

MINUTES
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #84
 MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1998
 WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

I The meeting was called to order by President-Elect Gatterdam at 1:35 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Barnhardt, C.
 Basham, C.
 Bruder, J.
 Conti, E. (Duffy)
 Curda, L. (& S. Johnson)
 Deal, S.
 Dinstel, R.
 Fitts, A.
 Gatterdam, R.
 Grigg, S.
 Illingworth, R.
 Johnson, T..
 Lando, C.
 Luick, B.
 Manfredi, R.
 McBeath, G.
 McLean-Nelson, D.
 Mortensen, B. (J. Esop)
 Musgrave, D.
 Nance, K.
 Norcross, B.
 Perkins, M.
 Porter, D.
 Reynolds, J.
 Sankaran, H.
 Weber, J.
 Whalen, M.
 White, D.
 Yarie, J.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Bader, H.
 Bandopadhyay, S.
 Corti, L.
 Olson, J.
 Schatz, M.
 Sonwalkar, V.
 Zilberkant, E.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bird, R.
 Layral, S.
 Mills, M.
 Reichardt, P.
 Thomas, D.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Richardson, J. - President, ASUAF
 Alexander, V. - Dean, SFOS
 Leipzig, J. - Dean, CLA

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

Fletcher, H. - GSO
 Frey, B. - President, UAFSC
 Tremarello, A - Registrar

B. The minutes to Meeting #83 (November 16, 1998) were not available for approval.

C. The agenda was approved as distributed via e-mail.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions approved:

1. Motion to approved Unit Criteria for Music.

B. Motions Pending:

1. Motion prohibiting faculty from receiving a graduate degree from UAF.

III A. Remarks by Provost, Paul Reichardt -

Paul Reichardt had two items to discuss. The first was the RIP process. The Chancellor first sent out a memo in October that emphasized RIP will be used as a management tool. Reichardt then followed it up with a memo to Deans and Directors indicating that UAF would be looking at this year's applications more closely. President Hamilton subsequently issued a memo saying that everyone is expecting the same consideration as the last two rounds. So that is how it will be done this year. The use of RIP as a management tool will be confined to the issue of cost savings and each application must be documented to demonstrate cost savings over the three year period. The only change that Reichardt can foresee as a possibility is that Deans/Directors have always done replacement calculations at the entry level. We now have units that have been hit hard enough by the last two RIPs that it may well be the judgement of the administrator that some replacements would have to be made above the entry level or at a senior level. At this point the only applications that are being reviewed on an immediate basis are for employees who are taking retirement in January 1999. The rest are being collected in the dean/director offices to be forward to the provost in approximately a week. The Chancellor will then meet with the Provost in early January and will then make the final decisions.

Jerry McBeath asked about the process of replacement. Reichardt indicated they would probably follow a similar process as last year. Maynard Perkins asked when departments may know when and how much the monies would be. Reichardt indicated that there would probably be a two-tiered process. We have to be a bit cautious in term of what we obligate ourselves to early on.

The other topic Reichardt spoke on was the work of the Instructional Technology Task Force. This is a group to advise him about guidelines and policies on instructional technology issues. The draft report is being circulated among task force members for final editing. It will be made available soon. It is clear that there are a number of positions they are taking. One is the issue of student computer labs as opposed to individual students owning or having access to their own computers. The Task Force recommended a two-pronged approach to that. One is to begin actively encouraging all incoming UAF students to bring their own computer. The second approach is to initiate a discussion about the pros and cons of moving toward a position of requiring students to have their own computer. A few private colleges started moving in that direction and now a few public institutes are requiring students to have their own computer. The Senate may be interested in taking up this topic strictly from an academic stand point. We have some economic questions about it that may become part of a class project. It's clear that if you move in that direction, then it's important to have network support. Other aspects of the report is a strong statement in support of faculty development programs in instructional technology. There is a section on the forefront of technology and the learning environment that defines the niches that we might look at in terms of being in the forefront of instructional technology. It specifies media and web based courses as two of the principle ways to address distance delivered instructional technology. They had an interesting discussion of importing IT courses. Are we interested in looking at what is out there and directly incorporating some of it into our curriculum? They felt that it should be a departmental decision. There are a number of other issues addressed but these are the highlights.

Larry Duffy asked about the pending motion. Reichardt indicated that the Chancellor has submitted the motion to Legal Council for review.

B. Guest Speaker - Dana Thomas

Dana Thomas gave a presentation on Educational Effectiveness Assessment. A similar presentation was given to the Regents in November by Paul Reichardt. As part of his administrative role this year Thomas has a small assignment with faculty development. The presentation slides are on the Provost's outcomes assessment web page.

