

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #167
Monday, May 3, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 4:15 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 2009-10 Faculty Senate

Members Present:

ABRAMOWICZ, Ken

ALLEN, Jane

ANGER, Andy

BAKER, Carrie

BARTLETT, Christa

CAHILL, Cathy

CHRISTIE, Anne

DAVIS, Mike

DEHN, Jonathan

DONG, Lily

GANGULI, Rajive

HAZIRBABA, Kenan

HOCK, Regine

HUETTMANN, Falk

JOLIE, July

KADEN, Ute

KERR, Marianne (Leslie Shallcross)

KONAR, Brenda

KOUKEL, Sonja

LARDON, Cecile

LAWLOR, Orion

LEONARD, Beth

LIANG, Jingjing

MCEACHERN, Diane

MCINTYRE, Julie

NEWBERRY, Rainer

PALTER, Morris

Members Present (cont'd):

REYNOLDS, Jennifer

ROBERTS, Larry (Josef Glowa)

THOMAS, Amber

WEBER, Jane

WILSON, Timothy

Members Absent:

BOGOSYAN, Seta

BROCIOUS, Heidi

FOWELL, Sarah

HANSEN, Roger

JIN, Meibing

RALONDE, Ray

Others Present:

Dan Julius – guest

Linda Hapsmith – guest

Abel Bult-Ito

Joy Morrison

Mike Ernest

Karl Kowalski

Non-voting Members Present:

Tim Stickel

Denis Wiesenburg

Pete Pinney

Martin Klein

Brian Rogers

Susan Henrichs

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #166

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 Reaffirm ANLC/ANLP Unit Criteria
2. Motion to Approve an A.A.S. Degree in Drafting Technology
3. Motion to Approve a Minor in Mining Engineering
4. Motion to amend the UAF "Policies and Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty"

B. Motions Pending: None

III Public Comments/Questions

No public comments or questions.

Note: Jon D. allowed public comment again right before the break on behalf of Dana Thomas, who had missed it at this portion of the meeting. See page 9.

IV A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

Jon thanked everyone for the eventful past year and for their support for the coming term, with particular thanks to President-Elect Cathy Cahill.

Faculty Alliance continues to focus primarily on the Academic Master Plan, and they want feedback from the faculty at each of the MAUs. Also, Faculty Affairs will request that the System Academic Council include faculty representatives from all three of the MAUs at each meeting. The current rotation regularly leaves one of the campuses unrepresented at each meeting.

A University of Alaska Senate Summit has been mentioned to the Board of Regents and discussed at Faculty Alliance. It would be a once-per-year meeting of the Faculty Senates from each of the MAUs to address university-wide issues.

The Graduate Student Conference was mentioned which takes place in the fall. August 1 is the registration deadline. The abstract deadline is in one week. There is a flyer at the back table.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

Cathy mentioned the campus-wide survey that is being distributed electronically to follow up on the single point of failure situation that occurred at the power plant recently (the fried squirrel incident).

Discussion of the Core Curriculum is on the agenda; and, please plan to be involved in the broader discussions that will be starting up in the fall. It's important to the accreditation process, as well as our students.

Cathy reminded committee chairs to turn in their annual year-end reports which are so important to provide for those new to the committees when starting up in the fall.

Cathy thanked Jon for his service this year, and mentioned that a more formal recognition of his service will take place at the end of next year's term.

V A. Chancellor's Comments – Brian Rogers

Promotion and tenure letters were sent out last Friday, and the Chancellor remarked upon what a major commitment to the institution's future these actions are, as well as an investment in the university's future. He congratulated everyone, and thanked the peer unit committees for their work on the files.

The university did as well as he can remember in the last 25 years on the legislation side of things in the current session, with half-a-dozen bills passing that contain positive effects on the university. He mentioned specifics of those. On the disappointing side, the Life Sciences building ended up on a bond issue to go out for vote next year. Deferred maintenance fared better than most years (\$22 million), while there is still a large portion unfunded. We're still better off than public institutions in 45 other states. But the legislation doesn't cover our core costs. Reallocation is required to meet costs, and administrative program review will begin, along with looking at academic and research programs after that, also. The university is facing a \$5.5 million shortfall for next year.

There will be a reception on May 14 here at Wood Center for President Hamilton.

Ballot measure 1 will be on the August primary ballot. It's an initiative that prohibits public organizations or persons employed by the state from using public resources for any political agenda such as campaigning or lobbying. So, to spend university dollars to go lobby on behalf of the university will become illegal. He calls this to everyone's attention so that they take this into account as they go to vote.

