motion hereby DEFINES 'change from face-to-face to Distance Delivery' as a 'major' change.

Asynchronous distance delivery methods are fundamentally different methods of communication than face-to-face instruction. Effective instruction by distance delivery requires adapting or designing content for new formats and modes of communication. It cannot be assumed that a course approved for face-to-face delivery automatically passes review for a COMPLETELY different mode of delivery. The structure and content of courses intended wholly or in part for Asynchronous distance delivery must be separately reviewed.

This motion applies to all distance delivery courses within UAF, whether listed by an academic department, a rural campus, or the Center for Distance Education (CDE).

DISCUSSION of proposed motion:

Dana mentioned the additional workload to senate committees that would result with review of even just asynchronous courses. Rainer stressed the fact that faculty feel strongly about this issue and that there is significant fundamental change to courses that were delivered in a classroom going to distance delivery.

Carol mentioned her post to the Faculty Senate discussion group which included details about their approval process at CDE. Department heads must approve the course, and their designers adhere to a checklist. Would a senate review process supersede theirs? Rainer reiterated that a senate approval process is wanted, so that courses went through a Faculty Senate committee for review. If a course changes mode of delivery, then it must be re-reviewed by a senate committee. Carol asked if this extra scrutiny isn't a penalization. Concern over student learning outcomes was noted by Dana. He had the evaluation report from the recent accreditation visit, and gave an example about library usage. Rainer observed that contact hours aren't defined for asynchronous instruction. Dave noted the value of interaction of faculty with students equates with contact hours. Carol asked what defines the interaction value – is it emails, telephone or face-to-face?

Everyone agreed that it was too soon for this motion to go before the senate. It should go back to the discussion board and Carol is encouraged to comment further. She was also invited to continue meeting with the committee on a regular basis.

Carol mentioned the fact that there are 15-30 course revisions and developments being reviewed by CDE each semester.

BH comments RE CDE presentation today [He wasn't able to be at the meeting and this comment was included in the agenda.]

“Thank you for the explicit 4-step details, including the required 8-p form, regarding the quality mechanism established by the Center for Distance Education (CDE). I believe that the CDE process will alleviate concerns that the Faculty Senate has regarding oversight of distance-delivered courses at UAF. I suggest that you create a separate box under "Syllabus" that describes what a grade of "Incomplete" means. Thus, the instructor and the student are *fully aware* of the implications of not completing the course, except under extenuating dire circumstances encountered by the student. Finally, I recommend that the CDE form include the required signatures from the school's or college's program or department chair, curriculum council chair and dean, so that all entities agree to which CDE course is being devised, revised, or transformed from a solely in-class taught course. Then, each person can be involved in assessing how well each course was being delivered and received by the students.”

Because of time constraints, discussion on the rest of the agenda items (below) had to be postponed for the next meeting. Dana shared some further comments from the accreditation evaluation report before the meeting was adjourned.

5. Princess Tour CDL = 3 credit UAF 200 level course. Part of a bigger problem??? Yes. There's a pattern of courses from some programs NOT meeting minimum contact hours. Other problems???

6. Moving date of graduation...Sunday → Saturday ...should we weigh in? Yes??? but not now??

7. Proposed MS 'hooding' ceremony to happen Thursday night. GAAC HAS agreed to deal with this!

**Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes
October 12, 2011 3:30-4:30 pm Kayak**

Voting Members Present:

Brian Himelbloom (audio); Carrie Baker; Dave Valentine; Debra Moses; Diane McEachern (audio); Jungho Baek; Rainer Newberry, Chair; Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Todd Radenbaugh (audio)

Voting Members Absent: Anthony Arendt,

Non-voting Members Present: Lillian Misel, Libby Eddy (for Mike Earnest); Linda Hapsmith; Donald Crocker. Non-voting Members Absent: Dana Thomas; Doug Goering

Guest: Pete Pinney

Taking Notes: Jayne Harvie

1. OLD Business

- **Approval of 28 Sept Minutes**
Minutes were approved as distributed.

