

DRAFT MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #173
Monday, March 7, 2011
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn
A. Roll Call

Members Present:

ALLEN, Jane (video)
ARENDT, Anthony
BAEK, Jungho
BAKER, Carrie
BARTLETT, Christa (audio)
CAHILL, Cathy
DAVIS, Mike (audio)
DEHN, Jonathan
DEHN, Lara
DONG, Lily (Craig Wisen)
FOWELL, Sarah
HANSEN, Roger
HIMELBLOOM, Brian (audio)
HOCK, Regine
JENSEN, Karen
JOLY, Julie
JONES, Debra (audio)
KADEN, Ute
KERR, Marianne (audio)
LARDON, Cecile
LAWLOR, Orion
MCEACHERN, Diane
MCINTYRE, Julie
METZGER, Andrew
NEWBERRY, Rainer
RENES, Sue (Joanne Healy)
REYNOLDS, Jennifer
ROBERTS, Larry (audio)
THOMAS, Amber

Members Present (cont'd):

VALENTINE, Dave
WEBER, Jane
WILSON, Tim (Patrick Marlow)

Members Absent:
ANGER, Andy
BARBOZA, Perry
BROCIOUS, Heidi
GANGULI, Rajive
PALTER, Morris
HUETTMANN, Falk (Sabbat.)
ZHANG, Xiong

Others Present:

ASUAF: Robert Kinnard
Linda Hapsmith, AAC
Joanne Healy (Alternate)
Kris Racina
Brad Lobland
Carol Murphrey (RSS)

Guest Speakers:

Michelle Hebert
Megan Damario
Clara Johnson
Annette Freiburger

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Susan Henrichs
Dana Thomas
Mike Earnest (phone)

Eric Madsen
Jordan Titus

Committee Reps:

Ken Abramowicz
Josef Glowa
Latrice Laughlin
Cindy Hardy

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #172
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:
1. Motion to Amend the Mandatory Placement Policy for Math Placement Test Expiration Date
 2. Motion to Clarify Grading Policy for Graduate Programs
 3. Motion to Accept Students Transferring to UAF with AA/AS Degrees as Satisfying the 100-200 Level Core Curriculum
 4. Motion to Change the Academic Disqualification Policy
- B. Motions Pending:
1. Motion to Approve the DANSRD Unit Criteria

III Public Comments/Questions

Orion mentioned that he brought some comments from a constituent to share later in the program during discussion of stacked courses.

IV A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

The systemwide academic council had a joint meeting with the President's Cabinet prior to the last BOR meeting. A suggestion that such joint meetings take place regularly was accepted. The rough plan is to have a joint meeting prior to the BOR meetings. This provides faculty a seat at the front table as one faculty from each MAU sit on SAC along with the three provosts and chief research officers. President's Cabinet includes the three chancellors and the vice presidents. This is seen as a big step forward in dealing with larger academic issues.

The Faculty Alliance is looking at such academic issues as incomplete grades, and "C" grades policy with a view toward aligning academic policies across the system.

SAC has asked Faculty Alliance to form committee of faculty to address distance delivered lab courses and determine best practices for lab material that can be adapted for distance delivery.

Word has been distributed today from statewide that the deadline for responding to the audit has been extended. Communication has improved, and some progress has clearly been made. Faculty Alliance passed the same motion on the health care dependent audit as UAF passed at its last meeting. UAS also passed it. Next, it's hoped that the "guilty until proven innocent" approach will be discussed, and we will be looking for the audit of the audit. Our voice was heard.

Roger H. asked if the legalities of the request were looked into. Jon said the issue is still being looked into.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

The Academic Master Plan as reformulated at Faculty Alliance was accepted with minor edits by the BOR. UAF was highlighted for having economic systems in our core. The BOR recommended

adding governance citizenship, as well as adding degree programs that focus on the Alaska economy; for example, environmental chemistry, fisheries, tourism, and economics.

As a Faculty Alliance member, Cathy serves on the Tuition Taskforce. They have been discussing differentiated graduate tuition where different rates are paid depending upon the program (a different rate for science programs, another rate for law, etc.). Cathy invited input from the faculty to take to the committee.

Jennifer R. asked what grounds would be used to set the differentiated tuition rates at the schools. Cathy responded that the details are still being discussed. The idea is, in cases where a student is in a master's or doctoral program in a very specific, highly paid field and where the student is not supported on research grants, the tuition would be set at one rate, while areas supported by research grants would possibly have another rate. The economics of the system are being taken into consideration. Students who will go into higher paying fields of work are probably more willing to pay a higher tuition rate. In the fields where students are supported by research grants, it's getting cheaper and cheaper to hire and pay a post-doc than a graduate student. Having higher tuition in those fields is a disincentive to bringing in and having graduate students.

Cecile L. asked about the timeline for this discussion and the decisions coming out of it. Cathy noted that the task force is looking at the end of this semester to finish discussions and set which ideas they'll pursue and bring up to the President. She and Mike are keeping UAF's unique situation in mind with regard to many of its programs and the issue of consolidated tuition. UAF has many vocational programs which are more expensive than the traditional community college associate degrees.

Dave V. asked about Cathy's comment regarding graduate students vs. post-docs. Cathy responded that having graduate students is preferable in keeping with the university's goal to graduate students. It comes down to the matter of helping one's career (a post-doc can immediately begin writing papers, for example) vs. supporting the education mission of the university and investing time in grad students.

V A. Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers was absent due to illness.

