

DRAFT MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #175
Monday, May 2, 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
ANGER, Andy
ARENDT, Anthony
BAEK, Jungho
BAKER, Carrie
BARBOZA, Perry
BARTLETT, Christa
BROCIOUS, Heidi (audio)
CAHILL, Cathy
DAVIS, Mike
DEHN, Jonathan
DEHN, Lara
DONG, Lily - Craig Wisen
FOWELL, Sarah
GANGULI, Rajive
HANSEN, Roger
HIMELBLOOM, Brian
HOCK, Regine
HUETTMANN, Falk
JENSEN, Karen
JOLY, Julie
JONES, Debra
KADEN, Ute - Joanne Healy
KERR, Marianne (audio)
LARDON, Cecile
LAWLOR, Orion
MCEACHERN, Diane (audio)
MCINTYRE, Julie

Members Present (cont'd):

METZGER, Andrew
NEWBERRY, Rainer
PALTER, Morris
RENES, Sue
REYNOLDS, Jennifer
ROBERTS, Larry (audio)
THOMAS, Amber
VALENTINE, Dave
WEBER, Jane
WILSON, Tim

Members Absent:

ZHANG, Xiong

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Susan Henrichs
Brian Rogers
Dana Thomas
Mike Earnest

Committee Reps:

Ken Abramowicz
Josef Glowa
Cindy Hardy

Others Present:

ASUAF: Robert Kinnard
Olga Skinner, RSS
Linda Hapsmith
Claudia Koch
Kris Racina
Pat Pitney

Guest Speaker:

Beth Behner
Mike Humphrey
Vickie Gilligan

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #174

Minutes for meeting #174 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

Agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Approve the A.A.S. in Paramedicine
2. Motion to Reaffirm the Fisheries Division Unit Criteria
3. Motion to Approve the DANSRD Unit Criteria

B. Motions Pending: None.

III Public Comments/Questions

No public comments were presented.

IV A. President's Report – Jonathan Dehn

Jon thanked members of the Faculty Senate for their service and summarized the senate's accomplishments of the past two years under his leadership. Sixty-six motions were passed during the last two years, which included passing nine unit criteria and voting on five new programs along with deleting one program. Highlights during the last two years also included hiring a new UAF chancellor and UA president, and the completion of a new academic master plan. Shared governance has been evident through collaboration on motions with Staff Council and working with ASUAF student leaders. Faculty are now involved at all levels of decision-making including System Academic Council and President's Cabinet.

The President's Report is posted online at:
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/>

Recognizing those who helped make this progress possible, Jon thanked Cathy Cahill for her unwavering support, as well as the Chancellor and Provost. He thanked Jennifer Reynolds for her work on Faculty Alliance and help with redrafting the academic master plan, along with accepting the duties as new president-elect of the senate. He also thanked Jayne Harvie for her work as coordinator, graciously presenting her with a gift of appreciation on behalf of the Administrative Committee.

Jon mentioned current business of the Faculty Alliance which includes aligning grading policies across the campuses and examining distance delivery of laboratory courses. A ten-member e-learning task force (consisting of three reps from each MAU and a chair) is planned to look at best practices and address concerns. Because of the complexity and diversity of distance delivery at UAF, a local committee has been formed for UAF and Orion Lawlor will chair it. They'll be doing some work over the summer to examine what works best for UAF to deliver lab courses via distance learning.

Cecile L. thanked Jon for his hard work and leadership of the senate. Applause on the senate floor echoed Cecile's expression of thanks.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

Cathy reported that the Planning and Budget Committee has met, and the good / bad news is that the reallocation is 1% for performance-based budgeting (PBB). She noted that new priorities will be particularly difficult to get through the budget process.

She mentioned that statewide is planning to implement electronic timesheets for faculty in the fall. Beth Behner and Vickie Gilligan are here today to talk about that, and discussion is invited. She urged senate members to let their constituents know about this upcoming development.

Cathy provided a Tuition Task Force update. She noted that the President is changing the timeline for setting the rate of tuition from 27 months in advance to only 15 months in advance. He's doing this because of the uncertainties of the budget and related factors, but this makes it difficult for students to plan ahead, as well as faculty who are planning work for grant-funded projects. Cathy invited faculty to share their ideas with her or Mike Earnest as they continue their involvement on the committee.

She thanked Jon Dehn for the pleasure of working with him the last two years, and noted his continued involvement on Faculty Alliance. Cecile L. expressed her thanks for Cathy's work and for continuing the momentum of progress (along with new president-elect Jennifer Reynolds) into the coming year.

V A. Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers highlighted the celebratory activities taking place to recognize many accomplishments of students and faculty. He announced the winners of the Emil Usibelli Awards: Greg Owens for teaching, Vladimir Romanovsky for research, and Roger Hansen for service. [See also Attachment #175/15 for the list which includes nominees.]

The Chancellor mentioned his April review of the promotion and tenure files. He reads the faculty self-narratives and the reviews provided at each level (noting that he reads the entire file if there is any controversy). He complimented the faculty, saying he enjoys reading the files and seeing the variety of teaching, research, service and publications. Promotion and tenure of faculty are million-dollar decisions over the long-term. To all those who are tenured already, and those achieving tenure this year, you are worth the investment.

On the Facilities side of things, two ground breakings and a keel laying were mentioned. He noted the plywood mock-ups that were done of the labs and the bridge on the new ship.

The legislature is still working on the budget. On the university side, they're only funding 50% of the salary increases. They've also made it clear that new general fund requests must be matched by outside funding – which will create some challenges in that process.

The President is embarking upon the Strategic Planning process in the coming year. The details of that are still being determined.

B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

The April BOR meeting was held in Palmer, and the Regents visited the AFES Palmer Center for Sustainable Living. The meeting was relatively uneventful compared to those of the recent past.

Provost Henrichs noted that commencement is in two weeks. There are approximately 1,200 graduates, with 125 certificates, over 250 associate's degrees, 600 baccalaureate degrees, 230 master's degrees and 45 doctorates being awarded.

C. Remarks by Vice Provost Dana Thomas

Dana announced there are a number of accreditation reports available for examination on the accreditation web site. New additions this week are about each of the accreditation themes: Educate, Discover Prepare, Connect, and Engage. One of the reports is about defining mission fulfillment at UAF.

A hiring search is in progress for a new director of undergraduate research and scholarly activity. There are two finalists and they will both be giving presentations this week to which all are invited.

Dana thanked the General Ed Revitalization Committee for their work this past year and Dave Valentine for his work as chair of the committee. The ongoing process involves four steps, with the first step being today's Faculty Senate motion identifying student learning outcomes. The second step is identifying courses and experiences to achieve these goals. Dana noted the need for discussion about this, and suggested, for example, more flexibility in the required courses, and reducing the required credits by three credits (probably from the area of Perspectives on the Human Condition). The third step involves core assessment – looking at how students are achieving those goals. Right now the process used is too piecemeal; a more holistic assessment of the core is needed. The last step involves a plan for the regular review and revision of the core. Ideally, this review would align with the new seven-year accreditation cycle and probably occur prior to strategic planning. Dana recommended treating this like a living document, subject to amendment and revision over time.

Jane W. asked Dana about the survey he mentioned from a couple of years ago – faculty staff and students and advisory board groups were invited to comment. Full results of the survey are on the GERC's Blackboard site. Dana noted there had been a good response rate from faculty, but not from students.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Maria Russell

No report was available.

B. ASUAF – Nicole Carvajal, Robert Kinnard

Robert Kinnard reported on the student and FS senate discussion which Latrice Laughlin (Core Review Committee chair) and Jon Dehn had attended. Problems with the plus/minus grading system were talked about at that meeting. Robert also noted that Chancellor Rogers and President Carvajal had a successful student forum in April. He touched briefly on current ASUAF items of business.

C. UNAC – Jordan Titus

Cecile L. reported on behalf of Jordan. The UNAC Representative Assembly had their meeting, and the new contract was ratified. Abel Bult-Ito is the new president of UNAC, and Debu Misra is the

vice president for UAF. The new secretary-treasurer is a faculty from UAA. The ORP lawsuit is progressing with nothing new to report. A trial in February is anticipated.

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane mentioned they're in the process of ratifying their new CBA.

VII Guest Speakers

- A. Beth Behner and Mike Humphrey
Topic: Health Care Benefit Plan Changes

Beth Behner introduced Mike Humphrey, HR director of benefits, noting the open forums held recently on campus to discuss the health care benefit plan changes.

Mike briefly highlighted points from his PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of upcoming changes. For FY11 the health care plan cost is estimated at \$70 million, or about \$16,000 per employee. Over the last six years the cost increase has averaged about 10% per year. Blue Cross estimates cost increases at 15%. Either way, this means the plan cost is going up, in addition to costs related to the health care reforms that will go into effect. The impact of the reform changes is about \$7.2 million for the university, and \$4.5 million for employees. Rates would have gone up about \$1,000 per employee if nothing were done. Realistically in a short time frame, the only thing to be done was to increase deductibles and out of pocket maximums for the plan.

Preventive services from a network provider will be covered at 100% and the list of what's covered has been expanded. Dependent children are now covered up to age 26 years, without restrictions on whether they're students or living with the employee or not. There will be no life-time maximums to benefits. The vast majority of the plan has not been modified. Dental and vision benefits have not changed. Pharmacy coverage has gone up in cost slightly for tier 3 medications. Mail-order of maintenance medications is being required (after two local refills). Medications that could be damaged by sitting in the cold will be exempted from this. Co-pays will double for maintenance meds if mail-order is not utilized.

There will be no surcharge for tobacco users in next year's plan. But, they'll be encouraging smoking cessation programs for employees who smoke.