2. Recent GERC issues (chairperson, etc) —comments by Carrie Baker

Alex Fitts was chosen by the GERC to chair the committee. She's a good fit for the position because she's a full professor with general education background. She will be a voting member of the committee.

The GER Committee decided upon a two-thirds' majority standard for decision-making; though they may be able to use the consensus method based on the committee's past experience.

CEM membership is still lacking; Doug Goering is still talking to Rajive Ganguli.

The representative for the A.A. program will be Mahla Strohmaier, but in her absence (family medical leave) Arvid Weflen has agreed to substitute.

Pete P. asked about having Michael Koskey on the committee to represent the university's mission regarding Alaska Natives. Carrie said the committee had initially considered his nomination as a rep from Rural Development, which is a relatively small department; but, in this broader context they would be willing to consider him again. Pete will write an email statement for Carrie to take to the committee.

Linda Hapsmith noted that Latrice L. and Leah Berman will rep for Math, depending upon what fits into their teaching schedules.

Rainer asked the group if there was a consensus on having Alex Fitts chair the GERC, and the answer was yes.

3. **'Stacked' courses** -- Tony was not able to present at this meeting, so the topic will be taken up at the next committee meeting.

4. **NON-UAF courses taught AT high schools FOR high school students with UAF 100-level designators—Rainer** Suggestion: students *taking such must have passed the SOA HS Exit Exams*

Rainer clarified that the courses under discussion are those which are non-UAF courses taught at high schools and designed specifically for high school students. Curriculum Review Committee is seeing them proposed more frequently for the purpose of attracting the students to a particular field of study (e.g., teaching, fisheries) and to UAF. The problem lies in the fact that instructors and schools wish the courses to have 100-level status so that students earn college credit while taking them at the high school. The issue becomes whether or not the course is rigorous enough to merit 100-level status. Right now, CRC has handled the course requests by approving them as trial courses only.

It's been suggested that the State of Alaska High School exit exam scores be used to gauge student eligibility to enroll in such courses. If the student had passing grades in all three areas of these exams, they would be allowed to enroll in the course and earn college credit. The majority of eligible students would thus be juniors in high school.

Discussion followed about the rigor of the SOA HS exams and what passing scores actually mean, which is a minimal level of skills to graduate from high school. Libby E. asked who would actually monitor these scores at the high schools, noting that it could be a very subjective process. It was generally agreed that a student should have to present evidence of passing scores on the exit exams.

Pete P. noted two perspectives on college courses in high school. 1.) There's a marked difference in a vocation or tech prep course vs. a course in physics; and 2.) With an instructor's permission anyone of any age can technically take a college course. Rainer noted it's the prerequisites for a course that indicate course-level, and that HS exit exam scores would serve as the prerequisite for college 100-level courses at the high school.

Frequency of offering of the SOA HS exit exams was brought up. Rainer noted they are offered usually once a year in the spring, and 10th-graders on up are encouraged to take them, essentially making prospective students juniors by the time they can enroll in the courses.

Linda H. noted that a two-tiered approach could be considered for allowing enrollment: passing exit exam scores for students wishing to earn college credit, and allowance for those students who wish to take the course out of interest alone without earning college credit.

5. Incompletes....cont.

A. "Fairbanks CDE" & "Rural Ed CDE" high% of I and I→ F: ANTH, ENGL, HIST, and MATH. Single high %INC were ABUS, ECON, and HLTH for "Fairbanks CDE" and only BA for "Rural Ed CDE".

51.5% of all the INC in Spring 2010 were given by CDE (Fairbanks) and Rural Ed CDE which resulted in 43.4% of all the INC becoming F. If the 289 INC which remain in the combined CDE (amounting to 9% of UAF enrollment) could be resolved, the effect would be to reduce the overall UAF INC from 2.9% to 1.9%.

I recommend that a goal for UAF (campus and off-campus) should be to reduce the overall UAF INC to 1% in academic year 2012-2013 (highlighted in blue). GREAT...so...now what????

