

MINUTES  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #169  
Monday, October 11, 2010  
1:00 p.m. – 3: 10 p.m.  
Wood Center Ballroom

I        Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn

Faculty Senate President Jonathan Dehn called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A.       Roll Call for 2010-11 Faculty Senate

Members Present:

ALLEN, Jane  
ANGER, Andy  
ARENDT, Anthony  
BAEK, Jungho  
BAKER, Carrie  
BARBOZA, Perry  
BARTLETT, Christa  
BROCIOUS, Heidi  
CAHILL, Cathy  
DAVIS, Mike  
DEHN, Jonathan  
DEHN, Lara  
DONG, Lily  
GANGULI, Rajive  
HIMELBLOOM, Brian (Alex Oliveira)  
HOCK, Regine  
JENSEN, Karen  
JOLIE, July  
JONES, Debra  
KADEN, Ute  
KERR, Marianne  
LARDON, Cecile  
LAWLOR, Orion  
MCEACHERN, Diane  
METZGER, Andrew  
NEWBERRY, Rainer  
PALTER, Morris  
REYNOLDS, Jennifer  
ROBERTS, Larry

Members Present (cont'd):

THOMAS, Amber  
VALENTINE, Dave  
WEBER, Jane  
WILSON, Timothy  
ZHANG, Xiong

Members Absent:

FOWELL, Sarah  
HANSEN, Roger  
HUETTMANN, Falk  
MCINTYRE, Julie  
RENES, Sue

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Susan Henrichs  
Anita Hughes (Assoc. Registrar)  
Eric Madsen  
Doug Goering  
Maria Russell (audio)  
Nicole Carvajal  
Jordan Titus  
Josef Glowa  
Latrice Laughlin  
Ken Abramowicz  
Dana Thomas  
Brian Rogers

Others Present:

Joy Morrison  
Linda Hapsmith  
Mike Sfraga  
Carla Browning (audio)

GUEST SPEAKER:

Pat Pitney, VCAS

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #168

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Eliminate the B.S. in Statistics

B. Motions Pending: None

III Public Comments/Questions

No public comments were given.

IV A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

Jon announced several items:

- Edith R. Bullock Prize nomination forms are at the back table.
- Life Sciences brown bag lunch takes place this week, hosted by Staff Council.
- Due to some recent events, Faculty Alliance will be very busy through December with the Academic Master Plan. Other items of business will be of lower priority until their task is completed.

B. President-Elect's Comments – Cathy Cahill

Cathy reported on the Faculty Alliance meeting. They met to prepare for the Board of Regents meeting. They emphasized communicating effectively with Statewide administration. "When in doubt, sound us out" was their message.

Cathy mentioned concern that UAA hasn't started their new chancellor search.

There's now a university task force on tuition and affordability. The committee has nine people who will be discussing where the tuition dollars go and what constitutes well-justified use of those funds. They will make a recommendation to President Gamble about the FY12 tuition increase before the November BOR budget meeting. They will make a final recommendation to the chancellors before the BOR meeting in December. Cathy invited questions about where the dollars go.

V A. Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers

1. The BOR had their first meeting about the budget recently. President Gamble expects relatively flat funding for the operating budget, at least for the next couple of years. The

request to the BOR on the capital side requests no funding for new construction, due to needs for deferred maintenance and renewal needs on existing buildings.

2. The November bond issue (Life Sciences) was mentioned, and a reminder given that we can not spend public resources on support of the proposition; we must be careful how we step forward on this. UA Foundation has spent private funds supporting it.
3. In the current economic state, opportunities for growth will be through enrollment increases, tuition and fee increases, new research grants and contracts, and cost savings realized through reallocations and reductions. They are looking closely at administrative support programs and academic and research programs.
4. Reminder about the Chancellor's reception for the Faculty Senate later today.

#### B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

Susan quelled the rumor that tenure-track faculty are being laid off for financial reasons. There is no reason for such action; however impacts from the pullback of funds have been felt by the units and this has affected filling vacant positions.

Susan shared some highlights from the draft of the Performance Based Budget (PBB) report she has been working on. On the metric of high demand job area degrees (which includes health careers, engineering and other areas) UAF had 775 degrees (including certificates, associates, and bachelors). By comparison, in FY09 there were 646 degrees in those areas.

Retention numbers for undergraduate students has been improving steadily: in FY09 it was 66.5% (which includes associate-seeking students and lowers the number), in FY10 it was 66.7%, and FY11: 69.2%. Retention of baccalaureate-seeking students is over 82% for FY11. Student credit hours grew dramatically last year. In FY09 there were 174,000 student credit hours, and 184,000 hours in FY10.

Grant funded research expenditures were \$114 million dollars, which is quite a bit more than the \$106 million dollars expended in FY09.

The university-generated revenue was \$223 million dollars last year, an increase of more than \$10 million dollars from the previous year. This was due to the increased research revenue and tuition generated by the increased enrollment.

Jon D. asked when the report will be available. Susan responded that it will be posted on the statewide web site in a few weeks, in time for the BOR meeting.

A copy of the report is posted on the Faculty Senate home page: [www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate)

## VI Governance Reports

#### A. Staff Council – Maria Russell

- Maria announced the Brown Bag Lunch / FAQ discussion on Life Sciences – all are welcome.
- Staff Appreciation Day is calendared for May 19, 2011.
- A law case involving copyrighted material found on employee computers was resolved. OIT policy was rewritten as a result. Maria will send information to Jon.

- The ASEA union has withdrawn their petition, so there will be no vote before the staff. Both ASEA and APEA unions can thus start card-signing efforts again. Staff are frustrated.

#### B. ASUAF – Nicole Carvajal

- An update was provided on the Sustainability Fee. Action to put the vote before the students again failed. Work continues on finalizing the board membership.
- Work with the task force on tuition and affordability continues.
- Nichole was on the +/- grading subcommittee of Curricular Affairs, and some recommendations will come before the senate soon.

#### C. UNAC – Jordan Titus

Jordan mentioned that bargaining is ongoing and that those meetings are open. Faculty may attend. They're usually meeting on Mondays and Tuesdays, alternating one week in Anchorage, then in Fairbanks. The schedule and any changes are posted on their web site. Executive board meetings of UNAC are also open meetings. Time is provided at the beginning of those board meetings for public comment.

UNAC wants to work collaboratively with Faculty Senate and share the discussions. AAUP is offering training sessions on November 12 -13, in Washington, D.C., focused on shared governance. If anyone is interested in attending, call Cindy at the union office.

A future discussion item mentioned at September's senate meeting was a legislative coordinating committee. The Union is interested in this idea. They are having sessions to prep faculty for speaking to legislators, prior to the union representative assembly meeting in Juneau on February 25-26. Cathy C. asked Jordan to let everyone know when those sessions will be held for prepping faculty.

Jane W. shared that UAFT CBA bargaining is still ongoing.

Jon asked about the status of the ORP law suit. Jordan reported that the post hearing briefs have been filed. The university appeal process is progressing. An October 26 date is set for actual hearings on that and may go as long as two weeks. The law suit trial, however, is not expected to progress. January 2012 has been projected for the trial date.

## VII Guest Speaker

#### A. Pat Pitney, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services

The tuition waiver issue came up over the last year and a half as a significantly under-budgeted item. This is partly due to the way they have checks and balances on tuition waivers. Nothing has been changed dramatically, but they are raising awareness of it because it needs to be addressed as an ongoing issue. It has been one of the major items covered by the pullback funds. That said, it's an investment the institution has chosen to make for both undergraduate and graduate students.

