

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #191
Monday, May 6, 2013
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds
A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Members Absent:
ALBERTSON, Leif (14) - Julie Cascio	ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (13)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (13)	ALEXEEV, Vladimir (13)
BROWN, Stephen (13) - audio	BANDOPADHYAY, Sukumar (13)
COOK, Christine (14)	CEE, Vincent (14)
DAVIS, Mike (14)	CHAMBERS, Izetta (14)
FALLEN, Chris (13)	CHEN, Cheng-fu (14)
GEORGE-BETTISWORTH, R. (13) – Rob Duke	FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)
HARDY, Cindy (13)	GUSTAFSON, Karen (13)
HARDY, Sarah (13)	MCEACHERN, Diane (13)
HEALY, Joanne (13)	WEBLEY, Peter (14)
HEATON, John (14)	WINSOR, Peter (14)
HENRY, David (13)	ZHANG, Xiong (14)
JENSEN, Karen (14)	
JOHNSTON, DUFF (13)	Others Present:
JOLY, Julie (13)	Chancellor Brian Rogers
LARDON, Cecile (13)	Provost Susan Henrichs
LAWLOR, Orion (13)	Alex Fitts
MARR, Wayne (14)	Dani Sheppard
MEYER, Franz (13)	Debu Misra
NADIN, Elisabeth (13)	Eric Madsen
NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)	Libby Eddy
NG, Chung-Sang (13)	Carol Gering
RADENBAUGH, Todd (13)	Elizabeth Allman
REYNOLDS, Jennifer	Scott Bell
SHORT, Margaret (13)	Leslie McCartney
VALENTINE, Dave	Amy Lovecraft
WEBER, Jane (14)	Xiaoqi Han
WINFREE, Cathy (13)	Ataur Chowdhury
YARIE, John (14)	

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #190

Minutes for Meeting #190 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to approve a new B.A. degree in Secondary Education with Content Area
2. Motion to approve establishment of a central online collection of expanded course descriptions for all UAF courses

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Comments – Jennifer Reynolds

Referencing the establishment of a central online collection of expanded course descriptions, Jennifer reported that we [David Valentine, Cecile Lardon and Jennifer] met with Karl Kowalski and others from OIT to talk about the practical side of establishing a database and user interface. OIT will be working on a mock-up over the summer which will be rolled out in stages to a core group in the fall, and then more broadly to the Faculty Senate during fall semester. OIT has said that they can automatically load everything in the template from Banner except for the course description, the course goals and the learning outcomes. This also provides an opportunity for faculty to do error checking on Banner's contents for your courses. There will be more on this in the fall.

B. President-Elect's Comments – David Valentine

David reported on the ongoing efforts of the Interdisciplinary Issues Faculty Committee chaired by Craig Gerlach this spring. The committee is nearly finished with its report. They've identified and categorized interdisciplinary issues faced by faculty. They've also compiled information on different models from other universities which may help in addressing the issues. The final report will probably come in later this month. It will be posted online at the committee's web site and included in the Faculty Senate agenda in the fall.

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/interdisciplinary-issues/>

The Learning Management System (LMS) pilot project is wrapping up. E-learning has gotten some initial reactions from the faculty who've been trying out the alternative software and there are some participants who do not want to switch back to Blackboard. There should be a full report in the fall. There will also be multiple focus groups of faculty set up in the fall to try out many of the more common tasks with the LMS software programs.

David publicly thanked Jennifer Reynolds for all her work this past year. He acknowledged what a pleasure it was to work with her and the huge amount of behind-the-scenes work she did on behalf of Faculty Senate. He mentioned it was rather telling that she referred to him as the senate president-in-training and noted humorously that he only recently put the acronym for that together. He emphasized that she did not treat him like that, however, and that she leaves some large shoes to fill. A round of applause followed.

[Susan Henrich's remarks came next as the Chancellor had not yet arrived to the meeting.]

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers thanked everyone for a successful semester and congratulated the faculty on Senate who were recently promoted and/or tenured. He reminded everyone of his comment in prior years that the decision to promote and tenure faculty is a one to two million dollar investment by the university. The tenure decision is one that commits the university for a long period of time to pay for a faculty member. There were some spectacular files this year, and he thanked them for all they've done to support students, research, creative / scholarly activities, and extension. The breadth and depth of work that's being accomplished here is exciting. Looking at an individual's body of work over four to seven years gives one a sense of what a great institution this is with its variety of skills and disciplines. He also reminded everyone that this evening they would be honoring the Usibelli Award winners.

Regarding the capital and operating budgets, the legislature has finished its work since the last Faculty Senate meeting took place. The university did not get everything it hoped for in either budget, but does have enough in the capital budget to move forward with construction of the new engineering building. Next year they will submit a request for the rest of the design funds needed for the new combined heat and power plant. The university filed a permit modification on that and public comment should come up in the fall. Permitting might start as early as December of next year, and construction could possibly start in summer of 2016. In the meantime, they will "baby along" the present plant as best they can.

On the operating budget side, the legislature provided half the funding needed for pay raises (the usual practice by the legislature). The legislature also provided funding for fixed cost increases along with a couple of new program amounts. That leaves the university short by about \$8 million dollars this year that will have to be absorbed, given the "perfect storm" of a modest state increase, roughly flat federal spending, and the smallest tuition increase in over a decade. A basic outline of the steps being taken to live within that budget was sent out by memorandum recently. Unlike prior years the university administration will not do a general across the board pull-back from units. However, each department will have to cover that portion of their pay raises not covered by the legislature's appropriation. One little bit of relief is that health care rates are not going up. The university continues to push energy cost savings. Moving from leased spaces back onto campus will help save some money. For all staff positions that become vacant in the next year, there will be a 90-day required vacancy on Fund 1 positions and the cost savings will be used to help cover the shortfall centrally. This won't apply to faculty positions, but the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Research will continue to review any new faculty hires before the search goes forward. Over the coming fiscal year, there will be some small vertical cuts in all the vice chancellor areas. Those will need to go through a review process at the Planning and Budget Committee, and at the Faculty Senate if academic departments are involved.

With regard to next year's budget process, the Board of Regents will be approving their guidelines for the budget at the June meeting here in Fairbanks. A very modest legislative request is anticipated. The biggest decision will be one made this September about tuition increases for 2014. The UA President is still considering options on what tuition may be for the fall of 2014.

One issue that we continue to get pushed on by others concerns Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). A lot of public policy leaders think that MOOCs are a panacea to solve all problems in higher education. Chancellor Rogers is skeptical about that. He acknowledges there is some advantage in extending learning in terms of providing a college education, but he doesn't think it's the way to go particularly for relatively small institutions like ours that can't participate in any of the large ones. He doesn't see a path forward in this direction that makes sense for UAF. He noted that UAF is looking at,

within the the University of the Arctic, a proposal for an online climate change course focusing on the Arctic. This would be mostly to extend knowledge about the Arctic and about climate change. He'll be talking with some UAF faculty about what role we might play within that plan as a leading institution on the Arctic and climate change. Leadership for the project would be the University of Alberta, not UAF. He does not see this as a for-credit opportunity, but really an opportunity to get knowledge out and for us to learn a little bit about what it takes. It's not an inexpensive process to take on.

We are also looking at whether the university can assist in the coverage of high school math in rural Alaska. The aim would be to promote math and science disciplines at the high school level by helping with instructional design. This would potentially get us students who are better prepared for college. Interested faculty were invited to contact the Chancellor. He does expect that we will be pushed in this area from the state level and potentially the Regents level, and may eventually have to take more steps. He thinks that taking a measured look at this time is the right approach, and would appreciate input on this.

Summer Sessions' activities have begun with a Judy Collins concert last night.

Debu M. thanked the Chancellor for the detailed report. He asked for clarification about the pay raise funding, and the Chancellor confirmed that with half being covered by state funds, the university had receipt authority to find the additional funds needed to cover the raises. Debu then asked what the deficit amount was that the Chancellor had mentioned, and he replied that he had mentioned eight million, though it's in the range of between seven and nine million dollars, depending upon what happens with enrollments and federal grant and contracts.

Debu commented that he was glad to see UAF taking the lead helping students in the area high school math to prepare them for college. He said it would be a good idea to form a committee of developmental math faculty to brainstorm on this idea to effectively recruit and retain students, particularly because of the growing issue of STEM education.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs announced that the Faculty180 software is now ready for use in beta testing mode. She is looking for volunteers to try it out this spring and provide feedback. A communication about that will be sent out shortly.

A recap of the promotion and tenure results from this year's review process was shared. A copy of the report is posted at the Faculty Senate web page: <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/>

There were more than 90 files submitted, with about 15 in the pre-tenure review category, 35 in the post-tenure review category, and the remainder in either the promotion to associate professor with tenure decision area, or separate promotion decisions or tenure decisions. By and large these were excellent files showing really impressive performance on the part of our faculty, and consistent with this, most candidates were successful. All the candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure, and the separate decisions on tenure, were successful. The promotion to professor decisions were a little mixed, with 12 successful applications, two that were not successful, and one file that was withdrawn. Candidates for promotion to research associate professor were largely successful. There were five that were successful and one file withdrawn. The pre-tenure reviews were carefully and thoroughly done, with 12 of those candidates making satisfactory progress toward promotion and tenure application; three were unsatisfactory at this time.

- V Adoption of Consent Agenda
 - A. Motion to approve the list of 2012-2013 degree candidates, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 191/1)
 - B. Recognition of Service for Jennifer Reynolds, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 191/2)
 - C. Resolution for the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 191/3)
 - D. Special Recognition of Senate Service

There were no objections to the consent agenda and it was unanimously adopted.

- VI Old Business
 - A. Resolution to recommend ending automatic university-wide review in post-tenure faculty evaluation, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 191/4)

Jennifer reminded everyone that at the last meeting this motion had been tabled until Faculty Senate leadership had a chance to meet with United Academics. The meeting with UNAC took place, and the Union fully supports the resolution and is willing to help with its implementation. There are no more concerns about the process of this item. Jennifer noted that the Senate did not hold a full discussion of the resolution's content last month and invited discussion of the content. The resolution would change post-tenure review of UNAC faculty members by removing reviews by the Provost and university-wide committees if the unit-level reviews were satisfactory. Rainer N. commented that it's one of the best ideas brought before the Senate in a long time.

A vote was taken and the resolution was passed unanimously.

- B. Motion to agree to the discontinuation of the PhD in Mathematics, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 191/5)

Jennifer described the old and new business covered by this previously tabled motion and the new motion which follows (item C). By tabling this motion last fall and a second time this spring, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics (DMS) faculty were provided time to work with the Provost and CNSM Dean to formulate a revitalization plan for the program. DMS has now submitted a plan which is included in the new motion.

The Administrative Committee supports the new motion to continue the PhD program under the plan that DMS has submitted. They recommend that the older motion be voted down, and the new motion supported.

The older motion states, "The UAF Faculty Senate agrees to discontinuation of the PhD Degree in Mathematics." The new motion states, "The UAF Faculty Senate supports continuation of the PhD Degree in Mathematics on the condition that the Department of Mathematics and Statistics (DMS) submits annual reports to the Faculty Senate and to the Provost demonstrating success in meeting the intent and milestones of its plan ("Revitalizing the Mathematics Ph.D. Program at UAF"), submitted to the Faculty Senate and attached here. These reports are to be submitted by the Program Review document deadline established by the Provost; in 2013, the report is due on December 2. This condition will continue until the program's next formal Program Review, currently scheduled for 2015-16." Jennifer noted the Faculty Senate may choose between these two motions, or modify one of them.

Elisabeth N. commented that she does not like the reporting conditions that are being proposed in the new motion. David V. asked for discussion on the tabled motion first before discussion of the new motion.

A vote was taken on the older, previously tabled motion. The motion to discontinue the PhD in Mathematics program was unanimously voted down.

C. Motion to approve continuation of the PhD in Mathematics and DMS PhD Revitalization Plan, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 191/6)

Jennifer asked for discussion on the new motion to continue the PhD in Mathematics program with the DMS revitalization plan, and noted Elisabeth's earlier comment that she does not agree with the reporting conditions included in the motion.

Jennifer asked Provost Susan Henrichs to address a question about whether there are other programs that have conditions imposed upon them. Provost Henrichs responded that other programs have been placed on probation as a result of the most recent program review process. They have the requirement of submitting an improved student learning outcomes assessment plan and/or reporting on their progress in implementing their student learning outcomes assessment plan. Others were placed on probation because their enrollments and graduation numbers were very low. For most of them the follow up will be at the next program review rather than annually. However, this particular program has zero enrollments right now, and has had very few graduates over the last decade. Compared with other PhD programs at UAF, it has the lowest numbers of all in terms of admitting and graduating students, and that is why these special conditions have been placed upon it. Jennifer noted that the milestones on which the program has been asked to report have to do with their recruiting and admittance numbers, and then in successive years, administering PhD exams and related kinds of activities once there are students admitted.

Elisabeth N. commented that math programs across the country have low student enrollment, and in Alaska one might expect enrollments to be even quite lower. To get rid of the program because there is no immediate demand precludes the case where there might be demand later on. It also might force the hand of having to admit students simply to meet the requirement of showing numbers, whether or not those students are good candidates for the program.

Jennifer noted that if the program doesn't meet their milestones, they are not automatically ended. The reporting requirement is intended as a means of making the department's efforts visible. But she acknowledged Elisabeth's point about taking admissions to the program under pressure to admit students to meet the requirement of showing numbers.

Franz M. commented that the reporting requirement could be a positive for the department. It keeps the matter on the front of their minds as something they're supposed to focus on for several years, and gives them the chance on a year-to-year basis to explain their efforts and progress or lack of progress. Later, when it's time for program review once more, they will be able to show activity and a paper trail of their efforts. In the end, the effort is fairly low and acts as a protection for the department rather than a punishment.

Cecile L. commented that from an institutional perspective it's hard to defend the argument that a program should continue because there might be a single talented student interested at some point. From the institutional perspective, the need in the state for a program should be considered. Right now,

the department has the opportunity to show that there is interest in this program. It's never just the faculty or just the students, but rather a synergy of both. The faculty can use the situation right now to show their energy and interest in the program and see if they can recruit enough good students. So, this is a good way of testing and documenting that.

David noted that the present discussion needs to look at the intent of the motion on floor, rather than the issue about conditions to continue the program. He asked if Elisabeth meant to propose an amendment to the motion to drop the conditions--which could then be discussed. Elisabeth asked what would happen if the motion were voted down because of the part about the conditions. David said that would return the situation back to a limbo state, which is why he was suggesting to talk about the removal of the conditions as an amendment to the motion.

Jane W. asked Margaret S. what she thinks. Margaret deferred to Elisabeth Allman who was present from the Department of Mathematics and Statistics (DMS). Elisabeth A. stated that while she is personally on board with what Elisabeth N. has said, collectively as a department the DMS do not feel annual reporting is a particularly onerous condition. She noted that she personally cares about quality vs. quantity and wants that to be a long term issue. Numbers are down because admissions to the Ph.D. program without a Master's had been eliminated and students had to get a Master's degree first. Discontinuation of the Ph.D. program left two students stranded who were working on their Master's degree to gain entrance to the Ph.D. program. She said again that annual reporting would not be onerous, and agreed that it would be good to document their progress.

A vote was taken on the motion to approve continuation of the Ph.D. in Mathematics and DMS Ph.D. Revitalization Plan and it was passed by majority. There was one nay vote and no abstentions.

VII New Business

A. Motion to approve a new Minor in Dispute Resolution, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 191/7)

Rainer N. encouraged senators to support the new minor which has good departmental support and interesting classes. Rob Duke (Justice Department) noted that Department Chair Michael Daku was here in case there were questions. Rob noted that the field is new for Alaska, but is a broad one in the United States and they think it will become influential here with a multi-door courthouse model instead of just coming and going to a civil or criminal trial. They anticipate seeing more and more calls for mediation and arbitration in the future. Their program is well suited because they are the only degree program in the U.S. that houses an arbitration / dispute resolution (ADR) program within a Justice department.

A vote was taken and the motion to approve the new minor in Dispute Resolution was carried unanimously.

B. Motion to discontinue the Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 191/8)

Rainer acknowledged that no one likes to see programs go away, but this one simply does not have students and does not have support where it is presently housed. They are anticipating that a new leadership minor will be emerging next year from a different program (School of Management), and it stands a good chance for success. Getting rid of this older minor clears the path for that to happen.

The motion to discontinue the minor was passed unanimously.

- C. Motion to approve the Fisheries Division Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 191/9)

Karen J. introduced the motion, explaining that the new additions to the criteria addressed faculty with joint appointments. There were a few other minor changes. Jennifer thanked the committee for working with the Fisheries Division to get a good proposal before them.

A vote was taken and the motion to approve the revised unit criteria for the Fisheries Division was passed unanimously.

[The break occurred at this point in the meeting.]

VII New Business - Continued

- D. Motion to amend the grading policy for C-, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 191/10)

Rainer N. explained the need to amend this motion passed at the March 4 meeting. The word 'baccalaureate' needs to be changed to 'undergraduate' so that the policy change applies to all undergraduate degrees as well.

Ataur C. commented that C- (1.7) would be the passing grade for courses, but academic probation would still occur for a cumulative GPA of less than C (2.0). Rainer pointed out that these are two different issues. One issue involves whether a course is going to count as satisfying a requirement for a degree program or not. The other issue involves whether or not a student is doing well enough in their studies, or whether they should be alerted along with their advisor that they need to make overall improvement.