Cecile L. asked Mike if it wouldn't make more sense to work with local vendors for the pharmacy plan. Requiring mail order does not support the local economy and puts more plastic mailing containers into the environment. Mike responded that they looked at local providers, but mail order provided significant cost savings. Amber T. expressed her support of Cecile's comments, particularly supporting our local economy and our state.

Rajive G. asked about the supplemental life insurance change and the requirement of filling out the evidence of insurability form. Mike reiterated Rajive's statement in answer, so, this does mean that applicants could potentially be turned down for supplemental life insurance coverage over \$200,000.

Regine H. asked about future costs of the health care plan after this year. Mike responded that FY13 costs to employees will remain the same; however, FY14 is still being looked at. FY14 will also be impacted by further changes to health care out of Washington, D.C., and the ramifications are being anticipated.

Beth Behner encouraged employees to talk about their questions and concerns with the members of the Joint Health Care Committee or the Staff Council Health Care Committee. There will be increased discussion on a range of issues focusing on employees who engage in health-promoting activities and whether they should get a break in costs.

Lara D. asked about liability with mail-order delivery of medications that end up someplace other than intended. Mike responded that sensitive meds are supposed to be delivered with a chain of custody; e.g., FedEx delivery requiring signature. He did not have an answer about liability for situations where drugs are stolen or not delivered with the chain of custody, or otherwise mishandled due to being left at homes when no one is there.

Roger H. asked about the pros and cons of the university joining the state's system for health insurance. Mike responded that the state's per employee costs are higher than the university's, and the university would lose its flexibility for tailoring the health care plan to its users. There might be more flexibility on the pharmacy side, however.

Cecile L. asked about including students in the university health care plan – this has been successfully done at other universities such as the University of Florida. Mike said it has been discussed with Student Services in the past and that they'd be willing to look into it further. Jane W. noted that the Joint Health Care Committee has just formed a smaller committee to look into this.

BREAK

VII Guest Speakers – Continued

B. Beth Behner and Vickie Gilligan Topic: Electronic Timesheets

Beth Behner introduced the timesheet topic as one that the IT Executive Committee has identified as a high priority to move forward with automating. She introduced Vickie Gilligan, HR director of operations, to address the specifics. Vickie has been leading the project for the past year.

Vickie noted that grant effort certification will still require biweekly timesheets. The web timesheet will be made available in UAOnline for faculty and exempt staff. Faculty and exempt staff will only have to submit a web timesheet if they have used leave or work off of a grant. The pilot will begin in November 2011; and a pilot for non-exempt staff will start in August. A hand-out with mock-ups of the two types of timesheets was made available.

One problem that was identified by the project committee was that PPAs and fiscal officers have been filling out timesheets for people or changing them after the fact. They wish to resolve this by pulling those staff out of the timesheet process. More error checking will occur online with the automation of the process.

Vickie invited questions and emails. Cecile L. asked for e-reminders. She also noted the awkward timeline used currently for turning in timesheets before the end of the pay period. Vickie responded that the timeline will be changing so that timesheets will be filled out the following Monday after the pay period ends.

Lara D. asked about the process when employees are out in the field or on a ship without internet access. Vickie responded that there will be exceptions in these types of cases, requiring use of paper or faxed timesheets.

Amber asked about reminders and Vickie confirmed that they will send electronic notices. Amber asked about the 9-month contract employees and how the new system will affect pay cycles. Vickie said that there will be no difference in payment dates and timelines that have existed.

Jane W asked about faculty who aren't paid on grants and not taking leave during a pay period. Vickie reiterated that in such cases no timesheet need be submitted.

Jennifer R. noted that in SFOS all faculty work out of grants in addition to state funding throughout the contract year. A uniform system such as Vickie has described removes unit staff involvement from the process, making management of their grant and state funds extremely difficult. Automatic grant tracking does not take place in Banner, thus it takes key unit staff to keep track of the funds available to faculty, particularly for those working out of several grants. Taking away the unit's ability to manage their budgets is of great concern and will create more work in the long run for staff who will be working to fix problems after the fact. Because many faculty work more than 40 hours a week, it's not always possible to match effort to a grant during each pay period.

Vickie responded that statewide is working with over 60 fiscal officers on this project and getting their input. Jennifer commented that this system is unworkable because it cuts out the administrative link in the chain that's responsible for tracking and managing their grants. If the only people who can access the timesheet are the employee and the supervisor, where does grant management come in?

Vickie noted they're hoping to have more grant management occur before pay periods occur, but stated they'll try to work closely with the fiscal officers. The issue with administrative staff changing timesheets is that it disqualifies grant effort certification. Statewide will provide reports to help the administrative staff manage the grants for their units. Meetings are occurring monthly to get feedback with the fiscal officers to help build the grant reports that are needed.

Amber T. expressed deep concern because there is too much staff turnover at HR. Units need their administrative assistants on the job for their departments particularly where grants are concerned. HR needs to stabilize before taking on projects like this.

Vickie reiterated that they're not trying to take administrative staff and personnel/payroll assistants (PPAs) out of the information loop; they're just making the process such that those staff cannot access and change timesheets. Vickie asked what type of access the departments want their admin personnel to have with regard to timesheets. Jennifer responded that statewide should allow the units to handle this in a way that's productive and workable for them. Currently the employees do fill out their timesheets themselves. Then, their staff check numerous funds after the timesheets are filled out which helps prevent shuffling funds after the fact. Mistakes are corrected by the employee and their admin staff together before the timesheets are signed off by the supervisors. Vickie stated that she recognized the need for checking on the current fund balances in this process.

Provost Henrichs suggested an electronic process that allows for more review in the routing process so that administrative staff are kept in the loop and if changes are made, the timesheet would route back to the employee for their review and approval. This would still preserve grant effort certification. Vickie asked for people to ask their fiscal officers to bring forward their feedback to

her team. She thought the Provost's suggestion was a possibility. Suggestions can be emailed to syhr@alaska.edu.

Amber urged the senate to be cautious, noting the difficulty with hiring processes which are also automated by HR.

Debra J. commented on the labor intensity of the process here at UAF and asked why the biweekly payroll approach is used for grant effort certification when a more simple process could be used to accomplish that. Vickie noted there is another committee looking at the possibility of using a longer term approach for grant effort certification rather than the biweekly payroll system used now.

Jon D. commented about his experience with grant termination. The time delay in finding out what funds are left to be expended is too long. Electronic reporting time needs to be shortened so that faculty and administrators can see what the actual fund balances are, particularly when a grant is ending and funds need to be closed out.

VIII Announcements

A. Campus Research Day on May 5.

Information at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/research/studentsindex/opportunities/researchday.xml>

IX Adoption of Consent Agenda

- A. Motion to approve the list of 2010-2011 degree candidates, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 175/1)
- B. Resolution of Appreciation for Jonathan Dehn, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 175/2)
- C. Resolution for the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 175/3)
- D. Special Recognition of Senate Service

The consent agenda was adopted as presented.

X New Business

- A. Motion to Amend the Course Compression and Approval Policies, submitted by Core Review and Curricular Affairs Committees (Attachment 175/4)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor explaining that the purpose of it is to bring all courses being compressed up for review by curriculum committees in the same manner as core courses. The Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee also supports the motion. Jon asked for questions. There were none; the motion was called to question and seconded. The motion to amend the course compression and approval policies was passed unanimously.

B. Motion to Enforce Core Assessment Compliance across Delivery Methods, submitted by the Core Review and Curricular Affairs Committees (Attachment 175/5)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor. It came out of Core Review because that committee has had much difficulty finding any assessments for courses delivered by various methods, particularly non-traditional offerings. The motion was called to question and seconded. It was passed unanimously.

C. Motion to Approve a New Set of Student Learning Outcomes for General Education, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee and General Education Revitalization Subcommittee (Attachment 175/6)

Dave V. brought the motion to the floor and described the committee's efforts to devise the new objectives and learning outcomes. Questions were invited, but there were none. The motion was called to question and seconded. The motion to approve a new set of student learning outcomes for general education was passed unanimously.

D. Resolution to Review UAF's Interpretation of the "Completion Date" for Graduate Programs used for International Students, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 175/7)

Ken A. brought the resolution to the floor and gave some background, noting that there is progress being made by administration already toward obtaining legal counsel to review the current interpretation of the completion date for graduate programs for international students. No one had questions about the resolution, and it was called to question and seconded. The resolution was passed unanimously.

E. Motion to Amend the Academic Dismissal Policy for Graduate Students, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 175/8)

Ken A. brought the motion to the floor, explaining that it puts into writing policy that already exists. Amber asked about statements C and D in the motion and Ken explained the reasoning for combining those items into one statement. The motion was then called to question and seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

XI Committee Reports and Year-end Summaries

A. Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 175/9)

Minutes for Curricular Affairs Committee are attached.

B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair (Attachment 175/10)

Jennifer noted the project continuing next year: teaching by non-regular faculty at UAF. These are faculty who are not research faculty nor are they tenure-track. The committee has data for three and a half semesters [years] which they're compiling into a usable format. They're also working on a questionnaire for units to help put the data into perspective. They'll share results next year. Jon thanked the committee for their ongoing multi-year effort.

Minutes and year-end report for Faculty Affairs Committee are attached.

C. Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Ute Kaden, Co-Chairs

A year-end report is forthcoming.

D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair
(Attachment 175/11)

The promotion and tenure workshop was a great success with about 40 attendees. Morris P. commented that it was a good workshop, and suggested feedback forms as a way to respond after the fact with ideas and suggestions.

The CSW year-end summary is attached.

D. Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair

A year-end report is forthcoming.

F. Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

Rainer noted their workload on items being reviewed, and the committee is hoping to wrap it all up very soon this month.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks, Chair

No report was available.

H Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair
(Attachment 175/12)

Committee minutes are attached. A year-end report is forthcoming.

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee –Ken Abramowicz, Chair
(Attachment 175/13)

The committee is still working on curriculum proposals, and their last meeting will be on May 16. A report will be made available and posted on the committee web site.

[The GAAC year-end report is now posted at both the committee's web page; and the FY11 Meetings page: <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#175>]

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair

Cindy noted they have one more meeting. The subcommittee for the Learning Commons still continues work on this project with the Library. The SADA committee has mostly been looking at the consequences for mandatory placement this year, and continues with that effort.

K. Research Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen,
Co-Chairs (Attachment 175/14)

Orion noted the big accomplishment, of course, has been becoming a permanent senate committee. He reported that the FAQ for principal investigators is approaching completion. They've worked with the tuition task force this past semester. They'll continue working with VC Mark Myers and his shared vision for research at UAF. Myers serves on the committee as an ex officio member.

The committee plans to work on tracking grant money allocation and transparency issues related to that. Also, Orion will be working on the issues with remote science labs. Minutes are attached.

XII Members' Comments/Questions

No comments were shared.

XIII Award Presentations and Announcements

A. Presentation of the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award

Cathy read the resolution aloud and the bound version was presented to Rainer Newberry with much applause from those present. Reference Attachment 175/3.

B. Announcement of Usibelli Awards (Attachment 175/15)

President Jon Dehn announced the winners of this year's teaching, research and service awards. Reference Attachment 175/15 for a complete list of the winners along with the names of those nominated.

- Winner, Distinguished Teaching: Gregory Owens, Associate Professor of Mathematics
- Winner, Distinguished Research: Vladimir Romanovsky, Professor of Geophysics
- Winner, Distinguished Service: Roger Hansen, Professor of Seismology

C. Announcement of Emeriti Faculty Awards (Attachment 175/16)

President Jon Dehn announced the names of those awarded the status of emerita/us. Reference Attachment 175/16 for the complete list of awardees.

D. Recognition of Senate Service

President Dehn and President-Elect Cahill presented recognition letters and certificates of appreciation to all of the Faculty Senate committee chairs. A special letter was announced for Jordan Titus for her faithful service to the senate during the past year on behalf of United Academics.

E. Presentation of Resolution of Appreciation for Jonathan Dehn

A special resolution of appreciation for President Jon Dehn was read aloud by Cathy Cahill (reference Attachment 175/2), followed by resounding applause from the Faculty Senate. She also presented Jon with a generous gift certificate and a t-shirt befitting Jon's good humor over the past eventful year.

XIV Adjournment of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate

Just before adjournment, Jon requested a moment of silence to show respect for the recent passing of both Dr. Oscar Kawagley and Mr. Fred Smits.

Upon a motion of adjournment, Jon passed the gavel to President Cathy Cahill.

Continued on next page.

XV 2011-2012 Faculty Senate Members Take Their Seats

A. Roll Call of 2011-2012 Members

Members Present:

ABRAMOWICZ, Ken

REYNOLDS, Jennifer

ARENDT, Anthony

SHORT, Margaret

BAEK, Jungho

VALENTINE, Dave

BAKER, Carrie

WEBER, Jane

BANDOPADHYAY, Sukumar

WINFREE, Cathy

BARBOZA, Perry

BROWN, Stephen - Leif Albertson

Members Absent:

CAHILL, Cathy

ALEXEEV, Vladimir - Traveling

DAVIS, Mike

BRET-HARTE, Donie

DEHN, Lara

RADENBAUGH, Todd

FALLEN, Chris

ZHANG, Xiong

GEORGE-BETTISWORTH, Retchenda

Non-voting/Administrative

GOLUX, Stephen

Members Present:

GUSTAFSON, Karen - Vincent Cee

Susan Henrichs

HEALY, Joanne

Dana Thomas

HENRY, David

HIMELBLOOM, Brian

Committee Reps:

JENSEN, Karen

Ken Abramowicz

JOHNSTON, Duff

Cindy Hardy

JOLY, Julie

JONES, Debra

LARDON, Cecile

LAWLOR, Orion

MATHIS, Jeremy - Sarah Hardy

MCEACHERN, Diane (audio)

METZGER, Andrew

MEYER, Franz

MOSES, Debra

NADIN, Elisabeth

NEWBERRY, Rainer

NG, Chung-Sang

RENES, Sue

B. President's Remarks – Cathy Cahill

Cathy welcomed everyone, thanking new and continuing members for serving on the senate. She mentioned important business items /issues coming up for the 2011-12 term, including the accreditation site visit, electronic timesheets, revision of the Core, use of non-regular faculty, and revising the Blue Book.

C. President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer also welcomed the new senate. She announced that an informal orientation session will take place in the fall (announcement to follow in late summer). It will be informal and will cover how the senate works and what to expect.

Mike D. commented that he had attended a governance conference last fall, and will attend another one in June. Jennifer invited him to present a summary to the senate in the fall.

XVI Remarks by Susan Henrichs

The Provost also extended her welcome to new and continuing members of the senate, anticipating a busy 2011-12 term.

XVII New Senate Business

- A. Motion to Endorse 2011-2012 Senate Committee Membership, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 175/17)

Cathy brought the committee membership motion to the floor, mentioning that the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee membership is still being updated and their committee membership was inadvertently left out of the motion. With their membership update pending, the rest of the motion was called to question and seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

- B. Motion to Approve the 2011-2012 UAF Faculty Senate Meeting Calendar, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 175/18)

Cathy brought the motion to the floor. Orion noted that October 3 is the first day of the accreditation site visit. The Provost noted that she may not be able to attend the meeting that day. The motion was called to question and seconded. The 2011-12 meeting calendar motion was passed unanimously.

- C. Motion to Authorize the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate during the summer months, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 175/19)

Cathy introduced the motion, explaining its need during the summer break. The motion was voted upon and passed unanimously.

XVIII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30 PM.

ATTACHMENT 175/1
UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Regents that the attached list of individuals be awarded the appropriate UAF degrees pending completion of all University requirements. [Note: a copy of the list is available in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall]

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: These degrees are granted upon recommendation of the program faculty, as verified by the appropriate department head. As the representative governance group of the faculty, UAF Faculty Senate makes that recommendation.

ATTACHMENT 175/2
UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR JONATHAN DEHN

WHEREAS, Jon Dehn has served the UAF Faculty Senate in a manner deserving of the UAF Faculty Senate's greatest admiration and respect, especially during his two years as President of the UAF Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, Jon Dehn has served as Senator to the UAF Faculty Senate from 2006-2008, as a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee from 2006-2008 and as chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee from 2007-2008; and

WHEREAS, Jon Dehn has served as a member of the Administrative Committee from 2007-2008, as Chair of the Administrative Committee and as President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate from 2008-2009; and

WHEREAS, Jon Dehn has served as a member of the UAF Governance Coordinating Committee from 2009-2011; and

WHEREAS, Jon Dehn has served as President of the UAF Faculty Senate from 2009-2011 and with keen insight and good humor has successfully led the Faculty Senate through difficult and often contentious discussions; and

WHEREAS, Jon Dehn effectively advocated for UAF faculty as a member of the UA Faculty Alliance from 2009-2011 and as Faculty Alliance Chair from 2009-2010; and

WHEREAS, Jon Dehn, as a member of Faculty Alliance, demonstrated that faculty can collaborate across MAUs to achieve goals of importance to UA, such as finalizing the Academic Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, Jon Dehn, as Chair of Faculty Alliance and President of the UAF Faculty Senate, fought for faculty across MAUs to have a larger voice on academic issues at the UA Statewide level; and

WHEREAS, Jon Dehn constructively led the UAF Faculty Senate's effort to inform the UA Administration of the difficulties with the Health Care Audit, resulting in a change in timelines and an improvement in communications; and

WHEREAS, The UAF Faculty Senate wishes to acknowledge the outstanding service rendered the faculty and the University by the work of Jon Dehn as he concludes his extended term as president; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate acknowledges the many contributions of Jon Dehn and expresses its appreciation for his exemplary service.

ATTACHMENT 175/3
UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

**OUTSTANDING SENATOR OF THE YEAR AWARD
FOR
ACADEMIC YEAR 2011**

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has served the university in the UAF Faculty Senate for the past nine years; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has provided a mother lode of leadership as Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee during academic years 2003 through 2006, and 2010-2011; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has also served as Chair of the Curriculum Review Committee for the past seven years; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has served as a member of the Core Review Committee from 2010-2011; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has served as a representative of both Curricular Affairs and Curriculum Review on the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has led the Curricular Affairs Committee to pay dirt in bringing 10 motions before the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry engaged faculty in dialog aimed at digging to the core of academic issues ranging from courses designed for high school up to stacked graduate courses; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry, unabashedly ungroomable, has provided down-to-earth, provocative and highly caffeinated advocacy for issues about which he is passionate; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate, not wishing to take his outstanding service for granite, recognizes Rainer Newberry as Outstanding Senator of the Year for Academic Year 2011. He rocks!

ATTACHMENT 175/4

UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011

Submitted by the Core Review Committee and Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the policies on course compression and course approval as shown below:

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011

RATIONALE: If core courses are important enough to be reviewed for compressed offerings, then why not all courses? Are not all courses important? Doing so creates a uniform evaluation method for this variety of course offerings. Further, we ought to be able to use the lessons learned in compressing core courses to non-core courses. Along those lines we intend to have guidelines for course compression created as part of the 'course and degrees manual'.

