

DRAFT MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #203

Monday, December 1, 2014

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. at the Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Cécile Lardon

A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (16)	NEWBERRY, Rainer (15)
ALLMAN, Elizabeth (16)	PETERSON, Rorik (15)
BARNES, Bill (15) - audio	RADENBAUGH, Todd (15) - audio
BRET-HARTE, Donie (15)	RICE, Sunny (16) - audio
CASCIO, Julie (16) – Mara Bacsujlaky	SHALLCROSS, Leslie (15) - audio
CHERRY, Jessica (15)	SKYA, Walter (16)
COFFMAN, Christine (15)	VALENTINE, Dave (16)
CONDE, Mark (15) – Ataur Chowdhury	WEBER, Jane (16)
COOK, Brian (16)	WILDFEUER, Sandra (16)
DEHN, Jonathan (15)	
DISTEFANO, Diana (16)	Members Absent:
FALLEN, Chris (15)	BERGE, Anna (15)
HANKS, Cathy (16)	DUKE, Rob (15)
HARDY, Sarah (15) – Ana Aguilar-Islas	GIBSON, Georgina (16)
HARTMAN, Chris (16)	MEYER, Franz (15)
HEALY, Joanne (15)	WINFREE, Cathy (15)
HORNIG, Joan (16)	
HORSTMANN, Lara (15)	Others Present:
JOHNSON, Galen (15)	Provost Henrichs
JOLY, Julie (15)	Chancellor Rogers (audio)
LAN, Ping (15)	Dean Paul Layer
LARDON, Cécile (15)	Alex Fitts
LAWLOR, Orion (16)	Libby Eddy
LOVECRAFT, Amy (15)	Cindy Hardy
MAHONEY, Andrew (16)	Tim Wilson
MAXWELL, David (16)	Chris Beks
MCCARTNEY, Leslie (15)	Raaj Kurapati, Amanda Wall, Martin Klein
MCDONNELL, Andrew (16) - audio	Linda Hapsmith
MISRA, Debu (15)	Ginny Redmond
MOSER, Dennis (16)	Carol Gering

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #202
Minutes for Meeting #202 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda
The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Require Baccalaureate Degree Programs include a Capstone Experience
2. Motion to Approve Deletion of the Bachelor of Arts and Sciences Degree Program

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – Cécile Lardon

Cécile's comments were very brief to allow time for the discussions to follow later in the meeting.

Libby E. announced that UAOnline will be down for several hours on Sunday morning, December 28, which is just after the day grades are due.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Debu Misra

Debu expressed thanks at the end of this calendar year to all the senators, committee chairs and committee members for their excellent work and contributions, and extended holiday wishes to all.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers joined the meeting via audio conference at 1:55 PM. He was calling in because he had attended the new governor's swearing-in ceremony today, and was attending the UA Foundation Board of Trustees meeting the next day.

Governor Walker will be facing a fiscal challenge far greater than was known even just a month ago. If there was a bright note it's that he has drafted one of the best people in the state from UAF to help address the budget challenges, having appointed Vice Chancellor Pat Pitney as the new director of the Office of Management and Budget. He's also drafted Vice Chancellor for Research Mark Myers as the new commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources, and has effectively taken 40% of the vice chancellors from UAF.

Two actions that will greatly affect the university in the near term are: the action on the budget, and the appointments to the Board of Regents. Governor Walker will introduce the outgoing Parnell budget on December 15 to meet the formal deadline, and over next two months they will submit amendments to the budget that are due by February 15. The drop in the price of oil puts the state at about a 50% deficit. The state reserves will be gone in about three years. The need to reduce budgets underscores the importance of the special program reviews and the academic program reviews. It's clear we're going to be a smaller university than we are today, and the important issue is to ensure that it's not so much smaller that it can't survive and thrive as an institution.

Governor Walker possibly will make his appointments or re-appointments to fill the four seats opening on the Board of Regents before the BOR retreat scheduled for January 22-23. There are now two vice chancellor vacancies. Given the 90-day freeze, he plans to appoint interims from within the university

and will discuss this with Chancellor's Cabinet today. There will be searches for both positions, but they will not be filled before the end of the 90-day freeze (or longer).

The question was asked if the search for the vice chancellor of research position will be a national one. The Chancellor responded that it would be a national search, but noted there are strong candidates within Alaska and UAF.

Chancellor Rogers was asked to comment about how the university can define itself for the future in order to survive. He responded that we must demonstrate that we add value to Alaska -- the fabric of life in Alaska, its economy, and to the arts and culture in Alaska. Being part of that is the key underpinning to success. He continues to stress that the university must tell its story and connect with the people of the state and its economy. If Alaskans care about the university, it will thrive and survive. Also important is our shaping of the arctic in the future by playing a key role for Alaska. Our leadership in this area affects the rest of the country as well. We have defined ourselves in this area and are recognized for it. Continuing the efforts to serve Alaska and the Arctic will help us thrive.

Provost Henrichs commented that the Planning and Budget Committee continues to work on the element of a future vision for the university. When they get a little bit further along with that process, they would value feedback on it from the Faculty Senate. She sees a successful future that involves more interdisciplinary research, and collaboration in both research and academic areas. UAF is already better at this than many arctic universities. Our smaller size puts us in closer proximity with many of our colleagues in other fields. We can distinguish ourselves by building on those strengths.

The question was asked about how the current budget crisis will affect the university's mission, especially with regard to Shaping Alaska's Future (SAF). The Chancellor noted that when SAF was being developed, a sudden crash in oil prices was not considered. He expects SAF themes and objectives will inform the decisions that the Board of Regents make as we move through the budget crisis. Delivery of the intended outcomes of SAF may be slowed down by the budget constraints, but he doesn't think that will change the fact that those are still the expected outcomes.

Clarification was requested regarding the statement that the university will be smaller -- was that just referring to UAF, or to all three universities? The Chancellor responded that he believes all three universities will become smaller, based upon what has been seen thus far from the actions of the BOR and the current president. Reductions have been proportional across all three universities. UAF will have larger reductions because it has the lion's share of the budget dollars.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs' remarks preceded the Chancellor's (he called in at 1:55 PM). She reported that Chancellor Rogers is attending the inauguration of the new governor. He, along with Vice Chancellors Mike Sfraga and Evon Peter, were members of the governor's transition team. Vice Chancellor Pat Pitney will be leaving UAF to be the new director of the Office of Management and Budget for the governor, and Vice Chancellor Mark Myers will serve as the new commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources. Vice Chancellor Pitney has already departed for Juneau, and Vice Chancellor Myers will leave in January. This provides an opportunity to make good points about our value to the state, and the need for the university to remain strong even through the state's budget challenges.