Discussion: Rainer summarized Brian Himelbloom's data summary. The meeting attachment is posted online at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/curricular-affairs-commit/>

The question was obviously what is going on at CDE to understand how and why instructors are giving such a higher percentage of Incompletes. It was noted that if Item #6 on the agenda is to be addressed, item #5 first needs to be understood.

Pete P. noted there has been a historically low success rate with paper-based courses which preclude an instructor and student relationship. CDE has a goal of converting those courses to the more successful cohort/instructor model. Paper-based courses will only be used for incarcerated students.

Lillian M. noted a problem of NB and I grades.

Pete talked about a new pilot program of 15 distance-delivered courses that hopefully will show a statistically significant improvement in the near future. Pete noted that quality improvement is the priority with Alex Hwu at CDE.

Linda H. mentioned Jodi Baxter who is the faculty liaison at CDE.

From the CDE web site --

The Faculty Liaison assists faculty with classroom management, monitors student satisfaction surveys, facilitates effective communication between faculty and students, provides helpful resources, and serves as a primary point of contact for faculty questions.

Rainer asked about getting data on the results of the pilot program. Pete P. responded that Carol Gering has that.

An orientation for students that teaches them how to be distance ed students was mentioned, along with the need for adequate resources and use of best practices.

Pete will follow up on getting pilot program results for the committee.

B. Exceptions to I→F (e.g., military on active duty). How to make this less arbitrary, e.g., 'exceptions will be granted in the following cases....' Have Mike E supply suggested list for discussion next meeting??

Discussion: Faculty Senate is looking at the need for a policy to further define the exceptions to the rule that I turns to F. Everyone agrees that things like serious medical conditions or deployment of active military personnel qualify for an exception. But, it's clear that many exceptions are being granted for much less serious reasons. Rainer asked the Registrar's Office for a listing of all the reasons that have been used, to help formulate better guidelines.

Brian H. mentioned the web page information he supplied about what other locations are using. Rainer noted it was too inclusive, citing example of "transportation difficulty."

Carrie B. asked about what the current policy is, and suggested sending it to all faculty to acquaint them with it and educate them about it.

Linda H. asked who gets to approve exceptions for I to F right now. Libby E. said there's a committee out of the Registrar's Office that looks at these.

Rainer asked that this discussion be continued electronically.

- **Proposed motion The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered wholly or in part by distance delivery, and all existing courses adapted or converted to distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the Faculty Senate. Furthermore, if the mode of distance delivery changes, then the course must be re-reviewed by the appropriate committee.**

Modes of distance delivery are those defined by the UA Office of Academic Affairs & Research: Independent Learning/Correspondence; Audio Conferencing; Video Conferencing; Web Meeting; Live Television/UATV; and Online/Web Delivered.

Effective: Spring 2012

Rationale: The Faculty Senate has primary authority to initiate, develop, review and approve academic criteria, regulation and policy (Faculty Senate Constitution, Article 1, Section 1). This includes curriculum review. Current policy is that all courses with 'major' changes must be re-approved. This motion hereby DEFINES 'change from face-to-face to Distance Delivery' as a 'major' change.

Distance delivery methods are fundamentally different methods of communication than face-to-face instruction. Effective instruction by distance delivery requires adapting or designing content for new formats and modes of communication. It cannot be assumed that a course approved for face-to-face delivery automatically passes review for a different mode of delivery. The structure and content of courses intended wholly or in part for distance delivery must be separately reviewed.

This motion applies to all distance delivery courses within UAF, whether listed by an academic department, a rural campus, or the Center for Distance Education (CDE).

Discussion on this topic will resume following further discussion of Item #5.

- **NEW Business**
 1. **Princess Tour CDL = 3 credit UAF 200 level course. Part of a bigger problem???**

Discussion: Rainer asked the group about what direction they want to take with this one. Debra M. shared that she had talked to Andy Anger at Applied Business about the course. He noted it had more than 45 hours of instruction. Rainer asked about the course content, however. Is it truly ABUS 267 course content if students are earning their CDLs?