[[]] = Deletions

BOLD CAPS = Additions

Any **EXISTING SEMESTER-LONG** course **THAT IS TO BE OFFERED IN A "compressed to less than six weeks" FORMAT** must be approved by the college or school's curriculum council **AND THE APPROPRIATE UAF FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE (SADA, CORE REVIEW, CURRICULUM REVIEW OR GAAC)**. Any **NEW** [[core]] course [[compressed to less than six weeks must be approved by the Core Review Committee.]] **PROPOSAL MUST INDICATE THOSE COURSE COMPRESSION FORMAT(S) IN WHICH THE COURSE WILL BE TAUGHT. ONLY APPROVED COUSE FORMATS WILL BE ALLOWED FOR SCHEDULING.**

ATTACHMENT 175/5

UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011

Submitted by the Core Review Committee and Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to enforce core assessment compliance across delivery methods.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011

RATIONALE: This motion ensures that courses bearing the core designator will be assessed in the same manner across delivery methods. Currently many correspondence courses and summer session courses do not observe the core assessment.

[[]] = Deletions

BOLD CAPS = Additions

ALL UAF COURSES BEARING A CORE DESIGNATION MUST COMPLY WITH CORE ASSESSMENT. THIS INCLUDES COURSES OFFERED THROUGH DISTANCE DELIVERY AS WELL AS COURSES NOT OFFERED IN FALL/ SPRING SEMESTERS.

ATTACHMENT 175/6
 UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
 Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee and
 General Education Revitalization Subcommittee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the following set of objectives and student learning outcomes for the purpose of developing the next general education curriculum and assessment system for all undergraduate students seeking BA, BS, AA, and AS degrees.

General education objectives and learning outcomes for the undergraduate students seeking BA, BS, AA, and AS degrees at the University of Alaska Fairbanks:

- 1. Build Knowledge of Human Institutions, Socio-Cultural Processes, and the Physical and Natural World** through study of the natural and social sciences, technologies, mathematics, humanities, histories, languages and the arts.
 - Competence will be demonstrated for the foundational information in each subject area, its context and significance, and the methods used in advancing each.
- 2. Develop Intellectual and Practical Skills across the curriculum**, including inquiry and analysis, critical and creative thinking, problem solving, written and oral communication, information literacy, technological competence, and collaborative learning.
 - Proficiency will be demonstrated across the curriculum through critical analysis of proffered information, well-reasoned solutions to problems or inferences drawn from evidence, effective written and oral communication, and satisfactory outcomes of group projects.
- 3. Acquire Tools for Effective Civic Engagement** in local through global contexts, including ethical reasoning, intercultural competence, and knowledge of Alaska and Alaskan issues.
 - Facility will be demonstrated through analyses of issues including dimensions of ethics, human and cultural diversity, conflicts and interdependencies, globalization, and sustainability.
- 4. Integrate and Apply Learning**, including synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies, adapting them to new settings, questions, and responsibilities, and forming a foundation for lifelong learning.
 - Preparation will be demonstrated through production of a creative or scholarly product that requires broad knowledge, appropriate technical proficiency, information collection, synthesis, interpretation, presentation, and reflection.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011

RATIONALE:

The American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) has assembled a framework of learning outcomes entitled “Liberal Education and America's Promise” (LEAP). This framework recognizes four broad goals of general education: increase disciplinary knowledge, develop thinking skills, connect academic work with societal issues, and prepare for lifelong learning.

The General Education Revitalization Committee (GERC) and its predecessor, the Core Revitalization and Assessment Group (CRAG), both found support within themselves and among the broader UAF faculty for revision of the UAF Core Curriculum to incorporate a LEAP-based set of learning outcomes. During 2011, the GERC circulated drafts for comment to academic deans, department chairs, curriculum councils, and faculty for comment; it also held two faculty forums to solicit feedback. The overwhelming thrust of the feedback has been supportive of the approach and direction of the working drafts. All of the feedback received has been carefully considered, and much of it has been incorporated into the proposed set of objectives and learning outcomes.

The overall result is a set of learning outcomes that reflects the near-consensus view of the GERC (9 Yea, 0 Nay, 1 Abstain, 1 absent). The challenge has been to set goals that are at once both general enough to not dictate strategy or tactics in achieving them, yet concrete enough that assessment efforts will be able to gain traction. The GERC proposes the following set of learning outcomes with three disclaimers. First, these learning outcomes do not necessarily correspond to courses; many are explicitly envisioned as being addressed across the entire curriculum. Second, the GERC remains divided about how best to advance student understanding of the increasingly pervasive role of technology in society as well as its societal consequences. Third, there should be significant continuity between the committees tasked with establishing the objectives and learning outcomes, the new general education curriculum, and the outcomes assessment.

Therefore the General Education Revitalization Committee, through the Curricular Affairs Committee, proposes

1. that the UAF Faculty Senate adopt the above objectives and learning outcomes as the basis on which to develop the next general education strategy for UAF and to develop assessment strategies for their achievement, and
2. that these objectives and learning outcomes be treated as a “living document” subject to revisions approved by the Faculty Senate or designated committees
3. that these objectives and learning outcomes will not replace the current objectives of the core curriculum until the process of developing a new general education curriculum and outcomes assessment is completed.

ATTACHMENT 175/7

UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011

Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

RESOLUTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends the Office of International Programs (OIP), in consultation with national immigration legal counsel, review UAF's interpretation of the "completion date" for graduate programs used for international students, and revise the "completion date" definition to enable students to complete all program requirements before losing F-1 status.

Motivation and background

- According to U.S. immigration rules students in F-1 status have to leave the country within 2 months of the expiration of their visa, or the end date of their graduate program, whichever comes first. Currently UAF considers students in F-1 status to have completed their graduate program ten days after the date of their defense or after the last in-person meeting of a required course.
- In contrast the graduate program for non-foreign students terminates at the end of the semester during which the students have fully met all UAF graduate school requirements.
- Students often do not take in-person coursework during the semester they finish their degree, instead taking 698 (non-thesis research project) or 699 (thesis/dissertation, preparing for scholarly or research activity) which does not extend their visa eligibility under the current definition.
- Typically, a students' thesis is not 100% complete at the date of the defense. The graduate committee recommends some amount of additional work, such as collecting supplementary data or refining the existing data analysis.
- This additional post-defense work often requires access to specialized scientific instrumentation, computer software/hardware, sample collections, and datasets that are not accessible from another location.
- Due to the current definition a student can no longer be paid ten days after his/her defense. While this can be overcome by application for Optional Practical Training (OPT), the process of securing F-1 OPT status requires significant advance planning and expenditure of both student and university resources.
- Many universities use a more student-friendly definition of the "completion date," such as the end of the semester in which the student defends the thesis, the date when all requirements are fulfilled or the date of graduation and degree conferral. [See the appendix for examples.]
- Immigration law is complex and contains many ambiguous regulations. Lawyers often specialize in the field of immigration law and dedicate their whole career to serving clients in this area.
- Seeking consultation from a lawyer specializing in immigration law would aid UAF in revising its definition of the "completion date" for graduate students and ensure that U.S. immigration law is complied with.

Appendix:

What Constitutes 'Graduate Program Completion Date' for International Students at some other US Universities? (compiled on: April 6, 2011)

UAFs definition: "If you are graduating this semester and you are enrolled in classes that end in May, your program completion date will be May 12 - the last day of final exams. If you are a graduate student and enrolled in only thesis or research credits, your program completion date will be your date of project or thesis defense plus an additional 2 weeks. If you are employed on a Research or Teaching Assistantship, employment authorization ends effective with the program completion date ~ not the end of the semester ~ unless you have applied for and received your OPT card (see below)."
<http://www.uaf.edu/oip/news-and-announcements-1/information-and-reminders/>

University of Arizona: "For graduate students, a true completion date is typically the submission date of final thesis/dissertation draft (and allowable time for revisions) or the comprehensive exam date if no thesis/dissertation is required (completion date can be any date during the calendar year)"
<http://internationalstudents.arizona.edu/pageview.aspx?id=19217>

Boston University: "Graduate Students in Thesis or Dissertation Programs - Your official date of completion will be the day of the graduation ceremony of the semester in which submit your thesis/dissertation. You must be enrolled in that semester, as well. Please note that all students who will complete and submit their thesis/dissertation during the summer must be registered as continuing students during the summer semester to maintain lawful F-1 status."
<http://www.bu.edu/isso/students/prospective/immigration/f1/legal.html>

University of California Berkeley: "Your completion date is the day on which all degree requirements are fulfilled, such as filing the thesis or dissertation in the Graduate Division."

Johns Hopkins University: "The University considers the date that President Daniels signs the official degree roster (which can only be done after the Graduate Board has signed off on it) as the student's completion date. This is the date referenced for University processes, community wide."
<http://semps.ses.hsa.jhu.edu/stujob/employer.cfm?pid=4&grad=1&bk=emp>

NC State University: "For Master's thesis and Ph.D. students, program completion is defined by OIS for non-immigrant status-related benefits purposes as successful defense and the subsequent draft submission, provided that a student is registered at the time of defense".
<http://www.ncsu.edu/ois/current/completion.php>

Minnesota State University: "Graduate students completion date is the day on which all degree requirements are fulfilled, such as filing your thesis or dissertation in Graduate Programs."
<http://www.mnstate.edu/intl/opt.cfm>

Virginia Tech Graduate School: "International students who have some work remaining on their thesis or dissertation and who plan to defend any time during the semester are required to enroll for 3 credit hours. The 3-hour enrollment documents your need to be physically present on campus for the semester, utilizing university resources and pursuing degree requirements (which are required for continued eligibility for F-1/J-1 status)."

Washington University in St. Louis: "This completion of studies date is the date a student completes all requirements for his/her specific degree program, not necessarily the official commencement date established by the institution." <http://oishome.wustl.edu/students/current/RegResp/F1OPT.html>

ATTACHMENT 175/8
 UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
 Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the academic dismissal policy for graduate students (currently stated on page 48 of the 2010-2011 UAF Catalog) as follows:

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011

RATIONALE: This amendment combines two existing items [(c) and (d)] that are defined to be “unsatisfactory performance.” It also adds a paragraph delineating the consequences that may result if one is academically dismissed from a graduate program.