One fact which the Chancellor brought back from the transition team that the Provost found very striking is that the state is running about a 50% budget deficit (expenditures relative to revenues). It will clearly have an effect on state spending and the legislature will have to make reductions. Reserve accounts that were built up when the price of oil was high will only last for about another two and a half years.

The UA system as a whole and UAF in particular, have already been planning for state revenue reductions. The special program review process is a part of that planning effort. Program choices for special academic review were based predominantly on enrollment and graduation statistics. The Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) did not look at issues such as program centrality to the university mission – but those factors will be taken into account during the process. Not all the programs on the list will be eliminated – just reviewed. Decisions will be based the merits of each program. The budget situation is severe and there will be cuts somewhere across the university. Also, the focus is not only on academic programs. All areas of the university are being examined, including research, facilities, and administration.

The question was asked if the vice chancellor positions would be subject to the 90-day freeze. Provost Henrichs responded that there will almost certainly be more than a 90-day delay in filling the positions. The VCR position will likely be a national search. Interim appointments will be made.

It was also asked if there were similar plans to review administration as there are for academic programs. The Provost was not aware of any specific plan to review vice chancellor positions; however, there is a review of administrative functions which is published on the OMB web site. Overall, there has been a reduction in lower level administrative positions over the last five years. A comment noting that there was no faculty input in those reviews was confirmed by the Provost.

Another question asked was how much savings there actually are if a program is cut, but no faculty are laid off. Are there enough savings to make doing so worthwhile? The Provost responded that the observation is generally correct. In an example where a department has both a master's and baccalaureate programs, and the master's is cut without a reduction in faculty numbers, there might only be savings if fewer adjuncts were then hired because the workload could be spread around more for the remaining program. However, depending on the severity of the budget situation, untenured faculty might not be retained, and /or vacancies from faculty retirements might be left unfilled.

The Provost was asked to comment regarding the short timeline for the special academic reviews, and she noted that it's a difficult one because results are expected this month. The Chancellor wants preliminary feedback in mid-January. Provost Henrichs has been instructed to do all she can to facilitate the reviews. But, she does not see the possibility of completing the program reviews with Administrative Committee and then the Chancellor's Cabinet before the end of February. Membership of the review committees will be posted on the OMB web site. (They are waiting on final appointments by one or two deans.)

<http://www.uaf.edu/finserv/omb/uaf-program-reviews/program-reviews-in-proces/>

Cécile commented about her involvement on the Planning and Budget Committee last spring and this fall. She has been impressed with everyone's willingness to put everything on the table and consider all possibilities. There are no easy options. The committee members have admirably refrained from advocating for their own units and have made the effort to understand all the options and get more information as necessary, as well as look at possibilities from multiple perspectives. They've taken great care to be mindful of trying to keep a disproportionate burden from falling on those in lower ranks who would be hit hardest (staff and lower-ranked faculty, for example).

The comment was made that term-funded faculty would be likely laid off first, and it was asked how the committee was being mindful of that fact. Cécile responded that there's not a good solution for that fact. But, some of the options considered for the personnel management category include furloughs and 37.5 hour work weeks. Provost Henrichs added that it's unavoidable that term faculty are more vulnerable to lay-offs than tenured and tenure-line faculty because of the policies of the university and the faculty union contracts. But one way the committee tried to be more even-handed was not to target CRCD

programs because they are more populated with term-funded faculty. Those programs are not disproportionately represented in the special academic review process. The Provost invited faculty to write her via email or make appointments if they wish to have further discussion.

V Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Chris Beks

Chris reported that Staff Council submitted some suggested changes for the draft regulations regarding the proposed tobacco-free campus policy last week. The biggest suggestion coming from the resolutions submitted by Staff Council and Faculty Senate is to allow designated smoking areas on campus. They haven't heard back about those suggestions, yet. He also mentioned that staff are represented on the PBC and have similar budget concerns as faculty. Suggestions from staff have been made concerning the draft regulations for furlough policy and those are at the General Counsel's office right now.

B. ASUAF – Mathew Carrick

No report was available.

C. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

No report was available.

D. UNAC – Tim Wilson

UAFT – Jane Weber

Tim was present, but had nothing new to report.

Jane noted UAFT is still in negotiations. She also reported on the Joint Health Care Committee (JHCC). They met with Blue Cross in November, and for the first quarter of the year, health care costs remain fairly flat across the university. The majority of the pharmacy benefit is being spent on specialty drugs and that trend is expected to continue. She reminded health plan members to use the appeals process if claims are denied. She also reminded everyone that the wellness program dates began November 1 and go through April 1. The wellness program is tied to the health care cost rebate.

Debu asked if the JHCC has talked about how the budget situation will affect the health plan next year. Jane said they have not.

VI Guest Speakers

A. Raaj Kurapati, Amanda Wall, Martin Klein

Topic: Parking Changes (Handout)

A copy of the slide presentation (distributed as a handout for the meeting) is posted online at: <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2014-15-fs-meetings/#203>

Raaj K., associate vice chancellor for Financial Services, was the main presenter for the group. He introduced Amanda Wall (bursar for Financial Services) and Martin Klein (manager for Facilities Services' Auxiliary and Contract Services), and noted that the presentation contains recommendations which came out of the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) discussions last spring.

A detailed overview of revenue vs. expenses generated by Parking Services was given. Parking has always operated in a deficit mode and an explanation of actions that have been taken to address the deficits was provided, including administratively moving Parking Services from Facilities Services over to Financial Services. The move eliminated three FTEs, a savings of \$187,000. They also moved parking enforcement to the campus police.

The projected trend is for costs to increase, particularly fixed costs such as keeping shuttles running, lots cleared of snow, and electrical costs. Other immediate actions taken to address the deficits include eliminating the Taku bus route, a savings of \$105,000 per year. They are going to recommend that summer shuttle service be eliminated, which would save about \$80,000 per year by FY16. It was also noted that the Office of Sustainability has purchased an electric-powered bus which will be driven by students. It will be used for the Wood Center to West Ridge route in the summer of 2015.

The recommendation from PBC has been for a reduction amounting to \$200,000 in costs. To address this, there has been a reduction in shuttle service to off-campus locations. They will focus efforts to provide shuttle services to areas which provide classes. This should save \$35,000 to \$50,000 per year.

Raaj K. responded to the issue of safety concerns with the removal of shuttle service from areas, especially in evening hours. He noted that these were also brought up at the Chancellor's Forum held last week. They will look more closely at safety issues and at different options to address safety concerns.

In spite of the changes to bring down costs, revenues have been constant. The deficits will still creep up in spite of the changes that have been made. Revenue enhancements include looking at raising the transportation fee. This fee is paid for by the students and has never been raised since its inception. Also being considered is a 3% increase per year for the next three years to parking permit fees, as well as increases to the daily meter rates. Dollar amounts were provided for these enhancements and are included on the handout.