While there are a variety of tuition waivers provided, the graduate student waivers are the ones they're trying to address, where a department assigns a Teaching Assistantship (TA) and pays

the stipend, and their tuition is covered out of central funding. So, as many TA stipends as a department can afford has an impact on how much is then paid out of central funds to cover tuition. It's this scenario that has no boundaries right now. Currently, \$2.5 million in graduate tuition waivers for TA's is being paid right now. Over time, boundaries need to start being set to control the costs. They want to be able to budget for a known number of TA's from the departments. It's also an instructional and capacity issue for all departments.

Pat emphasized they are trying to raise awareness among the units. They don't know how many TA-ships there will be from year to year, nor how many might be in-state students vs. out-of-state students coming in. But, they need to start being able to budget for it. There will be some controls on teaching assistant increases in the future.

It matters significantly whether in-state or out-of-state tuition costs are waived, since out-of-state tuition is three times more than in-state. A department is only paying the stipends, and gets 60% back in tuition revenue. The budgeting challenge is finding out how much is in-state and how much is foreign or out-of-state after the fact. Since it changes every single year, they can't budget adequately at this time for it. It's not cost neutral to award TA's.

Lara D. noted that these are a major recruitment tool for out of state students. Susan H. commented that administration is making every effort to handle the matter without reducing the number of TA's right now. They hope to be able to address future numbers more carefully.

Dave V. commented about handling the tuition funds by a cost-share approach, but the Chancellor noted that CLA and CNSM would be adversely affected by that because they have so many TA's and need the tuition revenue. The goal is to preserve the current practices, but have more clarity and awareness about the process and its impact when departments hire more TA's.

Cecile L. asked if it makes a difference by offering Research Assistantships rather than TA's, and Pat responded that it's the same in terms of the tuition waiver and revenue back to the department. Pat commented about incentivizing more RA-ships than TA-ships in the future, because of the positive benefits with RA-ships.

Orion L. commented about the terms "waiver" vs. "award" with regard to assistantships. When he receives a grant, a sizeable amount goes to tuition, and it's more truly an "award" to the student. The Chancellor commented that it really is a unique form of scholarship award and they are moving away from the term "waiver" because of how these must be accounted for. "Institutional tuition scholarships" is the new term they are starting to use.

Rajive G. commented about RA pay being almost the same as that for a post-doc, and how it makes it less competitive in terms of getting grants. He's seen issues with grant-funding agencies over the high rates of pay. He would rather hire undergraduates or a post-doc.

Amber T. commented about need for figures in front of them during these types of discussions. Units operate differently based on what grants they have coming in, and some units have much larger grants than others. Liberal Arts typically offer much smaller stipends from their limited budgets. Lara D. noted that graduate rates of pay are consistent across campus, though certain interdisciplinary programs (like IGERT) have higher stipends associated with them.

Dean Eric Madsen noted the real issue is one of predictability for the numbers of RA's/TA's being hired and the resulting tuition awards.

Anthony A. commented that some RA's seek out a TA-ship instead to get teaching experience. He wondered if maybe there are ways for graduate students to acquire teaching experience without the associated TA-ship. Pat responded that they don't want to discourage the right behavior, but rather create awareness of what needs to be preserved in the program while looking for ways to have predictability in the process.

Jon D. stressed the need to expand the awareness of the program, so that financial realities aren't driving the choices being made for teaching and students instead. We need to focus on the university's mission of educating graduate students, and we don't want to limit their opportunities because of financial constraints.

## BREAK and PHOTO SHOOT

### VIII Announcements

#### A. Triennial Campus-wide Surveys by the Rasmuson Library – Karen Jensen

The last survey was three years ago and yielded great information that resulted in many changes. For example, one can place their own holds in Goldmine now, and lots of books and journals were added in certain areas.

Everyone should have gotten an email with the link. Teaching faculty surveys are just a little longer. Please fill it out over the next 3 weeks.

#### B. Eric Mazur Presentations on Peer Instruction – Josef Glowa

On behalf of the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement (FDAI) Committee and the Faculty Development Office, Josef announced upcoming campus events with Professor Eric Mazur. Dr. Mazur is the Balkanski Professor of Physics and Applied Physics at Harvard University. He will offer a series of lectures and workshops on campus on October 28 and 29. He specializes in science education and is one of the pioneers of using peer teaching in the classroom. He will also give a public lecture for all including K-12 teachers at the Reichardt auditorium. Flyers have been distributed.

#### C. Accreditation Steering Committee Vacant Seat – Jon Dehn

Jon asked for a volunteer to represent the Senate on this committee. Jon himself volunteered.

### IX New Business

#### A. Motion to Approve an Updated Procedure for the Program Review Process, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 169/1)

Dana Thomas spoke to this motion which would revise the program review process in three major ways:

- Make the process more efficient so that departments produce fewer materials (paper reporting) for it. Department focus would be on outcomes assessment instead. PAIR info would be supplied to the departments for program review.

- To help promote consistency in the review process, a single committee would review all the programs, comprised of a broad range of faculty. The committee would look more like the Promotion and Tenure committees. An administrative program review committee would be comprised of deans and they would review what the faculty committee said and add their perspectives. Then the Provost would have her say on it – more like the P&T process of levels.
- The previous process did not fully meet BOR policy requirements. This proposed process would do that.

Cecile L. asked about the set of recommendations described in the new process. Dana listed them as 1.) Continue the program; 2.) Continue but improve the outcomes assessment process; 3.) Continue with some other proviso about it; or, 4.) Discontinue the program, even if agreed upon by the three groups. The last action is not a done deal because it must come before the Senate for the final vote and then go on to BOR for their approval.

Dana shared that the process is moving from a five year review process to a three year process. Doing so aligns better with the accreditation cycle that is now every seven years. There would be two three-year cycles between each seven-year accreditation.

Jane W. asked about the numbers given for membership on the faculty review committee – there is one tenured faculty from each unit, but for CRCD there are five. Dana responded that it's based upon the number of programs at CRCD.

Provost Susan Henrichs added that they're reviewing all the programs this year to get everyone off on the same footing with the new timetable. They need to gather the outcomes assessment info for the accreditation site visit, also. After this year it will be on a rotation where a third of the programs are done each year. The time of the accreditation site visit is October 3-5 of 2011.

Cecile noted that a small number of faculty would be reviewing a large number of programs each year. Dana responded that the questions they're being asked are more straightforward. Does each program have an outcomes assessment plan? Are they collecting and summarizing data on a regular basis? Are they improving their curriculum over time? Is this an efficient and productive unit? Trend graphs will be provided.

Amber T. noted that it sounds like a lot of work for the committee.

Lara D. expressed concern about the fact that Ph.D. programs would be reviewed every three years. They usually take longer than three years, and this more frequent review might do them an injustice. Susan agreed that small enrollment graduate programs won't see much change in this short of a review cycle. But regularly keeping up with outcomes assessment and related information collection will stand them in good stead when they're undergoing re-accreditation.

Dave V. asked logistical question about the rotation cycle. Dana explained that this year all programs are being reviewed. Next year everyone takes the year off from program review, for strategic planning and writing the accreditation report. Then, in 2012 the first rotation of review for a third of the programs will start, followed by the next third the next year, and so on.