Jennifer noted the motion has already been voted on and will be in place for baccalaureate programs. This motion is intended to cover the other undergraduate programs. Individual programs were provided the chance to retain the grade of C (2.0) or C- (1.7) as the minimum grade for their courses.

Ataur C. commented about efforts to increase our academic standards while making it easy to gain admission to the university. In his opinion, this is moving backward. He also noted the changes with plus/minus grades occur frequently, and suggested that numerical values only be used to help avoid confusion.

Todd R. commented in support of the motion which brings the associate and certificate programs in line with the standard that will be used for the baccalaureate degrees.

A vote was taken on the motion, and it was passed by majority vote. There was one nay and one abstention. Jennifer noted as a point of order that Ataur C. was present for Mark Conde, a new member of the 2013-14 Faculty Senate.

- E. Resolution to recommend addition to General Education Requirements, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 191/11)

Jennifer read the resolution out loud:

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends that the current UA system regulation concerning General Education Requirements (GER) for Baccalaureate Degrees (R.10.04.040) be

modified to allow for two 5-credit courses in a single non-English language to count toward fulfilling any six of the 15 credits required for the Social Sciences/Humanities/Arts section of the GER.

Rainer N. commented that this has been practiced for decades by means of a “don’t ask, don’t tell” philosophy. This potential change would formalize the practice. David V. noted that the UA President can approve such a change to the regulations.

Ataur C. asked if this will include American Sign Language (ASL). There was some brief discussion about whether ASL qualifies as a non-English language. Jennifer noted that this may be out of the scope of this discussion.

Debu M. made the comment that this is an excellent resolution. It retains languages and faculty, adding value to the university.

Julie J. asked if the resolution was not going to include ASL. Jennifer responded that they were trying to codify a long-standing practice, and not trying to get to that level of detail with this right now. She asked if Rainer or Libby knew if ASL had been included or excluded in the past. Rainer said it had been included in the past, but in terms of credits, the ASL courses are three credits, not five. This will need some clarification. Julie asked if the resolution could be amended. Jennifer made the recommendation to return it to committee to consider the permutations of differing credits for the ASL courses.

Orion L. brought up the point that he teaches three-credit courses in assembly language, and there are other programming language courses – all of which are non-English languages.

Rainer reiterated the intent of the resolution: to make our present policy with regard to non-English languages and the Core officially approved at the UA regulation level. The language UAF uses, however, is different from that of the resolution because it includes American Sign Language. Perhaps tabling the motion is the best thing to do.

Franz Meyer noted this is a resolution rather than a motion, so perhaps the language is not as critical. Jennifer responded that the Faculty Senate still needs to have it say what is intended and there needs to be agreement on the details or they will be decided by someone else further down the line.

Cecile L. suggested returning the resolution to Curricular Affairs Committee for further discussion. A motion was then made to table the motion by Julie and seconded by Rainer. Ayes passed tabling the resolution, with one abstention.

- F. Motion to approve a new Graduate Certificate in Science Teaching and Outreach, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 191/12)
The full proposal is posted at:
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2012-13-fs-meetings/#191>

Donie B. brought the motion to the floor, urging its support. The courses for the program exist, and creating the certificate will help graduate students improve their instructional abilities and links to community engagement, as well. Receiving the certificate improves their job worthiness. It’s restricted to graduate students who are already enrolled in natural sciences programs.

Ataur C. asked where the program will be housed, what other departments are involved, and how it will be funded. Jennifer and Donie responded to his questions, noting the information was contained in the

motion. Donie noted that the biology, chemistry and physics faculty involved with the program are in support of it and it's only a modest addition to their workloads. Administrative costs are low because the existing administrator for the biology and wildlife department is willing to take on this one, also.

The motion to approve the new graduate certificate was passed by majority, with one abstention.

VIII Discussion Items

A. Executive Summary of the Electronic Course Evaluation Project

– Franz Meyer (Attachment 191/13)

The full report is posted online at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2012-13-fs-meetings/#191>

Franz Meyer, chair of the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee (FDAI), reported on the committee's findings and what they are recommending be done next. Last October, the FDAI committee and Dr. Eric Madsen began looking at course evaluation systems, seeking to find out what systems were current and state of the art. They analyzed them to assess their fit and applicability to UAF. After their initial research, they met with twelve vendors for one-hour demos to assess what their capabilities were and how well they matched needs at UAF. The demos were broadly advertised to faculty, staff and students to get broad participation across the campus. They got a core group of 9-10 people who attended most of the demos. It included both rural and on-campus faculty, as well as representation from the Provost's Office and OIT. They also had occasional student participation.

The committee formulated a large list of evaluation criteria which they used to get a good sense of how these systems fit UAF. The list was furnished to everyone at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Based on this list, they started analyzing systems between December and April. Franz thanked faculty who attended the demos for their contributions and the time they had invested.

The main finding has been that the course evaluation technology is just one piece of the whole puzzle. They realized they would have a hard time analyzing or selecting technology without also considering the main goal of identifying what they want this technology tool to achieve for them. What kinds of benchmarks need to be used to evaluate faculty, and what sort of indicators will be used to measure whether or not course evaluation is working for them, i.e., response rates, and quality of responses. So, there needs to be a larger discussion around the topic of course evaluation itself before they can move forward on the technology.

The deliverables of the committee's work are comprised in a larger scale report. Within today's meeting agenda is an executive summary of the full report which is posted online. Rather than being merely a report that addresses course evaluation technology, the report is more of a guideline proposing a process to go through when one wishes to re-evaluate the approach to course evaluation.

Franz described in detail the nine main findings and recommendations from the report, summarized as follows:

1. We recommend to formulate a clear understanding of the main purpose(s) of course evaluation at UAF before deciding upon changes in course evaluation technology (see Section 2).
2. If a change in the course evaluation procedure is planned, we recommend to not change technology and question sets at the same time, but instead follow a step-by-step approach.
3. Electronic course evaluation systems have a number of benefits and drawbacks relative to traditional paper-and-pencil technology that need to be carefully analyzed and compared before selecting the most appropriate evaluation technology for UAF (see Section 3.1).

4. While student response rates are an important factor in evaluating the success of a course evaluation system, it is only one of many performance parameters (see Section 3.2).
5. Electronic course evaluation can produce satisfactory student response rates if students are incentivized, if the course evaluation system is easy to use, if faculty and administration actively promote the importance of course evaluation, and if regular reminders of active or upcoming survey periods are provided to faculty and students (see Section 3.3).
6. Nowadays, a large number of highly capable electronic course evaluation systems are available whose capabilities are ever improving (Section 4.3).
7. From our system survey, we conclude that available technology varies widely in aspects including (1) hosted vs. host-yourself solutions, (2) online-only vs. hybrid (paper plus online), (3) University-focused vs. generic survey-focused, and (4) flexible question set vs. fixed survey format. Also the amount of applied data analysis varies widely (see Section 4.3).
8. Three systems were identified that are excellent in their flexibility and functionality and are also well matched with UAF's needs (Section 4.3).
9. We recommend starting a discussion on the development of a culture of course evaluation on campus to improve course evaluation quality independent of evaluation technology.

In short, UAF needs to have a discussion about what course evaluation should do for the university and the faculty using it. Franz thinks there is a disconnect between what people want course evaluation to do and what it is actually capable of doing and how it is implemented at the moment. And many faculty may not realize that there is a disconnect. There needs to be a discussion on that. Faculty need to have a say in every step of this discussion. Any implementation of a system without faculty input and support in the classroom, will fail.

The committee talked with colleagues at UAA and UAS about their systems. They advised that if UAF changed course evaluation strategy, we should use a step-by-step approach. Specifically they advised against changing the question set at the same time a new technology is adopted. Both universities consider that that was a mistake that they made.

The committee came up with a list of the benefits of electronic vs. paper-based systems, both of which have advantages and disadvantages that are worth reviewing and analyzing. The response rate is an important talking point for electronic course evaluation systems. While it's true that some universities have not had high response rates with electronic systems, this is not true at other universities. Rates vary widely, but a high response rate is not necessarily an indicator of the high quality of the responses. In the end, an unbiased assessment of courses is the goal along with quality of the responses and not just a high response rate. An electronic course evaluation system can produce a high response rate under certain conditions. Students must have a stake in the game and be incentivized. Section 3 of the report discusses how course evaluation response rates can be improved independently of the paper or electronic system that is utilized.

There is a wide variety of different technologies out there, serving a broad variety of needs. This makes it important for the selection process to first identify what we want the system to do for UAF. For example, some systems would not be useful in a promotion and tenure process, but would accomplish evaluation of courses or assessment of learning outcomes very well.

The committee recommends that the next steps include a discussion, perhaps led by Faculty Senate, in order to get a consensus on what the goals of course evaluation at UAF should be. Currently, there is strong evidence that we are using course evaluation predominantly for the promotion and tenure review process, and course evaluation and course improvement are more secondary goals. The open-answer

and checkmark systems being used are focused mainly on the faculty promotion and tenure review process. This approach contradicts what existing research shows -- that both faculty and administration in the U.S. think course evaluation goals should be to improve courses and student learning outcomes.

The FDAI Committee and Dr. Eric Madsen will continue their research on course evaluation software. They have selected four promising new systems and will more fully analyze them in the fall. They are discussing the possibility of having larger scale town hall meetings to host demos of the software. Should UAF change its course evaluation strategies, it is important to involve everyone because all are affected. Come to the demos next fall and ask critical questions and make your opinions known. Please participate in this, especially untenured faculty who will be dependent on these systems for their promotion/tenure reviews. The demos and related information will be advertised in the fall.

Cecile L. applauded the huge amount of work done by Franz and the committee. She also expressed support for their recommendations because as a social scientist she knows how powerful the phrasing of a question is. In many ways, the wording and types of questions elicit specific answers. She shared her own experience of using the existing course evaluation system along with a questionnaire on Blackboard that contained questions she had designed. Her questionnaire asked how students used the materials she provided for the courses, and how they made use of the assignments and readings and what they found most helpful. When reading through the comments later, it was as if two completely different sets of people answered the evaluations. There was no similarity between the two instruments and how students responded to the questions focusing on their involvement with the course materials. This anecdotal experience supports what Franz had said about the importance of examining the questions and how they're asked in relation to our goals.

Mike D. asked if doing mid-course evaluations had come up during the committee's discussions. He has found them valuable to learn about what the students are learning during the course and more useful than finding things out after the course is over. Franz said that this topic had come up, and noted it is an advantage of electronically-based evaluations which allow more flexibility in when and how assessments are done. It also came up in terms of incentivizing students to complete course evaluations because they can see that by doing a mid-term evaluation their feedback is valuable and applied to the course. This increases their participation in the process because they benefit from it. All of the systems the committee looked at have the option of mid-term evaluations.

Ataur C. asked about student involvement and feedback in the committee's work. Franz responded that students have been invited regularly throughout what has been done to date, and they will more actively approach the students and invite their participation as the process moves along. He stressed they want participation from faculty, students, staff and administration. He also reiterated that the discussion about what the goals of course evaluation should be for UAF needs to take place first and involve everyone, independently of any decision about the actual system to be used.

Margaret S. commented that as a statistician, she does have concerns about the response rates. She emphasized obtaining unbiased samples of responses particularly if the response rate were low, around 20%, for use with promotion and tenure decisions. She didn't want to see us end up with something as bad as the "rate your professors" type of web sites. She asked to be kept on the email list.

Franz urged everyone to read the full report, and to email Dr. Madsen or himself with any concerns, comments or questions. Jennifer reminded everyone this topic would continue in the Faculty Senate next fall.

B. Report from the General Education Revitalization Committee – Jonathan Rosenberg (Attachment 191/14)

Jonathan R. noted the executive summary from the committee attached to the agenda. He invited comments and questions, noting both Alex Fitts and Cindy Hardy from the committee were also present.

He pointed out there is much more reporting from the committee to come. The executive summary contains a section called *Process and Timetable* which outlines their next steps. GERC will submit a more complete report on GERC findings and recommendations as a discussion item for the first regularly scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate in fall 2013. The report would include more detail about how the new course attributes would be considered and what they would look for in courses that were assigned those attributes; and some alternative scenarios of how students would satisfy the requirements.

Jonathan commented on the length of the committee's progress to date, noting the milestone of two years ago when the LEAP-inspired learning outcomes were adopted by the Faculty Senate. It's been very challenging to create a set of requirements that speak to two different philosophical approaches to general education. The Board of Regents policy contains a more traditional philosophy requiring completion of a certain amount of credits in certain disciplinary areas to attain a breadth of education expected for a baccalaureate education. The LEAP-inspired approach is based upon integration and application of a broad body of knowledge into that education. Therein is the challenge. Also, what BOR policy requires to pass muster as a general education requirement versus, for example, what might fulfill requirements for a designator such as (s) or (h) for the Catalog, can be two very different things. It starts to look very complicated and challenging. But, he thinks they can come up with something that will be the result of a very complicated and challenging process, and which they will eventually present to students as comprehensible and doable.

He pointed out the report heading *UAF Faculty Senate Learning Outcomes and Possible Course / Credit Requirements*, noting it's the "OMG" portion of the report. But, the approach they are taking is to try and find as many ways as possible to satisfy and integrate the LEAP requirements with BOR requirements so students can fulfill them in a timely manner. The GERC has been cognizant of keeping the requirements under 39 credits, and trying to get them down to the 34-credit minimum if possible, as stressed in the GERC faculty survey results from earlier in the year.

GERC's aim at this point is to make this a deliberative, participatory process, bringing it to the faculty at each important decision point without presupposing anything, while staying neutral about any possible "turf battles" that could ensue between departments and programs over enrollments or courses.

Jennifer reiterated that there is nothing to vote on regarding this topic today, urging everyone to review the report.

Rainer N. asked Jonathan about adding a fifth item under the section *Process and Timetable* to be titled "assessment" and Jonathan agreed that would be useful. The new general ed requirements must be assessable. Currently, courses are assessed in the general ed curriculum, but the possibility of assessing the impact of the entire curriculum has eluded them and is one of the underlying goals of the changes being proposed.

Cecile L. observed that any change is bound to elicit the sorts of reactions between programs that were mentioned; but, she is excited about the opportunities that are inherent in this approach because she

thinks it will allow departments to attract students in many different ways instead of just having one core course.

David V. asked if they have had any interactions with units about how this might work for them. Jonathan responded they haven't yet, but that's where the "fun" soon begins. He stressed the details will need to come from the ground up at departments and not be imposed upon anyone.

C. Request for Faculty Senate representative for new Bookstore Advisory Council – Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 191/15)

[This item was picked up later in the meeting after the new Faculty Senate was convened, following Provost Henrichs' remarks.]

David V. read the information provided in Attachment 191/15 about composition and purpose of the Bookstore Advisory Council. Its creation follows the earlier events and missteps of the past several years concerning the bookstore's existence. He encouraged any interested senators to volunteer.

Please email or phone the Faculty Senate Office. Contact info is posted at:
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/>

IX Public Comments/Questions

Sine Anahita, associate professor in Sociology, and coordinator of the Women's and Gender Studies program, and associate director of Northern Studies, spoke to the Faculty Senate in order to notify them about what she thinks are very serious sexual harassment events going on in the *Sun Star* student newspaper. Under Title IX, sexual harassment is forbidden at a university. She mentioned specific instances occurring in the April 2 and April 23 editions of the *Sun Star* to describe the sexual harassment taking place along with the creation of a hostile environment for women, noting it was also a failure of leadership at the *Sun Star*. Title IX requires that the university must take action once they are made aware of sexual harassment occurrences and the creation of a hostile environment for women. She urged the Faculty Senate to take action.

Mike D. asked what action was being requested by Dr. Anahita. She responded that federal law under Title IX requires that the university prohibit sexual harassment, and once it has learned of an incident of sexual harassment that is either severe or pervasive, it must take steps immediately to end the harassment and to effectively manage the situation. She filed a complaint of sexual harassment with the Director of Diversity and Equal Opportunity three weeks ago and they declined to investigate the matter upon advice from General Counsel that the *Sun Star* enjoys unlimited First Amendment rights. Under a system of shared governance, she asks the faculty through Faculty Senate to step up to the plate because this is sexual harassment of our students, staff and faculty, and something should be done about it.

Todd R. asked if any of the students who were named in the paper have made any complaints or filed any grievances. Dr. Anahita responded that she was not aware if any had done so, but under Title IX a person does have to file a complaint. If a hostile environment exists, the university must act even in the absence of a complaint.

Jane W. asked for suggestions of what action to take. Dr. Anahita suggested the education of key administrators about what Title IX requires us to do to end sexual harassment, and a discussion of this in the Faculty Senate.

Jennifer R. thanked Sine Anahita for bringing this to their attention, noting they will take the matter under advisement.

X Governance Reports
A. Staff Council – Juella Sparks

No report was available from Staff Council.

B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag

No report was available from ASUAF.

C. UNAC – Debu Misra
UAFT – Jane Weber

Debu commented in support of shared governance and urged Faculty Senate uphold it. It's very critical that faculty get involved in decision-making and not just pass along decisions made by administration. That is the key to their future well-being and success.