The idea of parking zones was described. It would be a three-tiered system based upon proximity to campus buildings. The current gold lots would become the highest tier, and would include the West Ridge where there have been no gold lots in the past. There would be a medium tier, and then a low tier based upon the most remote lots that are the furthest away from buildings. So far, there has not been much support for the zone idea, based on survey feedback to date. Martin K. described the zone plan in more detail and answered questions. He and Raaj both invited feedback by means of the online survey. (Link to the survey was provided in the handout.)

A comment was made about the Murie Building having been intended as a student-oriented research building. The zone plan would make it impossible for students to park near it. Martin responded that that is exactly the type of feedback they are seeking. He stressed that zones were an idea right now. The comment was also made that the lowest-tier zones (furthest away) would also have no shuttle service and would likely impact students the most and during the colder winter months.

Raaj reiterated Martin's comment that no decisions have been made and they are asking for feedback by means of the survey.

One of the senators asked that the map include labeling of all the proposed zones, noting it's hard to provide feedback with only part of the information available. Martin noted that the current gold lots would probably be "C" lots, but this hasn't been figured out for West Ridge which has had no gold lots.

The comment was made this idea just expands on the existing gold and non-gold zones, and does not address the issue of unfairness that already exists on lower campus vs. upper campus.

1:55 BREAK

VII New Business

- A. Motion to approve a new Minor in Forest Management,
submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 203/1)

Rainer introduced and provided some background about the new minor in Forest Management. The BS in Natural Resources Management is unique in that it requires a minor in addition to the major requirements. In the past the BS had concentrations, one of which was Forestry. With the departure of several faculty, the concentration was removed from the degree. A compromise to that removal was to create a minor in Forest Management. Doing so allows the students in the major to meet certification requirements by the Society of American Foresters. No new courses or faculty are involved. The bulk of students taking the minor will be those enrolled in the major program; however, the structure of the minor will also allow non-majors in other baccalaureate degree programs to pursue the minor.

With no objections the new minor was approved.

VIII Presentation by Cécile Lardon

- A. Roles of Faculty Alliance and Faculty Senates

A copy of the slide presentation is posted online at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2014-15-fs-meetings/#203>

Cécile provided an overview of the UA Governance structure and system, explaining how the governance bodies at the three universities work with governance groups, the BOR and the UA president at the system level. She also provided background on the basis for governance in BOR policy and UA regulations.

Faculty Alliance (FA) provides official representation for faculty in matters affecting the general welfare of the university system as a whole, along with its educational purposes and effectiveness. FA provides consultation to the UA Summit Team, the vice president for Academic Affairs and Research, the UA president and the BOR. FA provides a means of communication to and from the faculty of the three universities for discussion and coordination of information that concerns all the faculty.

Responsibilities of the FA were outlined. They include an advisory and coordinating role in academic affairs, e.g., academic program review, the addition, deletion or merging of academic programs, curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, and faculty welfare issues such as compensation, benefits, workload, hire issues, promotion and tenure, and ethics (among others). Again, this is at the system level with regard to the entire University of Alaska system.

An overview was provided on the transmittal of recommendations and actions, both to and from university administration and the Board of Regents. There is an expectation by the Board that FA will provide them with recommendations that reflect input from all three universities. David V. gave the recent counter-example of this point regarding the common calendar action that came solely out of UAA, to which the Board had a very negative response. The Board and the president would have preferred that all three Faculty Senates pass similar resolutions and bring those to the FA. The FA would take them to the UA president and inform him of the sentiments of the faculty across the system. The president would go forward as might be necessary to the Board. Cécile noted that if FA has an issue deemed important enough to be on the BOR agenda, then the FA Chair would be part of the discussion. David concurred, saying he would report on the issue to the UA president and BOR. He added that the FA chair has a new seat on the BOR Academic and Student Affairs Committee, providing FA with direct access to the Board.

Cécile described the informal workflow between the Faculty Senates and the Faculty Alliance and gave various examples to illustrate how issues come to Alliance from the Senates and vice versa. There are no regulations or procedures set down in the current constitution or bylaws for how these interactions are to take place. As the need for the three senates to address common issues is increasing, the FA needs to address this. Examples of more recent issues include common admission standards across the three universities, student dispute resolution policy, the common calendar, and the common set of General Education Requirements (GERs).

Faculty Alliance has the role of coordinating the efforts to address the issues, but not the nitty-gritty work on the issues themselves. David described the three committees that have been formed this fall to address Math course alignment, English course alignment, and the broader task of aligning the policy regarding common GERs. Once work is completed by those committees, FA will bring the results back to each of the three Faculty Senates for consideration and passage. Cécile reiterated the fact that the FA chair meets regularly with the UA president who has authority to change the regulations concerning GERs. President Gamble has indicated that he is willing to do so if the FA produces a good plan for those changes. Changes to regulations do not have to go through the Board of Regents, which demonstrates the importance of a good working relationship between the FA and the president.

The importance of having members of the Faculty Alliance agree on issues is crucial. If agreement on an issue cannot be found at the level of the FA, it's dead on arrival at the Faculty Senates. When there is agreement, the FA can take issues back to the senates and have them vetted further and possibly passed by the senates, or send them back for further revision. Even things that seem fairly simple on the surface can take a long time and go back and forth between the various levels, requiring people to keep an open mind and think about not only what works at their own university, but what could potentially work across the system. This, of course, can make things very complicated.

David supported Cecile's statements, and observed that they're not about how things ought to work, but reflect how things actually do work at this present time. It is complicated, can be cumbersome at times, and presents multiple opportunities for failure. There is now more pressure on university governance to be able to act and respond more quickly. A key challenge that the Alliance and the three Faculty Senates have to deal with is how they can take this current "cobbled-together" coordination system and make it more efficient and more quickly responsive. He wondered if the Alliance shouldn't become something more like a conference committee that works between the Senate and the House, with the power to come up with a final version of things to pass. It would save a lot of time, though decisions could come out of the Alliance that individual senates would not necessarily agree with.

Cécile noted that it's a real problem when the three universities disagree on issues that affect the entire system, or when two agree and one does not. Right now there isn't a process to address that kind of stalemate. It's something that must be addressed in order to be more efficient and expedient, while still preserving the interests and input of the individual universities. The Alliance members are keenly aware that each of the universities have a unique identity and want to preserve that, and that each has unique issues and challenges and are striving to serve a regional clientele. The question becomes how to balance the reality of universities with unique identities, with the common issues and needs that cut across the system. Can it be done without involving several years' worth of back and forth among the governance groups? David commented that Alliance is being increasingly asked to address the common needs and issues occurring across the system, noting this year had been the busiest of the three years of his Alliance term. They've "spun up" four committees, and the results of their work will be coming out in the spring. Faculty Senate will see a lot more coming from the Alliance due to these committees.