Dana Thomas opened his presentation with a number of questions about students.

UAF outcomes assessment falls into four areas: student information; core curriculum; degrees and certificates; and out of class learning. We have something going on in all of these areas. The Senate recently formed an ad hoc committee on out of class learning. They have met approximately six times to sort out the areas they might take on and they have identified two areas they are interested in: 1) out of class experiences including internships, graduate research, student jobs, volunteerism, and 2) uniquely Alaskan experiences.

Why are we doing assessment? The main reason should be a professional responsibility to continue to improve our curriculum. We also have an accreditation requirement. Dana Thomas gave a brief progress summary in the following areas: The Core curriculum has plans in place for all components. All the components but one have collected and summarized initial information; one is scheduled to collect their first information during spring term. 37 of UAF's 164 certificates and degree programs have assessment plans in place. Approximately 136 faculty and 20 graduate students were involved in assessment during 1997-98. An unknown number of staff were involved. An annual budget of \$40,000 is spent on outcomes assessments at UAF. The vast majority of this money (\$25,000) is spent on faculty contract extensions for assessment of the Core..

Sample findings or what are we learning include information on how we are we doing assessment plans, what the evaluations look like, we are learning things about the assessment process, and we are involved in curricular change.

An example of the Natural Resources Management Undergraduate Program assessment plan includes four key areas: an expanded statement of institutional purposes, intended outcomes or objectives, assessment criteria and procedures, and how the process is being implemented for that degree program. The Bachelor's in Business Administration plan and a downloadable template are on the UAF outcomes web page: <http://www.uaf.edu/provost/outcomes>. The Values and Choice assessment process is considering adopting a new instrument of assessment. A lot of programs are working and revising their process.

Evaluations has both good news and bad news. The first strength was of lab report and reflected the quantity of writing students generated in the semester. Generally the committee felt this was a strong sample and consistent with the expectations of a writing intensive course. Problems with this sample spurred the committees agreement for standardization within the department of what is acceptable for a writing intensive course. The committee found a lot of variability within departments.

In terms of how the process is going there is a lot of statements about how faculty learned about how they are going to do

assessment in the future. This was a starting point and it needs to be refined.

Some curricular change were mentioned in the Core. They have selected a new text for all PHIL 322 courses to better meet learning objectives.

The next step is getting the first draft of assessment plans in place for all degree and certificate programs by January 15, 1999. Revised drafts are due March 15. Due on May 15 are the pilot samples of data collection and faculty review.

The overall analysis of where we are at and what we have learned is that this exercise can be useful, its labor intensive, there is a steep learning curve, there is evidence that curricular reform will occur, and we have a challenging schedule for completion.

Clif Lando asked about the actual cost to departments in terms of both time and money. Thomas indicated that his budget has supported the Core process because it extends across departments. Paul Reichardt said that there are many issues of cost that are unresolved and encouraged the use of existing materials on which to base the assessment. At this point the general approach is to minimize costs. The questions then becomes what about the time it takes to do the assessment. Reichardt hopes that some combination of money we find somewhere to pay for time plus incorporating aspects of this into faculty members workload would be the final approach to take.

Larry Duffy asked about coordination of assessment with the other campuses. Dana Thomas indicated that he has met with members of UAA. They have taken a similar approach. UAS has taken a different approach. They have set up student competency requirements. Reichardt indicated that UAA is concentrating their efforts on the programs that generate two-thirds of their credit hours, which is about a fourth of their programs.

Dana Thomas added that the web site has been expanded to include approximately 50 web page links to other institutions that have very detailed assessment plans.

IV Governance Reports

A. ASUAF - J. Richardson

Jean Richardson updated the Senate on the ongoing issues they are dealing with. The first one is the Technology Advisory Board. They would like to see it more autonomous. They don't have any standing bylaws and would like to see a consistent set of procedures from one year to the next. A lot of people are very unhappy this year because they planned to put in proposals.

The second issue is the AWARE program. It is dissolving. They have been looking at what kind of program the students would like to see to replace it. Residence Hall need to have something set up. The police department needs to have something they can refer students to especially for first offenses. This issue is in one of their committee right now. Dean Kirts will also be forming a committee which will identify and create an action plan for dealing with alcohol and drug awareness on campus.

For the holidays they are doing a clothing drive. It was pretty successful and they are still accepting clothing. They also did a

food drive. In community service they are doing Santa Claus letters. This spring they will be doing a blood drive.

Ron Gatterdam indicated that the students passed a different academic calendar than the Senate. They would like to start on Wednesday and rather than end on Monday. Both academic calendars will go forward to the Chancellor.