Pete P. asked why this course wasn't being offered for credit out of the Automotive program.

Lillian M. noted that the accounting for the course is hard to decipher. It appears Summer Sessions is waiving the tuition for the course. ABUS gets the student credit hours.

Libby E. noted this IS a transfer credit mechanism for these types of courses that are partnered with a business. However, no regular mechanism was utilized to offer the ABUS 267 course out of Princess Tours' driver training program. This was arranged by Michelle Bartlett and Charlie Dexter. As noted in the attachments (printouts of Princess Tours web pages) students are earning course credit (3 in 2008; 10 more recently). Now a student is asking for credit retroactively, which is how the Registrar's Office learned this was happening.

Rainer noted the particular problem of truth in advertising. Are these students actually getting the ABUS 267 course as advertised in the catalog? Is this an isolated instance, or are there other cases of it?

2. Moving date of graduation...Sunday → Saturday ...should we weigh in?

3. Proposed MS 'hooding' ceremony to happen Thursday nite—conflicts with Final Exam Schedule.

Should we weigh in?? Should we recommend GACK deal with this????

There was brief discussion on items 2 and 3 of new business. Issues were mentioned, including semester start date in spring (before or after Alaska Civil Rights Day), and the end date (final exams, Mother's Day). The process of actually changing the approved commencement date in 2013 will entail a motion that is approved out of CAC (originating from the Registrar), with final approval by the Governance Coordinating Committee and the Chancellor.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 PM.

ATTACHMENT 179/5
UAF Faculty Senate #179, December 5, 2011
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes for November 15, 2011
2-3 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Nilima Hullavarad, Melanie Arthur, Ellen Lopez, Jenny Liu, Shawn Russell, Johnny Payne, Stefanie Ickert-Bond
Members absent: Derek Sikes, Jessica Larsen

1. Brown Bag Lunch Report. 11/4/11, 2.00-3.00pm, Women's Center,

Kayt gave an update on the brown bag lunch held on Nov 4th at Women's Center. The topic of discussion was "Having it All". It was decided that "Having it All" topic should be discussed again sometime later. Kayt mentioned a video recording will be available on the Women's Center blog. The committee would like to see more faculty participation and hence advertising the upcoming Brown Bag Lunches earlier might attract more faculties. Discussion on upcoming Brown bag Lunches and the facilitators was carried out. The upcoming Brown Bag Lunches will be held on
1] Feb 16th, 2011, the topic of discussion "Workloads", Facilitated by Dean Paul Layer and Dean Johnny Payne.
2] March 22nd or 29th 2011, the topic of discussion "Career Mapping", Facilitated by Provost Susan Henrichs.

2. Difficult Dialogues Workshop – December 9, 1.00- 3.00 pm

Jane Weber reminded that Libby Roderick of UAA's faculty development office will lead a workshop based on the Difficult Dialogues project. 1:00 - 3:00 pm, Alumni Lounge, Constitution Hall.

3. Scheduling of Women Faculty Luncheon

It was discussed whether Women Faculty Luncheon should be held one week earlier or later. This year's Women Faculty Luncheon was held right after the Faculty Senate face to face meeting so that the faculty attending that meeting could attend the Women Faculty Luncheon. It was decided that we have the Women Faculty Luncheon earlier when the new faculty come up.

4. BOR Policy and Regulations

CSW has been assigned the task to review some of the Board of Regents Policy and Regulations, details found on website: <http://www.alaska.edu/bor/policy-regulations/>. Shawn mentioned that only some sections have mention of 'sexual orientation', whereas some sections have left it out. CSW will discuss detailed review of BOR policy and Regulations on Dec 13th meeting.

5. Important CSW Meeting Dates:

December meeting date. Tuesday, Dec 13th, 2011, 1.30-3.30pm, 718 Gruening.

February Brown Bag Lunch date. February 16th, 2012, 1.00-2.00pm.