Carrie B. asked about the programs reviewed last year. Susan noted that information is still useable, particularly the outcomes assessment portion. They should be able to recycle key parts of last year's report. It's not wasted work.

Amber asked about the program review committee's authority to recommend that a program be discontinued. Dana reiterated that the group only makes recommendations, and that final decision on program elimination belongs to the Faculty Senate, the Provost and Chancellor, and the BOR.

Rainer N. explained how this process feels like agreeing to be whipped – that administration will do whatever they wish anyway. It's an endorsement of a process over which the faculty have no power. Susan responded that the program review process is already BOR policy and her office has no choice about the fact it must be done. They're asking for the new process to be approved based upon the new accreditation process, not the fact that programs must be reviewed. Rainer noted the issue of changing the frequency of the review cycle to every three years. Susan explained that BOR policy mandates program review every five years, but this does not fit well within the new seven year accreditation cycle. She has decided upon a three year cycle of review because student outcomes assessment must be monitored closely for accreditation purposes. They want more information and to keep it current and have two reports in any given accreditation cycle, which makes the accreditation reviewers more satisfied with how often it's happening. Dana commented that the accreditation process was changed by the Commission because of the lax program reviews at many institutions based on the old ten-year-review cycle.

Cecile L. asked what the consequences were for negative program ratings. Susan answered that time would be allowed to make improvements for the next scheduled review, unless the situation were more critical. In a critical case, she could request to have regular reports from a dean to review for improvement.

Rajive G. expressed concern about the quality of information one would get in shorter reports of two pages. ABET examines their outcomes assessment data in great depth. Will shortening reports give them worthwhile data? Dana clarified that the information to be shortened to two pages is for the regents, and that outcomes assessment reports will be longer than that. Rajive commented on the great amount of work involved for department faculty to process outcomes assessment of programs, and its impact on faculty workloads. He expressed concern about compacting this work into a time frame shorter than five years.

Jordan T. commented about problems her small department encountered during their program review, particularly with institutional data and the way it's compiled. Students with double majors, for example, were not documented as such, only their first major was counted. She asked whether the means by which data is collected, compiled and provided to them, has improved. She also noted that her department was approved with the recommendation for another faculty hire. That hire has not happened. The improvement to their program was not up to them – it was up to an administrator.

Susan responded that faculty would not be blamed in such a case where the suggested improvement was out of their control. Regarding the accuracy of data, PAIR has started creating reports to handle dual majors – they do have the capability to address it now. The data is intended to be supplied to the departments with time to review it before their reports are due.

Regarding the issue of associated workload, Susan agreed with Rajive's comments about how much work it is and with the fact that specialized accreditation places a lot of emphasis on student outcomes assessment. The dean should provide appropriate workload and adequate time for the faculty with this responsibility. Units with specialized accreditation may request an appropriate time schedule from her office. Her office wants sufficient outcomes assessment and is willing to be flexible to that end.



Dave V. brought up Jordan's point about reviewing the review process itself, to give feedback into this system regarding the data so problems can be regularly addressed. Susan noted the PAIR office reports to her, and she and Dana would take feedback on any problems with the data.

Dana commented feedback will be incorporated into the electronic formats to be used for the faculty and administrative committee reporting.

Amber commented on the sense of urgency and pressure with the new process this year. It'll be interesting to see what comes up in three years, so she recommended this process be brought back to the senate in four years to evaluate it.

Jon D. noted the motion before them and asked what the senate wishes to do with it. Amber and Cecile had no issues with the process, just its three-year frequency. Cecile supported the idea of reviewing the frequency of the new process in 3-4 years. Rajive suggested the Provost look into granting exceptions for those with rigorous specialized accreditation review. He feels the frequency of the new process is overkill for Engineering. Dana reiterated that BOR policy won't let anyone off the hook, and that the BOR review asks questions which ABET does not. Rajive noted that while he sees improvement in his program because of the outcomes assessment process; we need to look into optimizing the process to make use of the existing outcomes assessment already being done by programs like Engineering.

Susan suggested that an amendment on the floor could be made and that she would promise to look at the process after the first third of the programs came up for review again in the new cycle (FY12 or FY13), and she would accept specialized reports for other programs a year or two earlier in the program review cycle. She emphasized the need to monitor the outcomes assessment process more frequently, while acknowledging the great amount of work involved for everyone.

Rainer asked what the adverse effects might be of not approving the motion at this time. Susan said this is an ongoing process this year. It will throw a monkey wrench into efforts right now.

Dana noted, from what he's heard thus far, that the frequency of the process is the main problem. There's plenty of time to address the frequency issue down the road, so he suggested they consider following this process this year. Chancellor Rogers expressed agreement with Dana's statement on discussing frequency issues in the near future. If senate accepts the proposed process for now, however, it's important to know that now.

Amber moved to approve the new process for this year only, amending the motion on the floor to reflect that it's approved for this year only. Dave seconded that. Orion L. noted that frequency is not referred to in the existing motion – that it only addresses the new process.

Rajive brought up that faculty workloads have already been set for this year. Susan noted that the deans must address the workload issue, and that an overload may be justified. She has limited resources, but could consider providing financial assistance if a unit can not meet the overload.

Ayes passed the motion as amended on the floor (that the new process be followed this year only). There were four nays and one abstention. Issues of faculty workload, frequency of the

new process, units with specialized accreditation, and evaluating the new process will all be revisited by Faculty Senate in the future.

## X Discussion Items

### A. Status of the Academic Master Plan – Susan Henrichs

The Academic Master Plan (AMP) was turned down at the last BOR meeting. They felt that the plan was too long, complicated, and difficult to understand. They wanted clearer direction for approval of new programs and allocation of resources. They wanted delineated instructions for action on budget approvals, program approvals, approvals of new buildings and other BOR actions related to the AMP. The existing plan was turned over to the Faculty Alliance (FA) to condense it from a full-blown 30-page plan down to the “Nature” condensed version.

Jon D. commented that FA agreed to take the plan. Faculty Alliance members agree that the current plan is quite a good one as is, and it’s absolutely essential to have it in order to take the next step to condense it. The BOR wants the condensed version quickly and there’s an issue with turnaround time. It is not the intent of FA to change the content. He is not sure he can bring it before the entire senate again before it’s time to bring it before the BOR in February. He’ll try to have it reviewed via email, including both the long and short versions.

### B. Draft Motion to Amend the Faculty Senate Constitution – Jon Dehn (Attachment 169/2)

Jon brought the motion to the floor, commenting on the change and rationale for it. He commented on the use of Robert’s Rules of Order (RRO) by the senate, particularly noting that they don’t always apply to an academic body which functions on a consensus model rather than an adversarial one.

Cecile L. asked about what specifics of RRO are not a good fit for this body. She asked how deciding on this now would affect future leadership that could have a “my way or the highway” mindset. Jon responded that our authority is derived from BOR policy and our own Constitution and Bylaws and supersede RRO. RRO by themselves would not stop anyone who wished to operate as a dictator since they’re designed to foment discussion. The senate’s use of RRO is in many ways not correct, and rather than redefine the culture of the group, he wanted to clarify the fact that we are a consensus group.

Dave V. commented about the use of RRO and resorting to them when there are conflicts. Jane W. concurred with his statement.

Andy A. commented that we’re clearly not observing RRO unless there is a conflict, and that they are in fact being used as a guideline rather than an authority. If we keep with the statement that they’re an authority, we should then follow them to a “T”, but, if we’re not doing that, then we should clearly state they are guidelines for the group.