Cecile L. asked about money for technological upgrades, mentioning the need for such in classrooms. The Chancellor said there's no new money for technological improvements; however, there is some deferred maintenance money for electrical upgrades because of last week's electrical incident. Unless we're able to turn the legislature's thinking about higher education, we're in for some grim years. There's legislative intent (which he hopes the governor will veto) that would set a ratio in the budget – meaning what counts for us is how

much money we raise, and to the extent that we raise more money, the state will give us more money. If this goes through, it will mean a \$12-15 million reduction in what we get right now from the state. We are going to have to work to change public support for public higher education. There are much better metrics to use for what higher education contributes to the state (like graduation rates, for example) than money.

Mike D. spoke about three students who presented on climate change to legislators last week. Representative Benjamin was in attendance, and commented to them that the legislature needs to hear from students and faculty about what the university's priorities are. He urges everyone to talk to their legislators and establish relationships now. The Chancellor responded that UAF serves the whole state, not just locally in Fairbanks. CES, MAP, and UAF research reaches the entire state. It's also important to emphasize this point to our legislators.

Rajive G. asked what the percentage of the shortfall deficit is, and the Chancellor reported that it's 3.5% of total unrestricted funds (5% of general fund). There may be some short-term actions to reduce that amount, such as attracting a greater student enrollment increase.

Dave V. asked about Ballot Measure 1 being an anti-corruption measure according to its backers, and whether the Chancellor knows of any recent corruption that would have been prevented in Alaska by having such a measure in place. The Chancellor noted that what have been issues related to corruption and campaign fund usage in other states do not really apply to Alaska because of the way sole source contracts are utilized here. He noted that a New York individual wrote the initiative, who has also underwritten this campaign in several states. The issues they're trying to address do not really relate to those here in Alaska.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

A reminder was given about the reception next door following today's meeting, for the Usibelli awards and Emeriti recipients.

Regarding the recent BOR meeting held at Dillingham, the support of the campus by its community as well as the involvement of the campus with community activities (beyond that for faculty and students) was wonderful to see. She sees it as a model for the university on how to build community support.

The BOR had quite a bit of executive session. But in open session they focused on distance education and the audit that was completed by the state last year. The audit requires several responses on the part of the university which the BOR will be tracking. Information about distance ed course offerings needs to be readily available to all students across the state, along with an easy system for enrollment in courses. There also need to be degree and certificate programs that can be earned online. Broader issues of developing distance ed within the state need to be addressed.

A representative for rights to carry concealed handguns asked the BOR to change their policy prohibiting concealed weapon carry on campus, which the BOR did not do. The group plans to demonstrate on the UA campuses; so, administration and public safety staff urge everyone to remain calm and not approach any demonstrators. Notify the campus police and they will

respond. The demonstrators are not intending to go into classrooms, but, if it occurs then notify campus police (if it can be done in a low-key manner).

Weekly meetings of the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) are occurring for discussion of new budget requests. They will also be considering what criteria should be used to look at what the university should continue to support or build up, what they can no longer support at the same current level, and what new things can be added. They will prepare a FY12 budget request.

Regarding the recent promotion and tenure process which is not yet completed (some responses are still coming in) a summary of results will be given to Jayne when they're compiled. She was impressed with the files and proud of the accomplishments of the new faculty. A few signs, however, show that new faculty need careful mentoring by their deans and by senior faculty in their units. Faculty are encouraged to talk about this with other faculty in their departments. If there is a department in one's unit that only has junior faculty, look for ways to help them develop their research, teaching and service capabilities.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Martin Klein

- Staff Appreciation Day is on May 19. Ashley Munro has coordinated the ice-cream social and they have a complete list of faculty helping to serve for that.
- The union organization efforts are now limited to just ASEA. The statewide Labor Relations web site has lots of information available about the unionization effort.
- Maria Russell will soon be taking the reigns as president, and a vice president will be elected.

B. ASUAF – Todd Vorisek for Adrian Triebel

- Incoming president Nicole Carvajal was introduced.
- The Graduate Student Committee will be hosting a research conference in the fall.
- Looking into public domain textbooks, some of which are free to use in classrooms. Todd asked how FS feels about this and if the library could compile a list of these. He is seeking a resolution by ASUAF to support the use of public textbooks.

C. UAFT/UNAC

No report available.