March Brown Bag Meeting date. March, 22nd or 29th, 2012 (TBD).

Meeting was adjourned at 3.00pm;

Respectfully Submitted, Nilima Hullavarad

These minutes are archived on the CSW website: <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/>

ATTACHMENT 179/6

UAF Faculty Senate #179, December 5, 2011

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for November 15, 2011**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 4:04 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Alexandra Oliveira, Channon Price

Excused: Stephen Brown, Mike Castellini

Absent: Julie Joly

III. Report from Joy:

Joy reported that the Nov 4-5 Winning Teams, Winning Grants workshop on collaborative grant writing went very well and had 36 participants.

She recently attended the POD conference, and brought back several resources, including information on courses and curriculum design. She also has a set of “clickers” faculty may borrow to try out in class.

Duff would like to see workshops specifically on designing new courses and writing syllabi. Diane is curious as to the lack of course content guides at UAF, which are particularly helpful for new faculty. She mentioned that UAA has curriculum development guide.

Franz suggested more faculty might come to development opportunities if they are called “presentations/lectures” instead of “workshops” since the latter sounds too time intensive. Joy agreed to change the word on the OFD website. Duff suggested that instead of counting the number of faculty development presentations a faculty member attends for meeting a set minimum, we should count the number of hours involved.

Joy has a new contract and will be off-contract during December and January. She reports that OFD finally received funding from United Academics after negotiations with UA Statewide, UNAC and all three MAUs. Development opportunities for spring will focus on course design aligned with departmental goals and learning outcomes, using the Design by Objective method.

IV. Old Business

1. Duff’s report on his meeting in October with Abel and Cyndee at the UNAC offices; and 2. Continuation of discussion of faculty survey:

UNAC supports the move to commit faculty to a set number of faculty development presentations. They would like to see a core set of sessions that are required for all faculty and want training on ethical issues as well so faculty are not in violation of said. They suggest linking travel funding to participation in conferences and attending faculty development sessions at UAF. They also want to see more

accountability on what faculty gain from conference attendance in the form of thorough reports. They suggest waiting until after implementing this procedure before sending out a faculty survey so they can see what kinds of faculty development opportunities faculty are attending.

After some discussion, Kelly suggested that the committee design the survey and have it sent out to all faculty, not just those represented by UNAC, through the Provost's office. Joy feels that UNAC should do the survey since their funding is contingent on finding out what faculty want for development opportunities.

V. New Business

1. Policy and Regulations Review assignments:

Joy recommended approval of Faculty Senate president-elect Jennifer Reynold's revisions. We decided each committee member will read through the packet before our next meeting in December and report any issues at that time.

VI. Next Meeting: Tuesday, December 13, 2011, 10:00 – 11:00 am, Bunnell 222

V. Adjourned at 5:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 179/7

UAF Faculty Senate #179, December 5, 2011

Submitted by the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee

GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate
2011-10-25 Meeting Minutes

Present:

Voting: Orion Lawlor, Vincent Cee, Chung-Sang Ng, Lara Horstmann, Xiong Zhang

Ex officio: Timothy Bartholomaeus, Anita Hughes, Laura Bender, Larry Duffy

GAAC course items and assignments are listed in [this Google Doc](#), with supplementary information in [Jayne's official GAAC curriculum page](#). Thanks to those who've volunteered!

Discussion of proposed Thursday evening master's hooding ceremony, a separate ceremony to honor graduate students separate from the main ceremony. Tim recommends bundling Masters and PhD ceremonies, rather than splitting out Master's students only. It would be interesting to measure the time taken to (1) just read the names (2) read thesis titles, and (3) perform hooding. Thursday is not an ideal day for this, due to student and advisor final exams, but they're discussing moving graduation itself to Saturday, and the rehearsal to Friday, so the best possible schedule is unclear. There was once a Thursday night banquet for PhD students, but it went away due to the expense of a catered banquet.