Debu acknowledged that the Faculty Senate will be honoring Jennifer Reynolds' service as president during the meeting, but he also wished to applaud her leadership of Faculty Senate. He noted that because of her efforts, leadership of Faculty Senate has risen to a new level. She has reached out to the faculty and United Academics, providing open forums for more discussions. He asked the Senate to join him in a round of applause, which they did.

Debu said he looks forward to working with incoming President David Valentine next year, and hopes senators get more involved in the decision making processes next year.

Jane W. commented on the Joint Health Care Committee (JHCC), reminding everyone that open enrollment closes on May 15. One thing JHCC is looking at is the use of salary "bands" to determine employee contributions for health care. There will be more news about that in the fall. The committee will meet during the summer.

D. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

Dani shared that the Chancellor has appointed her to another two-year term as Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR). She will also be chairing the Great Northwest Athletic Conference FAR Council as well for the next two years. She invited faculty to give her input over the summer on some of the initiatives she will be pursuing. She expressed her willingness to take faculty input to pass on to student athletes, coaches and the Athletics Department as a whole.

She mentioned that in July the Hockey Conference will be moving from the CCHA to the WCHA. Eight of UAF's ten teams made it to post season play, and six teams made it to the national level. UAF had its first national champion this year in swimming. The men's basketball team beat the reigning national champions, and three basketball team players made it to the Conference all-academic team this year. UAF got the Conference rookie of the year award in volleyball, and the Conference scholar athlete of the year in hockey, and they also had the winner for the Conference coach of the year in men's basketball. She thanked the Faculty Senate for their comments and support over the past year.

XI Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. Announcements

No member announcements were made.

B. Chair Comments / Committee Reports and Year-end Summaries

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry (Attachment 191/16)

Faculty Affairs – Cecile Lardon (Handout)

Unit Criteria – Karen Jensen (Attachment 191/17)

Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber (Attachment 191/18)

Core Review - Jean Richey

Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy
(Attachment 191/19)

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer
(Attachment 191/20)

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte
(Attachment 191/21)

Research Advisory Committee – Jon Dehn (Handout)

XII Award Presentations and Announcements

A. Presentation of the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award

David Valentine read aloud the resolution honoring Cindy Hardy as the outstanding senator of the year, and presented her with the framed OSYA resolution amidst much applause from the Faculty Senate. (The text of the resolution may be found in Attachment 191/3.)

B. Announcement of Usibelli Awards (Attachment 191/22)

Provost Susan Henrichs announced the 2013 Usibelli award winners, along with the nominees. A full list is included as Attachment 191/22.

C. Announcement of Emeriti Faculty Awards (Attachment 191/23)

Provost Henrichs announced the emeriti awardees. The full list is included in the attachment.

D. Recognition of Senate Service

Jennifer and David presented letters of service to members of Faculty Senate who chaired standing, permanent and ad hoc committees this year, as well as to the UNAC representative to Senate, Debu Misra, and to Faculty Athletic Representative Dani Sheppard. A round of applause followed to thank everyone being recognized.

E. Presentation of Recognition of Service for Jennifer Reynolds

David V. read aloud the resolution recognizing Jennifer Reynolds' substantial and outstanding service as President this year. The full resolution is included as Attachment 191/2. A very hearty round of applause followed the reading of the resolution, bringing many members to their feet.

XIII Adjournment of the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate

Before final adjournment, Rainer N. offered a resolution to the Faculty Senate to have the Administrative Committee address the incidents of sexual harassment that Sine Anahita had brought to the Senate's attention earlier, as exemplified in the recent *Sun Star* issues.

RESOLUTION

The UAF Faculty Senate resolves that the Administrative Committee address incidents of sexual harassment at the UAF as exemplified by recent issues of the UAF Sun Star.

Motivation and background

- The Faculty Senate has learned of two offensive articles published in April editions of the UAF student newspaper Sun Star (not an official publication of UAF). A UAF faculty member has charged that these articles constitute sexual harassment.
- Having the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee look into how they might address this matter now rather than in the fall will ensure the matter is not forgotten.

David H. expressed support for the resolution, noting some response was better than no response at all. Cecile L. commented that she was not opposed to doing something, but was not sure what the Administrative Committee could do. Rainer responded that the committee could take the lead in looking into the matter in terms of what might possibly be done to address the matter. Todd R. expressed support for looking into the matter. Cindy H. seconded the resolution and a vote was taken. The resolution was passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:18 PM. A short break followed before the new 2013-14 Faculty Senate was convened.

XIV 2013-2014 Faculty Senate Members Take Their Seats

A. Roll Call of 2013-2014 Members

FS Members Present:	FS Members Absent:
ALBERTSON, Leif (14) – Julie Cascio	BARNES, Bill (15)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (15)	BERGE, Anna (15)
COFFMAN, Chris (15)	CEE, Vincent (14)
COOK, Christine (14)	CHAMBERS, Izetta (14)
CONDE, Mark (15) – Ataur Chowdhury	CHEN, Cheng-fu (14)
DAVIS, Mike (14)	DEHN, Jonathan (15)
DUKE, J. Rob (15)	FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)
FALLEN, Chris (13)	GUSTAFSON, Karen (14)
GIBSON, Georgina (14)	WEBLEY, Peter (14)
HAN, Xiaoqi (15)	WINSOR, Peter (14)
HARDY, Sarah (15)	ZHANG, Xiong (14)
HEALY, Joanne (15)	
HORSTMANN, Lara (15)	
JOHNSON, Galen (15)	
JOHNSTON, DUFF (13)	
JOLY, Julie (15)	
KIELLAND, Knut [KEY-land] (14)	
LARDON, Cecile (15)	
LOVECRAFT, Amy (15)	
MARR, Wayne (14)	
MCCARTNEY, Leslie (15)	
MEYER, Franz (15)	
MISRA, Debu (15)	
MOSER, Dennis (14)	
NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)	
RADENBAUGH, Todd (13)	
SHALLCROSS, Leslie (15)	
SHORT, Margaret (15)	
VALENTINE, Dave (14)	
WEBER, Jane (14)	
WINFREE, Cathy (15)	
YARIE, John (14)	

B President's Remarks – David Valentine

David thanked the returning and new members for their willingness to serve on Faculty Senate. It's an important and worthwhile job, and he guaranteed that if effort is put into performing the job, they will agree with him about that.

The Faculty Senate web site was mentioned for accessing agendas, minutes and other important items of information. <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate>

David noted that the committees are really where most of the work of the Senate gets done. Each Senator will be assigned to one committee, generally speaking, and this is where their help is needed the most. The monthly Senate meetings ratify the work that comes out of the committees. He urged Senators to put time and energy into their committee assignments. Committee conveners will be notified soon of their assignments, and they will convene their members in the fall. Chair elections will be held once committees are convened.

David announced that Mike Davis has some Alaska state budget information for anyone interested. Meet with him after today's meeting has concluded.

C. President-Elect's Remarks – Cecile Lardon

Over this past semester, as she's paid closer attention to what Jennifer and David do in consideration of taking on the role of president-elect, Cecile remarked that her appreciation for the complexity of the leadership roles in Faculty Senate has grown, whether one is participating as a senator, or committee chair, or other leadership role. She's excited about the opportunities and challenges coming to them next year. She reiterated David's thoughts about taking the committee work seriously and being informed organizational citizens making smart decisions about our present and future. She looks forward to working with everyone.

David added a comment he meant to make earlier, to express his appreciation for the work done by Jayne Harvie to support the functions of Faculty Senate. He urged the new Senate to pay attention to all the emails they will be receiving from Jayne!

XV Remarks by Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs welcomed all the returning and new members and expressed her appreciation for all the work done by Faculty Senators. She particularly expressed her appreciation for President David Valentine and President-Elect Cecile Lardon, noting how time-consuming and important their roles are on behalf of the Senate.

Provost Henrichs mentioned two issues that Senate will be working on next year which are close to her heart in terms of being vital to the university. The first is the revitalization of the General Education Requirements which are now more than 25 years old and ripe for adaptation to the changes in the nation, the world and, of course, the university. She appreciates the thoughtful work done thus far, and, hopes what is produced will also stand the university in good stead for many years as has the Core Curriculum. She acknowledged that thoughtful and productive progress in this effort will take time.

The second item she is very interested in is the preliminary assessment of the outcomes of the course evaluation systems. Student assessment of instruction is a very important component of the evaluation of faculty as well as being an important source of feedback to faculty for improving instruction. She

believes both functions of student assessment of instruction are important and hopes an instrument or instruments can be found that will help satisfy both purposes very well.

David brought up the Bookstore Advisory Council discussion item that was overlooked at the earlier meeting. (See notes at item VIII.C above.)

XVI New Senate Business

- A. Motion to Approve the 2013-2014 UAF Faculty Senate Meeting Calendar, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 191/24)

The motion to approve the 2013-14 meeting calendar was passed unanimously with no objection.

- B. Motion to Authorize the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate during the summer months, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 191/25)

David explained the function of this motion to provide representation for the Faculty Senate over the summer months while many are off contract. He noted the issue on point about looking into the *Sun Star* sexual harassment incidents that were brought up today. The motion was passed unanimously.

- C. Status of 2013-2014 Faculty Senate Committees – David Valentine

David reported on the status of the Faculty Senate committees. Their composition is mostly done; however, he and Cecile are waiting on some answers to emails sent to some members who are out of town. He hopes that they will be able to email everyone with the results before they go off contract.

Debu M. commented that he will be wearing two hats next year, both as a Senator and UNAC representative. If there is a conflict of interest, he will request someone else be the UNAC representative.

XVII Adjournment

The 2013-14 Faculty Senate was adjourned at 3:43PM.

ATTACHMENT 191/1
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

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

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

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

ATTACHMENT 191/2
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

RECOGNITION OF SERVICE BY JENNIFER REYNOLDS

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds has served the UAF Faculty Senate for ten years in a manner deserving of the UAF Faculty Senate's highest admiration and respect; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds worked tirelessly to promote participation by UAF Faculty in shared governance of the University; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds served as Senator to the UAF Faculty Senate from 2003-2005, as an Alternate from 2006-2008, and again as Senator from 2008-2009 through 2010-2011; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds served on the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee as a member in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds served as chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee from 2009-2010 and 2010-2011; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds served on the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee as a member from 2009-2010 through 2010-2011, and served as chair in 2011-2012; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds served as a member of the UAF Governance Coordinating Committee from 2011-2012 through 2012-2013; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds served as President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate in 2011-2012; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds served as President of the UAF Faculty Senate in 2012-2013, bringing exceptional leadership, unflagging energy, persevering dedication, and absolute commitment to the work, and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds effectively advocated for UAF Faculty and programs as a member of the UA Faculty Alliance from 2010-2011 through 2012-2013, notably with her work on the e-lab task force; and

WHEREAS, Jennifer Reynolds worked strategically and effectively on behalf of UAF Faculty on the UAF Planning and Budget Committee from 2010-2011 through 2012-2013; and

WHEREAS, as a direct result of Jennifer Reynolds's leadership, the Faculty Senate has made excellent progress on a variety of issues and has had substantial positive impacts on UAF; and

WHEREAS, The UAF Faculty Senate wishes to acknowledge the truly outstanding service rendered the Faculty and the University by the work of Jennifer Reynolds as she concludes her term as President; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate acknowledges the many contributions of Jennifer Reynolds and expresses its appreciation for her exemplary service.

**OUTSTANDING SENATOR OF THE YEAR AWARD
FOR
ACADEMIC YEAR 2013**

WHEREAS, Cynthia Hardy has served as an alternate senator for many years and was appointed to a full senate seat in April 2012, and

WHEREAS, Cynthia Hardy has served on the Student Academic Development & Achievement (SADA) Committee since 1993, and

WHEREAS, Cynthia Hardy has served as chair or co-chair of the SADA Committee since 1997, and

WHEREAS, under Cynthia Hardy's leadership, the SADA Committee has actively worked to improve developmental education and students' long-term success, and

WHEREAS, , Cynthia Hardy served on the Curricular Affairs Committee, acting as liaison with the SADA Committee, and

WHEREAS, Cynthia Hardy has consistently and actively contributed to the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee, providing valuable assistance to Senate leadership in handling matters both routine and extraordinary, and

WHEREAS, Cynthia Hardy served as Senate liaison with the General Education Revitalization Committee (GERC), providing an important channel of communication between GERC and the Faculty Senate, and

WHEREAS, Cynthia Hardy engaged actively in GERC, including attending a Faculty Alliance general education workshop in Anchorage and agreeing to serve as a UAF representative on the Faculty Alliance General Education Learning Outcomes Committee; and

WHEREAS, Cynthia Hardy consistently and strongly advocates for the best interests of students, and

WHEREAS, Cynthia Hardy consistently is well prepared, takes a thoughtful and well-reasoned approach to issues under discussion, and maintains an open mind to new information, and

WHEREAS, Cynthia Hardy consistently sets an outstanding example of a committed senator; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the UAF Faculty Senate recognizes Cynthia Hardy as Outstanding Senator of the Year for Academic Year 2012-2013.

RESOLUTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends that the process of post-tenure performance review of UNAC-represented faculty be modified to eliminate levels of review above that of the dean in cases where both the unit peer committee and the dean have judged the performance to be satisfactory. Review by a university-wide committee and by the Provost should be required if either the unit peer committee or the dean rates performance as unsatisfactory in two of the three areas (teaching, research, service), or if either rates performance as unsatisfactory in one area if that area is the main part of the faculty member's workload.

RATIONALE: According to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University of Alaska and United Academics, in effect between January 01, 2011 - December 31, 2013: "The post-tenure review process is generally intended to be a formative rather than a summative process of faculty evaluation, focused on faculty development. It is not intended to be the equivalent of the probationary evaluation of tenure track faculty. At the same time the process should review and encourage progress toward promotion where applicable, ongoing development, scholarship and productivity." The post-tenure reviews also serve to identify faculty whose performance is unsatisfactory. The CBA states that "Unit members who receive an unsatisfactory comprehensive post-tenure review shall be ineligible for market and merit salary adjustments until they receive a satisfactory outcome in a subsequent post-tenure review."

The current system of full university-wide review of post-tenure files by a committee of full professors is costly in terms of effort, yet for several reasons these university-wide reviews are useful in only a small number of cases. First, approximately 35 post-tenure reviews are conducted each year at UAF and typically just 0-3 are rated unsatisfactory overall. This low number is expected in light of the fact that tenured faculty have already undergone rigorous review for tenure and promotion, and nearly all continue a high level of performance after tenure. Second, for the stated purpose of faculty development, the portions of the post-tenure reviews that are most useful to the faculty are the reviews at unit peer and dean levels. Third, the need for a university-wide review committee composed of full professors draws experienced faculty away from the university-wide committees on 4th Year Reviews and Promotion & Tenure, where their advice would be more effective.

To fulfill the purpose of post-tenure review, in most cases review by a unit peer committee and the dean will be sufficient. Review by a university-wide committee and the Provost can be reserved for cases in which the results at those levels indicate a possible unsatisfactory rating overall, without compromising the goal of post-tenure review. Results at the unit peer and dean rankings can be used to identify these files. The recommended trigger of an unsatisfactory rating in two of three areas (teaching, research, service) or an unsatisfactory rating in the main area of the faculty member's workload, by either the unit peer committee or the dean, is based on UAF experience. Focusing on these files would be a more productive use of university resources and would not compromise the purpose of post-tenure review.

Modification of the post-tenure review process will require a change in the CBA because the current CBA requires that comprehensive post-tenure review must include review by MAU Peer Review Committees (at UAF, the university-wide review committees).

The Faculty Senate resolution will be forwarded to the UAF administration and to United Academics. We will request that Labor Relations negotiate an MOA to permit this change under the current CBA, and also request that the change be incorporated into the next CBA.

TABLED MOTION FROM MEETING 186:

The UAF Faculty Senate agrees to discontinuation of the PhD Degree in Mathematics.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE: During the 2010-2011 program review process, the Faculty Program Review Committee recommended that the Ph.D. in Mathematics be continued, but stated “DMS should investigate ways to increase this number [of students] or make clear the reasons for the continuation of this program.” The Administration Program Review Committee and the Chancellor's Cabinet recommended the Ph.D. in Mathematics program be discontinued. The Mathematics Department (which administers this degree) appealed that recommendation, but the appeal was denied by the Chancellor's Cabinet on the grounds that there was no evidence that enrollment would increase or other compelling reasons for continuation.

Background and Information:

There was total of only two Ph.D. in Mathematics graduates during the period from FY06 to present. Enrollment was 7 in FY06, but since then has ranged between 0 and 3 students. As shown below, there has been zero enrollment for a year. Of the students enrolled in 2009-10, two graduated and the other student is not expected to return.

Program Review Enrollment Data

Degree and major sought:	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
PHD					
Mathematics	7	2	3	3	2

Enrollment in the Mathematics Ph.D. Program by semester, 2009-present

Program	Su09	Fa09	Sp10	Su10	Fa10	Sp11	Su11	Fa11	Sp12	Su12	Fa12*
PHD	1	2	1	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	0

*As of October 25, 2012.