VII Guest Presentation: Academic Advising Center (AAC)

Presenter: Linda Hapsmith, Director

A complete PDF of Linda Hapsmith's PowerPoint presentation is posted online at the Faculty Senate Meetings page, and more information is available at the Academic Advising Center's website: <http://www.uaf.edu/advising/>

- A brief history for the Academic Advising Center was given, along with a full description of its current structure and the services being offered.
- Housed within the Division of General Studies; Dana Thomas is their vice provost.
 - Two full-time academic advisors: Ginny Tschanz and Lilian Anderson-Misel
 - Nine faculty advisors from across campus, representing five schools/colleges
 - One peer advisor
- Students seen at AAC:
 - General Studies – GENR
 - Baccalaureate undeclared
 - Pre-major - Bachelor Intended (BI)
 - Interdisciplinary General Studies option – INDS GENR
 - Students in transition out of baccalaureate major (exploratory)
 - AHEAD Program: High School early admit students
 - Non-degree Students
 - Pre-professional Advising
 - Student Athletes (only at the very start of their enrollment)
 - ROTC Degree Plans
- For Students:
 - Major Explorer Guides
<http://www.uaf.edu/advising/majors/>
 - Annual Major Mania Majors Information Fair
<http://www.uaf.edu/advising.majormania/>
 - Student Success Workshops
<http://www.uaf.edu/advising/student/resources/>
 - Study Skills 101
 - University Skills 201
 - Semester Learning Assistance Resources
<http://www.uaf.edu/advising/docs/spring-10-Resources.pdf>
 - Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)
<http://www.uaf.edu/cpl/>
 - Peer Advising Class & Practicum
http://www.uaf.edu/advising/peer_advising/
 - HMSV F340 Peer Advisor Training
 - HMSV F342 Peer Advising Practicum
 - Degree Program Check-sheets (from the Graduation Office)
http://www.uaf.edu/advising/degree_info/
 - Semester Class Lists
http://www.uaf.edu/advising/degree_info
 - Oral/Writing Intensive
 - Social Sciences/Humanities
 - Early End
 - Pre-Professional Information Center for Check-out
 - Student Success Resources for Check-Out
- Services for faculty and staff include:
 - Academic Advisor Success Workshops° Academic Advising 101
 - Academic Advising 201

- Academic Advising 301
 - Academic Advising 401
 - Capstone (Feist/Shamel Panel)
- NACADA Webinars
- Don't Cancel that Class program
- Academic Advisor Professional Development Resources for Check- Out
- Academic Advising Council
 - Plan for Improvement Submitted to Chancellor Rogers in March, 2009
 - Six Recommendations:
 - Web-Based Advising Resources and Training
 - Student Advising Development
 - Faculty, Staff, and Peer Advisor Development
 - Targeted Advising for Identified Student Populations
 - Academic Advising Council
 - Assessment
- Purpose of Council:
 - Provide an advising development plan
 - Continuously improve the quality of academic advising at UAF
 - Communicate the purpose of academic advising
 - Help UAF implement best advising practices
 - Executive Committee members:
 - Mike Daku, Justice
 - Karen Eiler, School of Education
 - Linda Hapsmith, Academic Advising Center
 - Kacey Miller, Northwest Campus
 - Michele Stalder, Tanana Valley Campus
 - Debbie Toopetlook, Rural Student Services
 - Council members:
 - AAC – Linda Hapsmith
 - CEM – Cheng-fu Chen & Ryan Smith
 - CLA - Mike Daku
 - CNSM – Carolyn Pennington-Chapin
 - SFOS – Katie Straub
 - SNRAS - Dave Veazey and Meriam Karlsso
 - SOE - Karen Eiler
 - SOM - Kate Gramatico
 - CRCD:
 - RSS - Debbie Toopetlook
 - TVC - Scott Culbertson & Michele Stalder
 - CDE - Brighton Brooks
 - NWC – Kacey Miller
 - Rural Heath – Jodi Baxter

Linda provided details about the General Studies option under the Interdisciplinary Studies program.

Amber T. asked what has changed this year regarding the AAC's responsibilities to the colleges, like CLA, for example. Linda explained that in the past—over the summer when many department faculty are gone—the AAC would see students from all the schools and colleges. These students would want to continue with the AAC in the fall. So, now they're trying to help students understand that they have a faculty advisor in their home department. Where deadlines are involved (drop course deadlines, for example), the AAC will see students, and they send the department notes and files for student majors they've advised.

Amber expressed concerns for student retention issues in her department. All their faculty are on 9-months contracts, and students coming in over the summer get frustrated. Linda said her staff are struggling to have time to see their own students. AAC is sending out a questionnaire to find out whom to refer students to at each of the departments; and asking if departments want students to use the AAC over the summer. They will also provide summer advising by means of two CLA faculty and two CNSM faculty.

Jane A. asked about the official title of the general studies degree. Dana clarified that it's Interdisciplinary Studies, with the General Studies option. Paperwork for this goes through the Graduate School; but the AAC advises them.