The fact that UAF is the lead research and PhD-granting institution among the three universities was brought up and discussed. How this fact is treated and balanced at Alliance, but more so at System Academic Council, was described. For the most part there is collaboration, but there are issues that

become contentious. The issue of minimum admission standards is a recent example that illustrates the disagreement about which university decides for the others when they disagree. UAF has maintained that they will preserve the right to have higher admission standards for their university regardless of what is decided as common policy for the system.

David clarified how he interprets ‘final action’ as described in the FA constitution with regard to the work of a taskforce it has created to address an issue. Final action is what the Alliance conveys to the Board and UA president. The taskforce reports back to the Alliance; the Alliance takes that report and makes recommendations to the Faculty Senates; the Faculty Senates take action which the Alliance then reports to the Board and UA president. While all three senates might not agree on the action taken, it better serves their purpose before the Board and president to be united. The Alliance can present a majority view along with a minority view, but it is more effective to find agreement.

IX Public Comment

Linda Hapsmith, director of the Academic Advising Center, and Ginny Redmond, director of Student Support Services, announced their recruitments for faculty advisors at their respective offices. Handouts were distributed and information has been made available on their respective web sites.

- <http://www.uaf.edu/advising/faculty/>
- <http://www.uaf.edu/ssss/>

X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

B. Committee Chair Comments

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 203/2)

Faculty Affairs – Chris Fallen, Chair (Attachment 203/3)

Unit Criteria – Chris Coffman, Chair (Attachment 203/4)

Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 203/5)

Core Review Committee – Leah Berman, Chair

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
(Attachment 203/6)

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair
(Attachment 203/7)

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair
(Attachment 203/8)

Research Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair

Information Technology Committee – Rorik Peterson, Convener

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:10 PM.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new minor in Forest Management, housed in the School of Natural Resources and Extension.

Effective: Fall 2015

Rationale: This new minor will effectively prepare students for careers in forestry.
See the program proposal #80-UNP on file in the Governance Office, 312B
Signers' Hall.

Overview:

The Natural Resources Management degree was restructured and three concentrations were lost, including one in forestry which was accredited by the Society of American Foresters (SAF). Providing the accredited degree had allowed our students to obtain forestry positions in state government and with private companies that require a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution. To enable future students to learn the essentials of forestry in our new degree structure (the elimination of the three concentration areas) and be eligible for professional certification by SAF, we propose a new minor in Forest Management. The minor will be available to students in any major that have satisfied course prerequisites. In combination with the NRM major, the Forest Management minor will prepare students for application for professional certification by SAF. This credential identifies individuals with the training and knowledge required to manage the state's forest resources.

This minor will allow our students to apply to take the SAF accreditation exam. The accreditation exam is a key hurdle in the professional development of a Forestry Professional throughout the country. The potential for a Natural Resources Management major to take the exam will allow them to obtain jobs that do require a Forestry Degree. It will have a minor effect on Faculty resulting from potentially larger class sizes or the need to restructure a class as independent study for potentially smaller class sizes. In one case (NRM F453) an adjunct faculty will have to be located when the course is offered, but this need will exist even in the absence of the minor. There are no anticipated changes in the school's budget or facilities/space requirements as a result of development of this minor degree program.

In addition this Forestry Minor will give us the opportunity to gauge the interest in developing a Forestry Major in the future.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

Forest Management Minor*

1. Students must complete the following courses (cannot count toward major): **
NRM F375-Natural Resource Ecology-3 credits,
or BIOL F371-Principles of Ecology-3 credits

- NRM F240-Natural Resources Measurement and Inventory-3 credits
NRM F251-Silvics and Dendrology-4 credits
2. Complete at least 6 credits from the following (cannot count toward major):**
NRM F370-Introduction to Watershed Management-3 credits
NRM F440-Silviculture-3 credits
NRM F450-Forest Management-3 credits
NRM F452-Forest Health and Protection-3 credits
NRM F453-Harvesting and Utilization of Forest Products-3 credits
3. A student must complete at least 16 credits dedicated to the minor. If the student has taken courses from group 1 in order to complete major requirements, the credits must be made up from additional courses in group 2. **

** Potential accreditation as a Certified Forester by the Society of American Forests will require completion of the following Natural Resources Management courses: F251, F440, F450, F452, and F453 in combination with the Natural Resource Management BS degree. Prerequisites required for the courses listed are part of the Natural Resources Degree Program but students from other programs will be required to complete the prerequisites specified for individual classes. NRM F452 also requires the completion of either BIOL F239 or NRM F211 as a prerequisite. These two courses are not required for the general Natural Resources Management program. The prerequisites will not apply to the number of credits for the Forest Management Minor.*

*** Student must earn a C grade or better in each course.*

Relationship to Purposes of the University:

State Division of Forestry, USFS, native corporations, etc. will all need trained forestry professionals to fill the need for vital forest management tied to various resource uses (e.g. fuelwood, lumber, biomass, wildlife management, park management, etc.).

This minor will help to support the NRM program by attracting students that are interested in the forestry profession. The minor will help to prepare NRM students for the certification exam that is conducted by the Society of American Foresters.

The minor will fill an important existing gap in our ability to meet the employment needs of the state.

Curricular Affairs Committee
Weds 15 October 2014 Minutes 3-4 pm Reich 300

present: **Brian Cook, Catherine Hanks, Dennis Moser, Rainer Newberry, Rob Duke, Todd Radenbaugh** (remote), **Jayne Harvie, Alex Fitts, Casey Byrne, Holly Sherouse, Libby Eddy, Linda Hapsmith,**

- I. Approved minutes of Oct 1 meeting**
- II. Old business: what to do about C/O/W??**

Rainer sent GERC a memo outlining problems with the proposed 'C' and suggested solutions. GERC met Tues 14 Oct. Leah Berman, GERC chair sent results of that meeting by email. These are listed below.

(0) There seemed to be consensus in the room that 2 C courses would be ok (albeit not ideal), rather than 3. This addresses some concerns that currently, in many disciplines, it is possible to meet the W/O requirement via two courses that are each W + O/2, or one WO course and one W course. Note that there's an implicit assumption that more than likely, departmental Capstone courses would be written in such a way as to satisfy the C requirements.