[[]] = Deletions
 CAPS = Additions

ACADEMIC DISMISSAL

Graduate students –If recommended by the department chair, the graduate advisory committee, and the dean of the college or school, and approved by the Dean of the Graduate School, a student will be dismissed because of unsatisfactory performance. Unsatisfactory performance is deemed as one or more of the following:

- a. Exceeding maximum time limit for degree.
- b. Not being registered at UAF for a minimum 6 credits per year unless on approved leave of absence.
- c. Having less than 3.0 cumulative GPA ON COURSEWORK DIRECTLY RELATED TO DEGREE REQUIREMENTS FOR TWO CONSECUTIVE SEMESTERS. [[for courses taken since admission to graduate school.]]
- [[d. Being on probationary status for more than two consecutive semesters.]]
- [[e]]**d.** Violating the Student Code of Conduct.
- [[f]]**e.** Lacking progress as judged by the advisory committee and documented on the student's annual report.
- [[g]]**f.** Having substantive inaccuracies in the student's application for admission.

If the student does not have a graduate advisory committee, dismissal can occur upon the recommendation of the department chair and the dean of the college or school, with approval by the Dean of the Graduate School.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF BEING ACADEMICALLY DISMISSED FROM YOUR GRADUATE PROGRAM ARE SIGNIFICANT AND MAY INCLUDE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING RAMIFICATIONS. YOUR STATUS WILL BE CHANGED FROM BEING A GRADUATE DEGREE-SEEKING STUDENT TO A NON-DEGREE STUDENT. ANY CLASSES YOU MAY HAVE PRE-REGISTERED FOR WILL BE DROPPED. YOU WILL HAVE A

PRINTABLE NOTATION ON YOUR TRANSCRIPT THAT WILL STATE YOU WERE “ACADEMICALLY DISMISSED FROM DEGREE PROGRAM.” YOU WILL NOT BE ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE ANY TEACHING OR RESEARCH ASSISTANTSHIPS OR OTHER GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS. OPPORTUNITIES TO RECEIVE FINANCIAL AID WILL BE SEVERELY LIMITED.

ATTACHMENT 175/9
 UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
 Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes for April 6, 2011

Voting Members present: Rainer N. (Chair), Carrie B., Dave V., Sarah F. (phone); Diane M. (phone), Jungho B.

Non-voting Members present: Carol L., Libby E., Anita H., Linda H. Jayne H.

Carol Lewis noted she will talk to the deans regarding high school courses at next their meeting (which takes place next week).

1. April 7 Faculty Forums

- Carrie plans to take notes at the afternoon meeting; Jayne will make sure the meetings are recorded via audio conference.
- The only comments have been from Terrence Cole regarding history vs. histories.
- Technology is still being discussed, along with the bullet points.
- Deadline for all comments and changes is April 20, in order to make the April 22 Administrative Committee agenda/meeting.
- There was consensus that the group would prefer NOT to submit a document if they don't come up with a draft that is acceptable to the group.
- Some discussion about committee members continuing this effort next year. There will be two committees: one to set the goals and a second to decide how we get there.

2. Subcommittee for Stacked Courses:

From Ken A. – Chair of GAAC:

GAAC met last Monday and gave its blessing to go ahead with such a study and develop stacked course guidelines if the findings of such study indicate the need. Orion Lawler and Lara Dehn have both agreed to participate as GAAC representatives. Given that Orion and Lara have a strong vested interest in these courses and were two of the GAAC members who were most concerned about the stacked course guidelines, I expect they will be fantastic additions to the group. They are both go-to people on GAAC that can be counted on when something needs to be done.

Rainer plans to ask Anthony A. to also serve on this subcommittee.

3. Motion regarding Core Course Compression (from the Core Review Committee):

- Question: Can we say the course has to be approved by the college/school curriculum committee and then Core Review?
- Issue of how to measure 2 weeks vs. 14 weeks in terms of teaching effectiveness
 Where is data on this to be found? AAC&U a good source.

- Currently, there is no review process or requirement for approval in order to change the delivery format of an already approved course.
- Suggestion: Invite instructors who have taught these compressed courses to give input.
- How do we assess the effectiveness?
Pre/post tests were suggested.
Surveys?
Faculty input is needed.

4. Courses designed for High School students:

The Administrative Committee felt that this issue was complicated. They want the issue to be taken up again next Fall.

ATTACHMENT 175/10
 UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
 Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 22, 2011

Members present: Jane Allen (by phone), Mike Davis (by phone), Cecile Lardon, Andrew Metzger, Morris Palter, Jennifer Reynolds

Teaching by Non-Regular Faculty: We have made major progress on this project. The Faculty Affairs Committee now has data files from Banner for 3 ½ academic years, from Fall 2007 through Fall 2010. Colleen Abrams (Registrar's Office) worked with Jennifer Reynolds to produce custom files for the Faculty Affairs Committee. Analysis of the data requires combining information from four files, and takes approximately 30 hours per semester. The effort cannot be automated because departments around UAF use different protocols to enter data into Banner. To help with this, an undergraduate student assistant, Melissa Steward, has been hired to work with Jennifer Reynolds. Files for Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 have been completed, and we anticipate completing two more before the end of May.

During the meeting, FAC members looked at a preliminary analysis of Fall 2007 data and identified a problem in the way tenure-track and term faculty were identified. FAC also discussed whether the range of course characteristics and instructor information were necessary and appropriate, and decided to continue with the format as shown for Fall 2007. FAC members agreed that the next semesters in line for analysis should be Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, so that the end result would be data on two full, nonconsecutive academic years. Committee members pointed out that the rural campuses have grants to hire term faculty, and these grants (and therefore the term faculty) can change from year to year. Having multiple years of data is important, and data from nonconsecutive years is preferred.

Committee members also agreed that future discussion with the units about their use of non-regular faculty for teaching should concentrate on broader questions rather than specific course-by-course details. The input from units will be very helpful for understanding the data, but a course-by-course analysis is beyond the scope of this project. Before any discussion with the units, FAC members will be asked to help frame the questions for their units. These activities will be conducted by next year's committee.

Committee members expressed a desire to have a student assistant continue working with FAC on this project next year. It is time-consuming, but will be important for understanding and improving how different units at UAF operate.

This is the last meeting for the year. Three of the current members will continue on the Faculty Senate and Faculty Affairs Committee next year: Mike Davis, Cecile Lardon, and Andrew Metzger. In addition, Jane Allen and Morris Palter expressed willingness to continue assisting with the project on Teaching by Non-Regular Faculty next year even though they will not be formal committee members.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE 2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT

Members:

Jane Allen	CRCD, Kuskokwim Campus (Bethel), Math
Andy Anger	CRCD, Community & Technical College (Fairbanks), Applied Business and Accounting
Mike Davis	CRCD, Bristol Bay Campus (Dillingham), Rural Development
Lily Dong	SOM, Business Administration
Roger Hansen	GI, Seismology
Cecile Lardon	CLA, Psychology
Andrew Metzger	CEM, Civil & Environmental Engineering
Morris Palter	CLA, Music
Jennifer Reynolds (chair)	SFOS, Oceanography
Roger Smith (ex officio)	GI, Director

4th Year Review by campus-wide Promotion & Tenure Committee: In 2009, the Provost asked Faculty Affairs to discuss ways to reduce the workload on the university-wide P&T Committee. One possibility raised in the committee was to change the 4th year faculty reviews to make the campus-wide and Provost levels of review optional. This suggestion was put to the 2010-11 committee for discussion. The Committee expressed concern that 4th year faculty might not receive adequate feedback on their progress toward promotion and tenure without the campus-wide review. FAC members decided we needed information on how often the outcomes of faculty 4th year review were different at the unit and dean levels versus the campus-wide and provost levels. That information was compiled for the past ten years, with assistance from Provost's Office. FAC members agreed that the data clearly showed a need for 4th year review at the campus-wide and Provost levels, and did not recommend a change to the 4th year review procedure.

Reapportionment of the Faculty Senate: According to the Faculty Senate Bylaws revised in Spring 2010, reapportionment is to take place at the time of UAF reaccreditation, approximately every seven years, starting with this year. The Provost's Office provided faculty counts for the units at UAF as of October, 2010. The new reapportionment procedure counts each faculty member once, in their unit of primary appointment, and no longer tries to account for split appointments or partial FTFE. The result was an increase in the number of senators from CEM/INE from 3 to 4, and a change in the status of the three large research institutes. The GI, IARC, and IAB were previously represented together as a "conglomerate group" with 2 senators total. After reapportionment, the GI and IARC each have 2 senators, and IAB is effectively folded back into CNSM because nearly all of its faculty have primary appointments in CNSM. The faculty counts and calculations are on file at the Faculty Senate office.

Faculty Affairs Committee agreed on the principle that a research institute would be considered for separate Faculty Senate representation as an independent unit if its director reports to the Vice Chancellor for Research (e.g., Geophysical Institute), but not if the director reports to a dean of an academic unit (e.g., Institute for Northern Engineering).

The Committee also recognized that the Bylaws did not specify how to implement changes in the number of seats that each unit has, nor changes in unit affiliation of sitting representatives. The main question was how to handle continuing terms of people who were already on the Senate. The Committee agreed on these principles: (1) sitting representatives should serve out their terms; and (2) adjustments to the number of representatives for each unit should be made at the time of

regularly scheduled elections or by attrition, whichever occurs first. This would result in a one-year overlap between previous and new representation, and a temporary increase in the number of senators. At the April 2, 2011 Faculty Senate meeting, FAC submitted a motion to amend the Bylaws accordingly. The motion was passed unanimously and will take effect in Fall, 2011.