B. Staff Council - B. Frey

Beverly Frey was not available to give a report.

C. President-Elect's Comments - R. Gatterdam

President Schatz will return on Tuesday and resume duties on Wednesday, December 9th.

V Public Comments/Questions - none

VI New Business

A. Motion to amend the Academic Course and Degree Procedures Manual to requires the inclusion of a description of the student learning outcomes assessment process for new programs and revision for major program changes, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Jerry McBeath introduced the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION PASSED

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the New Degree Program Request (Format 3) and Major Program Change (Format 5) in the Academic Course and Degree Procedures Manual to include a full description of the student learning outcomes assessment process for new programs and revision for major program changes.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Development and implementation of student learning outcomes assessment programs and professional teaching duty are also a requirement of our institutional accreditation. This motion brings us into compliance with accreditation standards.

B. Motion to establish a Departmental Honors Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Jerry McBeath indicated that this originated from Paul Metz in Engineering who sought departmental honors for engineering students. The committee discussed this and felt that a number of departments and disciplines would like to award and acknowledge excellent students. Kara Nance indicated that she is on the Honors Council for the Honors Program and would like to see this discussed as to how it affects the Honors Program. McBeath indicated that

this was departmental based. Roy Bird of the Honors Program would also like to see some coordinating efforts between departments and the Honors Program. Larry Duffy asked about the mechanics of how the honors policy would work. Clif Lando asked that the motion be recommitted to Curricular Affairs for further discussion with the Honors Program. Jerry McBeath asked that the Honors Council consider it and respond to Curricular Affairs. Ron Illingworth indicated that this program would allow for more rural participation than the Honors Program. The motion to recommit to Curricular Affairs passed unanimously. Ron Gatterdam asked that this be coordinated by the Curricular Affairs Committee and presented to the Senate at the February meeting.

MOTION RECOMMITTED TO COMMITTEE
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to establish a Departmental Honors policy. Criteria for award of departmental undergraduate honors include:

1. An overall GPA of 3.0 and 3.5 in the student's major
2. Evidence of exceptional academic achievement in one or more of the following areas:
 - a. completion of significant research under guidance of university faculty member;
 - b. completion of a specific cluster of advanced courses with a GPA of 3.5 or higher;
 - c. completion of a senior thesis with distinction;
 - d. score at or above the 85th percentile on specialty GRE test or other "standard" test;
 - e. completion of an outstanding portfolio of student work.

Departments wishing to award this honors designation will submit a plan to the curricular affairs committee, indicating the specific evidence of exceptional academic achievement the department requires. Departments with approved plans are responsible for notifying the registrar's office of their honorees one month before graduation. Names of students receiving departmental honors will be listed with other student honorees in the commencement program, and the designation will appear on students' transcripts.

EFFECTIVE: 1999-2000 academic year

RATIONALE: UAF lacks a system for recognizing outstanding graduates in their fields of study, which this proposal would establish. Also, departmental honors will be an incentive spurring student achievement in UAF's disciplines and programs.

C. Motion on Common Grading Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Jerry McBeath reported on the history of the common grading system and reviewed the changes from past drafts. David Musgrave asked about the applicability of this to the graduate student. Maynard Perkins asked about the "I" grade remaining a permanent grade. Clif Lando also indicated he was worried about the "D" grade for graduate students. The motion passed.

MOTION PASSED
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the draft common grading system submitted by the UA Faculty Alliance be accepted.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Last year the Senate approved the recommendations of the Curricular Affairs Committee as their response to the UA Faculty Alliance common grading policy. This fall, representatives from all three campus curricular affairs committees and the registrars have worked together to formulate a new draft based on the recommendations made last year.

D. Motion on Course Level Definitions, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Jerry McBeath indicated that the major change on the Course Level Definitions is the replacement regulations and the proposed statement for the catalog. It is not much different from what is currently in the catalog. Discussion in Curricular Affairs focused on upper division courses and especially on the 300 level definitions. The only concern is those courses below the 100 level and the 500 level. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION PASSED
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the draft course level definitions submitted by the UA Faculty Alliance be accepted.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Last year the UAF Faculty Senate approved the recommendations made by the Curricular Affairs and the Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs on the draft course level definitions. This fall, representatives from all three campus curricular affairs committees and the registrars have worked together to formulate a new draft based on the recommendations made last year.