Additional factors are that the faculty member who has served as major professor for all recent Ph.D. students has left UAF, and that the program has persistently had low enrollment and graduates. During the previous program review period the enrollment had increased from zero (Fall 1999) to six (Fall 2004), but there were no doctoral degrees awarded. So, over the last 13 years there has been a total of only two graduates. The Program Review conducted in 2005-06 concluded in part:

“We also support continuing the Ph.D. program for the next review period, but it will be subject to a serious re-evaluation in 2010. Several questions that must be addressed at that time are (1) Has a broader group of faculty, especially including some of the recent hires, begun advising Ph.D. students? (2) Has an enrollment of about 5-10 students been sustained? (3) Have a reasonable fraction of the students admitted before 2007 completed their

degrees? (4) Have these students had successful outcomes, e.g., employment in their field, publication in peer-reviewed journals, etc.? Negative answers to most of these questions will probably result in termination of the program, or at least, suspension of admissions until a more favorable climate exists.”

Discontinuation of this program will have little effect on other programs, personnel, students, or budget. The department will be freed from administrative requirements of student learning outcomes assessment and program review. The vacant faculty position can be refilled to focus on other department needs. There are currently no students enrolled in this program, and admissions have been suspended pending Faculty Senate action. Therefore, the program can be discontinued immediately and does not require a teach out period.

ATTACHMENT 191/6
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate supports continuation of the PhD Degree in Mathematics on the condition that the Department of Mathematics and Statistics (DMS) submits annual reports to the Faculty Senate and to the Provost demonstrating success in meeting the intent and milestones of its plan ("Revitalizing the Mathematics Ph.D. Program at UAF"), submitted to the Faculty Senate and attached here. These reports are to be submitted by the Program Review document deadline established by the Provost; in 2013, the report is due on December 2. This condition will continue until the program's next formal Program Review, currently scheduled for 2015-16.

EFFECTIVE: Spring 2013

RATIONALE: During the 2010-2011 program review process, the Faculty Program Review Committee recommended that the Ph.D. in Mathematics be continued, but stated "DMS should investigate ways to increase this number [of students] or make clear the reasons for the continuation of this program." The Administration Program Review Committee and the Chancellor's Cabinet recommended the Ph.D. in Mathematics program be discontinued. DMS (which administers this degree) appealed that recommendation, but the appeal was denied by the Chancellor's Cabinet on the grounds that there was no evidence that enrollment would increase or other compelling reasons for continuation.

Program Review stipulates that the Faculty Senate must act on program deletion. Pursuant to this, a motion to delete the PhD Degree in Mathematics was made at Meeting 186 (November 5, 2012) and tabled pending development and receipt of a revitalization plan with identified goals and benchmarks. It was tabled first until the March 4, 2013 meeting, then again until the May 6, 2013 meeting. DMS has submitted a revitalization plan (attached) that the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee deems an adequate basis for recommending against program deletion at this time and for conditional program continuation.

Plan from the Department of Mathematics and Statistics:

To Whom it May Concern:

Enclosed please find a draft plan for 'Revitalizing the Mathematics Ph.D. program' at UAF. This plan has been drawn up over the course of several months, in consultation with the Provost and CNSM Dean, who support our revitalization plan at this time. The expectation is that more faculty members will be involved in supervising Ph.D. students in the future, and that enrollment numbers will grow.

MATHEMATICS PH.D. REVITALIZATION PROPOSAL

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics proposes the following plan for revitalizing its Ph.D. Program. We outline a new path for students through the program, we present clear goals for a successful program, and we develop milestones for determining its viability and success.

CONTEXT OF UAF'S MATHEMATICS PH.D.

Mathematics is a foundational discipline that contributes to many fields, and an institutional strength in it is a resource for the entire university. Having a Ph.D. program in Mathematics realizes UAF's vision of integrating teaching and research. Strong research universities that do not offer a Math Ph.D. are rare, or nonexistent, in the U.S. Of the 2012 UAF Equivalent Peer Group institutions, 9 of 11 have a Ph.D. program in Mathematics. All 9 of UAF's Aspirational Peers have a Mathematics Ph.D. program. If the program were deleted, Alaska would be one of only 2 states (with Maine) with no institution offering a Math Ph.D.

The opportunity to train graduate students is important for recruiting and retaining a strong faculty. The department currently has a number of members with strong national and international reputations, and UAF should seek to preserve and build on this strength. DMS personnel collaborate with those in other departments and institutes, and a weakening of the math faculty will have impacts across the full university.

Other institutions maintain Math Ph.D. programs with enrollments similar to UAF's recent enrollments. In general, mathematics Ph.D. programs are smaller than their counterparts in the lab sciences, and research papers are often single-authored or co-authored by a small number of people. Large numbers of graduate students are not necessary for faculty research. Enrollment figures for comparable institutions are given in Table 1 at the end of this document¹, and show UAF's degree production compares favorably with many other low-population state institutions.

CURRENT STATUS

In Spring 2013, the math graduate program has no enrolled or admitted Ph.D. students, and 9 enrolled M.S. students (3 of whom are expected to graduate this year; 1 of whom is expected to lose funding due to inadequate performance; 2 of whom are self-funded; 3 of whom are expected to graduate in 2014). Admission to the Ph.D. program is currently suspended, and M.S. admissions for Fall 2013 are underway. Thus, DMS is in the position of rebuilding the Ph.D. program from relatively low overall graduate enrollment.

Of the 10 full-time tripartite faculty in math, 6 are committed to rebuilding the Ph.D. (Allman, Avdonin, Berman, Rhodes, Rybkin, Williams); the others are either strongly opposed, or not interested. All, however, support the M.S. program and are interested in increasing its size. This plan is designed, therefore, to not require the participation of those faculty who wish to 'opt out' of Ph.D. involvement, but to try to use broad support for a larger program to support growth of the Ph.D.

Date: April 23, 2013.

¹Data for most universities include faculty in statistics and math education despite the fact they do not supervise math Ph.D.s since faculty figures are compiled only by department by the American Mathematical Society. Two of the three most productive schools (Oregon, N. Dakota) have separate statistics departments, and thus their productivity figure is inflated relative to other schools.

VITALITY GOALS

In the long term, we want to admit 1 to 2 students each year who intend to pursue a Ph.D. at UAF. Some of these students may not yet have a M.S. degree, so following current departmental rules, they will be formally admitted into the M.S. program. However, they will be internally tracked as “M.S./Ph.D.” students, so that it is clear that they intend to pursue a Ph.D. There will, of course, be some attrition, so that we envision eventually graduating approximately 2 students every 3 years. This means that at any point, the number of Ph.D. students in the program who are post M.S. will be approximately 4, spread among the interested faculty. (This is based on an expected completion time of 4-6 years post M.S.²)

This will necessarily require that multiple faculty members are advising both Ph.D. students and masters students. Six faculty members are committed to both active recruiting and Ph.D. advising of students with interests in their research areas.

Given that the first admission to the program cannot be before Fall 2014, we can hope to graduate our first Ph.D. student no earlier than Spring 2018 (assuming the student enters with an M.S. degree and progresses quickly through the program). Graduating our first student in Spring 2019 or Spring 2020 is a more realistic expectation.

To have an effective program, we need to:

- (1) Recruit effectively;
- (2) Have a clear plan for allowing students to progress through the program, and for recognizing when students are not making adequate progress;
- (3) Be able to provide adequate funding to students for program completion;
- (4) Assess the effectiveness of the program.

RECRUITMENT

Graduate student recruitment has been difficult for DMS. Faculty have not broadly considered this an individual expectation, nor have we taken effective departmental actions. With the strong efforts of several faculty excepted, we have simply hoped applications would materialize. This needs to change, for both the M.S. and Ph.D. programs, and a sustained effort to draw good students must be made. While we will attempt to recruit Ph.D. students specifically, we will also focus on recruiting more M.S. students. We hope for a mix of students who apply committed to a Ph.D., and other students who decide to continue toward a Ph.D. after successful completion of a M.S.

Specific steps to recruit students to the Ph.D. program may include:

- (1) Use of e-mail list servers, such as those of Project NeXT list or MAA sections, to reach faculty with a strong teaching interests across the country. (A trial attempt at this, timed to reach students who may not have been admitted to their first choice programs, generated 3 M.S. applicants within a few days.)
- (2) Mailings to smaller liberal arts colleges, especially in the Pacific Northwest and other northern states like Minnesota and Maine, to attract applicants who might not have considered UAF, but might find a smaller program a better fit for them.
- (3) Letters to undergraduate universities of recent graduates, emphasizing the program’s effectiveness with their former students, and encouraging new applications.

²See 2003 NSF data, Tables 3 and 4 from <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/infbrief/nsf06312/> which lists median Registered Time to Degree for Carnegie-classified research institutions as 6.8 - 7 years in mathematics, with average of 6.9 years for students who are primarily supported by teaching assistantships, which is the case in DMS. Aggregate median registered time to degree for all physical sciences, including mathematics, was 6.7 years in 2011, available at <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/2011/pdf/tab31.pdf>, but registered time to degree for mathematics specifically does not appear to be easily available.

- (4) Improving the DMS Web page, focusing on the goal of recruitment of students.
- (5) Mailings and visits to US universities that have MS programs in mathematics, but no Ph.D., to recruit recent graduates.
- (6) Leveraging faculty contacts at individual foreign institutions (e.g., UNAM–Morelia, Mexico, University of New Brunswick–Fredericton, Canada, University of Tasmania, University of Canterbury, etc.) to encourage more well-prepared foreign applicants.
- (7) Have individual faculty members send targeted emails to colleagues who work in fields related to the faculty member’s area of research, soliciting students who are interested in working in that field, and following up with calls to interested students who apply.
- (8) Meeting with personnel from the Office of Admissions and CNSM to discuss other ways to enhance recruiting.

REVISED PROGRAM FOR PH.D. STUDY

The current Ph.D. requirements, which were designed to reach an acceptable consensus across the full department (including those opposed to the program) are modeled more on those of much larger math departments, and are not practical for our size.

We propose two related paths, one for students who already have a M.S. and one for students who are entering the program directly, without a M.S.

M.S./Ph.D. students (admitted without an M.S. in mathematics).

Year 1: Take masters-level courses. Form interim program committee. Take a M.S. comprehensive exam at the end of the first year.

Year 2: Continue to take courses. Identify a broad proposed area of study through the Ph.D., and form M.S/Ph.D. program committee. Passing all required M.S. comprehensive exams by the end of year two is required. Take one (of two) Ph.D. subject exams, as designed by program committee, and pass it to be guaranteed of funding for year three. (One exam should focus on the intended area of research, and one on either a broader or distinct area.) Typically, earn a M.S. degree.

Year 3: Pass both Ph.D. exams by the end of year three, and if not done already, earn a M.S. degree. Failure to meet these milestones results in withdrawal of funding.

Year 4: Develop a detailed proposal for dissertation research and present it to the committee, in order to advance to candidacy. If a student does not advance to candidacy by the end of the year 5, then funding will be withdrawn.

Years 4 – 6: Do individual research towards the dissertation, in consultation with the student’s advisor and committee. Defend the dissertation. Assuming available funding, students would be guaranteed support for years 4 and 5, and then must demonstrate adequate progress to be eligible for funding for a sixth year.

Ph.D. students admitted with an M.S. degree in mathematics.

Year 1: Take graduate courses in the student’s proposed area of study. Form Ph.D. program committee. Take a Ph.D. exam (one of two), and pass it to be guaranteed of funding for year two.

Year 2: Pass both Ph.D. exams by the end of year two. Failure to meet these milestones results in withdrawal of funding.

Year 3: Develop a detailed proposal for dissertation research and present it to the committee, in order to advance to candidacy. If a student does not advance to candidacy by the end of year 4, then funding will be withdrawn.

Years 3 – 5: Do individual research towards the dissertation, in consultation with the student’s advisor and committee. Defend the dissertation. Assuming available funding and adequate progress, students would be guaranteed support for years 3 and 4, and then must demonstrate adequate progress to be eligible for funding for a fifth year.

FUNDING

Expanding the mathematics graduate program at the M.S. level and revitalizing the Ph.D. program will require funding a larger number of students than in the past. Nationally, the overwhelming majority of mathematics graduate students are supported by TA-ships through their entire programs, and we must expect to do so as well. Despite a tightening budget at UAF, CNSM Dean Paul Layer is working with us to increase graduate enrollments in DMS. We believe we can expand student funding through the following mixture of approaches.

- (1) More active involvement of graduate students in teaching, including online and summer courses, and low level (precalculus) courses: DMS uses a very large number of adjunct faculty, and qualified individuals are difficult to find. With adequate training, and possibly reconfiguring some course delivery, we can use more advanced graduate students to offset some of the need, with salary savings partially offsetting TA costs. On-line courses have generally poor student success rates, and graduate student involvement in support may help us address this persistent problem.
- (2) Attracting graduate students from countries which provide financial support for study in the US: Many countries, especially those that are rapidly developing, (such as Kazakhstan, Mexico, Turkey and some others), are eager to send students to US universities, and provide full support.
- (3) Individual research grants: Although RA-ships tied to faculty grants are less common in mathematics than in the sciences, there is potential for some faculty to fund students in this way (as has been done in DMS in the past). For students working on interdisciplinary topics, there is also potential to tie support to grants to faculty outside of DMS.
- (4) External grants to the department to support graduate students: There are a number of federal programs to support graduate students that the department can apply for, e.g. GAANN (US Dept. of Education), S-STEM (NSF), and LSAMP (NSF). We know of other mathematics departments that have successfully used these to expand their graduate programs. While we probably cannot be competitive until we have a few students in the Ph.D. program, in the longer term we can be.
- (5) Joint supervision of Ph.D. students with other universities: It is not uncommon nationally for students to study at several different universities during their graduate program. Under such an arrangement, students are usually supported by a TA-ship at each university during their time there. When appropriate for the student, this would both reduce our need to provide support, and give the student opportunities unavailable at UAF because of the size of our department.

MILESTONES AND ASSESSMENT

We propose the following goals:

Year 1:

- Recruit for Ph.D. students
- Admit 1 – 2 Ph.D. students (that is, students who have the intention of pursuing a Ph.D., although we may admit them into the M.S. program)

Year 2:

- Recruit for Ph.D. students
- Admit 1 – 2 Ph.D. students (that is, students who have the intention of pursuing a Ph.D., although we may admit them into the M.S. program)

- If possible, administer a Ph.D. exam

Year 3:

- Recruit for Ph.D. students
- Admit 1 – 2 Ph.D. students (that is, students who have the intention of pursuing a Ph.D., although we may admit them into the M.S. program)
- If possible, administer Ph.D. exams
- Ideally, approve a dissertation research proposal and advance a student to candidacy

Year 4:

- Recruit for Ph.D. students
- Admit 1 – 2 Ph.D. students (that is, students who have the intention of pursuing a Ph.D., although we may admit them into the M.S. program)
- Administer Ph.D. exams
- Advance a student to candidacy, if possible

Long-term: Graduate the equivalent of 2 Ph.D.s every 3 years.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1. Enrollments in Mathematics Ph.D. programs for UA Equivalent Peer Group 2012
(All members for which data was available are shown.)

	Tenure-track faculty in Math Dept. (includes math/stats/math edu- cation in most cases)	Math Ph.D.s in most recent 3-year period	Annual math Ph.Ds/faculty
UAF	15	2	0.044
U. of Hawaii at Manoa	27	2	0.025
Idaho State*	17	2	0.039
University of Idaho*	17	2	0.039
Montana State*	27	5	0.062
U. of Nevada, Las Vegas	29	3	0.034
New Mexico State*	23	11	0.159
U. of New Mexico	27	2	0.025
North Dakota State*	17	6	0.118
Oregon State*	25	12	0.160
U. of South Dakota	20	1	0.017
Utah State*	26	3	0.038
U. of Vermont	24	4	0.056
U. of Wyoming*	25	4	0.05

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new minor in Dispute Resolution (housed in the Justice Department of the College of Liberal Arts).

Effective: Fall 2013

Rationale: With high student interest and department support, this new minor is a practical addition to the Justice Program. See the program proposal #194-UNP on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Overview:

The minor in Dispute Resolution will provide students with a theoretical background for and practice of alternative dispute resolution. The curriculum will support the developing restorative justice emphasis of the B.A. of Justice, as well as being applicable to business administration, social work, psychology and counseling contexts. The core of the minor (JUST F201, JUST F302, JUST F403, and JUST F405) introduce students to concepts involved with dispute resolution systems and restorative practices, provide theoretical background, and have students apply the concepts and skills associated with dispute resolution practices. The electives for the minor (JUST F315 and JUST F401) look at application of the practices to two separate settings: corrections and cross cultural conflict.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

Minor in Dispute Resolution

1. Complete the following requirements:
JUST F201, Dispute Resolution and Restorative Practices (3 Credits)
JUST F302, Dispute Systems Design (3 Credits)
JUST F403, Law and Science of Arbitration (3 Credits)
JUST F405, Clinic in Mediation, Conferencing and Circle Practices (3 Credits)
2. Complete one of the following:
JUST F315, Correctional Counseling and Rehabilitation (3 Credits)*
JUST F401, Cross Cultural Conflict Analysis and Intervention (3 Credits)
“C-” grade or better is required in Minor courses.
400 level courses require Junior standing, but this may be waived by the instructor.

*JUST F315 requires JUST F310. For non-Justice Majors, taking JUST F401 avoids this extra course.