Mike D. commented about making up the rules as we go. Andy responded that we have put the rules we always wish to be followed into our bylaws.

Amber T. said the statement could be prefaced with BOR bylaws, and if they don't apply, then state that RRO should be used as parliamentary practice. This would get around the use of both words (authority vs. guidelines).

Jon asked that anyone who feels very strongly about this please send him an email. Any language changes to the motion will be sent out by email to everyone before the next meeting.

## XI Committee Reports

Reports were cut short because of time.

- A. Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 169/3)
- B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair (Attachment 169/4)
- C. Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Ute Kaden (Attachment 169/5)
- D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair  
(Attachment 169/6)  
Jane mentioned the Women Faculty Luncheon.
- E. Core Review – Latrice Laughlin, Chair (Attachment 169/7)
- F. Curriculum Review Committee – Rainer Newberry, Chair
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks, Convener
- H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowka, Chair  
(Attachment 169/8)
- I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Ken Abramowicz, Chair  
(Attachment 169/9)
- J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair  
(Attachment 169/10)
- K. Research Advisory Committee (ad hoc) – Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen,  
Co-Chairs

## XII Members' Comments/Questions

## XIII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:18 PM.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve an updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regent policy and regulations (10.06).

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The existing program review process (Meeting #102, May 2001) does not fully meet Board of Regents policy and regulations on program review (10.06). The proposed process aligns with the new accreditation cycle, is a more efficient process, i.e., it is less burdensome on programs, and is intended to yield more consistent quality of review.

\*\*\*\*\*

The new program review process will be completed as follows:

1. An initial brief review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit supplied two-page narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere in UA, and any special circumstances that explain features of the centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary (see attached program review template for more details). The information reviewed meets the requirements set by Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; attached). A single Faculty Program Review Committee comprised of one tenured-faculty member from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus five CRCD representatives will review the materials and make one of the following recommendations:
  - Continue program
  - Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
  - Continue program but improve other specific areas or
  - Discontinue program.The committee will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review.
2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and 4 administrative representatives from CRCD will review the recommendations of the Program Review Committee, may request additional information from about the program, and will state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.
3. The Provost will review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:
  - a. Program continuation is confirmed until next review cycle
  - b. Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be

required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.

- c. Recommend to discontinue program. Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, when appropriate admissions may be suspended pending action.

-----

### **Program Review Template**

The program will provide the following information (submit electronically to LaNora Tolman <latolman@alaska.edu> by December 1 – your Dean may ask for this information earlier to review it):

1. A current outcomes assessment plan and summary for each academic program (see attached appendix for more detail)
2. Concise narratives responding to the following (no more than 2 pages):
  - a. The prospective market for program graduates expressed need by clientele in the service area and documented needs of the state (note if program is included in state high demand job area list) and/or nation. The following sites provide state and national employment related information:
    - i. UA System list of high demand job programs  
<http://www.alaska.edu/swbir/performance/metrics/MetricDetail/HDJTable1.pdf>
    - ii. State of Alaska Department of Labor  
<http://www.labor.state.ak.us/research/iodata/occproj.htm>
    - iii. U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics  
<http://www.bls.gov/oco/>

Programs may use other appropriate data, e.g., placement information they collect or information from professional societies but should avoid anecdotal information. Continuing education such as baccalaureate enrollment for AA or AAS programs or graduate or professional school placement for baccalaureate programs can be included if appropriate. It is recognized that market data may not be available or appropriate for all programs.

- b. A description of unique and significant service achievements by unit faculty during the past three academic years. These service achievements should be ones where local or regional expertise was needed or were exceptional because of the achievement made. Please do not include common service functions such as refereeing journals, service on UAF committees or science fair judging. The following examples illustrate what is wanted:
  - i. Civil Engineering faculty worked with the local school district to implement a pre-engineering curriculum track.
  - ii. A Fisheries faculty member served on the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council
  - iii. An Anthropology faculty member serves as editor of a major journal in the field
  - iv. Music faculty participate in the Fairbanks Symphony, a collaboration between UAF and the local community
- c. A narrative addressing whether similar programs exist elsewhere in the UA system and briefly describe differences and/or justify program duplication. If the program is special or unique in the national context, the program should describe why.

- d. A narrative explaining any unusual features observed in the demand and productivity summaries listed below.
- e. Programs with faculty in the fine and performing arts units should supply a list of performances and exhibits by faculty from annual activities reports for 3 years. The Provost's Office will provide a list of publications by unit faculty in the previous three calendar years compiled from annual unit plans.
- f. A brief narrative describing successful partnerships resulting in scholarships, equipment or in-kind services during the past three years.
- g. Indicate whether the program has specialized accreditation (identify the professional association or accrediting body) or not.

The Provost's Office will provide the following by November 1:

- A list of publications by unit faculty in the previous three calendar years compiled from annual unit plans. Fine and performing arts units should supply a list of performances and exhibits by faculty from annual activities reports for 3 years.
- The UA Statewide annual list of unit principal investigators supported on external funding and the amount of funding over the past three years

PAIR and/or Financial Services will provide the following demand and productivity summaries by November 1:

- A graph illustrating 5- year trends in the following:
  - SCH lower division (developmental coursework listed as well for select units)
  - SCH upper division (500 level SCH not included unless specifically requested)
  - SCH graduate
- A graph illustrating 5-year trends in the following:
  - SCH by students outside the major
  - SCH by students outside the college/school
- A graph or table illustrating 5-year trends in distance SCH partitioned by those offered through the Center for Distance Education (CDE) and those not offered through CDE.
- A graph illustrating 5-year trends in the number of majors by degree/certificate type
- A table or graph illustrating the gender and ethnicity distribution of majors over 5 years
- A graph illustrating 5-year trends in the number of degrees/certificates awarded by type
- Average number of declared majors in program over 4 years /average number of degrees (certificates) over 4 years (no intention to compare across different degrees)
- A numerical summary of the following information for the previous fiscal year:
  - \*Total department annual budget
  - \*\*Tuition revenue generated by all designators associated with department
  - FTE faculty positions and a list of faculty funded by the program with an indicator as to whether the faculty member was an active PI
  - FTE staff positions

\*= Where department budgets are problematic to obtain, measures of the cost of the program will be developed by the college or school, described and used or college/school budget used.

\*\*= approximate tuition revenue will be determined by ignoring in-state/out-of-state and whether tuition waivers were applied or not.

## **Appendix A. Evaluating a Programmatic Outcomes Assessment Report**

Program will submit the following outcomes assessment information:

- An assessment plan for each program; programs are encouraged, but not required, to include employment placement and/or graduate school enrollment information as part of their assessment process.
- Assessment information collected and summarized during the previous three years
- A summary of programmatic revisions (improvements) resulting from the assessment information

The Program Review Committee will assess the quality of the programmatic assessment process. Quality shall be assessed based on at least the following characteristics:

- 1) Assessment Plan
  - a. Each program has its own outcomes assessment appropriate to the certificate or degree (the same plan for cannot be used programs of different levels, e.g., associate and baccalaureate because the outcomes should differ)
  - b. Multiple measures of student outcomes are utilized
  - c. Assessment includes direct evidence of student learning (student survey results are considered indirect evidence)
- 2) Assessment information is collected and summarized on a regular basis.
- 3) The assessment summary is based on aggregate student information not a statement about individual student outcomes. The intent of the process is to assess the effectiveness of the curriculum not individual performance. In addition, it is important to be able to share assessment information with external evaluators without violating FERPA.
- 4) Where the assessment process results in the identification of weaknesses in student outcomes, documented curricular changes have occurred intended to improve student outcomes.

