AGENDA

UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #219
Monday, December 05, 2016
1:00 - 3:00 PM - Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom
https://zoom.us/j/377547229
*Phone numbers for Zoom included below**

1:00	I	Call to Order - Orion Lawlor A. Roll Call B. Approval of Minutes for Meeting #218 (linked) C. Adoption of Agenda	4 Min.
1:04	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions Motions approved: A. Motion to amend the attendance policy B. Motion to authorize Office of the Registrar to change "DF" grade to "Pass" for F698 courses (excludes letter graded courses) Motions pending: None	1 Min.
1:05	III	A. President's Remarks - Orion Lawlor (5 Min.) B. President-Elect's Remarks - Chris Fallen (5 Min.)	10 Min.
1:15	IV	A. Interim Chancellor's Remarks - Dana Thomas (5 Min.) B. Provost's Remarks - Susan Henrichs (5 Min.) C. Senate Members' Questions / Comments (2 Min.)	12 Min.
1:27	V	Public Comment	5 Min.
1:32	VI	Governance Reports A. Research Report - VC Hinzman B. Staff Council - Faye Gallant C. ASUAF - Colby Freel D. UNAC - Chris Coffman UNAD Report - Katie Boylan UAFT - Kate Quick (Report linked) E. Athletics - Dani Sheppard F. Faculty Alliance Report (linked) G. Senate Members' Questions / Comments	8 Min.
1:40	VII	New Business A. Motion to approve a new Minor in Tribal Management, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee B. Motion to amend Academic Program Review Process, submitted	20 Min.

by the Curricular Affairs and Faculty Affairs Committees

2:00 BREAK

2:10 VIII Discussion and Information Items 15 Min.
A. GER Alignment of English across UA System and
Summary of SLOA for Writing Program (PDF linked)
B. Discussion: Faculty Senate Response to Strategic Pathways

2:25 IX Public Comments 5 Min.

2:30 X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements 15 Min.
A. General Comments / Announcements
B. Committee Chair Comments
(An active link is added if minutes are submitted.)
Standing Committees:

1. Administrative Committee - Chris Fallen (Minutes for 10/28/2016 linked)
2. Curricular Affairs Committee - Eileen Harney (Minutes for 10/31/2016 linked)
3. Faculty Affairs Committee - Andy Anger (Minutes for 10/12/2016 linked)
4. Unit Criteria Committee - Mara Bacsujlaky
Permanent Committees:
5. Committee on the Status of Women - Ellen Lopez, Diana DiStefano (Minutes for 10/13/2016 linked)
6. Core Review Committee - Andy Seitz (Minutes for 10/05/2016 linked)
7. Curriculum Review Committee - Rainer Newberry
8. Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee - Franz Meyer (Minutes for 09/01/2016 and 10/11/2016 and 11/15/2016 linked)
9. Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee - Donie Bret-Harte, Sean Topkok (Minutes for 10/21/2016 linked)
10. Information Technology Committee - Siri Tuttle (Minutes for 10/26/2016 linked)
11. Research Advisory Committee - Jamie Clark, Gordon Williams (Minutes for 10/21/2016 linked)
12. Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee - Sandra Wildfeuer, Jennifer Tilbury
13. Faculty Administrator Review Committee (No Group A reviews in 2016-17)

2:45 XI Adjourn

*Phone numbers for Zoom Meeting: Dial: +1 646 558 8656 (US Toll) or +1 408 638 0968 (US Toll)
(If calling without a nationwide calling plan, toll charges are incurred.) Meeting ID: 377 547 229

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new minor in Tribal Management, housed in the College of Rural and Community Development (Interior Alaska Campus).

Effective: Fall 2017

Rationale: The program proposal #56-UNP is on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

****

Overview:

The proposed minor in Tribal Management will provide students with the opportunity to acquire skills to work within tribal and local governments and other organizations in rural Alaska. The required courses will give students a foundation for applying the the knowledge gained in their majors to rural and tribal management contexts. The minor will be especially helpful for Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development rural based students completing their bachelor's degree as few minors are available by distance.

Relationship to Purposes of the University:

The Tribal Management minor supports the University's mission to emphasize the circumpolar North and its diverse peoples and to educate students for active citizenship and prepare them for lifelong learning and careers. It addresses the UAF core themes of Educate, Prepare, and Connect.

The Alaska Native Studies (ANS) B.A. and Rural Development (RD) B.A. are both offered to students by distance. Currently there are only a few minors available by distance, including the minors in ANS and RD, which can make it difficult for these students to fulfill the minor requirement for graduation. This additional minor will give rural students another minor option and is closely related to their interests and careers. The Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development requested the development of this minor and is in full support.