E. Resolution on qualifications of new Board of Regent members, submitted by Legislative & Fiscal Affairs

Scott Deal indicated that the Administrative Committee had requested the Legislative & Fiscal Affairs Committee to come up with a resolution to send to Governor Knowles regarding criteria for selection of new members to the Board of Regents. The committee met several times, read current literature, and sought outside input and came up with this resolution. We want someone that has the kind of depth and breath and experience to be able to come in and understand the issues, to grasp the issues, and to look at them from many points of view and not from a political point of view and to be an effective board member. We felt that the governor should hear that from the Faculty Senate. The resolution passed.

RESOLUTION PASSED
=====

WHEREAS, the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate considers the appointment of individuals to the University of Alaska Board of Regents to be of crucial importance, and

WHEREAS, this board governs Alaska's only public university system, and women and men from Alaska's diverse ethnic and cultural landscape should be appropriately reflected in its composition, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents must work in close association with and supervise the activities of the President of the University, and

WHEREAS, academic concerns and political matters of the state should be entirely separate issues, and

WHEREAS, a regent should have first-hand experience with a very large organization that has multiple objectives, functions, and geographic locations, and

WHEREAS, a regent must be a goodwill ambassador as well as zealously defend and protect the University of Alaska on all fronts, and

WHEREAS, a regent must possess a wide range of knowledge in order to understand issues from the perspective of faculty, staff, researchers, students, and community members at large, and

WHEREAS, a regent must possess the vision for Alaska to think far into the future, and base decisions on the goal of maintaining the University of Alaska as one of the State's greatest and most important resources, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate encourages the Honorable Tony Knowles, Governor of the State of Alaska, to use every resource and counsel available to him, and urges him to carefully weigh his thoughts in order to place individuals on the Board of Regents who will act in the best interest of the University of Alaska and the great State of Alaska.

VIII Committee Reports

A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath

A report was attached to the agenda. The next meeting is on January 26th.

B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - J. Yarie

The committee is working hard on the revisions to the policies and regulations

C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen

A report was attached to the agenda. They have had one meeting since that report was submitted. A number of course changes have been approved. Their next meeting is on December 15th.

D. Core Review - J. Brown

A report was attached to the agenda.

E. Curriculum Review - C. Basham

The following was distributed as a handout at the meeting.

Activities of the Curriculum Review Committee, Fall 1998 -
Charlotte Basham, Chair

Members of the Curriculum Review: Anatoly Antohin, Antonius Otto,
Ron Illingworth, Susan Todd, Carol Barnhardt, Gang Chen, Ted Cooney,
Mark Herrmann, George Guthridge, Gayle Gregory (ex-officio)

We have approved the following undergraduate course requests:

CHEM 194 - Trial course
ATM 194/ATM 101 - Trial course/new course
NRM 494/694 - Trial course

The following are from the list of academic courses requests
circulated by Faculty Senate.

#1-7 Changes in the ANL program to add a practicum, 2 new
courses, and changes in the certificate program.
#8, 9, 11-15 ANTH courses (#10 withdrawn)
#16-17 Art
#18-19 English
#20-28 Foreign Languages and Literatures (not approved)
#29-30 Foreign Languages and Literatures
#31-38b History
#39-42 JB
#43-45 Justice
#46 Humanities (not approved)
#47-50 Humanities
#51-52 Humanities (not approved)
#53-54 PE
#55-56 PE (on hold)
#57-104 CRA courses
#105-106 Biology
#107-108 Statistics
#109 CS
#110-111 ME
#112 NRM
#113-117 SOME
#118-122 BA
#123-125 MIN

#127, a proposal from School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences
require 12 credits, and a minimum of one year in residence at the
Juneau Center for Fisheries and Ocean Science, was not approved.

F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber

A report was attached to the agenda. Their next meeting is on
Thursday, December 10th.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley

A report was attached to the agenda.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -

D. Porter

No report was available.

I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - L. Duffy

A report was attached to the agenda.

J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal

A report was attached to the agenda.

K. Service Committee - K. Nance

The committee will meet in January.

L. Ad Hoc Committees

The following was distributed as a handout at the meeting. Alexandra Fitts stresses that this is a progress rather than a final report.