B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

The B.A. in Film was finally approved by the Board. Susan noted it was a real challenge with last minute concerns that had to be addressed for the President and Regents. It was made very clear at this meeting that the Regents are closely scrutinizing new programs and are not disposed to approving them right now. It has been suggested that new programs should only be brought up in the context of eliminating old ones. Susan's not sure about that approach, but she noted it's very clear that new programs must demonstrate ties to economic development and workforce needs in the state. Also recommended is that a program have substantial community support, in addition to faculty and student support. It's also evident that we have to agree up front to approve the program funding internally. The President has stated publicly on several occasions that he is not going to ask the legislature for money for new programs this year (and probably not in the foreseeable future either). She encouraged people to create options within existing programs because these don't have to go to the Regents and President for approval. An option within an existing program can demonstrate student demand for a new program down the road. Susan advised that faculty to talk to

their dean and to her first to see if funding a new program is likely to be viable before investing a lot of time and effort.

Susan announced that the BOR added sexual orientation to the nondiscrimination policy, noting it was widely covered in the news.

The Regents were concerned with the plans at UAA to build a larger sports arena than the one approved under the General Obligation Bond already. The Board is scrutinizing everything, and if we bring anything forward to them, we have to know all the answers and have all the backup information in place beforehand to answer their questions.

Regarding the clarification to the grading policy on the Incomplete grade for UAF which was sent forward to the President, he is still considering it and has yet to make his decision.

Susan mentioned the FY12 budget request status (still pending in the legislature). On the House side, they took out everything related to new programs; and only two fixed cost requests remained for operating expenses for new UAA building. They cut back required funding for salary and benefits to 50% rather than the usual 60% that was routinely funded. Efforts are ongoing to get those changes reversed in the senate bill, but so far not a lot of progress. Clearly, it's a very conservative mood in the legislature. On the positive side, they are significantly interested in funding a relatively large amount of the deferred maintenance. We had asked for permission to float a \$100 million bond systemwide to fund deferred maintenance, but there's some discussion of the legislature giving us either \$100 million or \$200 million in cash. Some legislators clearly support this while others don't; so it's not a done deal at this time and will probably come down to the final hours before it's determined.

The FY13 budget process will be different because of the President's decision that there will be no new program requests. New programs simply won't be put forward from UAF. They will instead be taking requests for internal reallocations, and some are already occurring such as the transition plan for ARSC. There will be a relatively abbreviated budget request process that's going to focus on internal reallocations to meet our highest strategic priorities.

The Chancellor was going to mention a new development in terms of establishing public / private partnerships to meet student life needs. There's a chance that the university will be able to get a private partner to have a new food facility constructed. Tentatively, the location could be in the Wood Center building extension. Interest rates in the current economy make this feasible right now.

Groundbreaking for the Life Sciences Building will be on March 30th at 4:00 PM. With the frozen ground, it will require a creative approach.

Amber T. asked for a clarification about the Regents' priorities for new programs in FY12 and FY13. Susan noted that in FY13 there is no money for new programs so we won't be asking for more increments for even existing programs outside of fixed costs. The Regents can be asked for permission to offer a new program, but it will be difficult to obtain and will depend upon meeting the recommendations mentioned earlier.

Cecile L. asked if there have been new discussions or plans related to the Fisher Report. Susan said preliminary discussions have centered around the president's comment that the report contained both good and bad advice. No specifics have been shared yet, however, to differentiate what is good advice vs. bad. At the BOR retreat, however, it was stated that they won't split the community

colleges off from the MAUs. They will separate the statistical information for the community college degrees out from the university's four-year programs for reporting purposes. Doing so should help alleviate problems with national rankings that were mentioned in the report.

The President is starting a strategic planning exercise at the UA system level, to be completed by the end of the calendar year. She thinks he'll ask them to look at the Fisher Report during this process. He has told Faculty Alliance that faculty will be included in the process, but no specifics are known.

Dave V. asked about the Fisher recommendation to have more commonality among the MAUs in their General Education requirements. Dana T. asked the President this question directly and his response was that the work on the strategic plan will answer that. The university has a lot of work to decide what the commonalities would be – there are many complicated issues. Susan commented that it's long been an issue at the BOR who want a high degree of transferability between campuses.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Maria Russell

No comments were available from Staff Council.

B. ASUAF – Robert Kinnard

ASUAF passed a nondiscrimination resolution and supported the passage of the nondiscrimination policy by the Regents. Fourteen people went to Juneau to talk about deferred maintenance needs, and a merit-based scholarship program. ASUAF elections will be held on April 14 and 15 for new senators and leadership. The Sun Star is requesting more funding for the newspaper as they're facing a \$15,000 deficit by the end of the year. They're also discussing an increase to next year's student government fee (which would help the newspaper, the concert board, and KSUA).

C. UNAC – Jordan Titus

Abel Bult-Ito has reassumed his position as UAF org VP as contract negotiations have concluded. Jordan will continue to be the UNAC rep through this term. The latest version of the CBA is on the Labor Relations web page. Carl Shepro's letter (which contains the URL) has been sent out and outlines the CBA changes. Voting ballots are coming out soon. Meetings will take place on March 10 for discussions with members of the negotiating team.

Nominations are open for executive positions in UNAC, and close on March 15. Ballots will come out March 25. .

Regarding legal issues with ConSova, their attorneys have addressed several of the questions. She did not have specifics, but noted there will be communication between union legal staff and the administration about the issues of concern.