Teaching by Non-Regular Faculty: The Faculty Affairs Committee has been developing this project over several years and made major progress during 2010-11. Non-regular faculty are defined as those who are not tenure-track or research faculty. We are looking at the role of non-regular faculty in teaching at UAF, using the number of course sections as the reference. This approach was adopted because FAC wanted data on how, where, and why non-regular faculty were teaching at UAF, in order to understand and improve how different units at UAF operate, to determine whether there is a problem, and to establish a baseline for future comparison. This approach is different from the more common surveys across the country that focus on the numbers of tenure track versus non-tenure track faculty and use the number of faculty as the reference.

The Committee's perspective is that there are both positive and negative aspects to teaching by non-regular faculty. One major question is what is a healthy balance for the mission(s) of a university.

Positive aspects: Expand the range of instructor expertise; use local resources (especially in the case of community colleges); greater institutional flexibility; potentially lower per-course instruction costs.

Negative aspects: Large numbers of instructors not participating in program and curriculum development, student advising, and university service; large numbers of instructors without a university-wide perspective (focus only on teaching their own classes); lack of continuity; students have difficulty finding and working with instructors outside of class time; instructors subject to favoritism; lack of job security leads to potential unwillingness to push or challenge students. Instructing courses is not the only role for faculty. In a broader sense, using large numbers of part-time faculty shrinks the proportion of faculty who have long-term commitment to the university.

Direct implications for the tenure-track and research faculty: Use of non-regular faculty for instruction, especially part-time faculty, shifts the burden of student advising, service, curriculum design, and dept/school/university governance disproportionately onto full-time regular faculty.

Another question is whether the role of non-regular faculty instructor is positive or negative for the individual faculty member. The 2007-08 Faculty Affairs Committee defined categories of non-regular faculty.

Professionals employed elsewhere, who offer a course based on their unique experience to augment programs at UAF. They may teach the course primarily for non-monetary personal rewards.

Retirees who teach a course suited to their skills which augments programs at UAF. They enjoy the benefits from their retirement and are not dependent on income from teaching at UAF. They also may teach primarily for non-monetary rewards.

Post-doctoral researchers, recent graduates or graduating Ph.D. students who teach a class to garner experience in preparation for a career in academia.

Adjunct Faculty who are repeatedly asked to teach courses in place of full-time faculty, teach more than one class a semester, and/or are trying to build a career based on this piecemeal

approach. These people are particularly vulnerable if they are dependent on adjunct teaching assignments for personal income.

During 2010-11, Jennifer Reynolds worked with Colleen Abrams (Registrar's Office) to produce custom data files from Banner. The Faculty Affairs Committee now has data files for all undergraduate course sections in fall and spring semester over 3 ½ academic years, from Fall 2007 through Fall 2010. Analysis of the data requires combining information from four files per semester into a single spreadsheet, and cannot be automated because departments around UAF use different protocols to enter data into Banner. A student assistant has been hired to help with this effort. Files for Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 have been completed, and we anticipate completing two more semesters before the end of May. The semesters identified by FAC as the next priorities are Fall 2009 and Spring 2010. This will give us the ability to examine two full, nonconsecutive academic years.

The next step will be analysis of the data, by unit, location, and program. The data allow us to examine the record from various angles: core courses; written and oral intensive courses; web and distance courses; developmental, lower division, and upper division courses. The spreadsheet analysis will be followed by discussion with the units about their use of non-regular faculty for teaching, to better understand the data. Committee members agreed that these discussions should concentrate on broader questions about why the unit employs non-regular faculty as instructors, rather than specific course-by-course details. These activities will be conducted by next year's committee.

ATTACHMENT 175/11
 UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
 Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women 2010-11 Annual Report

The Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) met monthly during AY 2010-11 concerning issues affecting women faculty at UAF.

CSW continued the “Brown Bag Lunch” series on topics of faculty interest held in various campus locations and via elluminate-live. Some of the “Brown Bag” topics were “Transitions – Graduate Student through Full Professor” and “Making a Great Life Here”. CSW will continue to organize these informal discussions with such topics as “Worklife Balance” in 2011-12.

CSW helped to get the resolution to strongly request that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an “open” meeting, and that “mandatory closed” meetings be avoided, publicly reaffirmed by UAF’s Faculty Senate in September 2010.

In October 2010, CSW organized UAF’s sixth annual Women Faculty Luncheon, which was web-streamed for faculty who could not attend in person. Over one hundred women faculty attended this event with UA Museum of the North Director Carol Diebel giving a fantastic keynote address. We gratefully acknowledge the financial support for this event from the Office of the Chancellor. We are in the process of securing the funding and planning for the seventh luncheon in October 2011.

CSW members participated on a Women and Gender Studies Panel, “Where Are the Women?”, where UAF practices related to employment, retention and promotion of women faculty, lecturers, and instructors were examined in December 1010.

In February 2011, CSW was given a presentation on the “Women in the STEM Disciplines at UAF” project where some of the statistically significant findings were that there are more women than expected in term/soft money positions and that there are more women in lower rank tenure track positions than men and conversely more men in higher tenure track ranks than women. CSW is deciding if the committee would like to further pursue some of these questions.

In April 2011, CSW again organized a two hour comprehensive tenure and promotion workshop, *Planning Strategically for Promotion and Tenure*. The workshop highlighted strategic planning for promotion and tenure and faculty attended both in person and via web-stream. This extremely useful workshop, which we facilitate annually, provides an informal venue for faculty to discuss strategies, file preparation, mentoring, effectively preparing for tenure and/or promotion, fourth year reviews, and other issues related to the T&P process for both United Academics and UAFT.

CSW has a permanent seat on the Chancellor’s Diversity Action Committee (CDAC). This committee met monthly during AY 2010-11, and the CSW representative brought issues of equity to the attention of the committee.

In Progress:

- Discussion of the issue of term-funded and adjunct faculty , especially as these issues differentially affect women

- Gathering and analyzing historical data information with gender on time to tenure and promotions, rank, and salary information for faculty at UAF for at least the last ten years – Gender bias? CSW is currently waiting for fifteen years of statistics from Institutional Research on nonretention.
- Promotion workshop for Associate Professors moving to Full Professors
- Examining structural, rather than individual, issues contributing to women being “stuck” at the Associate Professor level
- “Survey Monkey” survey and study about the tenure and promotion decision-making process
- Facilitating mentoring of new, mid-career, and senior women and allied men
- Strengthen liaison relationships with women staff members at UAF, the UAF Women’s Center, and with faculty at the other MAUs.

ATTACHMENT 175/12

UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 11, 2011**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:07 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Julie Joly, Channon Price, Larry Roberts

Excused: Mike Castellini, Alexandra Oliveira

III. Report from Diane

There are workshops this Tuesday and Thursday, one on using virtual worlds in teaching, and one on working with undergraduate researchers. Diane has been getting a lot of requests for making these Faculty Development opportunities available via audio conference – particularly from the Kuskokwim campus.

Unfortunately Chris Lott had to cancel his presentation on Instructional Design at the last minute, so this session will be rescheduled sometime in the future.

Diane is also currently working on getting the upcoming Promotion and Tenure workshop advertised. The workshop will be on Friday, April 29, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm in 109 Butrovich, and it will also be webcast. All UNAC and UAFT faculty are invited. This workshop is sponsored by the Committee on the Status of Women.

IV. Old Business

Josef reported that at the last Faculty Administrative Committee meeting, he brought up that the FDAI committee could possibly look into three systems for student evaluations if they were suggested by the Provost's Office. Provost Henrichs said that it was an issue too complex for the FDAI committee and that she did not think we would have the time. She also indicated that examining only three systems would not be sufficient. While Josef was unsure what action the Chancellor took regarding our motion on electronic student evaluations, it was passed in Faculty Senate. CP inquired whether or not a Faculty Review Committee was proposed by the Provost in lieu of the FDAI committee. Josef indicated that it was not.

V. New Business

Josef summed up the FDAI committee's work for the year and asked us to brainstorm about what our focus should be for the future. One suggestion was to think about how to encourage a larger turnout for our Faculty Forum (choosing a different place and inviting a guest speaker/discussion leader are two ideas we are aware of). Larry suggested that we invite Provost Henrichs to our next meeting in order to discuss our next step regarding electronic student evaluations. This would be an excellent opportunity for our committee to ask questions about what the Provost's next steps will be and for us to share directly what we have discovered in our research and discussions. This will be a

chance for the FDAI committee to get some concrete ideas on what we should focus on next. CP suggested that incoming Faculty Senate President Cathy Cahill may be interested in this meeting as well.

Josef reminded us that Joy Morrison has offered to take two FDAI committee members with her to the POD conference in Atlanta, GA, October 26 – 30, 2011. Larry reminded us that next year's Lilly Arctic Institute will be held in Kodiak the first week of April.

VI. Next meeting

Josef will check with Provost Henrichs' schedule and send out a meeting Doodle to our committee to schedule our next meeting during the first week of May.

VII. Adjourned at 8:35 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 175/13
 UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
 Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
 Meeting Minutes for Monday, March 28, 2011**

Voting members present: Ken Abramowicz (chair), Donie Bret-Harte (phone), Lara Dehn, Regine Hock, Orion Lawlor, Anupma Prakash, Sue Renes, Jen Schmidt

Nonvoting members present: Larry Duffy, Anita Hughes, Karen Jensen, Libby Eddy
 Guest: Jayne Harvie (taking notes)

1. The agenda was adopted as distributed.
2. Meeting minutes for February 28 were adopted without modifications.

3. Discussion Items

A. Graduate School objectives and indicators

Objective: Enable master's and Ph.D. students to master a subject area or advance knowledge.