TASK FORCE ON COURSE/INSTRUCTOR APPROVAL - Alexandra Fitts

The Task Force on Course/Instructor Approval met on 11/13 and 12/2. We have been charged with assessing the process of course and instructor approval of Rural Campus offerings by the Fairbanks departments. Issues that have been raised include the possibility of establishing a regular time-line for re-approval of instructors and syllabi, the qualifications that instructors must have at each campus, what impact program assessment will have, and the ability and/or responsibility of the Fairbanks department to oversee rural instructors. We determined that the present situation is:

1. The relevant Senate regulations are eleven years old and are very general, asserting little more than "discipline" control and oversight of courses taught in the Rural College, both of instructors and course content.
2. Current practice is for rural campuses to submit instructors and syllabi for approval the first time a course is taught by a particular instructor. Many "disciplines" (or departments on the Fairbanks Campus) have provided CRA with guidelines for minimal qualifications to teach at various levels (100, 200, and so on). It is the Fairbanks department's responsibility to supply and update such guidelines as they see fit.
3. Policies on renewal of instructor vary by campus; for instance, the Interior-Aleutians campus has a five-year expiration policy, after which an instructor must be re-approved to teach a given class.
4. No formal method currently exists for renewing approval on a regular basis, for overseeing syllabi every semester, or for enforcing changes in course content or instructor qualifications based on new accreditation requirements or other changed conditions in the discipline.
5. CRA is open to any level of review Fairbanks departments wish to institute.

6. No procedures currently exist for adjudicating disputes on course content or instructor qualifications. CRA acknowledges that Fairbanks departments have the final say, but the issue can be tricky, potentially involving academic freedom, especially when the dispute is between permanent faculty members.

IX Informational Item

A. Results of Evaluation Committee elections

Below are the result of the recent election for the Promotion/Tenure Review Committee and the Pre- and Post-tenure Evaluation Committees.

UAF FACULTY SENATE ELECTION BALLOT

PROMOTION/TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The following faculty have been nominated for the Promotion/Tenure Review Committee. Please vote for seven (7) candidates.

Ron Barry, Assoc. Professor (CSEM, Mathematical Science)
 Claudette Bradley-Kawagley, Assoc. Professor (School of Ed.)
 Peter Cornwall, Assoc. Professor (CLA, Social Sciences)
 Vidyadhar Kamath, Professor (CNRDM/SME)
 Jonah Lee, Professor (CSEM, Engineering)
 *** Jenifer McBeath, Professor (CNRDM/SALRM)
 *** Sathy Naidu, Professor (SFOS)
 David Porter, Professor (CNRDM/SOM)
 W. Roger Powers, Professor (CLA, Languages & Culture)
 *** James Ruppert, Professor (CLA, English & Humanities)
 *** William Schneider, Professor (CLA, Library)
 *** Gerald Shields, Professor (CSEM, Biology/Wildlife)
 *** Todd Sherman, Assoc. Professor (CLA, Arts & Communication)
 Sheryl Stanek, Assoc. Professor (ACE)
 *** Richard Stolzberg, Professor (CSEM, Chemistry)

PRE- AND POST-TENURE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The following faculty have been nominated for the Pre- and Post-Tenure Evaluation Committee. Please vote for seven (7) candidates.

*** Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Professor (CNRDM/SME)
 *** Roy Bird, Professor (CLA, English & Humanities)
 Don Carling, Professor (CNRDM/SALRM)
 *** Deben Das, Professor (CSEM, Engineering)
 *** Sven Ebbesson, Professor (SFOS)
 Perry Gilmore, Assoc. Professor (School of Education)
 Thomas Jahns, Assoc. Professor (ACE)
 *** John Keller, Professor (CSEM, Chemistry)
 Margaret Lee, Assoc. Professor (CLA, Languages & Culture)
 John Lehman, Professor (CNRDM/SOM)
 *** Tamara Lincoln, Assoc. Professor (CLA, Library)
 *** Janice Reynolds, Professor (CLA, Social Sciences)
 Mitch Roth, Professor (CSEM, Mathematical Science)

Return to: UAF Faculty Senate, 312 Signers' Hall, Fairbanks,
 AK 99775 Ballots must be received by 3:00 p.m., November

30, 1998.

*** Elected

NOTE: 12/14/98--Due to the withdrawal of Gerald Shields from the Promotion/Tenure Review Committee the Faculty Senate has forwarded the name of the next highest vote getter, Ron Barry, to the Provost's Office to be added to the committee.

X Members' Comments/Questions

Jerry McBeath asked about the bylaw revision effort to reduce the number of committees. Clif Lando asked if any consideration has been given to make Fairbanks one of the possible sites for giving future GRE and GMAT testing. Larry Duffy indicated that his committee are looked into this. Sheri Layral indicated that Patty White from UAF Testing Services will be drafting information on the current structure, the proposed structure, and what future plans might be. When we receive this it will go to both the Graduate Committees. Maynard Perkins indicated that the rural sites also currently give the GRE.

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Tapes of this Faculty Senate meeting are in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall if anyone wishes to listen to the complete tapes.

Submitted by Sheri Layral, Faculty Senate Secretary.