Jordan read a statement by Rajive Ganguli regarding health care issues in which he thanked the organizers of the health care forum (sponsored by Sociology), and expressed his view that the dependent audit is a red herring and people are not noticing the steep decline of our health care plan. He also noted the absence of Faculty Senate leadership at the event, and feels this important governance topic should be given more priority. Why costs are shifted to faculty should be

addressed. (Note: This statement is recorded. Copies of the recording are available at the Faculty Senate Office.)

UAFT – Jane Weber

They are still in negotiations for the new CBA.

VII Guest Speakers

A. Michelle Hebert, Office of Sustainability

Michelle passed around a statement of activities by the Office of Sustainability as a handout.

She mentioned the opportunity for a faculty and staff to be on the Review of the Infrastructure Sustainability and Energy (RISE) Board, which manages the funds collected from the Student Initiative for Renewable Energy Now (SIREN) fee. Though predominantly made up of students, they have developed a governance agreement inviting one staff and one faculty to serve on the RISE Board. She invited the senate to support this agreement. Signatures to finalize the governance agreement are still being collected.

Gary Laursen, head of the Honors program, has volunteered to serve as faculty on the Board. The faculty member does need to be approved by the senate.

Jane W. asked where the water bottle filling stations will be. The plumbing shop is looking at this now, but the students wanted them at the Wood Center and at the Moore-Bartlett-Skarland Complex. Equipment has been ordered about a month ago. The water is so folks can refill drinking water bottles, and it will be charcoal filtered.

B. Megan Damario, UAF Development Office

Megan Damario gave a brief presentation about the UAF employee giving program which she is chairing. Co-chairs Clara Johnson and Annette Freiburger from the Interior Aleutians Campus accompanied her and spoke about projects to which employees can contribute. The campaign runs March 16 through April 18 and communication will begin on that soon. Clara and Annette shared about a special park project near the Museum they've been working on for a long time and it's now in the university's master plan and design stages. Employees can contribute to the park or to many other projects they might be passionate about. More information can be found online at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/giving/ways/annual/employee/>

BREAK

VIII Announcements

A. OSYA Nominations are Open until Noon of March 25

Jennifer R. read from the guidelines for how to nominate someone for the OSYA.

B. Promotion and Tenure Workshop on April 29

Handouts at back table, and information posted at the Faculty Senate site:
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#173>

IX New Business

- A. Motion to Address Faculty Concerns about Electronic Student Evaluations, submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee (Attachment 173/1)

Josef G. brought the motion to the floor, explaining it contains the committee's concerns about new future electronic student evaluations and their implementation. Electronic student evaluations are already being used for distance delivery. They are not necessarily opposed to electronic student evaluations but want such choices made cautiously and with faculty approval. Amber T. asked a variety of questions about electronic evaluations, including whether these forms are requirements for students to get their grades; are they done in the classroom and do they have to be done in class. Josef noted that the motion before them is to make sure discussion of these types of issues includes the faculty.

Jon D. pointed out that at this point the campus uses paper forms and there are security issues with moving that paper around. The task of collating it is onerous. An electronic process would perhaps return results to the faculty more quickly. They're encouraging the provost to keep the same questions of the current in-class forms, and to keep the implementation of electronic evaluations in the classroom. This would keep the response similar while lessening the workload of processing forms.

Amber T. referred to a letter she got two years ago about all her forms being lost for a semester. Streamlining the process is positive, but the delivery method has to be appropriate. The senate wants a say in the matter.

Dana T. said he sees this is an opportunity for the senate to be proactive and suggest a new process.

Dean Madsen (School of Education) commented that e-forms for courses via distance delivery typically have response rates that are dismal. It would be great to improve that situation.

Josef noted we should address incentives for students to respond to evaluations for distance courses.

Mike D. welcomed the discussion.

Provost Henrichs mentioned it's been effective at other locations to delay release of final grades if students don't turn in their evaluations.

Amber inquired if anyone has provided demos of digital evaluations used in the classroom. Could someone come and talk about technology of this type?

Cathy C. mentioned the use of clickers in the classroom with the existing questions which have been vetted for use over a long time. A staff person would come into the classroom to receive the electronic results.

Lara D. asked how we would deal with the written comments by students. Cathy responded they would keep that part of the paper system.

Dave V. asked what groups are working toward a proposal for this. He thinks a smaller group tasked with this project would be effective.

Jon suggested that the FDAI Committee could do some research and make recommendations. Josef responded that the motion contains the bulleted point that the administration work on this and faculty also be involved. He suggested a faculty senate subcommittee.

Amber noted she thinks a demo would be very helpful. The Provost said she's looking into some available options but hasn't been able to find one package that has everything they want and need. But when she does find something, she'd show it to the senate and ask for input and volunteers in a pilot program to work out the bugs.

Cecile L. mentioned it's most important to get honest thoughtful responses. She suggested they think about what encourages students to be thoughtful in their evaluations. Incentives and disincentives might be counter productive in achieving a thoughtful end result.

Rainer N. called the motion to question, and Amber seconded it. The motion to address faculty concerns about electronic student evaluations carried unanimously.

B. Motion to Allow Foreign Language Test Exemption and Core Credit Waiver for Qualifying Foreign Students, submitted by the Core Review Committee (Attachment 173/2)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor and explained the rationale of the motion which is purposed for foreign students from international universities with which UAF has articulation agreements already in place.

Linda H. of Academic Advising was given the floor and she asked about the assumption made that the language of instruction at the partner university is actually the student's native language. She sees some slight issues with what is the native language of the student.