VIII Discussion Item

A. Academic Master Plan (AMP)

Guest: Dan Julius, UA Vice President for Academic Affairs

VP Julius summarized the current status and expected timeline for the development of a UA Academic Master Plan. It was strongly suggested to develop one in the MacTaggart Report, and the Board of Regents requested follow up on it. The process began in the fall of 2007; developing a charge in fall of 2008. System Academic Council (SAC) has developed the plan to its current state, and it's now out for discussion.

Generally, academic master plans are a roadmap for institutions; they're not easy when there are many political issues and solid academic issues. Educational systems don't self-regulate and where there is competition for resource allocation, there is a need for such a plan. There is, perhaps, not the level of appreciation in the state for higher education that there could be, making planned use of state dollars all the more critical.

SAC developed a timeline that they haven't been able to meet because there hasn't been agreement reached on some very critical issues. They met about four months ago, and broke the logjam on a number of them. The draft plan is out for discussion, and is posted online at the Academic Affairs web site. Feedback is encouraged from faculty, and can be given to President Jon Dehn to bring forward through SAC.

The draft plan will be given to the BOR in June, and responses to it are expected to be detailed, along with a willingness on their part to put different disagreements concerning it

behind them. There will be more meetings next fall. Then the plan goes back to the BOR in December 2010 to prepare it for President Gamble's approval.

The plan addresses issues that have not been settled by any means. Some areas highlighted in the plan include: engineering, education, distance education, and the development of doctoral programs. There will be no duplication of PhD programs in the system. The plan, when finalized, will be used for approaching the legislature and other constituencies. Its development takes time (taking three years already), as it's an ambitious document. The goal is for everyone to take ownership of the plan and for it to become institutionalized.

Cecile L. asked about the process for faculty input. VP Julius reiterated that the charge for the AMP outlines the process and timeline. At this point the senates are discussing it and are giving their input to the senate presidents. Input from senate presidents will go to the System Academic Council and move forward from there.

Rajive G. observed that new program creation and budget requests will obviously need to be in alignment with the plan, and asked VP Julius what he thinks about how the legislature will respond to the plan. Will the legislature honor this plan and pay attention to it in the event someone goes to their legislator to circumvent it? VP Julius responded that he doesn't see how any campus will be able to go around the plan. The way it's structured and being approached and discussed at the institutions will make it very difficult to go around this plan. He would be shocked if it occurs because of the checks and balances the plan contains. He's not saying circumvention wouldn't be tried, but it's unlikely because all the campuses benefit from the plan.

Ken A. asked what areas VP Julius sees the campuses taking leadership in, according to the plan. He responded that the AMP will institutionalize what the status quo is. Here at the UA system there's been a lack of adherence to what the status quo is in recent years. The major contribution of this plan will be to stay consistent to what exists now before creating new programs. Valid academic criteria for biomedical programs, for example, will have to be met before developing new plans. Rather than every campus replicating programs, the plan will help define who has what strengths and build from there. It's more than politics – it's about meeting academic criteria with substantive underpinning.

Jon D. reminded everyone of where to get copies of the AMP to give him their feedback on it.

Public comment was taken from Vice Provost Dana Thomas. After strongly encouraging every faculty to read the AMP and provide feedback, he reminded them that at the last senate meeting he spoke about the voluntary system of accountability (already adopted by 368 universities) – an agreement and process that was reached via the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities – and the need to select one of three official exams for incoming freshman and exiting seniors to provide assessment data for UAF.

Of the three exams that he had described at the last senate meeting, he is recommending UAF adopt the MAPP (Measures of Academic Proficiency and Progress) by ETS. It's components of critical thinking, reading, writing, and math (with sub-scores for humanities, social sciences and natural sciences) lines up the best with the existing (and proposed) UAF

baccalaureate core. Further, the test can be completed in 40 minutes (within a regular course period). Results relate clearly to UAF core areas and will give guidance for what might need improvement. Finally, its cost is the least of all the tests.

<http://www.voluntarysystem.org/docs/cp/LearningOutcomesInfo.pdf>

BREAK

IX Adoption of Consent Agenda

- A. Motion to approve the list of 2009-2010 degree candidates, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 167/1)
- B. Resolutions for the Outstanding Senators of the Year Award, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 167/2)
- C. Special Recognition of Senate Service

The consent agenda was adopted unanimously.

X New Business

- A. Motion to Reaffirm the CLA Departments of English and Philosophy & Humanities Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 167/3)

Orion L. called the motion to question and the motion was seconded. The vote to reaffirm was unanimous.

- B. Motion to Reaffirm the CLA Department of Theatre Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 167/4)

Andy A., Unit Criteria committee member, commented about the process of reviewing these criteria, and noted the committee was satisfied with them. The motion was called to question and seconded. The vote to reaffirm was unanimous.