ATTACHMENT 169/2

UAF Faculty Senate #169, October 11, 2010

### **DRAFT MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, Article IX, section 1, to state that the most current version of Robert's Rules of Order shall be the parliamentary "guidelines" for the Faculty Senate rather than the "authority".

Effective: Immediately

Rationale: Robert's Rules of Order in regard to a governing body serve the function to facilitate the mission of that body such that they:

- Are subordinate to the Constitution and Bylaws of a governing body
- Support majority rule while preserving the rights of the minority

- Are to facilitate collegial debate regarding matters of policy

In fact, past practice of the UAF Faculty Senate has demonstrated the use of Robert's Rules of Order in this manner. The "authority" of the UAF Faculty Senate is derived from its voting majority and its mandate in the University of Alaska Board of Regents and UAF Policy.

**CAPS** = Addition

**[[ ]]** = Deletion

#### ARTICLE IX - Parliamentary Authority

Sect. 1      The parliamentary **[[authority]] GUIDELINES** shall be the most recent version of Robert's Rules of Order.



**Curricular Affairs Committee  
9-7-2010 Approved Meeting Minutes**

Present: Mike Earnest, Anita Hughes, Ginny Kinne, Christa Bartlett, Dave Valentine, Rainer Newberry, Carrie Baker, Jungho Baek, Linda Hapsmith, Libby, Carol Lewis

**Motion to eliminate the BS Statistics:**

Rainer introduced the motion to the group. The minor program would still exist. Students can still major in Math with an emphasis in statistics. It's an option in the Math degrees.

Dave V. asked the question about whether there were any major arguments against it? Rainer noted there were no substantive objections.

Rainer would like CAC members to be able to speak in favor of the motion at a senate meeting. The question was asked if any students are enrolled in the program right now. Libby checked and found 1 student enrolled this Fall. Students would be accepted still, under the current Catalog.

Rainer asked if there any objections to the motion. Dave V. asked about transfer students – they would be subject to the current catalog, so would be accepted this year.

It was agreed this motion could go forward to the Senate.

**Motion re  $\pm$  grading clarification:**

Rainer summarized the attached letter and draft motion.

John Fox's letter addresses the catalog and how it should be interpreted. Dave is comfortable with a C and understands that it's different than a C-. Usage of  $\pm$  is optional for faculty in their courses. Question raised about courses taught in sections – one is taught with and the other without  $\pm$ . Rainer acknowledged the continual risk of that and other uncontrolled ambiguities – different instructors, etc. The  $\pm$  policy really impacts students who habitually keep a “life on the edge” approach to classes, because their low C's may turn into C- grades. ‘Typical’ students are as likely to receive a B+ in one class as an A- in another, and the differences basically even out..

We should be very explicit, esp. in the Catalog – use numbers. Reaffirm the 2.0 requirement for good standing. One place on page 43 of the Catalog needs clarification (Faculty-initiated drop or withdrawal section).

Dave V. asked if this really needs to be a motion. Rainer pointed out this makes faculty more aware of the issues by bringing it to the Senate. Motion language: senate affirms that a C means 2.0. The motion wouldn't read each page of the Catalog – but the committee should look at that detail and review it. Ideally, the committee should be able to say they looked at every catalog entry. Be picky here and now at the committee level, and then educate the faculty through the Senate.

Question asked if standards are being raised by this. John Fox feels it's unfair to some students who now get a GPA less than 2.0. But, the majority support setting C=2.0. They are raising the standard only in the sense of raising standards for those on the edge.

All faculty know a C grade counts for a major course, and can grade accordingly.

Page 35 of Catalog – transfer students can bring in a C-, and it's counting as a C in Banner (a 2.0). Traditionally has been done this way (before Banner). Issue of practice brought into question – Mike E. said this can be addressed now in Banner and brought more in line with the widely stated policy so that two standards aren't continued any longer.

Linda H. noted the issue of a passing grade = D-, but a "D" is not specified in numbers. Internal transfer issues. The table on page 47 needs to be clarified – about D- (vs. D) being a passing grade.

Dave proposed a blanket motion to clarify policy. Keep the language simple. Have an addendum with current examples. Don't vote on each one of those. Mike E., LJ Evans, and Linda H. will look at the catalog and send out e-copies at least three days before next meeting for discussion

#### **Future meetings:**

Every other Tuesday is good and the next meeting will be Sept. 21<sup>st</sup> at 2:00 PM. All members were OK with online voting and voting early if they couldn't make a meeting.

Carrie raised the topic of the ad hoc committee for the Baccalaureate Core. Rainer will include this in the next meeting and we will definitely discuss those issues.

-----

#### **Curricular Affairs Committee 9-21-2010 Approved Meeting Minutes**

Present: Anita Hughes, Ginny Kinne, Christa Bartlett, Dave Valentine, Rainer Newberry, Carrie Baker, Jungho Baek, Linda Hapsmith, Libby, Carol Lewis, Dana Thomas, Donald Crocker, Rajive Ganguli, Alex Oliveira

- Minutes from 9/7 meeting were approved as amended.

#### - Continuation of the + grading policy discussion

Anita Hughes provided the list below of places where C and (or) 2.0 are in the catalog. We agreed in principal to the notion of ***re-affirming that C = 2.0 = minimum grade and (or) GPA required in most cases for adequate academic progress*** and then we got stuck on the transfer issue. On one hand it's inconsistent to allow a C- to transfer in as a C (and thus be used for a major class); on the other hand, we accept transfer of courses with grades as low as D- for students from UAA and UAS. This follows from the 'transparency between MAUs' dictate of the Board of Regents. (All Hail!! The BOR has ruled!)

After about 10 minutes of discussion on this problem Dave V. pointed out that the meeting would last FOREVER unless we figured out a way to move quickly through the items. He proposed creating a subcommittee to make recommendations. EVERYONE agreed that this was a fabulous idea....as long as someone else was on (or at least in charge). Rainer closed his eyes and asked for volunteers. He was told that no one raised their hands....This lead to

Dave V. AGREED to convene and chair the subcommittee. Rainer twisted several arms and also agreed to serve. Dave (?) noted the need for a student on the committee. Christa (?) agreed to solicit a student for it. Linda agreed to ask the Provost (?) concerning accreditation issues that might arise from accepting grades from outside UA with < C-. The subcommittee is: David Valentine (chair), Rainer Newberry, Donald Crocker, Anita Hughes, & undergraduate student to be appointed by ASUAF President

- Formation of the new subcommittee on the Baccalaureate Core
- 

We agreed to the following strategy:

- A. One representative from each school/college + One student
- B. AT LEAST two members from CAC (Carrie Baker and Dave Valentine) + 1 member from Core Review (to be determined) + one from SADA (tbd).

These 4 will represent 4 different schools/colleges (in particular, CLA and SLRM + 2 not yet determined).

C. The additional school/college representatives will be chosen by the appropriate school/colleges however they'd like. (Obvious choice: curricular review committee chair).