- (1) We think it is important that the C courses integrate at least two forms of communication. (That is, we are choosing to not simply reformulate/revise the current W and O requirements.) In particular, we want to require that C courses include x% writing component, y% oral component, and z% other mode, where $x > 0$, $y > 0$, $z \geq 0$, $x > y$, and the minimum allowable for $x + y + z$ is in the ballpark of 60%. (The particular percentages have not been discussed, really. Numbers bandied about were 35% writing, 15% oral, 10% other, say, but I'm totally making those numbers up. Note the 'other' category *would not be required*.) The y% oral component could be in modes other than in-class presentation; they might also include synchronous video presentation (e.g., Skype), asynchronous video presentation (video/slides with narration), etc., to allow for the development of C courses offered via distance. The z% "other communication" might include websites, blogs, prezi/powerpoint slides (without voiceover) etc. Here, I think that these percents are probably "portion of the assessed work of this type that contributes to the grade" a la the current "W courses must have 50% of the assessed work be written" or what the current W guidelines say. Anyway, the point is that the committee thinks it's important that the C courses emphasize more than just writing but rather more forms of communication in a single course.
- (2) It's important that the C courses focus on communication within the discipline; that is, that C courses take audience/genre into account.
- (3) It is important that requiring human feedback on the C components of the course is baked into the guidelines for determining whether a course satisfies the requirements for a C.
- (4) We are going to try to steal/modify language from the current W and O course descriptions when drafting the proposed guidelines for C courses.
- (5) We are committed to providing options for C/2, but we need to determine what that would look like. (e.g., could a C/2 course *just* do some writing, or *just* some oral communication? Or would it need to do both, just less? We didn't have a chance to discuss this.)

III. New business GERC's proposed changes in Core requirements.

(Background: Pres. Gamble indicated to David Valentine that he'd approve any changes in UA regulations RE GERs and would even be willing to suspend regulations as needed. Dave's opinion: might as well get to work on revising UAF's core requirements, and assume that UA regs would be changed as needed.)

To that end we discussed
GERC-Proposed Changes in UAF 'CORE' requirements

Current Perspectives on the Human Condition	Proposed change
HIST F100X--Modern World History ECON/PS F100X--Political Economy ANTH/SOC F100X—Individual, Society and Culture	Two Introductory courses in two different social sciences (Note that at UAA History is a 'Humanities', at UAF a Social Science)

ENGL/FL F200X--World Literatures	An introductory course in the humanities (which could be a foreign language course)
ART/MUS/THR F200X, HUMS F201X, ANS F202X--Aesthetic Appreciation	an introductory course in the arts which is not exclusively based on skills acquisition
BA F323X, COMM F300X, JUST F300X, NRM F303X, PHIL F322X, PS F300X--Ethics	An additional social science, humanities, or Arts course
1 Math + 2 lab natural science lab courses	1 Math + 1 Nat Sci lab course + an additional Math or Nat science course

There would be merit in making our new GERs as similar as possible to those of UAA and UAS, so as to get closer to the BOR mandate of 'common GERs'.

Below are copies of UAS and UAA's GERs

What strategies should we employ in moving towards modifications to 'CORE'?

- Should individual departments create lists of appropriate 100 and 200-level courses?
- What to do about History? (Suggestion: ask them if they'd be willing to change to 'Humanities')
- What to do about foreign language courses: should only 5-credit versions be included in the list of acceptable courses?? (not discussed)
- Math + 2 Nat Sci vs. Math + Nat Sci + Math or Nat Sci? (not discussed)
- Lower division only vs. Upper Division & Lower Division? (the mood was towards lower division)

We agreed that Rainer would contact Dave Valentine RE contacting UAA and UAS about possibility of changing Arts requirements and would prepare a motion for Fac Senate RE changes above.

Brian agreed to (a) ask History Dept how they felt about re-classifying as a 'humanities' and a list of possible classes/criteria under the proposed GERC guidelines.

UAS GER REQUIREMENTS Minimum Credits 34

Written Communication Skills 6

ENGL S111 Methods of Written Communication 3

Select one from the following (3 credits):

ENGL S211 Intermediate Composition About Literature 3

ENGL S212 Technical Report Writing 3

Oral Communication Skills 3

Select one from the following (3 credits). Grade of C or better.

COMM S111 Fundamentals of Oral Communication 3

COMM S235 Small Group Communication and Team Building 3

COMM S237 Interpersonal Communication 3

COMM S241 Public Speaking 3

Fine Arts 3 Select one from the following (3 credits):

ART S160 Art Appreciation 3

ART S261 History of World Art 1 3

ART S262 History of World Art 1I 3

MUS S123 Music Appreciation 3

THR S111 Theatre Appreciation 3

THR S211 Theatre History and Literature I 3

THR S212 Theatre History and Literature II 3

Humanities 3-6 Select a minimum of one from the following (3 credits):

AKL S105 Elementary Tlingit I 4

AKL S106 Elementary Tlingit II 4

AKL S107 Elementary Haida I 4

AKL S108 Elementary Haida II 4

ASL S101 Beginning American Sign Language I 4

ASL S102 Beginning American Sign Language II 4

ENGL S215 Introduction to Literary Study 3

ENGL S223 Survey of British Literature I 3

ENGL S224 Survey of British Literature II 3

ENGL	S225	Survey of American Literature I	3
ENGL	S226	Survey of American Literature II	3
ENGL	S261	Introduction to Creative Writing	3
HIST	S105	World History I*	3
HIST	S106	World History II*	3
HIST	S131	History of the U.S. I*	3
HIST	S132	History of the U.S. II*	3
HUM	S120	A Sense of Place: Alaska & Beyond	3
JOUR	S101	Introduction to Mass Communication	3
PHIL	S101	Introduction to Logic and Reasoning	3
PHIL	S201	Introduction to Philosophy	3
PHIL	S301	Ethics	3
RUSS	S101	Elementary Russian I	4
RUSS	S102	Elementary Russian II	4
SPAN	S101	Elementary Spanish I	4
SPAN	S102	Elementary Spanish II	4

Social Sciences 6-9 Select a minimum of two from the following from two disciplines:

ANTH	S101	Introduction to Anthropology	3
ANTH	S202	Cultural Anthropology	3
ANTH	S211	Fundamentals of Archaeology	3
ECON	S100	Introduction to Economics	3
ECON	S201	Principles of Economics I:Macro	3
ECON	S202	Principles of Economics II:Micro	3
GEOG	S101	Introductory Geography	3
GOVT	S101	Introduction to American Government	3
GOVT	S102	Introduction to Political Science	3
GOVT	S230	Introduction to Political Philosophy	3
GOVT	S251	Introduction to International Relations	3
HIST	S105	World History I*	3
HIST	S106	World History II*	3
HIST	S131	History of the U.S. I*	3
HIST	S132	History of the U.S. II*	3
PSY	S101	Introduction to Psychology	3
PSY	S250	Lifespan Development	3
SOC	S101	Introduction to Sociology	3
SOC	S201	Social Problems	3

Select one from the remaining humanities and social science courses (3 credits) .