- C. Motion to Reaffirm the CNSM Natural Science Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 167/5)

Rajive G. mentioned the numbers and ratings for IAS scores mentioned under the assistant professor section of these criteria. He was wondering if these scores should be focused upon; however, no one had further concerns. Julie M. noted that the committee had suggested that fixed number be removed; but the unit wanted very much to keep it in there. Andy A. said that units are free to do that and if they want it (and it doesn't conflict with

the existing unit criteria) then they can't refuse them. Orion L. called the motion to question and it was seconded. The vote to reaffirm was unanimous.

D. Motion to Amend the Minor Degree Requirements, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 167/6)

Ken A. explained that the motion will eliminate the petition process now required for incoming students who already have a BA degree to have their minor recognized. Rainer N. called to question and was seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Motion to Change the Study Day Policy, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 167/7)

Falk H. asked Registrar Tim S. to speak about this motion. Tim explained that in spring semesters beginning before Martin Luther King Day, the study day between the last day of instruction and beginning of finals occurs later (because of the make-up day required for the missed Monday class), which means that finals then end on the Saturday before commencement. This causes many difficulties for graduating students and commencement preparation. This motion eliminates the study day in those spring semesters beginning prior to that holiday, so that final exams begin on Tuesday and end on Friday (lessening their impact on commencement activities).

Cecile L. asked if this problem was linked to the "-mester" issues or if it's separate. Rainer and Tim confirmed that it's separate from the "-mester" timing problems. The alternative is to have final exams on the Saturday before graduation in those years where spring semester begins before Martin Luther King Day. Ken A. reminded everyone that the contact hours required by academic policy must be met, so they must make up the lost Monday class in those years. This problem does not occur every year, only occasionally. The motion was called to question and seconded. The vote unanimously favored the motion.

XI Update on Core Curriculum Discussions – Falk Huettmann, Ken Abramowicz

Falk H. described the attached documents in the agenda (#167/8: the "Report to the Faculty Senate Concerning Revision of UAF's Core Requirements" and the "DRAFT REVISED UAF Baccalaureate Core Curriculum 2010"). The Curricular Affairs Committee felt that the LEAP proposal put forward last year had some issues. CAC talked to last year's members of the Core Revitalization and Assessment committee about those issues and decided LEAP wasn't what they wanted. They started revising the core and the attached draft document is a product of six months' worth of discussion. Falk and Carrie Baker also attended workshops on learning outcomes and had many discussions with Dana Thomas and others on these revisions. The current effort to revise the Core needs another one to two more years of work. They want to have a representative committee of the entire faculty to discuss the draft, not necessarily just Faculty Senate members (perhaps a subcommittee with CAC with wider membership). If the draft they've attached excites you, that's what they wanted. Faculty should ask how it fits their own department and UAF, and how it fits with the AMP.

Ken A. wanted to emphasize that they are not opening up a major debate today, just presenting their progress thus far. A full and open discussion is planned for the fall. Their committee became overwhelmed with the great volume of work that included the review of the core, among other duties having to do with new program review and the academic calendar issues. CAC recommends that a subcommittee work on the Core for the next year or two, which would involve other faculty across campus whether senators or not.

Rajive G. commented that when the first version went out, the CEM debated the draft. They feel it's too long; and, given the role of engineering in society, students should know about engineering and it should be included in the Core. Rajive endorsed the subcommittee approach just described by Ken, and CEM will share their responses with them.

Dana T. commented about his work with CAC this year. They didn't always agree, but the discussions were productive. He also endorsed the idea of a second committee to pick up the discussion, though he disagrees with it being only a temporary committee of a year or two. One of the ongoing problems is the need for assessment of the Core via an ongoing cycle of review. He encouraged a more permanent committee to generate a cycle of assessment and keep the process a dynamic one for undergraduate programs.

Regarding the length of the list that CAC has proposed, Dana is concerned because each and every one of these learning outcomes must be assessed. From the accreditation perspective, the Core must contain (at a minimum) content in communication, math, natural science, social science and humanities or fine arts. On the item "An ability to think critically and creatively across all disciplines" Dana noted that it would be hard to assess because of the wording "across *all* disciplines". From this example, he advised that as the Core is revised, the perspective of being able to effectively assess it must also be considered. He's happy to provide whatever support he can. He had sent six people from the Core Revitalization committee outside last year to conferences, and two from Curricular Affairs this year. He hopes those individuals will continue to contribute to this discussion. He would like to see at least one major public forum just on the Core, then one just on the assessment of the Core.