The latest international student degree completion policy reads "Graduate students, who are enrolled only in thesis or project credits (and no other coursework) have their official completion date as either (1) two months from the thesis or project defense date, or (2) the approval date on the Report of Thesis/Dissertation Defense form or the Report on Project Defense form when signed by the academic department chair, whichever is earlier." This means thesis advisors for international students should be careful to sign the Report on Defense paperwork only after the students' thesis is really complete.

GAAC recommendations:

- Add a disclaimer about signature date to the Report Defense form itself, for advisors, department heads, and international students, who may not be aware of the policy.
- Somehow, this information should percolate out to department heads.

What date shows up in Banner for degree completion? Right now, degrees get confirmed, posted, and then mailed out at the end of the semester in an enormous rush. The registrar is discussing changing to a system where after the degree audit, the degree gets "posted" into Banner, then confirmed at the end of the semester.

Stacked courses subgroup update: we are seeking a list of instructors for stacked courses. Lara suggested examining IAS scores for stacked courses, which are theoretically public information.

Next meeting: Tues, Nov 22 at 3pm.

ATTACHMENT 179/8

UAF Faculty Senate #179, December 5, 2011

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee Meeting Minutes for October 11, 2011

Attending:

David Maxwell, Curt Szuberla, Allan Morotti, Dana Greci, Cindy Hardy, Amy Barnsley, Gabrielle Russell, Deseree Salvador

Agenda:

Chair and co-chair for this committee:

Cindy has volunteered to continue to chair this committee, but would like to have a rural co-chair. We will continue to look for a co-chair. We also reviewed the definition of the committee as described in the Faculty Senate bylaws. We will need to update this definition to fit changes such as the renaming of TVC as CTC. We will continue to work on this definition.

Learning Commons update:

Amy will contact Rheba Dupras to set up a meeting with the library about progress on the Learning Commons and support from new library dean.

Committee topics for AY11-12:

Our core issues are student success and student retention. We discussed areas that committee members considered important to address. The science/math faculty on the committee felt that their students needed more writing across the curriculum and that their writing skills were an area of weakness in the students they see. This seemed to be a concern for social science faculty as well.

Accreditation follow-up:

Cindy reported that the Administrative Committee met with members of the accreditation team addressing the "Educate" theme. They wanted to know where the core themes came from and what level of participation faculty had in drafting the accreditation report.

Deseree will share a document on national graduation rates, "Time is the Enemy." She has sent this to Cindy, who will share it with us.

President Gamble's "Strategic Direction":

We discussed the idea "more students complete faster," concluding that this is directed mainly at traditional students who come to UAF prepared. We raised several questions for the committee to consider: Why are they not graduating in four years? How does this relate to the mission of our committee? Does this mean the certificate and associate degrees also need to be completed faster?

We noted that a Math bridge summer program has been implemented to better prepare students for university math expectations. However, this program is aimed for calculus-ready students.

We discussed the K-12 / college connection. How are we a part of this cycle? Do we want to explore this as a committee?

Allan reported on development of an Intro to Education class for high school seniors offered as online modules.

David asked if there is a document of demographics of students entering UAF, including SAT/ACT scores or pass rates for various “freshman” level classes. What classes are they passing or failing? He will formulate a set of questions and email it to Cindy for discussion at the next meeting. We will request data for questions that we feel we need to answer.

Other:

Next time we will discuss Sarah’s document proposing tracking the reasons for student failure. Dana will research early college efforts already in place for further discussion on these partnerships. We will also look at current student success initiatives.