***History courses can be used as humanities OR social science requirements, but not both.**

Mathematics & Natural Sciences 10-12 Select one from the following (at least 3 credits):

Mathematics and Statistics

MATH	S106	Concepts and Contemporary Applications of Mathematics	3
MATH	S107	College Algebra (or higher)	4
STAT	S107	Survey Statistics (or higher)	4

Select at least one from the following (4 credits): Lab Natural Sciences

BIOL	S103	Biology and Society	4
BIOL	S104	Natural History of Alaska	4
BIOL	S105	Fundamentals of Biology I	4
BIOL	S106	Fundamentals of Biology II	4
BIOL	S111	Human Anatomy and Physiology I	4
BIOL	S112	Human Anatomy and Physiology II	4
CHEM	S103	Introduction to General Chemistry	4
CHEM	S105	General Chemistry I	4
CHEM	S106	General Chemistry II	4
ENVS	S102	Earth and Environment	4
GEOG	S102	Earth and Environment	4
GEOL	S104	Physical Geology	4
PHYS	S102	Survey of Physics	4
PHYS	S103	College Physics I	4
PHYS	S104	College Physics II	4
PHYS	S211	General Physics I	4
PHYS	S212	General Physics II	4

The remaining 3 credits must be taken from mathematics, statistics, or the above natural science courses.

UAA vs UAF vs UAS General Education Requirements

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

ATTACHMENT 203/3
UAF Faculty Senate #203, December 1, 2014
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes: Monday, October 20, 2014

Present: Elizabeth Allman, Chris Fallen, Bella Gerlich (Ex officio), Galen Johnson, Leslie McCartney, Walter Skya, David Valentine

Guests: Debu Misra

Minutes:

September 29, 2014 Minutes approved.

Department Chair Policy Revisions:

Debu gave some background as to why revisions to the Department Chair Policy are being proposed. Under the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), department chairs are faculty members. In the past some faculty have been elected chairs then their position has changed to one of administrator which then removes them from the bargaining unit. Faculty who elected a faculty to be Department Chair believed that faculty would stay as faculty to represent them but were then moved to administration. Some faculty met with Debu to look at revising the Department Chair Policy.

A revised policy was drafted and the Chancellor objected to some of the language in the policy (specifically naming the unions involved). The Faculty Affairs Committee is now responsible for drafting up another Department Chair Policy.

The committee then reviewed the latest draft and made the following decisions:

Page 1C – will - accepted

1D – required and be - accepted

2A1 – comma between preparation offering and assessment of the academic program

2A4 – accept revision offered (and other necessary documents)

2C1 – advise - accepted

3B – accept proposed yellow revision

3C – 1 st sentence okay. 2nd sentence is ‘Only in exceptional circumstances should there be deviation from this policy as asserted by the majority of faculty. Do not accept bolded changes.

3F1 – delete as noted

3F2 – to tenured faculty member who is eligible to vote as a UAF faculty member in any department. Delete yellow part to Agreements

The Committee decided that we should not rush through this; we need take our time as this policy is very important. We will look at it again next meeting.

A Doodle poll will be sent out for meeting next month.

Meeting adjourned.

**UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes for September 9, 2014**

- Housekeeping
- Approval of Agenda
- Election of Chair. Chris Coffman willing to chair; any others?

Coffman elected by acclaim.

- Meeting Schedule for Fall 2014?

Possibilities: T or Th 10-11; T or Th 4-5.

We will meet T, 4-5, biweekly, and will drop meetings as needed.

- Approval of Minutes from 4/22/14 Meeting. See attachment.
Approved unanimously.
- Approval of Minutes from 5/6/14 Meeting. See attachment.
Approved unanimously.
- Department of Mathematics and Statistics: Proposed Unit Criteria.
(The committee discussed these criteria in 13-14; this document is in response to our feedback.)

These were to be approved at last meeting from last year, but there was no quorum at that meeting. No substantive issues were encountered last year, only formatting.

Criteria moved forward unanimously.

See attachment:

- Mathematics and Statistics Unit Criteria
- Marine Advisory Program: Proposed Unit Criteria
(The committee discussed these criteria in 13-14; this document is in response to our feedback.)

It was noted that the final round of edits last year regarded template compliance.

Criteria moved forward unanimously.

See attachment:

- Marine Advisory Program Unit Criteria

- Continued Discussion of Committee Bylaws

It was decided that the latter half of the document reflects instructions to departments submitting criteria to the committee and could be split off into a separate document posed on the senate web page, akin to the 'Helpful info' section maintained by the Committee on the Status of Women.

Proposed new language regarding how units submitting criteria will communicate with the committee will be moved to the instructions section. Language concerning how the committee will be governed by the Blue Book template will be added to the bylaws.

The proposed 'do not reply-all' section of the bylaws will be struck, but there is an understanding among the committee members that communication with the chair regarding absences will be conducted privately, not publicly.

Coffman will bring back two documents for review at the next meeting (revised bylaws, and instructions to departments). There is already an existing 'instructions to departments' email that can be used as a starting point.

See attachment:

- Proposed Bylaws

Final business:

We should decide how late in the semesters we want meetings to run.

Coffman will put a proposed schedule together. We will not meet before first week of spring classes, nor after the final faculty senate session.

UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes for September 23, 2014

I. Housekeeping

A. Approval of Agenda

Approved unanimously.

B. Approval of Minutes from 9/9/14 Meeting

Postponed until they can be distributed.

C. Meeting Schedule for Fall 2014: Tuesdays 4-5 PM on 9/23, 10/7, 10/21, 11/4, 11/18, and 12/2 in the Kayak Room

We will communicate by email to modify this schedule, as Sunny Rice cannot make this time.

II. Fisheries Division: Proposed Unit Criteria.

See attachments:

- Proposed Unit Criteria
- Overview of changes to criteria

We approved first change, noted that the “may not” in second change sounds like a prohibition. Will ask that to be changed.

David pointed out the part of the second sentence “WILL BE EVALUATED BY THEIR PERFORMANCE AND FOR NON-TENURE PROMOTION” is unclear and possibly can be stricken. We will ask them to clarify.

David mentioned that “A MEMBER OF THE GRADUATE COMMITTEE” sounds like maybe there is only one graduate committee. Also, the “SHOULD” in that sentence is unclear, how strong a prescription is that?

Chris Hartman pointed out the part about “SECTION A.1 DO NOT APPLY” might be out of compliance with the mandate to not modify the Provost’s template. David points out that is SFOS language and not Provost’s template, so it is not a violation, but we are not sure what section A.1 is. The section number should probably be III.B.2. After further review, the section numbers are confusing and we will just ask SFOS to fix them.

David: Suggest striking “ONLY” from last sentence.

Chris Coffman will relay our suggestions, along with formatting issues (differences from Provost’s template) and request a member of the unit be present at the next meeting.

III. Continued Discussion of Committee Bylaws

See attachment:

- Proposed Bylaws

There was some discussion of the practice of only adding to Provost’s template. Is this just past practice, or does it come from the Blue Book (in which case, is it redundant to restate that?) Chris Coffman will ask.