Indicators:

1. Employment or continuing education placement of recent master's and employment placement of Ph.D. graduates report in the national Survey of Earned Doctorate and by units.
2. Number of independently reviewed graduate student research and creative products (including articles and other publications, and juried shows and performances). This indicator also appears in the Discover theme.
3. List of successfully defended projects or thesis.

Larry Duffy explained the use of these indicators for Accreditation review under the "Educate" and "Discover" themes. The indicators above are being discussed and he asked that folks get the word out. Discussion followed about how the data for the indicators will be tracked. The Graduate School collects some data.

B. Stacked courses. Request for volunteer(s) to work with member(s) of Curricular Affairs Committee on joint project to study stacked courses and develop proposed guidelines for stacked courses.

Orion Lawlor and Lara Dehn volunteered to work with Curricular Affairs to gather more input on stacked courses from students and faculty. Orion would like to see clear guidelines developed about what is involved in stacking a course, and what is expected at the undergrad and graduate levels of a stacked course.

4. Proposed motions

A. Academic dismissal of graduate students (motion attached)

Members agreed the specifics of the academic dismissal policy should be spelled out. Regine noted that the time period on item c. needs to be clarified. Add language “in graduate study plan” to that item.

Larry Duffy will incorporate the revisions into the language of the proposed motion and will bring it back to the committee.

B. F-1 Students

Larry Duffy noted that the Department of Labor sets the rules and that it’s a Homeland Security issue. Carol Holtz at the Office of International Programs enforces it here on campus. (He suggests a resolution rather than a motion on this issue.)

Discussion took place about distinguishing between the defense of a thesis and what constitutes completing a degree. The rule is being interpreted as though the defense of a thesis completes the degree, but this is not how faculty interpret it. There has to be sign-off by faculty that a student has finished a degree program; which takes place after a thesis is defended.

Anupma noted that students are stalling their theses defense to extend their time because of how OIP is interpreting what constitutes finishing their degree program.

Carol Holz will be invited to a future meeting. Regine would like to be present for that meeting, and it will be scheduled when she’s able to attend.

5. Proposals passed since the last meeting were noted.

6. Review of new proposals:

#99-GCCh – BIOL F675 / F475 was discussed. There was consensus that the course is undergraduate level and lacks the rigor for graduate level. Anupma noted that there is not definitive guidance to follow on what constitutes graduate level in a stacked course. Regine noted that having two separate syllabi helps. Anupma suggested asking the instructor for graduate level learning outcomes. Lara suggested that public presentations be included for the graduate level (as opposed to just more reading or finding a greater number of papers). The committee is looking for quality of graduate level learning, not merely quantity.

#11-Trial – GEOG F694 / F494 (Climate Change Processes): Jen noted that it’s an undergraduate capstone course for the B.S. degree. It meets with the ATM course – what if a student enrolls for both? Confusing status of GEOG F412 course was noted. The main problem of note is that it’s supposed to be a core course for a degree program; therefore, how can it have NO prerequisites?

Anupma noted the difficulty of judging this course without the second half that’s supposed to follow it. Ken is going to follow up with instructor.

The next meeting is in two weeks, on April 11 (same time and location). Ken asked for members to be prepared for discussion of the new Education courses (new master’s concentration in instructional technology).

Suggested addition to the UAF Catalog under ACADEMIC DISMISSAL (current catalog definition) page 48 of the 2010-11 catalog:

Graduate students -If recommended by the department chair, the graduate advisory committee, and the dean of the college or school, and approved by the Dean of the Graduate School, a student will be dismissed because of unsatisfactory performance. Unsatisfactory performance is deemed as one or more of the following:

- a. Exceeding maximum time limit for degree.
- b. Not being registered at UAF for a minimum 6 credits per year unless on approved leave of absence.
- c. Having less than 3.0 cumulative GPA on courses taken since admission to graduate school.
- d. Being on probationary status for more than two consecutive semesters.
- e. Violating the Student Code of Conduct.
- f. Lacking progress as judged by the advisory committee and documented on the student's annual report.
- g. Having substantive inaccuracies in the student's application for admission.

If the student does not have a graduate advisory committee, dismissal can occur upon the recommendation of the department chair and the dean of the college or school, with approval by the Dean of the Graduate School.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE ABOVE:

The consequences of being academically dismissed from your graduate program are significant and may include all of the following ramifications. Your status will be changed from being a graduate degree-seeking student to a non-degree student. Any classes you may have pre-registered for will be dropped. You will have a printable notation on your transcript that will state you were "Academically Dismissed from Degree Program." You will not be eligible to receive any teaching or research assistantships or other graduate fellowships. Opportunities to receive financial aid will be severely limited.

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 11, 2011**

9:00-10:00 a.m.

408 Rasmuson Library (Kayak Room)

Voting members present: Ken A. (chair); Lara D.; Regine H.; Orion L.; Anupma P.; Jen S.

Non-voting members present: Anita H., Karen I, Larry D., Laura B., Libby E.

Guest: Roy Roehl, School of Education

Other: Jayne (notes)

1. Discussion/modification/approval of agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

2. Discussion/approval of minutes from 3-28-2011 meeting

The minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Review of new GAAC proposals

- 100-GPCh.: Program Change: M.Ed. - New concentration in Instructional Technology Innovation: (Sue, Anupma, Orion)
- 101-GNC: ED F650 - Current Issues in Technology (Anupma, Orion, Sue)
- 102-GNC: ED F651 - Web 2.0 Fundamentals: Participate, Produce, Publish (Orion, Sue, Anupma)
- 103-GNC: ED F652 - Fundamentals of Media Design (Sue, Anupma, Orion)
- 104-GNC: ED F653 - Instructional Design (Sue, Anupma, Orion)
- 105-GNC: ED F654 - Digital Citizenship, Internet Legal Issues, Digital Copyright and Fair Use (Orion, Sue, Anupma)
- 106-GNC: ED F655 - Online Pedagogy (Orion, Sue, Anupma)
- 107-GNC: ED F676 - Supporting Learning in Diverse Systems (Anupma, Orion, Sue)
- 108-GNC: ED F677 - Digital Storytelling (Anupma, Orion, Sue)

Discussion focused on concerns whether some of the courses were graduate-level and appropriate for a Master's degree. The committee recognized the good direction of the proposed new concentration in the M.Ed., but asked about the impact of eight new courses on the department, and why the two core courses were taught by adjuncts, not regular faculty. The sustainability of the program was questioned, as long-term base FTEs are needed to succeed.

Dr. Roehl noted that the individuals teaching the two core courses have a Master's or Ph.D. degree. Carol Goering at CDE has a master's. Chris Lott has a bachelor's but will work on a master's. The core courses are online and F601 currently has 17 students, including students from Japan and Nevada. Skip Via has a master's and has 27 years of experience in the school district. Don Peterson has a master's.

Anupma asked about the three options of project, thesis or comprehensive oral exam, noting the program name does not change for any of these routes. Roy explained that they want the students to complete a project; the mention of the exam is part of the M.Ed. program which they do not control.

Ken asked if these courses exist at the undergraduate level. Roy said no. Orion asked about offerings as 500-level professional development rather than graduate level. Roy shared a handout describing graduate level courses as defined by the NWCCU. Ken noted that UA Board of Regents has established regulations that describe the difference between 400-, 500-, and 600-level courses.

Anupma asked if students could complete the degree without meeting their instructors. Roy said they plan to have meetings during the semester where they have face-to-face interaction. It was noted that the syllabi state there is no synchronous interaction during the course, but Roy noted he has call-in times on his schedule that even include weekends. Orion expressed concern that some courses may not meet the number of contact hours of instruction that are required for UAF courses.

It was agreed after more discussion about the rigor of the program, to have Roy meet with three GAAC members to address concerns. Orion will take the lead in setting that up.

4. Discussion items

A. F-I students (Regime)

Regime and Ken spoke to the issue of how degree completion is defined at the Office of International Programs. UAF takes a conservative stance, defining degree completion by students as occurring ten

business days after thesis defense. Many other universities interpret the "completion of the program" differently.

Ken noted that VC Mike Sfraga oversees OIP; and Carol Holz carries legal liability for her role. It may be helpful to acquire a legal opinion from an attorney specializing in immigration law.

The consensus was that approaching the problem by having students enroll in a one-credit course was an unsatisfactory approach to deal with this issue.

A Wednesday morning meeting time to refine the motion / resolution (in time for the senate Administrative Committee meeting) was set up. [At this Wednesday meeting a resolution was drafted by Anupma, Ken, Jayne and Regine. After a round of email comments and revisions, GAAC approved the final resolution by email.]

Other items on the agenda were postponed due to time constraints.

ATTACHMENT 175/14
 UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
 Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

Research Advisory Committee 2011-03-31 Meeting Minutes

Voting members present: Orion Lawlor, Sarah Hardy, Kris Hundertmark, Margaret Darrow, Peter Webley

Not present: Tom Weingartner, Roger Hansen, Anita Hartmann, Bernard Coakley

Ex Officio: Mark Myers Guest: Perry Barboza

First item of business was to welcome our new Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR) and ex officio RAC member, Mark Myers. VCR Myers is the head of Center for Research Services (CRS), which includes a number of research-relevant pieces:

- Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), which approves outgoing grant proposals after your institute's proposal office is done with them.
- Office of Intellectual Property and Commercialization (OIPC), the new technology, copyright, and patents office headed by Dan White.
- A communications office, which among other duties organizes UAF Campus Research Day (May 5, 2011) along with the Provost.
- Office of Research Integrity (ORI), which oversees UAF's Institutional Review Board (IRB) for research involving human subjects, Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) for research involving recombinant DNA and dangerous toxins, and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) for research involving vertebrate animals.