Next meeting: Tuesday, November 15, 12:30-2pm

ATTACHMENT 179/9
UAF Faculty Senate #179, December 5, 2011
Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

**Research Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes - November 18th 2011**

Attending : Orion Lawlor, Peter Webley (chair), Sarah Hardy, Joanne Healy, Roger Hansen, Kris Hundertmark and John Heaton

Visitor: Barbara Taylor (URSA director)

Meeting started at 1:10 pm in WRRB VCR conference room

1. Meeting notes

Acceptance of last month's meeting notes from October 7th

2. Policy and Regulations document

Short discussion on what is required by the RAC. Peter Webley sent this out with the November Agenda. He stated that members should look at the two documents and have ideas suggestions ready for December RAC meeting and such that by January meeting we could have consensus of the edit we would like provided from RAC

3. Visit from Barbara Taylor, director of URSA.

Barbara gave an overview of URSA. She stated that she reports to the Vice Provost office of Dana Thomas.

She has been working to edit the annual activities reports to get a means to document where undergraduates are involved in publications/conferences etc and for faculty to get recognition for mentor students. She has been performing this with the Faculty Affairs committee.

URSA role is to help faculty to get funds for undergraduate support within UAF. Would like URSA to act as a office to match Undergraduate (UG) students with potential faculty. They will be a website that faculty and students could use to link to the URSA office.

She has met with the GI graduate students and they spoke to her on the ability for graduate students to act as mentors to UG. She stated they were very interested in this and how it could assist UG, graduate students and faculty alike

She'd like URSA to link faculty project ideas to the correct student. This would require some interaction between faculty, URSA office and student of interest to make sure all the relevant skills and requirements match.

URSA had funds to assist UG students for travel as well as competitions for funds to assist UG research

Roger Hansen asked about what is classified as research activity? Barbara spoke that it is the collaboration of UG students and faculty that leads to discipline specific knowledge.

Barbara would like URSA to help faculty in their grant writing by being part of the broader impacts of their proposals

URSA will use Google sites as the means to provide information to all as well as for uploading of interesting projects and student information (<https://sites.google.com/a/alaska.edu/ursa/>).

Kris Hundertmark asked about REU. Barbara spoke about how these are supplemental options onto of current NSF projects. She said URSA would like to have a list of all NSF projects at UAF, then contact the PI's and see if there is a part of the project that fits into the REU and then work with them on how to get this going and written. this would then be supplement funds onto of the current NSF project.

There was consensus from within the group to add Barbara Taylor, URSA director as an ex-officio member to the RAC committee. Peter Webley (chair) will find out the process at the next Faculty Senate admin serviced committee meeting.

Meeting ended at 2:10 pm

**Research Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes - October 7th 2011**

Attending : Mark Myers (VCR - ex-officio), Orion Lawlor, Peter Webley (convener), Sarah Hardy, Joanne Healy and Roger Hansen

Unable to attend: Kris Hundertmark, John Heaton

1. MRI grant applications

With Mark Myers in attendance this item was discussed by the committee. Mark stated that there is a need for 30% matching funds and these need to be from state or other funds. Where might this come from in each group? There can be 2 proposal where UAF is the lead and at the moment there is no formal processor of how to find out if one can submit an application.

There was a discussion to have a meeting where all interested parties could attend and Mark said that we would look into the VCR office to set this up. An email would be sent to Deans and Directors.

2. UAF Supercomputing Task force

Make spoke that he was working with Greg Newby on how to work on the items listed in the Task Force document. Both Roger Hansen and Orion Lawlor had been part of the Task Force. One question was how might the system work as either a service versus recharge shop? How could one get the system to be grant funded with some seed money? How might OIT and ARSC work together?

3. FAQ document

We need to get the document finally edited and then viewed by Cathy and Jennifer so we can pass it to Joy Morrison and add it to the Faculty Development workshops and link from websites.

4. Changes to bylaws

On the suggestions of Orion and through the consequence of the group these were edited to allow any research faculty who is a member of the committee to be chair as long as one of the chair and co-chair is a faculty senate member.

Additionally that president and president-elect of the faculty senate would be ex-officio members.

Peter Webley was nominated an elected chair
Orion Lawlor was nominated and elect co-chair

5. Other items

Flora Grabowska presented at Faculty Senate on open access journals and we thought it a good idea that she comes to talk with us on this at December meeting.

URSA director, Barbara Taylor might come to talk to us at November meeting on URSA activities.