Relationship to the Purposes of the University:

In addition to the Justice professions, business organizations, human relations departments are realizing the need for employees possessing the knowledge and skills to resolve disputes arising within and without the organization. The Minor in Dispute Resolution will aid the State in developing a workforce that is able to work efficiently and cohesively. The minor is particularly well suited to supplement the education of Psychology, Social Work and Communication majors. The Justice Department faculty have spoken with faculty from those disciplines and received enthusiastic support for the creation of the minor. The Department also met with a focus group of Justice majors to query them as to the type of courses they would prefer to see created; restorative justice and dispute resolution courses were high on the list. Justice undergraduate courses are generally fully enrolled, and the courses for the proposed minor will also serve as electives for Justice majors. Thus, it is anticipated that the courses for the new minor will experience full enrollments.

ATTACHMENT 191/8
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate agrees to the discontinuation of the Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement (housed in the College of Liberal Arts, Northern Studies Department).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014

RATIONALE: The Northern Studies Department cites lack of student demand and lack of program and faculty resources as reasons they wish to discontinue this program. The School of Management's Northern Leadership Center has been in contact with the Northern Studies Department about this discontinuation, and the Northern Leadership Center will be undertaking development of a new minor in Leadership.

Background and Information:

The program was built on introductory and capstone courses within Northern Studies and electives taught by the Political Science and History departments and Rural Development Program. Subsequently the Minor was required for the Bachelors in Emergency Management, but the School of Management no longer requires the Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement.

Northern Studies has had so few students taking the minor (with none in the past few years) that deleting the program will not affect History, Political Science or Rural Development. It will take a program off the books that has not been in demand for several years.

The last time the introductory course was taught, the instructor was not paid for teaching it. The capstone course was taught five times as an individual study. Deleting the minor recognizes the reality that there is no demand for this program as presently constituted and CLA and Northern Studies do not have the capital or human resources to devote to this program.

The last time a student graduated with this minor was in 2008. While the faculty associated with the program had envisioned the program would grow and they would receive additional funding to deliver it, this never materialized.

ATTACHMENT 191/9
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the revised Unit Criteria for the Fisheries Division of the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013
 Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the SFOS Fisheries Division. Revisions were agreed upon by the department representatives and the Unit Criteria Committee, and the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

**UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY:
INITIAL APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, REAPPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION, TENURE, AND SABBATICAL LEAVE
AND
FISHERIES DIVISION UNIT CRITERIA
STANDARDS AND INDICES**

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS (BOR) CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY DEVELOPED FOR USE IN EVALUATING FACULTY IN THE FISHERIES DIVISION OF THE SCHOOL OF FISHERIES AND OCEAN SCIENCES. CAPITALIZED TEXT REFLECTS ADDITIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO UAF REGULATION. THESE UNIT CRITERIA ARE FOR USE IN THE ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY AS WELL AS PROMOTION AND TENURE.

**CHAPTER I
Purview**

The University of Alaska Fairbanks document, "Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies", supplements the Board of Regents policies and describes the purpose, conditions, eligibility, and other specifications relating to the evaluation of faculty at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). Contained herein are regulations and procedures to guide the evaluation processes and to identify the bodies of review appropriate for the university.

The University, through the UAF Faculty Senate, may change or amend these regulations and procedures from time to time and will provide adequate notice in making changes and amendments.

These regulations shall apply to all of the units within the University of Alaska Fairbanks, except in so far as extant collective bargaining agreements apply otherwise.

The provost is responsible for coordination and implementation of matters relating to procedures stated herein.

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment

Minimum degree, experience, and performance requirements are set forth in “UAF Faculty Policies,” Chapter IV. Exceptions to these requirements for initial placement in academic rank or special academic rank positions shall be submitted to the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee for approval prior to a final selection decision.

B. Academic Titles

Academic titles must reflect the discipline in which the faculty are appointed.

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank

Deans or schools and colleges, and directors when appropriate, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit shall establish procedures for advertisement, review and selection of candidates to fill any vacant faculty position. These procedures are set by UAF Human Resources and the Campus Diversity and Compliance (AA/EEO) office and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators as a unit.

D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

Deans and/or directors, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit, shall establish procedures for advertisement, review, and selection of candidates to fill any faculty positions as they become available. Such procedures shall be consistent with the university's stated AA/EEO policies and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators in the unit.

E. Following the Selection Process

The dean or director shall appoint the new faculty member and advise him/her of the conditions, benefits, and obligations of the position. If the appointment is to be at the professor level, the dean/director must first obtain the concurrence of the chancellor or chancellor's designee.

F. Letter of Appointment

The initial letter of appointment shall specify the nature of the assignment, the percentage emphasis that is to be placed on each of the parts of the faculty responsibility, mandatory year of tenure review, and any special conditions relating to the appointment.

This letter of appointment establishes the nature of the position and, while the percentage of emphasis for each part may vary with each workload distribution as specified in the annual workload agreement document, the part(s) defining the position may not.

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

Criteria outlined in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV, evaluators may consider, but shall not be limited to, whichever of the following are appropriate to the faculty member's professional obligation: mastery of subject matter; effectiveness in teaching; achievement in research, scholarly, and creative activity; effectiveness of public service; effectiveness of university service; demonstration of professional development and quality of total contribution to the university.

For purposes of evaluation at UAF, the total contribution to the university and activity in the areas outlined above will be defined by relevant activity and demonstrated competence from the following areas: 1) effectiveness in teaching; 2) achievement in scholarly activity; and 3) effectiveness of service, INCLUDING CURATION.

Bipartite Faculty

Bipartite faculty are regular academic rank faculty who fill positions that are designated as performing two of the three parts of the university's tripartite responsibility.

The dean or director of the relevant college/school shall determine which of the criteria defined above apply to these faculty. Bipartite faculty may voluntarily engage in a tripartite function, but they will not be required to do so as a condition for evaluation, promotion, or tenure.

B. Criteria for Instruction

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities.

1. Effectiveness in Teaching

Evidence of excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, evidence of the various characteristics that define effective teachers. EFFECTIVE TEACHING ENABLES LEARNERS TO GAIN KNOWLEDGE AND /OR SKILLS.

EFFECTIVE TEACHERS:

- a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for THEIR students;
- b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students, show interest/enthusiasm for the subjects BEING TAUGHT;
- c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are sensitive to student diversity;
- d. emphasize regular feedback to students and reward student learning success;
- e. demonstrate content mastery, discuss current information and divergent points of view, relate topics to other disciplines, deliver material at AN appropriate level;

IN ADDITION, EFFECTIVE TEACHERS WILL DEMONSTRATE SOME, BUT NOT NECESSARILY ALL, OF THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS IN AN INDIVIDUAL YEAR:

- a. regularly develop new courses, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design;
- b. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching;
- c. SUCCESSFULLY MENTOR GRADUATE STUDENTS;
- d. MAY WRITE TEXT BOOKS, TEXTBOOK CHAPTERS, OR ARTICLES ON TEACHING METHODS, DEVELOP CASE STUDIES, ORGANIZE TEACHING WORKSHOPS, OR PREPARE COURSE MODULES FOR BROAD DISTRIBUTION.

2. Components of Evaluation

Effectiveness in teaching will be evaluated through information on formal and informal teaching, course and curriculum material, recruiting and advising, training/guiding graduate students, etc., provided by:

- a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms,
and at least two of the following:
- b. narrative self-evaluation,
- c. peer/department chair classroom observation(s),
- d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials.

TEACHING IS AN IMPORTANT ROLE OF FISHERIES DIVISION FACULTY. FACULTY MEMBERS DISCHARGE THEIR RESPONSIBILITY BY TEACHING FORMAL COURSES, ADVISING UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS, DIRECTING INDEPENDENT STUDIES (497 OR 697), SUPERVISING EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING AND INTERNSHIPS, AND CONDUCTING INFORMAL COURSES OR WORKSHOPS. TEACHING AND ADVISING GRADUATE STUDENTS IS MORE DEMANDING THAN TEACHING AND ADVISING UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS; NEVERTHELESS, THE EXTRA EFFORT FACULTY INVEST IN GRADUATE TEACHING AND ADVISING ARE CENTRAL TO FISHERIES DIVISION'S MISSION. FACULTY WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENTS MAY REFLECT DISSIMILAR LOADS RELATED TO FORMAL CLASSROOM TEACHING AND GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE ADVISING LOADS; HOWEVER THE GUIDELINE EXPECTATION IS THAT FACULTY MEMBERS WILL TEACH AT LEAST FOUR ACADEMIC CREDITS IN THE CLASSROOM EACH YEAR. QUALITY OF CLASSROOM TEACHING IS INDICATED BY PEER EVALUATIONS OF COURSE MATERIALS, PEER EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE, AND THE RECURRING LEVEL OF ENROLLMENT IN CLASSES. QUALITY GRADUATE ADVISING IS INDICATED BY THE SUCCESS OF STUDENTS IN COMPLETING DEGREES UNDER THE FACULTY MEMBER'S SUPERVISION. FACULTY WILL BE RECOGNIZED FOR ADVISING GRADUATE STUDENTS WHO ARE NOT BASED IN SFOS IN THE SAME WAY THAT THEY ARE RECOGNIZED FOR ADVISING GRADUATE STUDENTS WHO ARE BASED IN SFOS. ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND MENTORING INCLUDES RESULTS OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS, PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATION OF STUDENTS' THESIS OR DISSERTATION RESEARCH; STUDENT PRESENTATIONS AT REGIONAL, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS; AND AWARDS TO STUDENTS.

RECOGNIZING THAT WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENTS VARY AMONG FACULTY MEMBERS THE GUIDELINE EXPECTATION IS THAT EACH CANDIDATE FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR SHOULD BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY AT LEAST TWO SUCCESSFUL GRADUATE STUDENTS WHO HAVE COMPLETED DEGREES UNDER HER OR HIS SUPERVISION (AS COMMITTEE CHAIR OR CO-CHAIR). SIMILARLY, EACH FISHERIES FACULTY MEMBER WITHOUT A JOINT APPOINTMENT WHO IS A CANDIDATE FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR SHOULD BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY AT LEAST SIX SUCCESSFUL GRADUATE STUDENTS UNDER HER OR HIS SUPERVISION. FISHERIES FACULTY WITH JOINT APPOINTMENTS WITH THE MARINE ADVISORY PROGRAM OR THE MUSEUM (FISH CURATION)

WHO ARE CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR SHOULD BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY AT LEAST FOUR SUCCESSFUL GRADUATE STUDENTS UNDER THEIR MENTORSHIP. IN ADDITION, CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR SHOULD BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY AT LEAST TWO REGULARLY SCHEDULED COURSES THAT THEY HAVE DEVELOPED OR HAVE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR DELIVERING AND WHICH ARE CENTRAL TO THE UNDERGRADUATE OR GRADUATE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate TO the mission of their unit, and equally importantLY, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere.

1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Whatever the contribution, research, scholarly or creative activities must have one or more of the following characteristics:

- a. They must occur in a public forum.
- b. They must be evaluated by appropriate peers.
- c. They must be evaluated by peers external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.
- d. They must be judged to make a contribution.

2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Evidence of excellence in research, scholarly, and creative activity may be demonstrated through, but not limited to:

- a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline.
- b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas; these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.
- c. Presentation of research papers before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.
- d. Exhibitions of art works at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by peers, juries, recognized artists, or critics.
- e. Performance in recitals or productions; selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.
- f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.
- g. Citations of research in scholarly publications.
- h. Published abstracts of research papers.
- i. Reprints or quotations of publications, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.

- k. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.
- l. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.

FACULTY IN FISHERIES APPLYING FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE MUST PRESENT EVIDENCE OF SUBSTANTIAL, HIGH-QUALITY CONTRIBUTIONS IN RESEARCH. WHILE THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR THE EXERCISE OF GOOD JUDGMENT ON THE PART OF THOSE WHO ARE CALLED UPON TO ASSESS RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY, IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH FACULTY MEMBER TO EXPLAIN AND/OR OTHERWISE PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THEIR RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES. THE VARIED NATURE OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTIONS MAKE IT DIFFICULT TO IDENTIFY SIMPLE CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING THE QUALITY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF SUCH CONTRIBUTIONS. IN GENERAL, THE PRIMARY EVIDENCE OF HIGH QUALITY RESEARCH IS PUBLICATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS IN RESPECTED PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS, BOOKS OR OTHER MEDIA AND EVIDENCE OF SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH IS PRIMARY AUTHORSHIP BY THE APPLICANT OR HIS OR HER STUDENT, OR LEADERSHIP AS PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR OF THE RESEARCH—QUALITY, AS JUDGED BY FISHERIES DIVISION FACULTY PEERS, IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN QUANTITY. FISHERIES DIVISION FACULTY ARE EXPECTED TO AUTHOR AN AVERAGE OF AT LEAST ONE REFEREED PUBLICATION PER YEAR. THUS CANDIDATES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR ARE EXPECTED TO HAVE AUTHORED AT LEAST SIX REFEREED PUBLICATIONS; CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR ARE EXPECTED TO HAVE AUTHORED AT LEAST TWELVE REFEREED PUBLICATIONS. THESE EXPECTATIONS SHOULD BE INTERPRETED IN THE CONTEXT OF ACTUAL WORKLOAD AND ADJUSTED ACCORDINGLY.

EACH PROMOTION APPLICANT'S COMPLETE PUBLICATION RECORD, INCLUDING PAPERS PUBLISHED BEFORE THEY WERE AFFILIATED WITH THE UAF FISHERIES DIVISION, IS RELEVANT TO TENURE AND PROMOTION DECISIONS. IN ADDITION, THE NATURE OF THEIR WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENTS AND THEIR OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLICATION THROUGHOUT THEIR CAREER LEADING UP TO THE REVIEW DATE IS CONSIDERED RELEVANT TO PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS. THE STANDARD FOR TENURE, PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, AND SATISFACTORY POST-TENURE REVIEW IS SATISFACTORY RESEARCH PERFORMANCE FOR THE PERIOD BEING EVALUATED. THE STANDARD FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR IS SUSTAINED, EXCELLENT RESEARCH PERFORMANCE, RECOGNIZED NATIONALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is fundamental part of the university's obligation to the people of its state. In this tradition, faculty providing their professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge, is identified as "public service". The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assume a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service".

UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE IS EXPECTED OF ALL FISHERIES FACULTY. PERTINENT SERVICE IS RELATED TO THE FACULTY MEMBER'S PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE OR UNIVERSITY POSITION. SOME MEMBERS MAY HAVE GREATER OR LESSER THAN AVERAGE ASSIGNMENTS IN SERVICE AND THE EXPECTATIONS OF THEM SHOULD BE ADJUSTED ACCORDINGLY. HOWEVER, EXCEPT FOR FACULTY ON SABBATICAL LEAVE, THE GUIDELINE EXPECTATION IS THAT EVERY FACULTY MEMBER WILL SPEND AT LEAST ONE MONTH OF TIME ANNUALLY ON SERVICE RELATED ACTIVITIES REGARDLESS OF THEIR LEVEL OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING. SERVICE IS TYPICALLY LIMITED TO 5 UNITS (APPROXIMATELY 1.5 MONTHS) UNLESS OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED IN THE WORKLOAD PROPOSAL. SOME FACULTY IN THE FISHERIES DIVISION HAVE A LARGER THAN USUAL SERVICE COMPONENT, WHICH IS REFLECTED ON THEIR ANNUAL WORKLOAD. THE MIX OF PUBLIC, UNIVERSITY, PROFESSIONAL, AND OTHER SERVICE

MAY ALSO VARY WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER'S FIELD OF EXPERTISE AND STAGE OF CAREER. SOME FACULTY MAY HAVE SUBSTANTIAL ADMINISTRATIVE OR SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS THAT INCREASE THE SERVICE PORTION OF THEIR WORKLOAD.

1. Public Service

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. AMONG OTHERS, THESE CONSTITUENCIES INCLUDE MEMBERS OF FISHING COMMUNITIES, SEAFOOD INDUSTRY, AND OTHER FISHERY STAKEHOLDERS. It includes all activities that extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing, programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, professional contributions to the community or to one's discipline, or other activities in furtherance OF the goals and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- a. Providing information services to adults or youth, INCLUDING ANSWERING QUESTIONS AND SOLVING PROBLEMS POSED BY THE PUBLIC AND THE INDUSTRY REGARDING FISHERIES, SEAFOOD SCIENCE AND MARINE RESOURCES.
- b. Service on or to government or public committees.
- c. Service on accrediting bodies.
- d. Active participation in professional organizations.
- e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- f. UNREMUNERATED Consulting IN THE FACULTY MEMBER'S AREA OF EXPERTISE AND DISCIPLINE CONSISTENT WITH THE OBLIGATION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE.
- g. Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.
- h. Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, SEMINARS or public INFORMATIONAL meetings.
- i. Training and facilitating.
- j. Radio and TV programs, newspaper or trade journal articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media.
- k. Judging and similar educational assistance at science fairs, state fairs, and speech, drama, literary, and similar competitions.

2. University Service

University service includes those activities involving faculty members in the governance, administration, and other internal affairs of the university, its colleges, schools, and institutes. It includes non-instructional work with students and their organizations. Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

- a. Service on university, college, school, institute, departmental committees or governing bodies.
- b. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance for specific projects.
- c. Service as department chair, or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college, school, OR PROGRAM.