D. We agreed to ask Dana, Jon, Cathy (and ADCOM?) to review our proposed strategy

## **2010 catalog**

### **References to “grade of C or better” or “grade of C (2.0) or better”**

P 26 in the Pre-Major “C (2.0)”, Transfer Students (“2.0 GPA” no mention of C) and the Probational Acceptance sections “C (2.0)”,

P 27 in the Home-Schooled Students Section “C (2.0)”

P 30 in the Admission Requirements section 2 instances “B (3.0)”

P 31 in the English Proficiency Requirements section, one reference to “successful completion”(C or higher)

P 34 in the Course Prerequisites section “C” (2.0) or better...

P 35 in items #3 and 4, transfer policy referring to C- or higher and C (2.0)

P 39 in the English Adv. Placement section “C grade or better” & in Mathematics section “C grade or better”

P 41 in the Non-Degree Students section ref to a 2.0 GPA (no mention of a C)

P 43 in the Faculty-Initiated Drop section “grade of “C” or better in prerequisites...”

P 45 in the Credit/No Credit section “...performance is at the C grade or higher...”

P 46 in the P ass section, “Satisfactory performance is the equivalent of a C grade or better...”

In the Incomplete section, “Satisfactorily completed (C or better)...”

P 48 discussion of Good Standing, Probation, Academic Qualification, multiple references

P 77 in the Intercollegiate Athletics section several references to “2.0 GPA” no mention of “C”.

P 79 in the Pre-Major section, “...C grade average (2.0) or better...”

P 86 General University Requirements, “ minimum GPA of 2.0 is required...” also in Occupational Endorsement Requirements “...have a cumulative GPA of at least 2.0...”

OE Program description pages 87-90: several footnotes that students must earn a C or better in each course some include (2.0) in the note, most do not

P 92 in the General University Requirements section, “minimum C (2.0) grade...” and Table 19

P 131 in the General University Requirements section, “minimum C (2.0) grade...” and Table 20

P 132 in the Minors section “cumulative GPA of at least 2.00 (C) in...”

Bachelors Program description pages 140-196: several footnotes that students must earn a C or better in each course some include (2.0) in the note, most do not

P 201 in the Grades and Grade Point...section “...a C (2.0) grade...”

P 203 in the Advancement to Candidacy section...”grades below C (2.0)...”

**Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**September 9, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

Members present: Andy Anger, Mike Davis (by phone), Lily Dong, Cecile Lardon, Andrew Metzger, Jennifer Reynolds, Roger Smith (ex officio).

Administrative Committee actions on Aug 30 were summarized by Jennifer Reynolds.

The committee reviewed five topics forwarded by last year's committee for consideration this year:

Teaching by Non-Regular Faculty: Discussion of this topic was postponed until the next meeting.

Reapportionment of Faculty Senate representation: Reapportionment will be conducted by Faculty Affairs in the fall semester, following the new procedure approved by the Faculty Senate last spring. The results will be in place for Faculty Senate elections in spring, 2011.

4<sup>th</sup> year review by university-wide P&T committee: Background: The 2008-09 Faculty Affairs Committee was asked by the Provost to look at ways of decreasing the workload for the Promotion and Tenure Committees, especially the campus-wide committees. FAC recommended that applicants' files be made available to P&T committees electronically, with specific security measures to ensure confidentiality. (This recommendation was not controversial, and has been implemented.) FAC also suggested that 4<sup>th</sup> year review files not be forwarded to the campus-wide P&T committees unless the candidate asks for this review. However, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) required that 4<sup>th</sup> year review files go to the campus-wide committee and the Provost, so a change in the CBA would have been required. Because the CBA is being renegotiated this year, FAC will discuss whether to recommend this change to the full Faculty Senate.

FAC members agreed that this change would reduce the workload on campus-wide P&T committees, but several members were concerned that the change might not be in the best interest of the faculty going through 4<sup>th</sup> year review. Members wanted to know how often the outcome of review at the campus-wide level is different from the outcome at the unit peer committee and dean's levels. These data will be requested from the Provost's Office before the next FAC meeting.

Legislative affairs: Fostering communication and strengthening relationships between UAF faculty and state legislators would be a big job. The Faculty Senate might create a new ad hoc committee to handle this, so Faculty Affairs will hold off on any action for the time being.

UAF budget: Administrative decisions about the budget impact faculty and instruction in a variety of ways, some obvious and some not so obvious. FAC members expressed concern and interest in knowing more about the budget issues. Members discussed possible approaches to obtaining timely information, without overwhelming detail, and what role FAC might play. There will be a follow-up discussion at a future meeting.

The Faculty Affairs Committee selected Jennifer Reynolds as chair for 2010-2011.

-----

## **Faculty Affairs Committee**

### **September 27, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

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

United Academics: We now have a new line of communication to United Academics. Jordan Titus, Assoc Professor of Sociology, is UAF's Organizational Vice President for United Academics. She will regularly attend Faculty Senate meetings this year as UNAC's 'ex officio' member of the Faculty Senate (as per FS bylaws). She has also offered to meet with the Faculty Affairs Committee whenever we feel that would be useful.

Database on Teaching by Non-Regular Faculty: There has been substantial and encouraging progress on this project during the summer and early fall. Jennifer Reynolds has been working with Colleen Abrams (Registrar's Office) to extract as much of the needed data as possible from Banner, and at this point it looks as though much more can be provided from Banner than we originally thought. In addition, the Faculty Senate office has identified a staff person who can help work with the data. As a next step, FAC needs to identify contacts in the departments across UAF who know the circumstances behind teaching by non-regular faculty in AY 2007-08 and AY 2008-09. Faculty Affairs members and other members of the Faculty Senate will be asked to recommend contacts.

4<sup>th</sup> Year Review: This topic was continued from our meeting on September 10, when FAC discussed changing 4<sup>th</sup> year faculty reviews to make the campus-wide and Provost levels of review optional. The motivation would be to decrease the workload on the campus-wide committee. However, there was concern about whether 4<sup>th</sup> year faculty would receive adequate feedback on their progress toward promotion and tenure. FAC members decided we needed information on how often the outcomes of faculty 4<sup>th</sup> year review were different at the unit and dean levels versus the campus-wide and provost levels. This information was compiled for the past ten years, with assistance from Provost's Office, and distributed to committee members. Faculty Affairs members agreed that the data showed a need for 4<sup>th</sup> year review at the campus-wide and Provost levels, and did not recommend a change to the 4<sup>th</sup> year review procedure. This topic will not be discussed further.

Reapportionment for Faculty Senate representation: The Provost's Office will provide the numbers of qualifying faculty in UAF units as of October 15. FAC will receive this information in late October or November, and expects to send reapportionment results to the Faculty Senate in December, well in advance of spring elections.

Changing Faculty Senate representation: FAC also discussed how to handle continuing Faculty Senate terms when Senate representation for a unit is changed. There will be situations in which changes cannot be immediately accommodated by elections; an example is the current situation in which CNSM is represented by a faculty member whose department (Computer Sciences) has been transferred to CEM. Committee members favored the following concepts: When a unit's representation on the Faculty Senate changes, elected senators should serve out the terms to which they were elected. Any decreases or increases in a unit's number of Senate representatives should be accommodated in the next election. However, if an increase can not be rapidly accommodated by election (for example, if the increase occurred in the fall and the next election was not until spring), then the unit should choose one of its alternates to fill the new seat(s). This would result in a one-year overlap between previous and new representation, and a temporary increase in the number of senators. The Faculty Senate bylaws do not restrict the Senate to a fixed number of elected senators,

but instead specify rules for representation and allow small increases in the number of senators to comply with these rules. This topic needs further discussion.