Patrick Marlow commented about the language of instruction vs. the native language spoken by a student. Rainer emphasized that the motion is addressing transfer students from institutions with articulation agreements in place. This motion aids those agreements.

Linda H. suggested clarifying the motion by taking out the word "native" in two places where it occurs.

Julie J. suggested adding the word "foreign" to the statement about universities we partner with.

Jon read the motion as amended on the floor. The motion was called to question and seconded. The motion to allow foreign language test exemption and core credit waiver for qualifying foreign students was passed by majority with one nay.

C. Nominations for President-Elect

Jon opened the nomination period for president-elect. Cathy encouraged folks to think about serving. She noted the presenate meetings which allow close interaction with the provost and chancellor; and she noted that interaction on Faculty Alliance is eye-opening.

Jane Weber nominated Mike Davis. Mike said he'd need to talk to some folks. Jon asked nominees to please get personal statements for the next agenda turned in by March 25 if possible.

X Discussion Items

A. Course Stacking – Rainer Newberry (Attachment 173/3)

Rainer gave some background about this discussion item and its recent history. He commented on a statement by Debasmita Misra. [This statement has been posted online at the Faculty Senate Meeting web page.] <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#173>

Rainer explained why stacked courses came about and the need for them in Master's programs to get enough students in a course. The important issue is how to ensure that there's a difference between the undergraduate and graduate course levels so undergraduate students are not overwhelmed and graduate students are not underwhelmed by the course. The Curriculum Review Committee believes the existing regulations do not sufficiently address this.

Orion L. commented that 600-level courses and 400-level courses are easier to teach as un-stacked. He's unsure about having formalized requirements for teaching stacked courses, and noted Debu Misra is worried that we might make it harder for stacked courses to exist.

Lara D. expressed concern about creating a double standard by requiring new courses to pass more rigorous standards while old ones don't change. Rainer defended the motion, using the example of the syllabus requirements motion that the senate passed years ago. The motion only affects new and changed courses and he suspects over a period of five or six years the process of course changes which happen would update other existing stacked courses.

Cecile L. commented that the point is not whether a master's program can be offered without stacked courses, but whether or not the students are getting taught at the appropriate level for their degree. We shouldn't offer the degree if they can't be taught at the required level.

Amber T. suggested that outcome assessments for programs across campus need to be analyzed to make a determination about whether or not stacked courses are accomplishing their intended purpose. She noted there are lots of teaching styles across campus, and unless we're looking at assessments of these courses, the discussion is too early at this level.

B. General Ed Revitalization Committee Update – Dave Valentine (Attachment 173/4)

Dave provided an extensive update about the work of the current and past committees looking at changes that are needed to UAF's core curriculum. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is posted as a PDF at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#173>

Dave shared about what feedback they have received from various entities across campus and invited faculty to provide their feedback.

There were statements made and general agreement that a lot more in-depth discussion was needed on this topic. Jon promised this topic would be brought up again.

XI Committee Reports

Comments were very abbreviated due to the meeting running over time.

- A. Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair
- B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair
- C. Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Ute Kaden, Co-Chairs
(Attachment 173/5)
- D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair
(Attachment 173/6)
- E. Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair
- F. Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks, Chair
- H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair
(Attachment 173/7)
- I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee –Ken Abramowicz, Chair
(Attachment 173/8)
- J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
- K. Research Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen,
Co-Chairs

XII Members' Comments/Questions

Carrie B. asked for the PowerPoint by Dave to be distributed to the entire senate, and more time for discussion at the April meeting.

[It has been put online. See URL:]

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#173>

XIII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:10 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 173/1

UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate, upon the recommendation of the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee, moves to approve the following actions:

- New electronic student evaluations will not be implemented without Faculty Senate approval.
- More research on this issue will be done at the administrative level in order to complement the FDAI committee's concerns and recommendations (attached).

Rationale:

During extensive discussions in the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee, areas were identified that indicate that some aspects of online surveys of teaching are unreliable. Reasonable arguments can also be made in favor of electronic evaluations, for example, under the following circumstances:

- electronic evaluations may be the only practical choice in some distance delivery situations.
- security has been an issue at UAF with the paper-based IAS forms; however, switching to electronic evaluations will not necessarily prevent this from ever happening again.

This motion asks for more research on this complex issue that is so crucial to our professional lives as teachers. The motion also seeks to ensure that faculty concerns are addressed before a decision on the implementation of electronic student evaluations is made.

Attachment to Motion submitted by the FDAI Committee:

To: Faculty Senate

From: Josef Glowa, FDAI

This is a summary of what has been discussed in our committee regarding the pros and cons of electronic student evaluations. Committee member Melanie Arthur deserves special credit for digging more deeply into this issue, and compiling and summarizing some crucial data (see below). Attached are the two articles that best illustrate the current unreliable state of online surveys of teaching.¹