- d. Participation in accreditation reviews.
- e. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.
- f. Service in support of student organizations and activities.
- g. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.
- h. Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.
- i. Mentoring.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

3. Professional Service

- a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.
- b. Active participation in professional organizations.
- c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.
- e. Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings.
- f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

4. OTHER SERVICE: CURATION

CURATORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA MUSEUM (UAM) CAN HOLD A TENURE-TRACK FACULTY POSITION. RANK AND TENURE ARE HELD WITHIN DEPARTMENTS AT UAF, AND CURATORS ARE THUS TREATED AS JOINT APPOINTMENTS BETWEEN A DEPARTMENT AND THE UAM. AS IS THE CASE FOR ALL TENURE-TRACK FACULTY IN FISHERIES, CURATOR'S PERFORMANCES ARE EVALUATED ON THE BASIS OF THEIR ACTIVITIES IN TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE.

CURATION INVOLVES THE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF A FORMALLY RECOGNIZED UNIVERSITY COLLECTION THAT EXISTS TO SERVE AS A RESEARCH RESOURCE FOR STUDENTS AND RESEARCHERS AT UNIVERSITY, STATE, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS. EXAMPLES OF CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- a. MAINTAINING, ENHANCING, AND ENLARGING THE COLLECTION (INCLUDES COMPUTERIZATION AND DATABASE DEVELOPMENT, ARCHIVAL UPGRADES, SPECIMEN CONSERVATION AND IDENTIFICATION, AND ADDING SPECIMENS OR OBJECTS TO EXISTING COLLECTION);
- b. INTERACTING WITH STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES AND WITH THE PUBLIC ON COLLECTIONS-RELATED ISSUES;
- c. FACILITATING COLLECTIONS USE THROUGH LOANS, EXCHANGES, AND VISITING RESEARCHERS;
- d. MAINTAINING APPROPRIATE PERMITS (AS NEEDED FOR THE COLLECTIONS);
- e. SUPERVISING COLLECTIONS MANAGERS, STUDENT EMPLOYEES, AND VOLUNTEERS;
- f. WORKING WITH PUBLIC PROGRAM STAFF TO CREATE EXHIBITS AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATE TO THE COLLECTION;
- g. PURSUING FUNDING FOR COLLECTIONS GROWTH AND MAINTENANCE;
- h. PRODUCING CURATORIAL OR COLLECTIONS-RELATED PUBLICATIONS, REPORTS, AND/OR MANUALS;

- i. ENSURING UNIVERSITY COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS AND INTERNATIONAL TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS THAT PERTAIN TO THE COLLECTION.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR CURATORIAL PERFORMANCE:

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AND CURATOR

EVIDENCE OF CURATORIAL ABILITY AND A COMMITMENT TO DEVELOPING AND MANAGING RESEARCH COLLECTIONS RELEVANT TO THE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING:

- a. CURATORS WILL DEVELOP THE COLLECTIONS AS A PERMANENT RECORD OF THE NATURAL AND/OR CULTURAL DIVERSITY OF ALASKA, THE CIRCUMPOLAR NORTH, AND BEYOND AND AS A RESEARCH RESOURCE FOR STUDIES OF BIOLOGICAL AND/OR CULTURAL DIVERSITY.
- b. COLLECTIONS CARE INCLUDES RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PHYSICAL CONDITION AND STORAGE OF OBJECTS/SPECIMENS, CORRESPONDING DOCUMENTATION, BUDGETARY MANAGEMENT, AND ANNUAL REPORTS.
 - (I). CURATORS WILL PRESERVE THE SPECIMENS, ARTIFACTS, OBJECTS, AND MATERIAL UNDER THEIR PURVIEW THROUGH THE USE OF METHODS AND TECHNIQUES PROFESSIONALLY ACCEPTED WITHIN THEIR RESPECTIVE DISCIPLINES.
 - (II). CURATORS WILL ENSURE THAT ALL RECORDS AND FIELD NOTES CONCERNING COLLECTION MATERIALS ARE MAINTAINED IN A SECURE FASHION AND MEET OR EXCEED DOCUMENTATION STANDARDS FOR THEIR RESPECTIVE DISCIPLINE.
 - (III). CURATORS WILL MAINTAIN CURRENT ACCESSION FILES, DEACCESSION FILES, AND CATALOGS OF OBJECTS IN THEIR COLLECTIONS. THEY WILL DEVELOP ELECTRONIC DATABASES WITH COMPUTER DATA FORMATS THAT FOLLOW DATA STANDARDS OF THE RESPECTIVE DISCIPLINE AND UAM.
 - (IV). CURATORS WILL DEVELOP, MAINTAIN, AND REVISE WRITTEN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR CURATION OF OBJECTS OR SPECIMENS IN THEIR COLLECTIONS.
- c. CURATORS WILL TAKE PART IN INTERPRETIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE MUSEUM IN ORDER TO FULFILL THE MUSEUM'S MISSION TO INTERPRET THE NATURAL AND CULTURAL HISTORY OF ALASKA.
- d. CURATORS WILL ACTIVELY SUBMIT GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR EXTERNAL SUPPORT FOR THEIR CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES AND COLLECTIONS-BASED RESEARCH.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND CURATOR

CONSISTENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERPRETIVE (EDUCATION AND EXHIBITION) ACTIVITIES OF THE MUSEUM, RESPONSE TO COLLECTION-RELATED INQUIRIES (FROM OTHER PROFESSIONALS, THE PUBLIC, AND STATE AGENCIES) AND/OR DEVELOPMENT OF INTERPRETIVE MATERIALS FOR THE PUBLIC-AT-LARGE ARE EXPECTED. USE OF THE COLLECTIONS FOR TEACHING AND/OR RESEARCH MUST BE EVIDENT. ACTIVE SOLICITATION FOR EXTERNAL FUNDS TO SUPPORT CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES AND COLLECTIONS-BASED RESEARCH MUST BE EVIDENT.

PROFESSOR AND CURATOR

SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLLECTIONS UNDER THE CURATOR'S CARE IS EXPECTED. THIS DEVELOPMENT INCLUDES SUSTAINED GROWTH OF THE COLLECTIONS AS RESEARCH RESOURCES AND AS A MEANS OF FULFILLING THE MUSEUM'S MISSION OF ACQUIRING, PRESERVING IN PERPETUITY, INVESTIGATING, AND INTERPRETING OBJECTS AND SPECIMENS RELATING TO THE NATURAL AND OR CULTURAL HISTORY OF ALASKA AND THE CIRCUMPOLAR NORTH. SIGNIFICANCE OF COLLECTIONS WILL BE MEASURED IN TERMS OF RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE, VALUE TO UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA RESEARCH AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS,

AND VALUE TO NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS. THE CURATOR SHOULD BE A RECOGNIZED AUTHORITY IN HIS/HER FIELD, LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY. HE OR SHE MUST HAVE A RECORD OF SUCCESS IN ACQUIRING EXTERNAL FUNDS FOR CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES AND COLLECTIONS-BASED RESEARCH.

5. Evaluation of Service

Each individual faculty member's proportionate responsibility in service shall be reflected in annual workload agreements. In formulating criteria, standards and indices for evaluation, promotion, and tenure, individual units should include examples of service activities and measures for evaluation for that unit. Excellence in public and university service may be demonstrated through, e.g., appropriate letters of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards, and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

EVIDENCE OF HIGH-QUALITY PERFORMANCE CAN INCLUDE SPECIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS RELATED TO THE SERVICE. SERVICE ON NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL BODIES IS EXPECTED OF CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR.

FOR FACULTY PROVIDING CURATION SERVICES, THE APPLICATION FOR PROMOTION SHOULD INCLUDE A LETTER PREPARED BY A COMMITTEE OF TENURED CURATORS AT THE MUSEUM. EXCELLENCE IN CURATION MAY BE DEMONSTRATED THROUGH, E.G., APPROPRIATE LETTER OF COMMENDATION, RECOMMENDATION, AND/OR APPRECIATION, CERTIFICATES AND AWARDS, AND OTHER PUBLIC MEANS OF RECOGNITION FOR SERVICES RENDERED.

MOTION

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the motion passed at Meeting #189 on March 4, 2013, concerning the application of the grading policy for the grade of C, so that it includes all undergraduate students, and is not limited to baccalaureate students.

Bolded **CAPS** = Additions

[] = Deletions

Original Motion:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend grading policy concerning the grade of C, such that C- (1.7) shall be the minimum acceptable grade that ~~[[baccalaureate]]~~ **UNDERGRADUATE** students may receive for courses to count toward the major or minor degree requirements, or as a prerequisite for another course.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE:

1. Consistency with the past. Before +/- grades, a 'C-' was acceptable because a 'C-' was simply a version of C
2. Consistency with faculty who do not use +/- grades. A student who receives a 'C-' from a faculty member who does not use + is ok because that grade gets recorded as a 'C'. Same course, different teacher, this one does use + and the grade is not acceptable.
3. Consistency with BOR policies. BOR defines a C as an acceptable grade. Clearly a 'C-', which is a version of C, also should be acceptable.
4. Consistency with transfer policies: a course with a grade of C- transfers. However, currently it only transfers as 'credit' for a course in one's major or minor. In order to satisfy the requirement for the major or minor the course would need to be re-taken and a grade of C or higher received.
5. A grade of C- is the minimum acceptable for a 'core' course. This is confusing for students, who recognize that sometimes a C- is good enough, and sometimes not.

Note that the proposed change wouldn't change the fact that a student's overall GPA and GPA in the major must be a minimum of 2.0.

ATTACHMENT 191/11
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

RESOLUTION

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends that the current UA system regulation concerning General Education Requirements (GER) for Baccalaureate Degrees (R.10.04.040) be modified to allow for two 5-credit courses in a single non-English language to count toward fulfilling any six of the 15 credits required for the Social Sciences/Humanities/Arts section of the GER.

Motivation and background

- UAF currently does this, probably in violation of UA system regulations. It would be great to clearly be in compliance with UA regulations.
- Doing so will continue to encourage undergraduate students to gain at least modest familiarity with a language other than English.

MOTION

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new Graduate Certificate in Science Teaching and Outreach (housed in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014, with Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: The UAF 2010 Vision statement includes an emphasis on “linking research discoveries with teaching, service, and community engagement.” UAF science graduate students are actively engaged in research, but have few opportunities to explore, understand, and engage in the teaching and service components of faculty workloads. When they do engage in teaching, they are sometimes under-prepared to do so. This program will enhance graduate student ability to teach laboratory sections of science courses, thus improving learning opportunities for undergraduates. The internship component of the proposed certificate will allow graduate students to link their research to university-level teaching and/or community engagement, including productive partnerships with Alaskan schools (SDI theme 2). In addition, the Vision 2017 Task Force recommends, among other things, that UAF “significantly expand internships, externships, and practicum opportunities for all students,” and that UAF “emphasize development of career and employability skills throughout the UAF curriculum...” This certificate will allow graduate students to explore and gain hands-on experience with teaching. Earning such a certificate will make graduate students more marketable in the highly competitive job markets they will enter upon completion of their degrees.

The costs of this program are essentially administrative. The majority of the courses required for the certificate are already either permanent, taught as trial courses, or taught as special topics courses. No new resources are required. One of the goals of this certificate offering is to give students who are already enrolled in graduate degree programs in the natural sciences a tangible credential associated with completing several of these classes.

The full proposal, 35-GNP, is on file at the Faculty Senate Office, 312B Signers’ Hall. It is also posted online at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2012-13-fs-meetings/#191>

STATEMENT OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM, ITS OBJECTIVES AND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

We hereby propose a new graduate certificate in Science Teaching and Outreach, to be offered at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. Many science graduate students have demonstrated an

interest in enhancing their teaching and outreach skills. In response, two courses and a seminar that meet this need have been developed and are currently offered. An additional course on mentoring has previously been offered, but not in the past year. The graduate certificate would package these courses, with the addition of an internship and two 1-credit seminars, to offer a formal credential to science students that are interested in enhancing their teaching skills. The certificate is expected to increase competitive ability in the higher education job market, as well as prepare students to be better communicators of their science.

Program Goals:

- 1) To provide students with a formal credential that documents their efforts towards enhancing their teaching, mentoring, and/or outreach skills
- 2) To better prepare future professionals for careers in science and engineering by increasing skill in teaching, mentoring, and/or community engagement
- 3) To increase student familiarity with pedagogical theory and best practices in teaching

NEED FOR PROGRAM

The need for improvements in how science and engineering graduate students are trained with respect to teaching and mentoring is well-documented (e.g. Committee on Graduate Education, 1998). Despite the multifaceted nature of responsibilities graduate students will have in their careers, most graduate programs in the sciences have not traditionally offered explicit training in teaching and mentoring (Pruitt-Logan et al. 2002). However, this trend is changing—as of 2009, about 45 institutions offered the option of earning a certificate in college teaching to their graduate students (Border and vonHoene, 2010). Some programs focus explicitly on preparing STEM faculty, while other programs are offered across disciplines. Science graduate students at other institutions who have participated in professional development programs related to teaching and learning have reported that their participation resulted in greater knowledge about teaching and learning, and a better understanding of faculty roles, compared to peers who have not had such training (Pruitt-Logan et al. 2002). Such training may enhance a candidate's marketability in higher education and in other science and engineering careers— in a national survey, hiring departments in a broad range of institutions placed high value on teaching readiness, as indicated by college-level teaching credentials (Benassi et al. 2001).

In addition, the certificate will prepare participants (in part) for the service component of faculty and other professional positions by requiring students to work with K-12 and public audiences. This experience should also increase student's ability to create meaningful broader impacts projects for federally funded grant proposals. Finally, participation in the coursework leading to the certificate is expected to have a direct impact on teaching skills in the short term. Because many science graduate students serve as teaching assistants, this is expected to have positive outcomes for undergraduates taking science courses at UAF.

Proposed General Catalog Layout Copy of Program

Graduate Certificate in Science Teaching and Outreach

The certificate in science teaching and outreach is a voluntary program that prepares science graduate students for science careers that include teaching and/or communicating science to the public. It does NOT meet the requirements for earning a state teaching certificate and will not allow graduates to apply for certified positions in the K-12 school system. Such training will enhance readiness for college-level teaching by providing hands-on training and familiarity with pedagogical theory. The certificate is expected to increase competitive ability in the higher education job market.

Requirements for the Certificate:

1. Complete the general university requirements
2. Have a Bachelor's Degree from an accredited institution
3. Admission to a graduate science or engineering degree program at UAF (CNSM, SFOS, SNRAS, CEM), or prior completion of a graduate degree in the sciences or engineering.
4. Complete the following:

STO 666- Scientific Teaching	2
STO 601- Communicating Science	2
STO 602- Mentoring in the Sciences	2
STO 603- Instructional Design	1
STO 604- Internship	4

11 credits

5. Complete 1 of the following:

STO 692 – Current Topics in Scientific Teaching	1
MATH 600 – Mathematics Teaching Seminar	1
PHYS 605 – Physics Teaching Seminar	1

1 credit

PROGRAM TOTAL: 12 credits

**RESOURCE COMMITMENT TO THE
PROPOSED DEGREE PROGRAM**

Resources	Existing	New		Total
		College/School	Others (Specify)	
Regular Faculty (FTE's & dollars)	\$60,800 (loaded salaries) 0.43 FTE			\$60,800 (loaded salaries) 0.43 FTE
Adjunct Faculty (FTE's & dollars)	\$0	\$0		\$0
Teaching Assistants (Headcount)	\$0	\$0		\$0
Instructional Facilities (in dollars and/or sq. footage)	The program will require 3-4 small classrooms per semester.	\$0		The program will require 3-4 small classrooms per semester.
Office Space (Sq. footage)	All faculty and support personnel have existing office space	\$0		All faculty and support personnel have existing office space
Lab Space (Sq. Footage)	\$0	\$0		\$0
Computer & Networking (in dollars)	\$0	\$0		\$0
Research/ Instructional/ office Equipment (in dollars)	\$0	\$0		\$0
Support Staff (FTE's & dollars)	The B&W office manager will schedule courses (<0.05 FTE)	\$0		The B&W office manager will schedule courses (<0.05 FTE)
Supplies (in dollars)	\$0	\$0		\$0
Travel (in dollars)	\$0	\$0		\$0



Board of Regents Program Action Request
University of Alaska
 Proposal to Add, Change, or Delete a Program of Study