Carrie B. asked about how a subcommittee will be created. Jon D. responded that he will create that ad hoc committee when the new senate is seated. Dana's suggestion that it be permanent committee is wise. Carrie reiterated that those who attended the conferences that Dana mentioned should be included in the committee so their training isn't lost.

XII Committee and Annual Reports

In the interest of time, Jon asked for key points only to be shared.

A. Curricular Affairs – Falk Huettmann, Ken Abramowicz (Attachment 167/9)

Falk mentioned that the highlight, as discussed earlier, was the discussion about the Core. He noted the open-mindedness of the group in their discussions. Their minutes are attached.

B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 167/10)

Jennifer mentioned that highlights are included in the annual report attached to the agenda: Next year they anticipate the issue of teaching by non-regular faculty to take up a good amount of their time. Looking at the role of teaching by non-tenured and non-research appointed faculty has been a multi-year effort to date.

C. Unit Criteria – Brenda Konar (Attachment 167/11)

Julie M. mentioned the report is attached to the agenda.

D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber/Alex Fitts
(Attachment 167/12)

Jane mentioned their annual report is attached to the agenda. The UAF Life Balance Committee has been formed to work on establishing family friendly policies.

E. Core Review – Latrice Bowman

No report was available.

F. Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry

The annual report is at the back of the room as a handout. [It is also posted online for meeting #167.]

G. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy

Cindy H. mentioned the issues addressed by the committee this past year, which included mandatory placement, particularly with reference to the writing sample requirement and cleanup of issues in Math area. The focus next year will be the Student Learning Commons.

H. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks

No report was available.

I. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa
(Attachment 167/13)

Josef mentioned the highlights of the past year, including the development of the peer observation form for seminar teaching, the faculty forum on academic duty and academic freedom; and researching the electronic student evaluation process. [The FDAI annual report has been posted online for meeting #167.]

J. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Rajive Ganguli

Rajive G. mentioned that they finished curriculum review for the semester.

K. Advisory Research Committee (ad hoc) – Roger Hansen

Orion L. reported that they did not meet during spring semester.

XIII Members' Comments/Questions

Abel Bult-Ito addressed the group to express his opinions about the election process for the extension of terms of the president and president-elect. According to his reasoning, he believes the new senate should be convened by Cathy Cahill, not Jon Dehn. He believes that to accept Jon Dehn as president is to violate the Faculty Senate constitution.

Kenan H. commented that he didn't think anything in the constitution was violated. He asked about taking another vote to quiet this discussion. Jennifer R. said that Faculty Senate accepted the voting results as final at the last meeting. Kenan concurred with her statement.

Jon D. commented that part of the process is to carry out the will of the majority while not withholding the rights and voice of the minority. He noted that we can't keep revisiting this issue ad infinitum and we must move forward with senate business. With the senate accepting the results of the electronic voting at the last meeting, he hoped this was behind us. According to the constitution, the vote does not require a motion. He appreciates the comments and would not wish to stymie anyone's voice.

Orion L. asked what part of the constitution was violated. Abel said he was talking about both the bylaws and constitution.

Jennifer R. noted that they have entertained comments, but it's up to the senate membership to put forth any motions or not. Her question is does the senate wish to pursue any action on that.

Amber T. made some comments to the process used, and stated that her position on the matter was addressed adequately by email and she feels we should move on. Kenan said his earlier comment was to address moving forward. Jennifer R. noted that they should proceed and move forward.

Mike D. commented about the class he teaches regarding legislative process and that he served in the legislature for eight years. He expressed his opinion that correct process was not followed and that we didn't set a good example.

Cathy C. cleared up a process question about the first vote being a motion, and the subsequent voting taking place by election. The constitution specifies an election, not a motion, is the process for term extension. This is the irregularity that was cleared up with the electronic election that took place.

Amber asked about holding an election on the floor today. Jon D. reiterated that it requires a two-thirds vote to change the agenda.

Ken A. commented about the electronic election that was held after the Administrative Committee met to discuss the concerns of those who've spoken today. They were present at that meeting of the Administrative Committee and they participated and agreed with the decision to hold an electronic election as the appropriate action to take. The bylaws and constitution were followed and we did do the proper thing by holding an election.

Jon D. noted that a new agenda item can be discussed in the future, if desired; but, not today. In the interest of time and the meeting running very late, the comment session was concluded.

XIV Announcement of Award Recipients

A. Presentation of the Outstanding Senators of the Year Awards (Reference Attachment 167/2)

The OSYA resolutions for Anne Christie and Jennifer Reynolds were read and presented to them. Each also received an award of 25,000 airlines miles.