-
- The first attached article compares modes of administration (paper vs online), finding a huge difference in response rates for in-class versus online evaluations (70% versus 29%, in the absence of special incentives for online evaluators). They included two additional groups of online evaluations, one in which the instructor provided an in-class demo of the online evaluation website and another in which a "modest" grade incentive was offered for completing the online evaluation. In the extra credit case, the response rates were comparable for paper and online evaluations. It should be noted, though, that no similar incentive was offered to the in-class students. Perhaps they could have gotten a response rate closer to 90% for the in-class evaluations if they had offered extra credit there? This was a single institution study of business classes and has not, to our knowledge, been replicated.
 - The second attached article is a lengthier review of practices, emphasizing the quality of ratings by different modes of administration, and emphasizing the importance of response rates. It reviews studies that have compared in-person and online and finds a difference in response rates ranging from 37 to <1% lower, with an average difference of 23% (notably in the 1% case the in-person evaluation only had a 33% response and included only distance ed courses). The author describes strategies that have been used to raise response rates, but notes in summary that these have typically NOT been used. In their absence, online surveys can be expected to fall well below the acceptable response rate. (Of course, this does not engage the question of students' ability to effectively evaluate their instructors, which is outside the scope of this discussion)
 - Acceptable response rates: Survey research methods texts (e.g. Babbie's Practice of Social Research) suggest that an absolute minimum response rate from which to draw valid conclusions is 50%, and 70% is desirable.
 - There is precedent (described in the second attached article) for using a combination of paper and online within a single institution. It is worth looking into more deeply if the administration appears completely inflexible in their desire to switch to online evaluation.
 - There is a lot more research out there on this topic, and both attached articles include lengthy bibliographies if one wishes to dig deeper. These two pieces appeared to be good representatives of the available literature.
 - Of note, UAA has not adopted an effective institution-wide strategy for improving response rates. Instead, they now write on their reports that the data cannot be considered valid for evaluative purposes in the case of low response rates.

¹ Curt J. Dommeyer*, Paul Baum, Robert W. Hanna & Kenneth S. Chapman, 2004. Gathering faculty teaching evaluations by in-class and online surveys: their effects on response rates and evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* Vol. 29, No. 5: 611-623.

Duncan D. Nulty, 2008. The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* Vol. 33, No. 3: 301-314.

ATTACHMENT 173/2
UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011
Submitted by the Core Review Committee

[This older version does not reflect amendments made on the senate floor.]

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to allow a foreign language test exemption and Core credit waiver for qualifying foreign students entering UAF via a formal transfer or articulation agreement as specified below, by adding the following UAF Catalog statement on page 40, as indicated:

Effective: Fall 2011

Rationale: The UAF Core allows students who have studied a foreign language for two semesters or more to substitute such study for six credits of courses from the Perspectives on the Human Condition portion of the Core. Current Faculty Senate policy allows undergraduate students transferring from other universities to transfer such credit if it is earned at the university level.

CAPS and **Bolded** - Addition
[[]] – Deletion

After the “Credit for Language Testing” section on page 40 of the 2010-2011 *UAF Catalog*, and before the “DANTES-DSST (Standardized Subject Test),” enter:

- **LANGUAGE TEST EXEMPTION/CORE CREDIT WAIVER – INTERNATIONAL ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS**

STUDENTS WHO ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGES TRANSFERRING FROM PARTNER UNIVERSITIES TO UAF ARE EXEMPTED FROM TAKING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEST TO DEMONSTRATE FLUENCY IN THAT NATIVE LANGUAGE. THE “LANGUAGE EXEMPTION/CORE CREDIT WAIVER” FORM SHOULD BE FILLED OUT AND FILED WITH THE OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND THE REGISTRAR. UPON APPROVAL, THE STUDENT WOULD HAVE SIX CREDITS OF CORE PERSPECTIVES ON THE HUMAN CONDITION WAIVED.

NOTE: THIS APPLIES ONLY TO STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN FORMALIZED ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS ESTABLISHED BETWEEN UAF AND PARTNER INSTITUTIONS.

ATTACHMENT 173/3
UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

PROPOSAL FOR DISCUSSION

In order to ensure that 400/600 stacked courses TRULY are two different courses taught at the same time that simultaneously do not overtax undergraduates and sufficiently challenge graduate students, we enact the following requirements for such courses:

Each part of the two courses will have a separate syllabus that contains significant differences justifying 400 vs. 600 level. These differences will be apparent on at least a weekly basis and not merely an extra assignment added at the end of the course (e.g., a term paper). Such differences will be such that each of the different versions will have different (a) reading assignments, (b) homework assignments, and (c) exams and each will be graded separately.

Further, these regulations and examples of contrasting types of assignments will appear in the course and degree handbook.

Rationale:

STACKED 400/600 LEVEL COURSES ARE VITAL TO OUR MS PROGRAMS. That said, existing regulations are too vague to provide insurance that 400 and 600 levels are actually both presented when stacked together.

Existing Faculty Senate regulations relative to stacked courses:

400 level (senior) courses may be double listed ("stacked") as 400/600. The 600 level version of the course must require additional student effort, such as a seminar or a term paper, to reflect the greater acuity that we expect from graduate students.

Courses are also sometimes offered simultaneously at different levels (100/200 or 400/600, for example) with higher level credit requiring additional effort and possibly higher order prerequisites from the student. Such courses are referred to as "Stacked" courses and are designated in the class listings by "Stacked with ____". In the case of 400/600 level stacked courses, graduate standing or permission of the instructor is required for graduate enrollment and a higher level of effort and performance is required on the part of students earning graduate credit.