1a. Major Academic Unit (choose one) UAF	1b. School or College CNSM	1c. Department BIOL																																								
2. Complete Program Title: Graduate Certificate in Science Teaching and Outreach																																										
3. Type of Program <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AAS <input type="checkbox"/> Baccalaureate <input type="checkbox"/> Post-Baccalaureate Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Master's <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Graduate Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate																																										
4. Type of Action <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add <input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> Delete		5. Implementation date (semester, year) Spring, 2014																																								
6. Projected Revenue and Expenditure Summary. Not Required if the requested action is deletion. (Provide information for the 5 th year after program or program change approval if a baccalaureate or doctoral degree program; for the 3 rd year after program approval if a master's or associate degree program; and for the 2 nd year after program approval if a graduate or undergraduate certificate. If information is provided for another year, specify (1st) and explain in the program summary attached). Note that Revenues and Expenditures are not always entirely new; some may be current (see 7d.)																																										
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Projected Annual Revenues in FY 15</th> <th colspan="2">Projected Annual Expenditures in FY 15</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">Unrestricted</td> <td>Salaries & benefits (faculty and staff)</td> <td>\$60,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>General Fund</td> <td>\$5,648</td> <td>Other (commodities, services, etc.)</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Student Tuition & Fees</td> <td>\$55,152</td> <td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td> <td>\$60,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indirect Cost Recovery</td> <td>\$</td> <td colspan="2">One-time Expenditures to Initiate Program (if >\$250,000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TVEP or Other (specify):</td> <td>\$</td> <td colspan="2">(These are costs in addition to the annual costs, above.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Restricted</td> <td>Year 1</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Federal Receipts</td> <td>\$</td> <td>Year 2</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TVEP or Other (specify):</td> <td>\$</td> <td>Year 3</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL REVENUES</td> <td>\$60,800</td> <td>Year 4</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Projected Annual Revenues in FY 15		Projected Annual Expenditures in FY 15		Unrestricted		Salaries & benefits (faculty and staff)	\$60,800	General Fund	\$5,648	Other (commodities, services, etc.)	\$	Student Tuition & Fees	\$55,152	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$60,800	Indirect Cost Recovery	\$	One-time Expenditures to Initiate Program (if >\$250,000)		TVEP or Other (specify):	\$	(These are costs in addition to the annual costs, above.)		Restricted		Year 1	\$	Federal Receipts	\$	Year 2	\$	TVEP or Other (specify):	\$	Year 3	\$	TOTAL REVENUES	\$60,800	Year 4	\$
Projected Annual Revenues in FY 15		Projected Annual Expenditures in FY 15																																								
Unrestricted		Salaries & benefits (faculty and staff)	\$60,800																																							
General Fund	\$5,648	Other (commodities, services, etc.)	\$																																							
Student Tuition & Fees	\$55,152	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$60,800																																							
Indirect Cost Recovery	\$	One-time Expenditures to Initiate Program (if >\$250,000)																																								
TVEP or Other (specify):	\$	(These are costs in addition to the annual costs, above.)																																								
Restricted		Year 1	\$																																							
Federal Receipts	\$	Year 2	\$																																							
TVEP or Other (specify):	\$	Year 3	\$																																							
TOTAL REVENUES	\$60,800	Year 4	\$																																							
Page # of attached summary where the budget is discussed, including initial phase-in: 16																																										
7. Budget Status. Items a., b., and c. indicate the source(s) of the General Fund revenue specified in item 6. If any grants or contracts will supply revenue needed by the program, indicate amount anticipated and expiration date, if applicable.																																										
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Revenue source</th> <th>Continuing</th> <th>One-time</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a. In current legislative budget request</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Additional appropriation required</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. Funded through new internal MAU redistribution</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. Funds already committed to the program by the MAU¹</td> <td>\$5,648</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e. Funded all or in part by external funds, expiration date</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>f. Other funding source Specify Type:</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Revenue source	Continuing	One-time	a. In current legislative budget request	\$	\$	b. Additional appropriation required	\$	\$	c. Funded through new internal MAU redistribution	\$	\$	d. Funds already committed to the program by the MAU ¹	\$5,648	\$	e. Funded all or in part by external funds, expiration date	\$	\$	f. Other funding source Specify Type:	\$	\$																			
Revenue source	Continuing	One-time																																								
a. In current legislative budget request	\$	\$																																								
b. Additional appropriation required	\$	\$																																								
c. Funded through new internal MAU redistribution	\$	\$																																								
d. Funds already committed to the program by the MAU ¹	\$5,648	\$																																								
e. Funded all or in part by external funds, expiration date	\$	\$																																								
f. Other funding source Specify Type:	\$	\$																																								
8. Facilities: New or substantially (>\$25,000 cost) renovated facilities will be required. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, discuss the extent, probable cost, and anticipated funding source(s), in addition to those listed in sections 6 and 7 above.																																										

¹Sometimes the courses required by a new degree or certificate program are already being taught by an MAU, e.g., as a minor requirement. Similarly, other program needs like equipment may already be owned. 100% of the value is indicated even though the course or other resource may be shared.

9. Projected enrollments (headcount of majors). If this is a program deletion request, project the teach out enrollments.

Year 1: 6

Year 2: 12

Year 3: 12

Year 4: 12

Page number of attached summary where demand for this program is discussed: 12

10. Number* of new TA or faculty hires anticipated (or number of positions eliminated if a program deletion):

Graduate TA	
Adjunct	
Term	
Tenure track	

11. Number* of TAs or faculty to be reassigned:

Graduate TA	
Adjunct	
Term	
Tenure track	

Former assignment of any reassigned faculty:

For more information see page of the attached summary.

12. Other programs affected by the proposed action, including those at other MAUs (please list):

Program Affected	Anticipated Effect	Program Affected	Anticipated Effect

Page number of attached summary where effects on other programs are discussed:

13. Specialized accreditation or other external program certification needed or anticipated. List all that apply or 'none': None

14. Aligns with University or campus mission, goals, core themes, and objectives (list): Linking research with teaching, expanding internship opportunities, development of career skills

Page in attached summary where alignment is discussed: 8

15. State needs met by this program (list):

Page in the attached summary where the state needs to be met are discussed:

16. Program is initially planned to be: (check all that apply)

☒ Available to students attending classes at UAF campus(es).

☐ Available to students via e-learning.

☐ Partially available students via e-learning.

Page # in attached summary where e-learning is discussed:

Submitted by the University of Alaska Fairbanks with the concurrence of its Faculty Senate.

_____/_____
Provost Date

_____/_____
Chancellor Date

- ☐ Recommend Approval
☐ Recommend Disapproval

_____/_____
UA Vice President for Academic Affairs on behalf of
the Statewide Academic Council Date

- ☐ Recommend Approval
☐ Recommend Disapproval

_____/_____
Chair, Academic and Student Affairs Committee Date

<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Approval	_____ / _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend Disapproval	UA President Date

<input type="checkbox"/> Approved	_____ / _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved	Chair, Board of Regents Date

*Net FTE (full-time equivalents). For example, if a faculty member will be reassigned from another program, but his/her original program will hire a replacement, there is one net new faculty member. Use fractions if appropriate. Graduate TAs are normally 0.5 FTE. The numbers should be consistent with the revenue/expenditure information provided.

Attachments: ☐ Summary of Degree or Certificate Program Proposal ☐ Other (optional)

Report on “Assessment of Electronic Course Evaluation Technology and its Applicability to the University of Alaska Fairbanks”

Executive Summary

Full Report is posted online at: <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2012-13-fs-meetings/#191>

In October 2012, the Faculty Development, Assessment, and Improvement (FDAI) committee together with Dr. Eric Madsen, School of Education, were entrusted by the UAF Faculty Senate to study the current state-of-the-art of electronic course evaluation technology and its applicability to UAF. Early in the study it was recognized that *course evaluation technology is an integral part of a university's overall evaluation process*. Hence, **to recommend appropriate course evaluation technology we need to evaluate all other components of an established evaluation process, including (1) the purpose of course evaluation at UAF, (2) the indicators that we want to use to determine success, (3) and the benchmarks we want to use to evaluate performance.**

With this report, we analyze course evaluation technology as a part of UAF's overall evaluation process and provide guidelines for a step-by-step approach to optimizing UAF's course evaluation philosophy. The main findings and recommendations are summarized in the following:

1. We recommend to formulate a clear understanding of the main purpose(s) of course evaluation at UAF before deciding upon changes in course evaluation technology (see Section 2).
2. If a change in the course evaluation procedure is planned, we recommend to not change technology and question sets at the same time, but instead follow a step-by-step approach.
3. Electronic course evaluation systems have a number of benefits and drawbacks relative to traditional paper-and-pencil technology that need to be carefully analyzed and compared before selecting the most appropriate evaluation technology for UAF (see Section 3.1).
4. While student response rates are an important factor in evaluating the success of a course evaluation system, it is only one of many performance parameters (see Section 3.2).
5. Electronic course evaluation can produce satisfactory student response rates if students are incentivized, if the course evaluation system is easy to use, if faculty and administration actively promote the importance of course evaluation, and if regular reminders of active or upcoming survey periods are provided to faculty and students (see Section 3.3).
6. Nowadays, a large number of highly capable electronic course evaluation systems are available whose capabilities are ever improving (Section 4.3).
7. From our system survey, we conclude that available technology varies widely in aspects including (1) hosted vs. host-yourself solutions, (2) online-only vs. hybrid (paper plus online), (3) University-focused vs. generic survey-focused, and (4) flexible question set vs. fixed survey format. Also the amount of applied data analysis varies widely (see Section 4.3).
8. Three systems were identified that are excellent in their flexibility and functionality and are also well matched with UAF's needs (Section 4.3).
9. We recommend starting a discussion on the development of a culture of course evaluation on campus to improve course evaluation quality independent of evaluation technology.

To further analyze the capabilities of a down-selected group of three electronic course evaluation systems, UAF will continue to examine their suitability in fall 2013. We will coordinate our activities with UAF faculty and administration. Details of the evaluation activities in the fall will be announced.

LEARNING OUTCOMES AND GENERAL EDUCATION

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

Faculty Senate action

With these goals in mind the Curricular Affairs Committee, on 2 May, 2011, transmitted GERC's proposal to the UAF Faculty Senate which approved:

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

New (LEAP-inspired) learning outcomes

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

1. Build Knowledge of Human Institutions, Socio-Cultural Processes, and the Physical and Natural World through study of the natural and social sciences, technologies, mathematics, humanities, histories, languages and the arts.
Competence will be demonstrated for the foundational information in each subject area, its context and significance, and the methods used in advancing each.
2. Develop Intellectual and Practical Skills across the curriculum, including inquiry and analysis, critical and creative thinking, problem solving, written and oral communication, information literacy, technological competence, and collaborative learning.
Proficiency will be demonstrated across the curriculum through critical analysis of proffered information, well-reasoned solutions to problems or inferences drawn from evidence, effective written and oral communication, and satisfactory outcomes of group projects.
3. Acquire Tools for Effective Civic Engagement in local through global contexts, including ethical reasoning, intercultural competence, and knowledge of Alaska and Alaskan issues.
Facility will be demonstrated through analyses of issues including dimensions of ethics, human and cultural diversity, conflicts and interdependencies, globalization, and sustainability.

4. Integrate and Apply Learning, including synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies, adapting them to new settings, questions, and responsibilities, and forming a foundation for lifelong learning.

Preparation will be demonstrated through production of a creative or scholarly product that requires broad knowledge, appropriate technical proficiency, information collection, synthesis, interpretation, presentation, and reflection.

Background

The General Education Revitalization Committee (GERC) and its predecessor, the Core Revitalization and Assessment Group (CRAG)—with representation for a cross-section of faculty, administrators and staff, and support from the broader UAF faculty—recommended revising the UAF Core Curriculum to incorporate a LEAP-based set of learning outcomes tailored to UAF's special qualities and circumstances. During 2011, GERC circulated drafts for comment to academic deans, department chairs, curriculum councils and faculty for comment; and held two faculty forums to solicit feedback. The feedback received supported the approach and much of it was incorporated into the proposed set of objectives and learning outcomes.

From the outset, the challenge has been to set goals to present to the faculty that are at once general enough that they do not dictate strategy or tactics, yet concrete enough to be assessable in ways that have sometimes eluded the Core Curriculum. In 2011, GERC proposed to the faculty the learning outcomes summarized below with three disclaimers. First, these learning outcomes do not necessarily correspond to courses; many are explicitly envisioned as being addressed across the entire curriculum. Second, GERC remains uncertain and needs to turn to its colleagues for input on issue related to operationalization of the new outcomes through the selection of appropriate courses. Third, faculty should be fully engaged in and take ownership of all processes related to specifying and implementing the resulting programmatic changes, including:

- 1) establishing the objectives and methods for fulfilling the new learning outcomes;
- 2) determining the range of options available to students satisfying—simultaneously and without creating any additional burden for students—the new learning outcomes and the General Education Requirements established by the Board of Regents, and
- 3) assessing the outcomes of the revitalized general education program as a whole.

Process and Timetable

GERC, CAC and Faculty Senate will need to decide when and in what form to approve a new model for general education. GERC is committed to a deliberative process with its proposal refined through faculty input. Nevertheless, the process whose progress is summarized in this document is in its third year and should be concluded as soon as possible. Therefore, GERC will take the following actions for the Faculty Senate to consider:

1. Submit a more complete report on GERC findings and recommendations as a discussion item at the first regularly scheduled meeting of the UAF Faculty Senate, fall semester 2013,.
2. Submit a proposal for a new general education model to the Curricular Affairs Committee to be transmitted to the Faculty Senate for approval at its second regularly scheduled meeting of fall 2013.

3. Organize a series of public meetings and consultations with faculty, cognizant administrators, staff and students on the proposal to receive input on such matters as: defining criteria for the new course Attributes; creating a process for reviewing courses; recommending specific courses for inclusion; and revisions of any aspect of the proposal.
4. Submit a revised and more detailed proposal to Faculty Senate in the form of potential catalogue copy for the general education requirements and a process for reviewing courses for inclusion in one of the new Attributes categories.

UAF Faculty Senate Learning Outcomes and Possible Course/Credit Requirements

The following are suggestions for the numbers of credits and types of classes that may be used to satisfy each Learning Outcome. In total the courses listed below could replace both the Core and related baccalaureate degree requirements such as Social Science and Humanities electives, Communication and Quantitative Reasoning.

Outcome #1. Build knowledge of human institutions, socio-cultural processes, and the physical and the natural world through the study of the natural and social sciences, technologies, mathematics, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts.

Competence will be demonstrated for the foundational information in each subject area, its context and significance, and the methods used in advancing each.

Fulfilled by:

- 4 cr of Natural Sciences
- 3 cr of Mathematics
- 3 cr of Arts
- 6 cr of Social Sciences
- 6 cr of Humanities

Outcome #2. Develop intellectual and practical skills across the curriculum, including inquiry and analysis, critical and creative thinking, problem solving, written and oral communication, information literacy, technological competence, and collaborative learning.

Proficiency will be demonstrated across the curriculum through critical analysis of proffered information, well-reasoned solutions to problems or inferences drawn from evidence, effective written and oral communication, and satisfactory outcomes of group projects.

Fulfilled by:

- Writing, including information literacy (6 cr)
- Communication: written, oral and visual (3 cr)
- Quantitative Literacy (3 cr)

Outcome #3. Acquire tools for effective civic engagement in local through global contexts, including ethical reasoning, intercultural competence, and knowledge of Alaska and Alaskan issues.

Facility will be demonstrated through analyses of issues including dimensions of ethics, human and cultural diversity, conflicts and interdependencies, globalization, and sustainability.

Fulfilled by taking one course with each of the following groups at some point before graduation (these courses may also fulfill other GE, major or minor requirements within limits allowed by current policy):

major, minor, or elective credits:

- Civic Engagement (3 cr)
- Alaska and Alaskan Issues (3 cr)
- Intercultural Competence & Diversity (3 cr)

Outcome #4. Integrate and apply learning, including synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies, adapting them to new settings, questions, and responsibilities, and forming a foundation for lifelong learning.

Preparation will be demonstrated through production of a creative or scholarly project that requires broad knowledge, appropriate technical proficiency, information collection, synthesis, interpretation, presentation, and reflection.

Fulfilled by:

- A capstone course or experiential learning opportunity (e.g. internship) in student's major

Challenges and Opportunities: GERs and Learning Outcomes

BOR General Education Requirements and the new Learning Outcomes (adapted from LEAP outcomes) share a fundamental goal: to prepare++ students who are broadly trained and socially and intellectually aware. But they flow from different philosophies: GERs pursue breadth through the satisfaction of course requirements in specified disciplinary areas; LEAP outcomes encourage students to integrate, critically evaluate and apply their undergraduate training holistically. But the two are not incompatible, and while the process of making them work together is complex, the product for the end user (the student) will not be. The UAF Core Curriculum was an early attempt to accomplish this. In passing the new Learning Outcomes, the Faculty Senate recognized that LEAP provides an opportunity to take the project to the “next level.”

Additionally, there is a question of assessment. Both GERs and the Core are assessable on a course-by-course basis. But neither presents the opportunity to assess the value to the student of the entire experience or the effect it has had on their abilities to apply the more specialized knowledge they receive through majors, minors and certificates to their post-baccalaureate studies and/or the “real world.”

Learning outcomes are better suited to that purpose. And, although the documents prepared by GERC have not directly addressed assessment, it has been actively considered by GERC in its deliberative processes.

The longer *GERC Proposal*, sets forth definitions and explanations of the new learning, meant to serve as discussion points for engaging faculty in the process of selecting relevant courses and activities. The following—using a Q&A format—attempts to:

- Suggest how to optimize the compatibility of GERs and the new Learning Outcomes by applying a new set of “Attributes”* to existing, revised and new courses;
- Give examples of how a very wide range of colleges, departments and programs can be directly involved in the delivery of coursework that satisfies both GERs and Learning Outcomes;
- Suggest multiple ways in which students pursuing any BA or BS degree can satisfy both sets of requirements in 39 credits (the number required by the current Core) or less;
- Indicate how and why faculty from all departments and programs should be engaged participants in all aspects of development and implementation.

* “Attributes” is the term currently being used by GERC to describe 4 new tags that may be attached to specific courses that satisfying a new learning outcome. The Attributes—A, C, E and D—would be appended to course numbers in much the same way that O and W now are, to indicate to students that successfully completing this class will help satisfy a general education learning outcome requirement.