## **Report**

**Unit criteria meeting from 9/10/10, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. at SOE meeting room**

**Present:** All members, + 3 guests from DANSRD

Perry Barboza, Heidi Brocious, Karen Jensen, Debra Jones, Ute Kaden, Julie McIntyre, Tim Wilson

Guests- DANSRD: Ralph Gabrielli, Jenny Bell –Jones, Mike Koskey

### **Agenda:**

- 1.) Discuss and comment on DANSRD unit criteria
- 2.) Select a new Chair for Unit Criteria Committee

## **Report**

### **1.) Unit Criteria DANSRD**

**“Department of Alaska Native Studies And Rural Development (DANSRD)” unit criteria**

pp 1, 2 – good introduction

p 5 e eliminate the word audio conference

p5 c rewrite c

p 6 Eliminate C. first paragraph .... *Research is a relative new part* .....

p 6 shorten second paragraph, clarify the use of the word “appropriate”, compare to the overlap with content on p2

p 6 Eliminate the bold paragraph

p 7 top paragraph shorten it

p 7 Second paragraph “*Given...*” consider to delete

p 9 m. simply and clarify wording

p 10 Eliminate top paragraph “*as noted...*”

p 11 e replace *related* with *campus wide*

**Consider including specific for recommendations for promotion and tenure.**

**2.) Perry Barboza will be the unit criteria chair for the 2010-2011 academic year and Ute Kaden will be the convener for 2010-2011 academic year.**

**Committee on the Status of Women,  
Meeting Minutes Tues, Oct 05, 2010; 1-2 pm, Gruening 718**

Members Present: Kayt Sunwood, Jane Weber, Jenny Liu, Melanie Arthur, Derek Sikes, Nicole Cundiff & over phone - Shawn Russell  
Dan White - administrative advocate

Members absent: Janet McClellan, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen

1. Chairs. Jane agreed to continue as co-chair and Kayt agreed to also be co-chair.
2. Final details for luncheon. 6th Annual Faculty Women Luncheon: Tuesday, October 12, 2010, 12:30-2:30, Wood Center Ballroom; Audioconferenced and webstreamed. Webstreaming issues discussed, might not work. Setup by Jane, Derek, Melanie, Kayt- meet at 11AM. Steffi did invitations, food is ordered.
3. Lack of female full professors. No women promoted to full last year in UAF - apparently none applied. How many were eligible but didn't apply? 12 men applied and were promoted.
4. Examine P/T stats and nonretentions. Is there is a gender bias? Categorized by reason for leaving. Dan will get statistics from Provost's office & aim for 15 years worth of statistics.
5. Annual survey tied to annual activities report. Discussion resulted in decision to not tie a survey to the AAR but to run a separate survey of faculty on P/T, mentoring, etc issues.
6. Brown Bag lunch committee. Shawn emphasized it should not be difficult to run these as distance delivery and would be helpful to build community with rural campuses. Kayt explained illuminate-live is an easy solution to this. Kayt, Shawn, and Melanie will be on the BBL committee. Shawn will investigate Center for Distance Ed options. Frequency of offering discussed.

Next meetings: Thursday Nov. 4th, 1-2  
Tues, Dec 14th 1-2  
Meeting was adjourned at 2:00;  
Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes



**CORE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Minutes for the Meeting of Monday Sept. 20, 2010**

*Present:* Chanda Meek, David Henry, Diane Ruess, Rainer Newberry, Burns Cooper, Christine Coffman, Latrice Laughlin (members) Faith Fleagle, Linda Hapsmith, Anita Hughes, Donald Crocker, John Craven (guests)

I. Old Business

A. **Core Revision.** A Core revision committee is being created to possibly adopt an entirely new Core manuscript. Rainer commented that committee members should be taken from the Core review committee and Curricular Affairs.

II. Faculty Senate Results

A. **BS in Statistics.** A motion by the Curricular Affairs committee to discontinue the BS in Statistics was passed. No apparent impact on the Core Review Committee as a result of this.

B. **Core Review Members.** Motion by the Core Review committee to increase its voting membership was passed. Currently Latrice and Jayne are investigating how many new members to add.

III. Assessment

A. **O/W Report.** Motion to remove the “O” capstone from Art 407 Advanced Printmaking for the spring and fall of 2011 or until the class can be assessed by committee members. Motion passed. Students currently enrolled in Art 407 will still receive an “O”. Art department chair and instructor will be notified of the impending assessment.

B. **Spring Assessment.** There are two assessment reports that have not been handed in from the spring assessment. Need to find out whether or not the last cycle was assessed from last chair.

C. **Core Reports.** Latrice is still compiling the list of courses that need to be assessed. There will be other Core courses besides those with an O/W designation. Latrice expects that Core Reports will have to be done over the summer time. Chris inquired if off contract pay will be provided because of the need to finish the Core Reports. Latrice will inquire about off contract pay.

IV. Petitions

A. **No Petitions**

V. Next Meeting 3:30-4:30. Monday October 4, location TBA

*Report for the Senate Minutes.* The committee met on September 20 with seven members present. The committee approved a motion to remove the “O” designation from ART 407 for the spring and fall of the 2011 school year or until the course can be assessed by the committee. The committee also discussed the timeline for the upcoming core reports. There were no petitions submitted. The next coming meeting will be on Monday October 4th

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee  
September 14, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Julie Lurman, Joy Morrison, Channon Price, Larry Roberts

Excused: Eric Madsen

III. Report from Joy

Reporting from Juneau, Joy met with Statewide's Anne Sakumoto in Anchorage, along with two people from UAA's CAFE (Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence), and Kathy DiLorenzo from UAS to discuss ways to collaborate. She asks that our committee be proactive by checking out UAA's CAFE website ([www.uaa.alaska.edu/cafe/](http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/cafe/)) to see what they have available, such as their list of workshops and their Faculty Technology Center. This center employs 2 staff persons to assist faculty to utilize technology in their teaching. CAFE has an introductory book group that is meeting to discuss "Making Inquiry into the College Classroom" and is open to at least 5 faculty members. She has also been meeting with UAF's School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences faculty while in Juneau at their new Lena Point facility

Joy also mentioned that new faculty are already signing up for the 2011 Lilly-West Teaching Conference in March.

IV. Old Business

1. Committee membership

As per Jayne Harvey's email, Diane McEachern may not have time to continue on the FDAI committee due to becoming a Faculty Senator and her other committee work. Jayne will let us know whom the Provost's Council confirms as its representative ASAP. Josef sent an email to Alex O. to encourage her to stay on the committee and got a positive response back, but as she did not call in to the meeting today, it is unknown if she plans to continue to be a member. Joy mentioned that Eric Madsen has volunteered to stay on our committee.

2. Report on Faculty Senate's discussion of online evaluations

Josef was able to get online evaluations put on the Faculty Senate agenda for their meeting yesterday. It bought up a lively discussion with many people interested in weighing in on the issue. Some general questions came up such as: 1) what is being done with the evaluations that are generated now; 2) what do those who evaluate faculty for tenure and promotion do with these evaluations; and 3) how much are these evaluations a part of the tenure and promotion process? When asked how she would use them, Provost Henrichs answered that she hoped there would be a consensus among everyone on how they would be utilized. One motivation for switching to electronic evaluations that the Provost twice alluded to was concern over confidentiality. It was pointed out that students could tamper with evaluations while delivering them to Wood Center, or

that the evaluations could get lost. Channon wondered if there was any documented evidence regarding student tampering. Melanie pointed out that while no solid evidence was given regarding student tampering, we do have research that undeniably states that electronic evaluations have a minimal response rate. Josef mentioned that some people at UAF have experimented with online evaluations and confirm what the research indicates: minimal response rate and so it is not a reliable evaluative measure.