OUTSTANDING SENATOR OF THE YEAR AWARD FOR ANNE CHRISTIE

WHEREAS, Anne Christie has served the university in the UAF Faculty Senate for the past three years; and

WHEREAS, Anne Christie has served as a valuable member of the Faculty Affairs Committee during the 2008-09 and 2009-10 academic years; and

WHEREAS, Anne Christie worked tirelessly to change the Faculty Senate bylaws to ensure all faculty and units are fairly represented in the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, Anne Christie performed extensive research to determine the use of non-regular faculty in teaching across UAF;

WHEREAS, Anne Christie has provided clear and intelligent input on many issues important to faculty, including promotion and tenure issues;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the UAF Faculty Senate recognizes Anne Christie as Outstanding Senator of the Year for Academic Year 2009-2010.

OUTSTANDING SENATOR OF THE YEAR AWARD FOR JENNIFER REYNOLDS

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds has served the university in the UAF Faculty Senate for six years; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds served as a valuable member of the Graduate Academic Advisory Committee during the 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years, and the Faculty

Affairs Committee during the 2007-08 through 2009-10 academic years; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds has provided leadership as Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee during academic year 2009-10; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds worked tirelessly to change the Faculty Senate bylaws to ensure all faculty and units are fairly represented in the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds was instrumental in the careful assessment and evaluation of electronic faculty activity reporting; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds has provided thoughtful, well-researched analysis on many issues important to faculty, including promotion and tenure issues;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the UAF Faculty Senate recognizes Jennifer Reynolds as Outstanding Senator of the Year for Academic Year 2009-2010.

B. Announcement of the Usibelli Awards (Attachment 167/14)

Jon announced the winners and spoke to the selection process. He serves on the committee and he read the names of the nominees into the record as well.

The 2010 Usibelli Awards for Distinguished Teaching, Research, and Service:
Winner, Distinguished Teaching: Richard Boone, Professor of Biology and Wildlife
Winner, Distinguished Research: Thomas Weingartner, Professor of Oceanography
Winner, Distinguished Service: Kara Nance, Professor of Computer Science

2010 Usibelli Award for Distinguished Teaching Nominees

Debendra Das, Professor of Mechanical Engineering
Debasmita Misra, Associate Professor of Geological Engineering
Paul Robinson, Adjunct, Applied Business

2010 Usibelli Award for Distinguished Research Nominees

Kara Nance, Professor of Computer Science
Chien-Lu Ping, Professor of High Latitude Agriculture
Roger Ruess, Professor of Biology

2010 Usibelli Award for Distinguished Service Nominees

Andreas Anger, Associate Professor of Applied Business and Accounting
Heidi Brocius, Clinical Associate Professor of Social Work
Godwin Chukwu, Professor of Petroleum Engineering
Roger Hansen, Research Professor of Seismology
Ping Lan, Professor of Business Administration
Todd Sherman, Professor of Art
Kenji Yoshikawa, Research Associate Professor of Northern Engineering

C. Announcement of the Emeriti Faculty Awards
(Attachment 167/15)

Jon read the names of the emeriti awardees into the record.

2010 Emerita/us

Mark Box, Professor of English
Godwin Chukwu, Professor of Petroleum Engineering
Joseph Dupras, Professor of English
Rheba Dupras, Associate Professor of Library Science
James Gladden, Professor of Political Science
George Happ, Research Professor of Biomedical Sciences
William Hibler, Research Professor of Sea Ice Physics
Ronald Illingworth, Professor of English and Development Education
Steven Jacobson, Professor of Yup'ik Eskimo
Ron Johnson, Professor of Mechanical and Environmental Engineering
John Kelley, Professor of Marine Sciences
Judith Kleinfeld, Professor of Psychology and Northern Studies
Tamara Lincoln, Associate Professor of Library Science
Dirk Lummerzheim, Research Professor of Geophysics
Mary Mangusso, Associate Professor of History
Joseph Margraf, Professor of Fisheries
Hans Nielsen, Professor of Geophysics
Henry Wichmann, Professor of Accounting

D. Recognition of Senate Service

Certificates and letters of appreciation were presented to each of the Faculty Senate committee chairs and co-chairs.

XV Adjournment of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 PM.