Some wordsmithing to fix the sentence “The criteria to be reviewed may include those submitted every five (5) years pursuant to Blue Book regulations as well as those proposed by units for revision at other times”

Approved unanimously.

IV. Discussion of Draft of “Advice for Units Submitting Criteria”

See attachment:

- “Advice for Units Submitting Criteria”

Make same change as in last item.

Change period at end of first paragraph to a colon.

Some discussion of whether to ask for a summary of changes in addition to a clean and marked up copy, but we decided just the two copies are fine.

Approved unanimously.

ATTACHMENT 203/5
UAF Faculty Senate #203, December 1, 2014
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women

Minutes Wednesday, November 5, 2014; 10:30 - 11:30 am, Library Kayak room

Members Present: Jane Weber, Mary Ehrlander, Ellen Lopez, Derek Sikes, Diana Di Stefano, Erin Pettit, Megan McPhee

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Kayt Sunwood

Members on sabbatical: Amy Barnsley, Jenny Liu

1. Fall Conversation Café (Nov 4): Topics were used to provide catalysts for strategic thinking. Event was well received and organized and lots of comments & ideas were generated. Next time an icebreaker / introductions will happen. What's the next step with this idea? Another one in Spring – perhaps same topic with new people. Goal to get up to 20 people – get the word out in different ways. Idea to thank attendees and solicit feedback to improve and seed next event in Spring.

2. Snapshot: UAF Faculty: 2014 data available but has errors – Jane will meet with Sine to deal with this.

3. Resolution Supporting the UAF budget request "Expanding the Early Childhood Program (Bunnell House)" – Passed in the Senate.

4. Luncheon – 2015: Date set Tues Sep 22.

5. Promotion/Tenure workshop: Friday April 24th, Springfest day. Need to figure out panelists soon. Discussion of whether we should include a focus on promotion from Associate to Full as part of this event, or have a separate event for this? One idea to emphasize - 4th yr review may be too late to fix some problems so new faculty should be proactive to obtain reliable annual feedback earlier. Idea to do an event for faculty starting their 2nd year in the Fall. Idea to do break out sessions that are focused on key issues to maximize the efficiency for attendees (so for example, 2nd yr faculty could have their own group for a 5 year plan while those who are about to go up for P/T will have their own group.) Need to decide on subgroups and panelists.

6. Next meeting: Dec 3, 10:30-11:30 Kayak rm.

7. Discussion of plan to gather data on retention / departures. Perhaps prepare a survey monkey that the Provost office could offer to departing faculty to gather feedback. Also solicit feedback from faculty who remain at UAF to understand why.

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

ATTACHMENT 203/6

UAF Faculty Senate #203, December 1, 2014

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee Meeting Minutes for October 3, 2014

Attending: Cindy Hardy, Alex Fitts, Sandra Wildfeuer, Joe Mason, Gordon Williams, Eileen Harney, Bobbie Jenson, Dana Greci.

Chair/Co-chair elections: Cindy Hardy and Sandra Wildfeuer indicated their willingness to continue as co-chairs for the 2014-15 academic year. No one else indicated an interest in serving at this point. The committee approved Cindy and Sandra continuing in these roles for the current year.

Course approvals: Kelly Houlton from Developmental Math joined the committee to answer questions and offer clarifications on the Modular Mastery Math courses (DEVM 069 D,E,F and DEVM 109 G, H, J) up for our approval. We had reviewed these courses as trial courses last year.

Kelly noted that these courses had had input from the chairs of Developmental Education and Math because the modular courses, when approved, will impact the list of prerequisites for Math. These courses are the equivalent of DEVM 060 and 105. She explained how the modular system works; for example, a student could test into a module in such a way that they demonstrate that they have mastery of part but not all of DEVM 105. This student would then complete the modules needed so that they might complete the course in less time than a full semester. She has been working with the registrar, the business office, and financial aid to be sure that this model will work smoothly for students.

We approved the courses.

Learning Center update: Brandon Uzzell was working on developing an online Learning Center; however, a job change means that he will no longer be the Academic Advising Center representative on SADA, and this project now needs someone to take it on. While there are a number of Learning Center type activities going on in the library, there is still no formal Learning Center with connections and participation from many departments. We will keep this item on the agenda on an ongoing basis for now.

BOR request for Alignment: We discussed the Board of Regents resolution on General Ed alignment, particularly in Math and English, including developmental math and English. We asked if the alignment the BOR is seeking is limited only to the core—would they want alignment of courses in degree programs, for example. Alex Fitts noted that the alignment they seek is limited to the Core or GER courses. Cindy noted that groups are being formed in Math/DEVM and English/DEVE to address the issues the BOR want addressed—placement, course designators and numbers, descriptions, and outcomes.

Obstacles to Student Success: We have discussed for some time the possibility of developing a survey to determine the non-academic obstacles to student success at UAF. Cindy will follow up with Sine Anahita about meeting with us to take steps to develop such a survey.

College and Career Readiness document: We have been forwarded a document being drafted statewide defining College, Career, and Cultural readiness, and have been asked to offer feedback. We

examined the statement being developed for the State of Alaska and compared it with statements from other states. The following is a summary of our comments:

These are vague statements and not measurable (compare with Maine's statement). Some of the items listed, such as meeting Alaska State Standards, are something we should already do. How does this move anything forward?

One committee member has met with Education Northwest, the group charged with guiding this process. She noted that it seems like they are having difficulty getting groups to work together on this. We agreed that there is currently a disconnect between what students are getting in high school and what they need when they enter the UA system.

We are unclear whether these are floor, average, or aspirational goals. We feel that these goals may be too low. We suggest starting with the objectives of college readiness and working backward.

Cindy asked the committee to send further comments that she will compile and send to Ashley Pierson, who is working on this project for Education Northwest. We will look at our comments and add detail to them at the next meeting.

Math placement update: We reviewed how new placement methods are going this fall.

Gordon reported that the Math Placement committee is beginning the process of post mortem on the roll-out of ALEX placement this fall. They are hoping to improve the process for spring and are developing metrics to improve the efficiency of the process. Gordon notes that because of the BOR push for UA alignment, the committee is not sure how long they have to work on this, but notes that there would be changes in any case because UAA and UAS are not doing the same thing as UAF.

The goal of the committee is to achieve measurable improvement in student performance. Accuplacer was convenient, but didn't work. They will do the first round of assessment in January—but would be more comfortable if they could gather four years of data first!

Some challenges to be addressed include that there is no set day for HS students to take ALEKS. Could the test be administered as part of Orientation?

English/DEVE placement update: We have aligned English/DEVE placement score ranges with UAA and UAS, which led to the placement changes implemented this semester, using combined reading and writing placement scores on Accuplacer for placement. We proposed combined reading and writing placement, but were asked to decouple them—in other words, a student placing in DEVE does not automatically take reading. However students need these skills, so we approved special topics courses last year that compress 6 credits of reading and writing into 4 and 5 credit courses at the lower and mid-level of placement. However, these classes were canceled due to low enrollment and budget limitations.