Proposed Catalog Layout:

Tribal Management

The minor in Tribal Management will provide students with the skills to work within tribal and local governments and other organizations in rural Alaska. The curriculum will give students a

foundation to apply the knowledge gained in their majors to rural and tribal management contexts.

Complete the following:
TM F101 - Introduction to Tribal Government in Alaska - 3 credits
TM F105 - Introduction to Managing Tribal Governments - 3 credits
TM F201 - Tribal Government in Alaska II - 3 credits
TM F205- Managing Tribal Governments II - 3 credits

Tribal Management electives - 3 credits

Minimum credits required: 15 credits

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve an updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regents Policy and UA Regulations (10.06).

Effective: Spring 2017

Rationale: The existing process was modified at Meeting #181 (March 5, 2012) to accommodate a five year review cycle. The revisions below are intended to ensure faculty input, and clarify the role of the Faculty Senate in program eliminations. The Program Review Template as well as the BOR Policy for 10.06 have also changed since the last Faculty Senate motion in 2012, and current versions are included.

****

Additions: ***bold italics***
Deletions: **bold** ~~strikethrough~~

The program review process ~~**will**~~ ***shall*** be completed as follows:
1. An initial ~~**brief**~~ review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit ~~**supplied**~~ ***-provided*** **two-page** ***brief*** 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 Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; ~~**attached**~~ ***current PDF posted with motion***). A single Faculty Program Review Committee ***shall be*** comprised of one ~~**tenured**~~ faculty representative from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus ~~**five CRCD representatives**~~ ***one representative from CRCD and one representative from CTC. The Faculty Program Review Committee shall be nominated by the Provost in consultation with the deans and directors, and, once formed, the list of committee members shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate for comment, and finalized by the Chancellor. The Faculty Program Review Committee*** ~~**will**~~ ***shall*** 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
- ***Modify program through consolidation with another program or other significant re-organization***
- ***Suspend admissions to program or***
- Discontinue program

The Faculty Program Review Committee shall allow up to two representatives from the program under review to attend the meeting and to answer questions. The Faculty Program Review Ccommittee ~~**will**~~ ***shall*** provide a brief narrative justifying their

recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review. ***A summary of the recommendation shall be shared with the program under review and the Faculty Senate President, who may request a copy of the full narrative. The Faculty Senate President, in consultation with members of the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee, then has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks.***

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and ~~4~~ ***four*** administrative representatives from CRCD ~~**will**~~ ***shall*** review the recommendations of the ***Faculty*** Program Review Committee, may request additional information from ~~**about**~~ the program, and ~~**will**~~ ***shall*** state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.

3. The Provost, in consultation with the Chancellor's Cabinet, ~~**will**~~ ***shall*** review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee***, the Faculty Senate President,*** and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:

a) Program continuation is confirmed ~~**until the next review cycle**~~**.**

b) Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by the next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.

c) Other actions, such as a major program restructuring. An action plan shall be required by the end of the next regular academic semester after a request for restructuring or similar action is made.

d) Recommend to discontinue program. ~~**Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, w**~~ ***W***hen appropriate**,** admissions may be suspended pending action.

4. Faculty Senate reviews the recommendations to discontinue or suspend programs and states their collective agreement or disagreement with the Chancellor's Cabinet's recommendation. If the Faculty Senate disagrees, it shall provide an alternate recommendation by the end of the semester in which the Chancellor's Cabinet's recommendation is made.

5. The Chancellor reviews all levels of recommendations and decides whether to recommend program discontinuation to the Board of Regents.

Link to current Instructional Program Review Template
Link to BOR Policy and UA Regulation 10.06

Information re GER Alignment of English across the UA System:

Faculty Senate--

This message is from Sarah Stanley who directs University Writing, a position that works with an English Department committee to oversee the required GER writing courses. Current capacity in the English Department includes 21 TAs who teach the majority of GER writing course offerings, with adjunct faculty teaching online and a few face-to-face sections each semester. In addition, a handful of English Department faculty also teach a section or two of 111x, 211x, or 213x. UAF currently supports one Writing Studies faculty member (Stanley) who has been the supervisor of these graduate students for 6+ years, and Stanley currently is working at max capacity. Stanley directs a program which operates in a transparent and open manner--and all lesson plans, outcomes, and assessment reports can be found at write.alaska.edu. Evidence of undergraduate writing showing signs of every assessable criteria over the course of our programmatic writing sequence is attached to this email. The Vice Provost has used our assessment procedures as an exemplar for Northwest Accreditors.

Yet, two years ago, we found ourselves in a situation where we were mandated to align with UAA and UAS regarding our GER writing courses. To some on faculty senate, I believe the assumption was that course names and titles and outcomes should not cause much harm and is one way to appease mandated changes which may threaten distinct campus cultures.