XVI 2010-11 Faculty Senate Members Take Their Seats

A. Roll Call of 2010-11 Members

Members Present:

ALLEN, Jane (Bethel)
ANGER, Andy
BAEK, Jungho
BAKER, Carrie
BARTLETT, Christa
CAHILL, Cathy
DAVIS, Mike (Bristol Bay)
DEHN, Lara
DEHN, Jonathan
DONG, Lily
FOWELL, Sarah (Rainer Newberry)
GANGULI, Rajive

Members Absent:

ARENDT, Anthony
BARBOZA, Perry
BROCIOUS, Heidi
HANSEN, Roger
HOCK, Regine -present 1st half
HUETTMANN, Falk -present 1st half
METZGER, Andrew
MOSES, Debra
PALTER, Morris
ROBERTS, Larry (Josef Glowka)
WILSON, Timothy

Members Present - continued

HAZIRBABA, Kenan
HIMELBLOOM, Brian
JENSEN, Karen
JOLIE, July
JONES, Debra
KADEN, Ute
KERR, Marianne (Leslie Shallcross)
LARDON, Cecile
LAWLOR, Orion
MCINTYRE, Julie
RENES, Sue
REYNOLDS, Jennifer
THOMAS, Amber
VALENTINE, Dave
WEBER, Jane

Others Present:

Abel Bult-Ito

B. President's Remarks – Jonathan Dehn

Jon D. welcomed the new senate and commented on the importance of their role. He noted items to consider over the summer that will be picked up in fall, which include:

- Update the academic appeals policy
 - how to select faculty mentors for students with appeals
- Core review will be one of the big efforts next year because of the accreditation process.
- The process for submitting new programs needs to be reviewed. The new “hex” form is already much more rigorous than the past form. The AMP and the financial climate of the university will also make it tougher to get them passed.
- All governance groups need to streamline their election processes. All the groups do them differently from year to year. He would like to see the elections in the units managed centrally. Many times faculty at units are appointed rather than elected.

Please bring your concerns to Jon and the Administrative Committee.

A motion was put to the floor by Mike D. to add public comment to the agenda. Jennifer R. proposed to amend the proposed motion to add comments by limiting them to members only, not the public, in the interest of time.

Debra Jones commented about the time constraints and the fact the meeting was running overtime. Rajive G. responded that it's too late in the year to worry about time constraints at these meetings. The election results are what they are. If there are people who are unhappy and have complaints, let them express themselves because this is the right forum for that to occur. Jon D. agreed.

On the motion to amend the proposed motion, the vote was eight ayes, eleven nays and one abstention.

On the motion to include both public and members comments to the agenda, the vote was one nay; and the ayes favored amending the agenda.

C. President-Elect's Remarks – Cathy Cahill

Cathy thanked everyone serving on the new senate. Commencement information was given for the faculty lineup on May 16.

The Chancellor has asked for the 2nd Amendment issue (guns on campus) to be looked at by the senate.

Please read the committee reports and be prepared to hit the ground running in the fall.

Public Comment (as provided for by the amendment to the agenda):

Abel Bult-Ito commented that this senate has now convened with an un-elected president which he finds very strange. He hopes that the issue is put on the agenda next year and addressed.

XVII Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs had to be at the Usibelli Awards to present them, and was unable to stay because of the meeting running overtime.

XVIII New Senate Business

- A. Motion to endorse 2010-11 committee membership, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 167/16)

Jon D. brought the motion to floor. It was called to question and seconded. The ayes carried the motion unanimously.

- B. Motion to approve the 2010-11 Faculty Senate Meeting Calendar, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 167/17)

Jon brought the motion to the floor. He also mentioned the idea for the UA faculty senate summit which would be potentially held during the winter break, in January (not during spring break which is held at different times at each campus).

The motion was called to question and seconded. A unanimous vote adopted the calendar.

- C. Motion to authorize the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate during the summer months, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 167/18)

Jon brought the motion to the floor and commented on the need for this arrangement. The motion was called to question and seconded. Ayes passed the motion unanimously.

XIX Discussion Item

A. Motion to Amend the Faculty Senate Constitution (Attachment 167/19)

Jon brought the motion to the floor and mentioned the 28-day minimum timeframe called for when considering changes to the constitution. He has submitted this motion for people to think about over the summer. He quoted a saying that is posted on the wall at the student governance office: “When process prevents progress, process needs revision; or, when purpose is lost in procedure, procedure has no purpose.” Looking at our constitution, it strikes him that the actual authority of the Faculty Senate body does not come from Roberts Rules of Order, but rather from our votes, from Board of Regents and university policy, and from the mission and mandates of this university. So he suggests a single word change from “authority” to “guidelines”.

Mike D. commented that a good reading of constitution and bylaws is in order. He observed that the legislature adopts rules, not guidelines, as do city councils. He feels it invites chaos if we don’t have rules about conducting our business. Jon commented that another word could certainly be considered, and asked everyone to think about this over the summer.

Members Comments (as provided for by the amendment to the agenda):

No member comments were made.

XX Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. It was adjourned at approximately 4:15 PM.