Those teaching DEVE report that the new placement ranges seem to have sorted out the students into better cohorts. We speculate that the other change, changing DEVE 070 to DEVE 104 has given students more motivation now that the class can be counted as elective credit.

???? My notes run out here. Does anyone remember any further discussion?

We did discuss the Friday late afternoon meeting time and agreed that there might be a better time.

ATTACHMENT 203/7

UAF Faculty Senate #203, December 1, 2014

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for November 10, 2014**

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

II. Roll call

Present: Bill Barnes, Diana DiStefano, Cindy Fabbri, Andrea Ferrante, Brian Himelbloom, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Chris Lott, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Channon Price, Leslie Shallcross

Excused: Trina Mamoon, Amy Vinlove

Absent: Mark Herrmann

III. Summary of activities of the Office for Faculty Development (report from Joy)

Joy reports that the POD Network Conference was excellent, as always. She would like to see faculty members who are interested in professional development attend next year's conference which will be November 4 – 8, 2015 in San Francisco. She informed us that she attended two workshops addressing "survey fatigue" that were very helpful. She is planning on implementing a survey in January to garner more feedback on faculty members' professional development needs.

Joy passed out a flier specifying all the professional development activities for November, and there was some discussion regarding the NSF presentations. Franz asked if attendees are aware that the Office of Faculty Development organizes this. Joy responded that she is unsure since she is focused on facilitating the presentations. She also noted that the NSF presentations are highly interactive so are not recorded and archived for those unable to attend. Joy explained that teaching faculty are more interested in faculty development in general as compared to research faculty.

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

Chris reported that he will send a list via email of the faculty development activities at eLearning so that it can be incorporated into our meeting minutes. He noted that the new Chancellor's Fellows have started and that there will be nine faculty members this year. He explained that the chosen Fellows will work with eLearning and Distance Ed for three semesters (Fall, Spring, Fall). He suggested we check out www.cite.community.uaf.edu to see the past groups' projects and what this year's Fellows are working on.

Chris noted that he is currently working on some reports for the BOR, the Chancellor and the Provost. He shared some of the challenges they are facing in tracking and quantifying their faculty development efforts. It has not been possible to have a lot of direct assessment, and there needs to be clear definitions of terms so that all faculty development efforts can be more clearly understood. Joy noted that this seems like something she should collaborate on and so it really is a good time for eLearning and the OFD to work closely. Chris added that it will be even easier next year when they are moved to main campus. Franz asked that if there is anything that the FDAI committee can do to help with some kind of assessment plan for eLearning's faculty development efforts to please let us know.

Chris passed out a few fliers from eLearning, including one regarding their Faculty on T.A.P. (Teaching and Pedagogy) where faculty members choose a topic of conversation and eLearning will provide a place to meet (with food!) More information on upcoming topics or booking time is available on their website.

V. News on Electronic Course Assessment Implementation Committee

This is a subcommittee of the FDAI Committee and will include a variety of members with experience teaching various types of courses. Franz notes that we still need someone who teaches a “pure” lab course; CP volunteered to help with this for the current semester, but he will not be able to participate for spring 2015.

Franz informed us that the Provost’s office is putting this together, and due to the fact that there have been a lot of things to set up, the committee may have to re-think the timeline. We will try to have a meeting this week, and Franz has sent out a draft brief outlining the committee’s focus. There will be some notes on the progress at our next FDAI meeting.

VI. Discussion: What is the state of UAF’s faculty development culture and how can we assist in its improvement?

Franz noted that while our committee has discussed this a lot in the past, it is a good time to revisit the topic since Chris has been added to FDAI, there will be a new faculty evaluation system, and there may be new ways of assessing faculty development efforts. Franz asked us to think about what FDAI can do to help, and what makes faculty development successful? He noted that successful faculty development cultures at other institutions indicate a strong support from administration, so how can we improve this at UAF? CP noted that where teaching is the main focus, faculty development is embraced. Joy added that the culture is formed by the leadership. Franz opined that connecting institutional culture with faculty development culture may require us to accept that UAF is a split campus between teaching and research. We may need to redefine faculty development as not being just about teaching, and we may need to suggest a reward structure for participation and success. Kelly asked if we might invite Paul Reichardt to come to one of our FDAI meetings so that we could ask him for some input since faculty development was something he really pushed for. We decided that this could be helpful, and that we will let Provost Henrichs know we will be inviting him.

Joy reminded us that she will be gone for December and January.

VII. Other Business

a. FDAI Committee mission and bylaws

We will continue to work on this.

b. Faculty 180 comments/actions?

We had no time to discuss this.

VIII. Upcoming Events

a. Next FDAI meeting: 12-8-14 at 3:00 pm

b. Next Administrative Committee meeting: 11-21-14

c. Next Faculty Senate meeting: 12-1-14

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

ATTACHMENT 203/8

UAF Faculty Senate #203, December 1, 2014

Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for November 4, 2014**

Attending: John Yarie, Lara Horstmann (by phone), Cheng-fu Chen (by phone), Sean McGee, Mike Daku, Mitchell Reed, Donie Bret-Harte, Laura Bender, Amanda (for Holly Sherouse), Amy Lovecraft

- I. Minutes from the two previous meetings were passed
- II. GAAC welcomed Mitchell Reed as our new graduate student representative.
- III. GAAC passed the following course and program proposals:
1-Trial: [GEOS F694 - Deformation and Metamorphism of Crystalline Rocks](#)
1-GNC: New Course: [FISH F641 - Ecosystem-based Fisheries Management](#)
2-GPCh.: Program Change: [M.Ed. - Elementary Education](#)
- IV. GAAC discussed current assignments. A lot of items have been reviewed, but many need work. Proposers have been contacted, and we are waiting for revisions. Sean and Mike are working on the proposal for a program in Homeland Security and Emergency Management, which has a lot of coursework. They have already received some revisions from the proposers, including changes to some of the course numbers. They hope to be able to come back to us with a complete package that is ready to pass soon.
- V. GAAC discussed the first VetMed course descriptions (reviewed by Donie and Lara), and spent some time considering what questions we would like the proposers to answer. Karsten Hueffer will attend our next meeting to give an overview of the program and how the courses fit together.
- VI. GAAC discussed the idea of providing optional language that could be inserted into course syllabi to inform students of the faculty member's obligations to disclose information about sexual harassment or assault to the Title IX coordinators. Amy will draft language that can be considered at our next meeting.
- VII. Because we ran out of time, no new reviewing assignments were made. However, there is plenty assigned to work on at present. GAAC will meet again next Tuesday, November 11, 2014.