ATTACHMENT 173/4

UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011

Submitted by the General Education Revitalization Committee

GERC Working DRAFT on recommended student learning outcomes as of 2011.03.02¶

Outstanding issues:¶

A. All changes are provisional pending explicit finalization by the GERC¶

B. Student learning outcomes have not yet been addressed in groups 3 and 4¶

C. At least some items will require elaborating paragraphs to include how the GERC interprets the broad goals. For example, it was suggested that an appreciation for the various ethical dimensions of the increasingly pervasive role of technology in society might be included in one of the “personal and social responsibility” goals. Similarly, basic technology literacy might at this point be viewed as a prerequisite rather than as a goal for general education at the university level.¶

¶

1. → **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World**¶

→ through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages and the arts¶

¶

2. → **Intellectual and Practical Skills across the curriculum**, including¶

→ inquiry and analysis, information literacy¶

→ critical and creative thinking, problem solving¶

→ written and oral communication (including the current upper division oral and writing intensive requirement),¶

→ quantitative literacy,¶

collaborative learning¶

3. → **Personal and Social Responsibility**, including¶

→ civic knowledge and engagement—local and global (including globalization, sustainability, knowledge of Alaska and Alaskan issues, and the current understanding of global economic interdependence Core curriculum component),¶

→ intercultural knowledge and competence,¶

→ ethical reasoning and action, and¶

→ foundations and skills for lifelong learning¶

→ anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real world challenges,¶

4. → **Integrative and Applied Learning**, including¶

→ synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies.¶

→ demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems (through, in part, first year courses).¶

Deleted: → focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring

Deleted: → information (and technology) literacy, teamwork

Deleted: → and problem solving¶
→ practiced extensively across the curriculum in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects and standards of performance

ATTACHMENT 173/5
UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Minutes Unit Criteria Review Committee - 21 February 2011

Perry Barboza, Karen Jensen, Ute Kaden, Julie McIntyre, Tim Wilson

Next Meeting 23 March 2pm.

SFOS Revision

Page 5. Please clarify the intent of the following section. "Additional evidence of teaching ... publications based on student's thesis or dissertation research" We understand that publication indicates the quality of work in a thesis and therefore reflects the quality of the instructor or mentor. However, the convention for promotion and tenure files is to list a product only once as evidence of either teaching or research. This section of the document would make it possible to use the same set of publications to demonstrate both teaching and research performance by the advisor. It seems more appropriate that publications co-authored with a student should only be counted either as scholarly work or as evidence of teaching but not as both. Student publications that are not coauthored by the advisor/ instructor could be used to demonstrate the quality of instruction in a writing class or the editorial guidance of the advisor. How does the unit want to use student publications to evaluate the faculty - only research, only teaching or both research and teaching simultaneously?

Please remove all comments from the margin.

Please add page numbers for ease of reference.

The final documents are distributed as black and white copies. Please convert the red text to bold or underlined font for clear copies.

Music Criteria

The committee would like to discuss revision of this document at the next meeting. We would appreciate the attendance of a representative from the music department to assist with questions about the criteria.

- The formatting of this document is difficult to follow and is not consistent with those of other units. Please consult the criteria for the Department of Theater that was approved in May 2010 (<http://www.uaf.edu/provost/promotion-tenure/unit-peer-criteria/>).
- Page 3. Please distinguish between "local" and "surrounding community"
- Page 3 **PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION DOCUMENT SUMMARY OF UNIT CRITERIA DESIGNATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS**
- This summary is very difficult to follow in this format. Please follow the format used by other units by including the expectations for teaching (B), research (C) and service (D) in the appropriate sections. Define expectations for Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and full Professor that are specific to the unit and additional to the established criteria for UAF. This document will be used to evaluate faculty for tenure and promotion. Criteria for evaluation of non-tenured faculty should be removed from the document to avoid confusion.

- Page 4. Statement of Purpose for the unit should be placed at the beginning of the document before Chapter 1. Please confine comments to the specifics of your department.
- Page 7 and following: Please integrate the description and evaluation of each activity in the existing format for Scholarly Work (7-10) and Service (14-16)
- Page 8. Please remove italics or clarify the need for the different font.
- Page 10: 1. “Achievement in research. 1.c. They must be evaluated by peers ...
- 1.c.1. and 1.c.2. Music criteria ..” Please combine the criteria into one statement. Use 1.c.i. to avoid confusion with the main category.
- Page 7. Please clarify the following statement **“MAY ALSO BE MEASURED BY WHATEVER METHODS FOR EVALUATION ARE IN PLACE FOR A PARTICULAR EVENT.”**
- Page 10. A better definition of “knowledgeable persons” as peer reviewers would be helpful.

ATTACHMENT 173/6
UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

**Committee on the Status of Women,
Meeting Minutes for Fri, Feb 18, 2011; 1-2 pm,
Library, Kayak Room (408)**

Members Present: Derek Sikes, Jenny Liu, Kayt Sunwood, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen, Melanie Arthur, Nicole Cundiff, (online - Shawn Russell), Nilima Hullavarad, Dan White
Members absent: Jane Weber

**1. Cecile Lardon presentation on Women in STEM Disciplines project. co PI
Joy Morrison**
see PDF of presentation ppt.

Some of the Statistically significant findings: More women than expected in term / soft money positions. More women in lower rank tenure track positions than men and more men in higher tenure track ranks than women.

On survey men and women agreed on all questions but there were significant (and predictable) differences in the strength of their agreements.

Salaries at each rank were different between genders with men being higher, however, this was explained by the men pool having had more years at each rank, which when factored in removed the significance of the salary differences. However, ranks weren't analyzed separately and sig diffs in salary at some ranks might be swamped by lack of sig diff at higher ranks.

Also, salaries were 'annualized' - hourly salary multiplied to represent 12 months. What about variation between 9month vs 12 month and variation in summer salaries from grants? Can compare rates of pay but not actual take home pay because the latter data are hard / impossible to obtain.