Channon mused on why students would not want to do evaluations online when they are the online generation? Julie pointed out that there is a formality in a face-to-face setting – filling out the forms in person – versus an online option. Once again we discussed the option of withholding students' grades until they had participated in an online evaluation, but since the evaluation process is voluntary, there would still need to be a way out for those students choosing to abstain from evaluating faculty. Julie said that this is accomplished by having those students go online and opt out. Channon suggested that UAF make course/instructor online evaluations a formal requirement of students for every course by adding it to the list of syllabus requirements.

Josef will send the FDAI summary, articles, and our meeting notes from February to Provost Henrichs and also to Jon Dehn and Jayne Harvey in order to make it available again to the Faculty Senate.

## V. New Business

### 1. Eric Mazur's presentations and workshops on peer instruction, October 28 – 29

Eric Mazur will only be here for 2 days, so Joy is looking at how we can maximize his time. A presentation on peer instruction is planned for Thursday, October 28, from 1:00 – 2:00 pm that will be video conferenced around the state. Channon requested that he give 2 talks: one for the Physics Department Seminar and one for peer instruction specifically for physics classes. Joy suggested that we have him present his talk on making physics accessible to the general public on Thursday evening in Reichardt 201, or Friday evening at the Noel Wien Library. The Vera Alexander classroom on West Ridge was also suggested due to support for Mazur's visit from the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences. It has a good tech set-up and may make the presentation more accessible. Joy will get the information on Eric Mazur's presentations out to K-12 teachers as well.

### 2. Sharing our guest speakers via video conferencing with UAA

Joy has been working on this and will video conference some of Eric Mazur's presentations. She has been discussing with UAA and UAS faculty who else we could share.

### 3. Forum for spring 2011

Using Kennedy's book, "Academic Duty" once again as a springboard, Josef suggested that we take a look at different chapters to get ideas on a theme for the next Faculty Forum. Academic duty and freedom were good topics last spring and generated much discussion – so much so that we did not get through much of the book. Kelly suggested we might take a look at chapter 9 "To Reach Beyond the Walls" and see if that refers to community outreach, which is part of UAF's Academic Plan. Josef suggested balancing teaching and scholarship since it seems to be a gray area.

The Faculty Forum will be in February or March 2011. We need to think about whom we might invite as our guest speaker to join in/facilitate the discussion. We decided to take a look at

Kennedy's book again and come up with some discussion ideas, which will then guide us towards choosing a guest speaker.

VI. Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 12, 2010, 3:00 – 4:00 pm in Bunnell 222.

VII. Adjourned at 3:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

**Graduate Academic Advisory Committee  
September 10, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

Voting Members Present: Ken Abramowicz (Chair), Donie Bret-Harte, Lara Dehn, Regine Hock, Orion Lawlor, Sue Renes, Xiong Zhang (phone), Jen Schmidt.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Larry Duffy, Laura Bender, Anita Hughes, Karen Jensen.

Meeting started at 10:00.

1. The proposed meeting agenda was approved without any modification.
2. Ken Abramowicz was elected to serve as chair during the 2010-2011 academic year.
3. After reviewing and discussing the results of a Doodle poll, the committee agreed that committee meetings during the current semester will be held on Mondays from 9:30-10:30 am. The next meeting will be held on Monday, September 27. Other meeting dates for this semester will be discussed and approved at the next meeting (Ken will submit a list of proposed dates).
4. Unfinished business:
  - A. ME-F634 Format 2.  
GAAC had concerns related to the initial proposal. Since the department did not respond to GAAC requests related to these concerns, this proposal was not approved.
  - B. PhD in Clinical Community Psychology Program Change.  
During the summer Orion received email votes from a majority of the committee. As a result of email vote during the summer, the proposed changes were accepted.
  - C. CHEM F618 (new course proposal).  
The proposal has been revised. Xiong Zhang will forward the revised proposal to Ken and it will be put on GAAC's website. The new revisions will be discussed at the next meeting.
  - D. FISH F414/F614 (new course proposal).  
Most committee members did not think there is sufficient time during Maymester for the students to learn the material contained in the course. As a result of email vote during the summer, the proposal was not approved. GAAC recommends that the department collect assessment data for FISH 314 during the current academic year, ask for a one-time (trial course) approval for FISH 614, collect assessment data for the trial FISH 614 course, and compare the results to provide evidence related to the equivalency of the student learning in these two courses.
  - E. Policy change related to tuition awards for RA/TAs.  
Larry Duffy discussed potential changes in tuition awards for RA/TAs and the related consequences. He also suggested that Pat Pitney be invited to discuss this issue at either a later GAAC meeting or a Faculty Senate meeting. It was agreed that all GAAC members

would discuss this item with their faculty/fiscal officer/dean with the purpose of identifying issues and concerns related to implementation of this new policy.

5. New proposed courses:

- A. MSL – Chemical Coastal Processes (trial course). After brief discussion, the new trial course was unanimously approved.
- B. MSL F694 – Scientific Writing Techniques (trial course). It was noted that similar courses are offered by other departments and a discussion related to the need for this course followed. After discussion, the new trial course was unanimously approved.

6. New discussion topics:

- A. Larry Duffy discussed the advisory role of GAAC on policy/administrative matters related to graduate studies at UAF. He discussed various topics that may arise during the coming year and welcomed input from GAAC.
- B. Laura Bender presented the possibility of including GAAC on the itinerary for the finalists in the search process for Dean of the Graduate School. The committee felt this would be a good idea.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00.

**Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee (SADA)  
September 17, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

**Attending:** Lily Misel, Sandra Wildfeuer, John Creed, Cindy Hardy (chair), Deseree Salvador, Margaret Short, Kate Quick, Jane Allen, Michelle Bartlett, Cindy Andrechek

The committee met and considered the following:

*Election of co-chairs:* Cindy Hardy was asked to continue as co-chair. She requested a rural faculty member to act as co-chair. Sandra Wildfeuer and Jane Allen are considering this position.

*Agenda items for 2010-11:* The committee discussed several agenda items for the year, some of which carried over from last year. SADA will continue to pursue the Student Learning Commons in conjunction with Rasmuson Library. Lily and Cindy agreed to form a small subcommittee to keep up with efforts to develop a Learning Commons.

We will also continue to track the effects of Mandatory Placement, including unintended consequences. In general, our impression is that this effort has been effective in placing students appropriately.

We will continue our discussion of ways to more effectively honor student achievement, especially at the developmental level. We discussed several possibilities for doing this.

The question of the DEV designator came up in discussion, once again. We discussed the possibility of cross-listing some DEV classes with the academic department where the subsequent class is offered. Margaret agreed to poll her colleagues about their thoughts on a DEV/Math cross-listing and report back to the committee. In general, we are interested in coming up with a few ideas for making a “developmental semester” more acceptable to students who need to strengthen their academic skills.

*Meeting times:* We agreed that the Friday 2-3:30 times worked for all who were in attendance. Cindy will check with Jayne Harvie and set meetings that do not conflict with Bethel faculty meetings. Cindy or Jayne will e-mail this to the group.