In our 2-year alignment process, we quickly discovered just how different the institutions are, and these differences are clearest in regard to the responsibility of writing courses. UAA relies on term, tenure track, and adjunct faculty to teach the majority of their GER courses; and while they do have a small cohort of teaching assistants every year--it is 20% of what we have at UAF. UAS does not have a graduate program and so no graduate teachers.

The 212 course has long been offered at UAA as a GER and we were being told to create mirror images of another campus' course offerings. As a system wide effort we found agreement by creating horizontal and vertical alignment. UAA was enthusiastic about a "writing in the disciplines" model for these 200-level courses, a vision that maintains the 211, 212, and 213 offerings in number but changes their focus entirely. These are no longer "about" courses; they are "and" courses. Some in the alignment discussions wanted to discard the 214 Persuasive Writing course. However, Rich, Cindy, and Sarah all pointed out that while "on paper" fewer courses appear to be a good idea; it is not possible given our current resources--the 214 persuasive writing course seemed to fit the needs and resources of our campus quite well. We asked:

- How are we to ensure expert training in three distinct disciplines with our current program capacity?
- How will graduate students looking to study literature or hone their craft in creative writing know how to help undergraduates write and think in the genres of disciplines?
- Is this kind of apprentice level attention to writing the English Department's job?
- What about the recently passed communication outcomes in UAF faculty senate?

UAF argued successfully to maintain a 214 writing course with the intent to help this course grow and provide value to all UAF degrees. In fact, Stanley reached out to all "w" intensive faculty last year and shared with anyone who followed up with her, the vision behind this course. Stanley came to faculty senate to speak about the Communication Outcomes and shared how the 200-level writing courses were shifting their focus to support Outcome #3--Translate disciplinary content to audience outside the discipline, when appropriate. The Composition Committee last year worked hard to highlight the goals of UAF's writing program--and the excellent work that teachers behind the program are doing. Most of what we've been able to accomplish through the years is a result of allowing graduate students some flexibility to pitch

theme-based writing courses in areas of their own expertise, in areas where they can lead their students through an in-depth discussion about topics across disciplinary interest.

SUMMARY: Our current writing curricula and support of that curricula is optimal for our current resources. Neither Stanley **nor anyone she has met at UAF** has the expertise (a dissertation and scholarly interest) in the field of professional and technical writing. Without such a person, who would create a supportive structure for mentoring and developing the curricula for TAs to teach 212X with any kind of assurance on quality of instruction and assessable outcomes?

Given this situation, and the difference in our writing programs, the addition of 212 as an option for the 200-level course raises capacity concerns at UAF.

Stanley's Position

Given UAF's capacity issues, as programmatic leader, I see strategic growth in making more visible current practice--a 214 course focused on argument across contexts--a way of thinking I see undergraduates struggling with. We need to help them with refining and asserting their perspective in academic and public conversations surrounding "persuasive situations," from generalized to specific audiences. Moreover, the 214 course is aligned with recently passed baccalaureate communication outcomes.

In 2017-2018, we will be offering TA led 214 courses. These courses will continue to be excellent as they will reflect custom designed courses with a scaffolded curriculum--the courses are selected by the Composition Committee and each TA receives one-on-one coaching from an experienced faculty member. The 214 course number reflects what we were doing already in 211 and 213 courses; however, now because of alignment the previous 211 and 213 courses will not be offered by TAs. The scope and focus of these courses has now changed to reflect a writing in the disciplines model.

There will be online offerings of 211, 212, and 213. I imagine that other UAF campuses will begin to offer 212. The online offering will need to be approved by the Composition Committee and be aligned with the new course outcomes. Current courses will have to undergo a redesign. We will need to hire a tenure-track professional and technical faculty member to assist in the training and development of a 212 course because this course clearly will be in high demand at UAF for certain degree programs.

I believe that 214 is the strongest option given the resources and commitment of the people behind it. I'm excited to teach it myself and to inspire a legion of teachers to teach it as well. Join us in creating a culture of writing at UAF--join our committee, join in on the assessment, teach with us. All perspectives are welcome.

Thank you,

Sarah

Sarah Stanley, Ph.D
Director of University Writing
Assistant Professor of English
University of Alaska Fairbanks
812 Gruening sstanley2@alaska.edu

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

UAFT Governance Report from Kate Quick:

At their November 11, 2016 meeting, UAFT executive board passed a resolution calling for a halt to Strategic Pathways until Statewide's spending is reduced and a cost-benefit analysis of Strategic Pathways is conducted by an unbiased third party. The full resolution will be available soon on UAFT's website.

UAFT plans to send a small delegation to Juneau in Febraury to lobby for sustainable university funding. Please send or discuss ideas/suggestions related to this to your UAFT campus representative.