Largest differences in salary is explained by discipline and time in rank. Really interesting discussion. Meeting was adjourned at 2:07;
Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes

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

ATTACHMENT 173/7

UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes February 16, 2011**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:10 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Mike Castellini, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Channon Price, Larry Roberts

Excused: Julie Joly, Alexandra Oliveira

III. Report from Diane

There was a good response to and turnout for Eugenie Scott's visit. Around 25-30 faculty members attended. Diane is working on getting information out to faculty on upcoming events. Statewide is taking care of advertising Neil Howe's Millennials presentation. Faculty are already signing up! Larry reminded us that Neil Howe will also be part of the upcoming Lilly Arctic Institute.

Diane mentioned that she is getting requests for travel funding but that there is no longer any money available. UNAC used their extra funding to pay for Neil Howe's visit. CP noted that the number of requests (and value, if known) should be sent along to the Provost.

People are indicating an interest in calling in for Don Foley's upcoming talk on working with challenging students.

IV. Old Business

Josef informed us of the Faculty Senate's reaction to our motion regarding electronic student evaluations, namely that the Senate felt the wording was not strong enough. It was suggested that we change the word "input" to "approval". After some discussion our committee tentatively decided on splitting the motion into two main bullet points: a) electronic student evaluations will not be implemented (mandated) without Faculty Senate approval; and b) more research will be done at the administrative level. Josef will update the motion based on our discussion and email the new version to committee members for more input.

V. New Business

Lilly Arctic Institute: Larry informed us that the registration fee for the Lilly Arctic Institute (March 3-5) will be waived for FDAI committee members, and while we are free to come and go as it fits our schedules, please register for the sessions you will be attending so as to keep track of the number of faculty expected.

Sub-Committees: After some discussion, it was decided we would not form sub-committees for electronic student evaluations and the upcoming Faculty Forums. We decided on a plan of action for

the first Faculty Forum (see below), and the issue of electronic student evaluations will require the energy of the whole FDAI committee.

Faculty Forums: The planned first Forum was cancelled due to too many things happening at once, so March 1 from 1:00 – 2:00 pm will be the new first Forum (IARC 417). Diane has emailed a link to a PDF file of the book *Start Talking: Difficult Dialogs in Higher Education* to committee members. The first Faculty Forum will focus on bridging academic freedom with difficult classroom experiences and discussion questions in chapter 1. Mike, Josef, and CP can attend the Forum and help guide the discussion.

Electronic Student Evaluations: Melanie urged us to resubmit our motion as soon as possible with the new, assertive language. We have been working on this for over a year and do not want the issue to be put aside.

VI. Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 9, 2011 at 8:00 am, Bunnell 222.

VII. Adjourned at 9:02 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 173/8
UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

GAAC Meeting Minutes
February 14, 2011

9:00-10:00 a.m.

408 Rasmuson Library (Kayak Room)

Voting members present: Ken Abramowicz (Chair), Donie Bret-Harte (phone), Lara Dehn, Orion Lawlor, Sue Renes, Amber Thomas (phone).

Ex officio members present: Larry Duffy, Laura Bender, Anita Hughes, Karen Jensen

Guests: Rainer Newberry; Jayne H. (note-taking)

1. The agenda was adopted with a revision to move item #7 (99-GCCh_BIOL F675/475) up with the item #5 discussion topic of stacked courses guidelines to solicit comments Rainer (since the course had already been reviewed by the Curricular Review Committee).

2. The minutes of the 1-24-2001 GAAC meeting were approved without modification.

3. It was noted that the following proposals were approved by email.

- 31-GCCh_PSY F652 - Practicum Placement - Clinical I, change repeatability
- 32-GCCh_PSY F653 - Practicum Placement - Clinical II, change repeatability
- 35-GPCh_M.Ed. -Remove Reading and K-12 Reading Endorsement Specialization

4. Discussion topic: UAF Catalog statement on academic dismissal of graduate students

Laura noted that the UAF Catalog lists reasons that students may be academically dismissed from graduate programs, but that it's not stated clearly that an academic dismissal is noted on the student's transcript. Language was suggested for addition to the Catalog, along with clear language about the ramifications of an academic dismissal.

Ken suggested that along with the transcript statement about academic dismissal, that reasons for it also be included, particularly a reason such as exceeding the time limit for the degree program. This leaves less to guesswork on the part of those seeing such transcripts. Amber disagreed, noting that the reasons could be many and varied. Laura responded that it takes a lot of paperwork to actually do a dismissal, and the first two reasons are almost never used alone (exceeding maximum time limit, and not being registered for at least six credits). Ken asked committee members to share their comments with Laura via email and she could present a revised proposal in the future.

6. Discussion topic: suggested guidelines for stacked 400-600 level courses

Rainer Newberry brought suggested guidelines to the GAAC and shared the reasons that the Curriculum Review Committee would like to see some guidelines put into place. Particularly, the college and school curriculum councils would find guidelines helpful. Often courses proposed for stacking are either too rigorous at the graduate level for undergraduates, or not rigorous enough for

the 600-level. Rainer noted the need for more truth in advertising for both levels of a stacked course.

Amber Thomas commented that more input should be gathered from department chairs first. Lara Dehn asked for more concrete examples of what is good or bad in terms of course submissions and syllabi for stacking. She also noted that financial cost was a factor for students who take stacked courses, noting some may not be able to afford the graduate tuition. She asked about obtaining student feedback on stacked courses.