VCR Myers' main goals in the coming months include:

- Assemble a Strategic Research Plan, to help explain the societal relevance and consequences of UAF research. This has to dovetail with Dan Julius' statewide plan, and UAF's nationally recognized strengths: remote sensing, disaster monitoring, native communities, biology, etc.
- Coordinate major research instrumentation grant proposals, in particular finding an open and transparent way to allocate the VCR's 1% of Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR, which shows up on our grants as F&A), which is typically used as matching funds for instrumentation proposals. This ties in with the recent ICR Distribution Review Committee's findings.
- Build an integrated data portal and archive, using ARSC's storage as a backend, to showcase and disseminate UAF research. In particular, new NSF grants require a data management plan section, which this resource could contribute to.

Perry Barboza discussed several shortcomings in the current organization of the UAF Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). In particular, today the three roles of Attending Veterinarian, IACUC representative, and director of the office of research integrity are currently all filled by the same person. Perry's concerns largely match those identified during consultant Dorcas O'Rourke's December 2010 onsite review. The VCR has begun adding staff to the veterinary office, and is aware of the issues.

Finally, we discussed the future of post-DoD ARSC, and UAF computing more generally. There are lots of little department and lab clusters tucked into closets, and some sort of UAF-wide shared

resource could increase capacity and lower costs, especially when the peak capacity needed is much less than the average (the “suburbs” vs “timeshare” model). However, many of these small clusters exist to fill a specialized niche that would not centralize well, such as running department-specific software or hardware, or satisfying high-performance visualization tasks such as GIS. Another key component ARSC has historically provided is system administration and high performance computing expertise. In recognition of this university-wide service, the Chancellor has agreed to provide several million in startup funds for the reborn ARSC as a “trickle contract.” The long term funding model is less clear; a pay-for-service model would discourage both small requests, and the computational needs of less lucrative fields such as anthropology or archaeology.

ATTACHMENT 175/15
UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011

**The 2011 Usibelli Awards for Distinguished Teaching, Research,
and Service**

Winner, Distinguished Teaching: Gregory Owens, Associate Professor of Mathematics

Winner, Distinguished Research: Vladimir Romanovsky, Professor of Geophysics

Winner, Distinguished Service: Roger Hansen, Professor of Seismology

2011 Usibelli Award for Distinguished Teaching Nominees

Abel Bult-Ito, Professor of Biology
Debasmita Misra, Associate Professor of Geological Engineering
Keith Swarner, Associate Professor of Computer and Information Sciences
Eduard Zilberkant, President's Professor of Piano

2011 Usibelli Award for Distinguished Research Nominees

Sergei Avdonin, Professor of Mathematics
Chien-Lu Ping, Professor of Soil Sciences
Roger Ruess, Professor of Biology
Kenneth Sassen, Professor of Atmospheric Sciences
Kevin Winker, Professor of Biology and Curator of Birds

2011 Usibelli Award for Distinguished Service Nominees

Larry Roberts, Associate Professor of Justice, and
Director of Alaska Rural Behavioral Health Training Academy
William Schneider, Professor of Library Science and Curator of Oral History
Linda Tannehill, Professor of Extension

ATTACHMENT 175/16
UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011

2011 Emerita/us

Dr. Robert Arundale, Professor of Communication, Emeritus

Dr. Stuart "Terry" Chapin, Distinguished Professor of Biology, Emeritus

Dr. Thomas Clausen, Professor of Chemistry, Emeritus

Mr. Kenneson Dean, Research Professor of Remote Sensing, Emeritus

Dr. John Fox, Associate Professor of Land Resources Management, Emeritus

Dr. Carol Gold, Professor of History, Emerita

Ms. Marjorie Illingworth, Associate Professor of Developmental Studies, Emerita

Dr. Douglas Kane, Professor of Civil Engineering, Emeritus

Dr. John Lehman, Professor of Business Administration, Emeritus

Dr. Kristine Long, Professor of Extension, Emerita

Dr. David Porter, Professor of Business Administration, Emeritus

Dr. William Schneider, Professor of Library Science, Emeritus

Mr. Richard Seifert, Professor of Engineering Extension, Emeritus

Dr. Davis Sentman, Professor of Physics, Emeritus

Dr. Roger Smith, Director Emeritus and Professor of Physics, Emeritus

Dr. Brenton Watkins, Professor of Physics, Emeritus

ATTACHMENT 175/17
 UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
 Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to endorse the 2011-2012 committee membership as attached.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: New Senate members' preference for committee selection were reviewed and weighed against membership distribution from schools and colleges.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Curricular Affairs Committee

Anthony Arendt, GI (12)
 Jungho Baek, SOM (12)
 Carrie Baker, CLA (12)
 Retchenda George-Bettisworth, CLA (13)
 Brian Himmelbloom, SFOS (12)
 Diane McEachern, CRCD Kuskokwim (13)
 Debra Moses, CRCD CTC (13)
 Rainer Newberry, CNSM (12) – (2010-11 chair) –
 convener
 Todd Radenbaugh, CRCD Bristol Bay (13)
 David Valentine, SNRAS (12)

Faculty Affairs Committee

Ken Abramowicz, SOM (13)
 Mike Davis, CRCD Bristol Bay (12)
 Chris Fallen, IARC (13)
 Karen Gustafson, CLA (13)
 Cecile Lardon, CLA (13)
 Jeremy Mathis, SFOS (13)
 Andrew Metzger, CEM (12) – convener
 Margaret Short, CNSM (13)

Unit Criteria Committee

Vladimir Alexeev, IARC (13)
 Sukumar Bandopadhyay, CEM (13)
 Perry Barboza, CNSM (12) – (2010-11 chair)
 – convener
 Stephen Golux, CLA (13)
 Karen Jensen, CLA (12)
 Debra Jones, CES (12)
 Cathy Winfree, CRCD CTC (13)

PERMANENT COMMITTEES

Committee on the Status of Women

Melanie Arthur, CLA (12)
 Nilima Hullavarad, INE (13)
 Stefanie Ickert-Bond, IAB (12)
 Jessica Larsen, GI (13)
 Jenny Liu, CEM (13)
 Ellen Lopez, CANHR (13)
 Shawn Russell, CRCD (12)
 Derek Sikes, CNSM (13)
 Kayt Sunwood, Women's Center
 Jane Weber, CRCD (12) – Chair

Core Review Committee

CLA:

Derek Burleson, English (13)
 David Henry, Humanities (12)
 Chanda Meek, Social Sciences (12)
 Jean Richey, Communication (12)
 Anne Christie, Library (13)
 Pending, At-Large CLA (13)

CNSM:

Latrice Laughlin, Math (12) – (2010-11 chair) –
 convener

Rainer Newberry, Science (12)

College Reps:

John Craven, CNSM
 Kevin Berry, SOM

Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee

Julie Cascio, CES (13)
 John Gimbel, CNSM (12)
 Marianne Kerr, CES (13)
 Jerry McBeath, CLA (13)
 David Mollett, CLA (12)
 Thomas Zhou, SOM (13)

Continued next page

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement

Stephen Brown, CES (13)
 Josef Glowa, CLA (12) – (2010-11 chair) – convener
 Duff Johnston, CLA (13)
 Julie L. Joly, SNRAS (13)
 Franz Meyer, GI (13)
 Alexandra Oliveira, SFOS (12)
Joy Morrison, Faculty Development Office - ex officio

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee

Donie Bret-Harte, CNSM (13)
 Vincent Cee, CLA (13)
 Lara Dehn, SFOS (12)
 Orion Lawlor, CEM (13) – convener
 Elisabeth Nadin, CNSM (13)
 Chung-sang Ng, CNSM (13)
 Sue Renes, SOEd (12)
 Xiong Zhang, CEM (12)

Research Advisory Committee

Roger Hansen, GI
 Sarah Hardy, SFOS (13)
 John Heaton, CLA (13)
 Joanne Healy, SOEd (13)
 Kris Hundertmark, IAB
 Orion Lawlor, CEM (13)
 Peter Webley, GI, ARSC – convener
 Mike West, GI
Mark Myers, VCR – ex officio

Curriculum Review

Rainer Newberry (2010-11 chair) – convener
 Membership updated with unit curriculum council chairs
 in Fall 2011.

ATTACHMENT 175/18
 UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
 Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following calendar for its 2011-2012 meetings.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Meetings have to be scheduled well in advance to allow for reservations at the Wood Center and to facilitate planning for Faculty Senate members.

Meeting #:	Date	Time	Type
176	Mon., Sept. 12, 2011	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
177	Mon., Oct. 3, 2011	1-3 PM	Face to Face*
178	Mon., Nov. 7, 2011	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
179	Mon., Dec. 5, 2011	1-3 PM	Audio Conference**
180	Mon., Feb. 6, 2012	1-3 PM	Face to Face
181	Mon., Mar. 5, 2012	1-3 PM	Audio/Video Conference
182	Mon., Apr. 2, 2012	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
183	Mon., May 7, 2012	1-3 PM	Face to Face

*The Chancellor's Reception for Faculty Senate is scheduled for the evening of Oct. 3, and the CSW Women Faculty Luncheon occurs the following day, Oct. 4.

**Physical location being determined. Ballroom closed for renovations.

ATTACHMENT 175/19
UAF Faculty Senate #175, May 2, 2011
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to authorize the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate on all matters within its purview, which may arise until the Senate resumes deliberations in the Fall of 2011. Senators will be kept informed of the Administrative Committee's meetings and will be encouraged to attend and participate in these meetings.

EFFECTIVE: May 2, 2011

RATIONALE: This motion will allow the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate so that necessary work can be accomplished and will also allow Senators their rights to participate in the governance process.