Orion noted that stacked courses are often a means of providing graduate level electives by different programs.

There was not a consensus about stacked course requirements in the group, but requiring a syllabus for each level of the 400/600 course was not opposed. Rainer was encouraged to have the Curricular Review Committee study this issue further before taking any action.

7. Preliminary discussion of review process for the 53 new courses proposed by Civil and Environmental Engineering

Ken commented that this group of courses appeared to be focused on providing continuing professional education, and this is the very definition of 500-level courses. The consensus of the committee was that these courses did not meet the requirements of 600-level courses. Ken will talk to Bob Perkins about the matter. Laura suggested using them for an undergraduate certificate. Orion suggested creating a Special Topics course at the 600-level for the graduate certificate program instead. It was questioned, however, whether the majority of a program should be comprised of Special Topics courses. The committee did not want to approve these as 600-level courses.

8. As the scheduled end of the meeting neared, it was noted that a March 1 deadline for catalog submissions has been established by the Office of the Registrar. Thus, the GAAC members agreed to hold another meeting on February 21 to maximize the number of proposals that could be approved before the catalog deadline.

9. Before the meeting was adjourned, a brief review of previously discussed courses was held.

- 18-GCCh_ ATM F613 was approved.
- 36-GCCh_EE F614 was not approved because requested syllabus revisions were not made.
- 19-GNC_ATM F666 was discussed, but questions about the syllabus remained.
- 25-GNC_ATM F678 were discussed, but questions about the syllabus remained.

19-GNC, 25-GNC and the remaining proposals on the agenda that were not discussed will be placed on the agenda for the next GAAC meeting on February 21.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 10:00.

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

February 21, 2011 GAAC Meeting

9:00-10:00 a.m.

341 Rasmuson Library

Voting members present: Ken A. (Chair), Sue Renes, Lara Dehn (phone), Amber Thomas (phone), Jen Schmidt (phone), Orion Lawlor, Anupma Prakash

Ex officio members present: Larry Duffy, Laura Bender, Anita Hughes

Guest: Jayne H. (Notes)

1. Discussion/modification/approval of agenda

98-GCCh _ GEOG F612 - Geography of Climate and Environmental Change, listed under item 4 of the agenda, has become a trial course submission (#II-Trial).

2. Minutes from 2-14-2011 meeting were approved.

3. GAAC proposals approved (review leader is listed first, followed by the secondary reviewers).

- 41-GPCh_ Ph.D. - Fisheries Modify Admission Requirements (Amber, Lara, Jen)

While it was noted that the changes raised the bar to get into the program, this was seen as positive by the majority of the committee. It was noted that a student without any published papers, can still be admitted to the program with faculty endorsements. Larry mentioned that the number one predictor of success in Ph.D. programs is undergraduate research. The proposal was unanimously approved by GAAC.

- 42-GPCh_M.S. Fisheries - Expand elective course requirements (Amber, Lara, Jen)

Amber noted this one consisted of straightforward changes to electives. Lara provided some background to the changes. The unit is adding a human dimension component to the electives as they have some Rasmuson Foundation funding. The proposal was unanimously approved by GAAC.

- 43-GNC FISH F680 - Marine Sustainability Internship (Amber, Lara, Jen)

While there was a question about the summer and fall parts of the course, Lara resolved this issue and the proposal was unanimously approved by GAAC.

4. GAAC proposals discussed, but not yet approved.

- 19-GNC ATM F666 - Atmospheric Remote Sensing (Donie, Jen, Xiong)

The course syllabus needs modifications (e.g., goals and outcomes, determination of points in course). Jen will email the instructor.

- 25-GNC_ATM F678 - Mesoscale Dynamics (Xiong, Jen, Sue)

The syllabus needs modifications (e.g., concern about tone of the syllabus, lack of alignment between the grading table and the projects that are listed). Ken will follow up on this course.

- 38-GNC_EE F646 Wireless Sensor Networks (Orion, Donie, Lara)

While the instructor is working on a revised syllabus, there was agreement that this proposal can not go forward until more detail is added to the syllabus.

- 39-GNC EE F668 Radar Systems (Orion, Donie, Lara)

The course syllabus needs modifications. While the course is similar to an existing Geoscience course, the material is a subset of that course. If changes aren't received, it may be best to ask the instructor to re-submit this course as a new proposal after the required changes are made.

- 40-GNC_EE F675 Robot Modeling and Control (Orion, Donie, Lara)

Orion has received some changes. Lara noted that there are no course policies included in the syllabus. Review was delayed until the next meeting.

- 27-GNP MA in Political Science and related courses (GAAC proposals 28, 29, and 30)

Ken commented on the facts that a new dean will be coming to CLA in the near future, and that UA President Gamble has stated that he will not forward new program funding requests to the legislature. The support of Northern Studies faculty for this new program is conditioned on Northern Studies keeping its current TA positions. Since the proposed MA in Political Science requires new TA positions, approval of this program by the administration is doubtful unless new funding is found. There are also concerns about the quality of the new program related to the number of stacked courses in the degree requirements and the appropriateness of the internship option as an alternative to the traditional thesis requirement. Finally, it was noted that the number of required credits differs between the two options (i.e., 31-33 for the Environmental concentration, 34-36 for the Arctic Policy concentration. Approval of this program does not need to be rushed. Therefore, the issues will be discussed with the provost and will be discussed again.

Due to lack of time, the remaining items on the agenda were not discussed and will be added to the agenda for the next meeting on February 28.

Meeting was adjourned at 10 AM.