GERs and the New Attributes

Q. How will students know if they are taking classes that satisfy a new Learning Outcome?

A. The exact notations are not set in stone,, but for the sake of illustration: Courses that may be used to satisfy Learning Outcomes 1 and 2, which will also satisfy some of the skills-based GERs, will have numbers ending with X: for example, English F111X, Communication F141X. Or they will carry a **C attribute, for Communication**. For Outcome 3 there will be new attributes attached:

A--Alaska and Arctic Issues

D--Intercultural Competence & Diversity

E--Civic Engagement

Q: Can students satisfy new requirements and BOR GERs within the current 39-credit minimum established by the current Core Curriculum? **Will it be possible to do so in less than 39 credits?** Will it be possible for AA degree-seeking students to satisfy at least some of the new requirements too? **Will these changes expand the range of choice available to students**—i.e. can we make them less restrictive than the Core?

A: Yes to all of the above, if **colleges, departments and faculty from all of UAF can identify or modify existing courses and/or are willing to develop new courses that satisfy both BOR GERs and qualify for an A, D or E attribute.**

Q: What would such courses look like?

A: They would have to: 1) Have the basic characteristics of required by BOR policy for a category of the Common Core of General Education Requirements (see below) and 2) meet the requirements for carrying a A, D or E attributes as described above. (And, although less likely, if they are upper division classes they might also qualify for a C attribute.)

Hypothetical 1: ENGL 217, Themes in Literature, seems like a natural choice to be both a BOR humanities GER and carry a D attribute, providing the description specifies that literature from a variety of cultures is examined from multiple perspectives.

Hypothetical 2: PS 202, Democracy and Global Society, JUST 110, Introduction to Justice, and NRM 101, Natural Resources Conservation and Policy may already satisfy BOR requirements for a social science GER. With the addition of a project in which students analyze or contribute to a relevant organization or activity they could merit an E attribute.

Hypothetical 3: GEOS 101X (The Dynamic Earth) and GEOS 120X, Glaciers, Earthquakes and Volcanoes already qualify as a GER and both contain (as currently taught) sufficient Alaska/Arctic content to carry the A indicator as well.

Hypothetical 4: (With a little tweaking for some) it is likely that most of the currently offered “X” courses under “Perspectives” would continue to qualify as BOR humanities, arts, or social science GERs *and* could take on a D, E or A attribute.

Hypothetical 5: Numerous upper division courses, taken for major and minor requirements or as upper division electives would currently qualify for one or more attribute, or could be revised, if departments and faculty so desired, to carry one. For example, most courses offered by ANS and ANL

and many GEOG, ANTH, SOC and PS classes could take on a D attribute. Several GEOS, BIOL and MSL classes could carry the A attribute.

Q: Who would offer such courses?

A: Essentially, that decision rests with the faculty, department heads, deans and directors based on their own assessments of their programs' needs and interests.

For courses that would carry an attribute and satisfy BOR requirements for humanities, arts and social sciences most, but not all, of the responsibility falls on the College of Liberal Arts. Courses given by NRM, RD, MIN, MILS, *inter alia* could qualify too.

Faculty will need to receive a clear set of BOR requirements for qualifying courses, and participate in establishing specific requirements for each of the new attributes. Then they will have to decide which courses they would like to submit for the dual distinction of being a BOR GER and carrying a new attribute. In short, many colleges, departments and programs already offer courses that could do double duty (GER and attribute) and/or would be highly motivated to find ways to create new opportunities to add attributes to their courses.

Q. What about that C attribute? Doesn't that mean that students will no longer get to refine their writing and oral communication skills in their major?

A. Not at all. The C attribute "modernizes" the Os and Ws by retaining the goal of advanced training in written and oral communication while recognizing the multimedia nature of modern professional communication and the need for technological, information and media literacy.

ATTACHMENT 191/15
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

Information from Becky Phillips, Bookstore Manager:

The Bookstore Advisory Council serves as an official committee to review and recommend bookstore operating policies and procedures and to provide guidance to both the bookstore and the institution on bookstore matters.

The council should be composed of members of the university administration, faculty, staff, and student body. The bookstore manager and regional manager may serve as full or ad hoc council members.

The council should solicit information from administrators, faculty, staff and students for discussion during committee meetings and then report back resolutions.

The council should meet on a regular basis, preferably monthly, to review concerns of both the institution and the bookstore. An agenda should be prepared and distributed in advance for committee members to review.

Possible items for the council to review:

- Ensure textbook adoption information is received by the bookstore on a timely basis
- Monitor the bookstore to help ensure that textbooks are available on a timely basis
- Recommend service policies that are customer friendly
- Recommend products such as special supplies, gifts, software, trade books, etc., to fulfill the academic mission of the university

The bookstore will respond in a timely manner to all concerns raised by the bookstore council.

The council may serve as a “sounding board” for new services and products offered in the bookstore.

The council may serve as a communication link between the university administration, faculty, students, and the bookstore.

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes for 18 March 2013

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry (Chair); Ken Abramowicz (phone); Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy (phone); David Henry. Voting members absent: Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Karen Gustafson; Todd Radenbaugh. Guest: Gary Jacobsen, School of Education. Ex officio members present: Doug Goering (phone); Alex Fitts (phone); Jonathan Rosenberg; Carol Gering; Libby Eddy; Lillian Misel. Jayne Harvie taking notes.

1. APPROVED MINUTES OF 25 Febr

2. NEW BUSINESS: Document from GERC + DISCUSSION (J. Rosenberg)

KEY QUESTION FROM GERC: WHAT'S THE NEXT STEP?

RJN's proposal: clarify some key issues relative to what this would imply about changes in the core curriculum. The following 7 were briefly discussed (more for the first than the last). CAC members had no additional questions to bring to GERC concerning the GERC document.

1. with regards to Communication: Would the 3 credit multimedia communications course replace Comm 131/141 or would it be in addition to Comm 131/141? Alternatively, would the 3 credit multimedia communications course serve instead of the O+W requirement or would it be in addition to the O + W requirement?

More clarification is needed from GERC, and GERC wants more faculty input on this topic. A subgroup of GERC seems to feel that the COMM courses could substitute for the O and W designator requirement, but this view may not be representative of the whole GERC (per Cindy H.). General agreement, however, that while O and W is a good concept, it's not working practically in execution.

2. With regards to 'Civic Engagement', is this envisioned as a course (but with multiple options) similar to the current required 'perspectives' courses (e.g., equivalent to Hist 100x) or is it instead envisioned as instead something equivalent to the current 'ethics' requirement? If the former, would it really fit in the BOR definition of the required GE social sciences courses ("broad survey courses which provide the student with exposure to the theory, methods, and data of the social sciences")?

Civic Engagement is a broad area! Jonathan R. agreed with the comment that social science courses could fit in this category. Perspectives on the Human Condition is the most controversial among both faculty and students. As this gets discussed at units, will they want to create even more courses to fit in this category? Statement was made to the effect that a Civic Engagement designation could supersede an (s) or an (h). Doug G. suggested integrating this idea with the Capstone courses. There continue to be issues with lower vs. upper division requirements and their availability in the programs, as well as the issue of satisfying BOR General Education requirements.

Discussion followed about compatibility of the(s) with Civic Engagement. Cindy H. pointed out there are two threads to this conversation depending upon value rubrics concerning Liberal Arts vs. the Sciences. David H. commented that Civic Engagement = service learning, and this is very different than the Perspectives core area.

Long discussion boiled down to the fact that the BOR GenEd requirements DO NOT EQUAL the (s) requirements of the Bachelor of Arts degree. And additionally, the recognition that only BA requires (s) and (h) courses.

3. Same questions as above regarding "intercultural Knowledge and Competence". Can this also be reasonably included in the category of 'broad survey courses which provide the student with exposure to the theory, methods, and data of the social sciences'?

4. Although no specific mention has been made of such in the document, past discussions suggest that GERC favors replacing the current 'perspectives' requirements by some combination of the above two + a wide variety of CLA courses that satisfy BOR minimum requirements for soc sci/hum. Is this the case? If so, would History fall under 'general humanities' (as specified by BOR regulations) or would it fall under 'social science' (as it does for the BA requirements)?

5. BOR minimum requirements are for 15 credits of soc sci/hum, including 3 credits of art, 3 of 'general humanities', 6 of soc sci, and 3 unspecified. The GERC document instead calls for 6 credits of 'general humanities'. How strongly is GERC committed to overriding the BOR minimum requirements in this case?

6. The faculty poll of October 2013 indicated a desire to decrease the total number of required core credits to a number closer to the BOR minimum of 34. In what ways do the proposed conform to that desire?
7. One version of current vs. new core requirements is given below, based on the document provided (and ambiguities). We would like GERC to supply their version.

Current

Engl 111 (3)
 Engl 211/213 (3)
 Comm 131/141 (3)

 Soc/Anth 100x (3)
 Econ 100x or PS 100x (3)
 Hist 100x (3)
 Engl/FL 200x (3)
 ART/MUS/THR 200x or HUM 201 Or ANS 202x (3)

 2 semesters of lab science (8)
 1 college math class (3)
 Ethics (3)
 2 W + 1 O class (integrated into major)

TENTATIVELY PROPOSED (??)

Engl 111 equiv (3)
 Engl 211/213 equiv (3)
 ???Integrated written, oral, visual (3) ???

 2 survey social science courses in 2 different fields (6)
 New intercultural course (3)
 (BOR indicates HIST is 'hum' not ss)
 1 survey course in Phil, FL, Lit, Art, or Hist (3)
 1 survey course in visual/performing arts (3)

 1 semester of lab science + 3 credit 'Q' class (7)
 unchanged (3)
 New Civic Engagement course (3)
 unchanged??
 Alaskan Emphasis course (integrated into major?)
 Capstone experience (integrated into major)

Jonathan R. agreed to take all of the questions proposed above to the GERC for discussion.

FURTHER: David H. asked if the provisional document could be shown to other faculty. J Rosenberg agreed to ask GERC about such and get back to us ASAP. GERC met the next day and agreed to respond to deal with the questions posed and STRENUOUSLY REQUESTED that the original GERC document NOT be circulated due to problems in interpretation.

3. OLD BUSINESS: NEW BA IN Secondary Education -- DISCUSSION W/ G. Jacobson

Gary Jacobson addressed the committee's questions, making the case for the uniqueness of the program proposal. It's truly a double degree designed to create teachers in secondary education. It will not replace the post baccalaureate degree in secondary ed. The new program will help reduce rates of students dropping out by starting out earlier to engage them as majors who wish to teach high school. An undergraduate degree program qualifies the students for loans and Pell grants (unlike the grad-level degrees). Saves students money.

Curricular Affairs UNANIMOUSLY approved the new program and moved it on to the Administrative Committee.

REVISIONS IN THE 2ND ED degree program in red (pg. 31-32)

"D. Planning

1. Evidence of Need

Based on the increased enrollments in the secondary minor since its inception in 2006 and the increased number of inquiries regarding a secondary baccalaureate program it appears that a substantial interest exists. In addition, the opportunity for advising early in potential students' college careers is likely to stimulate enrollment. Finally, there is most certainly a "need" in Alaska for teachers, most especially secondary teachers. **Currently, the vast majority of our secondary students are place bound, which means that they have either started a family or already have one that is located in the major urban areas of Fairbanks, Anchorage, Mat Su, or the Kenai. This does not help to provide secondary teachers for the rural areas of the State. With an undergraduate program, most of the students will not have established themselves in the urban areas and are more likely to accept positions in the rural areas. The addition of an undergraduate program would result in more students enrolling in the Education program, which would result in more secondary teachers available to meet the needs of the State, specifically teachers for rural Alaska and for STEM positions.**

Students entering a BA program earlier on in their programs will be far more likely to integrate their content classes with the education classes, which will increase the possibilities of forming cohorts.

These cohorts will strengthen student learning and provide student support, which will help to retain students in the Secondary Education program.

With students entering the Secondary Education program at an earlier date, the advising would take place in the School of Education providing more consistency to make sure students will meet the State requirements for certification. Currently, we receive applications from students without a content area that is certifiable. For example, we have had students enter the Secondary Education program with a criminal justice degree, which is not certifiable. This person had to take several history, political science, and psychology courses in order to be certified as a middle school social science teacher. This can create a hardship for people because they are required to take content courses in addition to the education requirements, and in this example, limits the person's opportunities.

Our recruiting efforts will be greatly enhanced with a baccalaureate degree. Currently, our recruitment focuses on college seniors and "unknown" career changers, because prospective students must have a degree in a certifiable content area before looking at the Secondary Education program. With a baccalaureate degree, we can begin talking to high school seniors about an education degree within a content area, which would be more effective than telling the high school students they need to complete a content areas and then come talk to us about a post bac program.

Another huge incentive for a baccalaureate degree is the fact that scholarship opportunities are not available to graduate students, while there are many available for undergraduate students, particularly the Alaska Performance Scholarship. The Alaska Teacher Loan program, which is limited to undergraduate programs, is not available for any high school graduating senior, who may want to major in secondary education in the University of Alaska system because there are no undergraduate Secondary Education programs, and students applying to the Alaska Teacher Loan program have to be enrolled in a teacher education program to be eligible. The Alaska Teacher Loan program is not available for post bac students.

The Secondary Education Baccalaureate program appears to require 16-18 credits a semester, which is very intense and very difficult for four years. This is based on the assumption that a student would enter the Secondary Education program as a first-semester freshman and would not make any changes to the major. Realistically, this scenario is unlikely. When we started this proposal, there was an emphasis on structuring programs that would allow students to complete in four years. The proposed baccalaureate could be completed in four years provided the individual students work very hard and are persistent, but the reality is that many students would not be able to complete their programs in four years, which is why we originally planned on a five-year program and have developed check sheets for a five-year program as well as a four-year program. We have researched many universities across the country that have a baccalaureate program in secondary education and the vast majority have requirements that in all probability will require students to spend five years to complete.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 am.

Curricular Affairs Committee Minutes for 1 April 2013

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry, Chair and MVP; Ken Abramowicz; Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Karen Gustafson (phone); Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy (phone); David Henry; Todd Radenbaugh (phone); Diane McEachern (phone). Jonathan Rosenberg reported for GERC (phone).

Non-voting members: Libby Eddy; Lillian Misel; Carol Gering; Alex Fitts; Doug Goering (phone); Jayne Harvie (taking notes)

1. MINUTES OF 18 March were approved as submitted.

2. Report on GERC from J Rosenberg and (or) Cindy Hardy

Jonathan R. reported that two models are being included in a report that should be available to CAC at their next meeting. The models will demonstrate how the new learning outcomes satisfy the General Education requirements. He noted there are no big surprises.

Cindy H. reported that GERC has not talked about the AA and AAS topics as they relate to GE requirements. There are still some questions about the new "designators" such as civic engagement. Broader input from more faculty is needed. Alex F. commented that the goal is to have the GenEd requirements met with the courses carrying special designators, and not adding new things to the baccalaureate core requirements.

Rainer noted the business of GERC will carry over to next fall. Alex noted that the problem of turn-over has been problematic from year to year of this ongoing work in progress.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. – Request from the Registrar's office

DF Deferred – "This designation is used for courses such as theses and special projects, which require more than one semester to complete. It indicates that course requirements cannot be completed or when institutional equipment breakdown resulted in non-completion by the end of the semester. Credit may be withheld without penalty until the course requirements are met within an approved time." (OE's underline)

From the Registrar: "As we clean up and crack down on some policies that have become lax, we've found several departments within CRCD that use DF grades for their undergraduate students that are on a student's transcripts for literally years. These become problematic when a student is up for graduation and it turns out the instructor for the course has moved on and there is no grade information for the student.

We would like CAC to discuss setting a time limit on DF grades so that the Office of Admissions and the Registrar can obtain grades for students in a timelier fashion rather than the ambiguous within an approved time that it currently reads."

Lili Misel described the current problem the Registrar's Office is having with the grade of DF (deferred). It is mainly a problem in CRCD with about 5-6 students every year. They are given a DF by the instructor, and later when the students are ready to graduate, there is no instructor still around to assign a real grade.

Unlike Incomplete grades, there is no form the instructors have to fill out. The Office of Admissions and the Registrar (OAR) cannot track them. Cindy H. asked if this was a problem with mixed mode courses (i.e., vocational ed). Lili responded that those haven't been a problem; it's mainly been a problem with health courses.

Diane M. suggested taking the matter to the CRCD Academic Council and have them appropriately address the problem. Cindy H. said she would Lili and Libby to the next council meeting. There was discussion about implementing some sort of timeline for DF. It was pointed out that the (appropriate) use of DF is very different in the Graduate School. A timeline might not work so well for them. Cindy spoke in support of implementing some sort of paper trail to make it possible to track them. Rainer asked for a proposal for the next CAC meeting in two weeks after the CRCD academic council has met and discussed this. The matter was...deferred.

**B. Preliminary request for deletion of Minor in Leadership & Civic Engagement
(are there ANY bizarre unintended consequences???)**

The Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement was conceived as a program that would prepare students to be leaders in the north. The electives allowed students to prepare for leadership roles in local / state, national or international arenas.

note: we envisioned that as the program grew we would receive additional funding and I would teach the Leadership course rather than one of my other courses. However this vision never materialized.

The Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement was developed in the context of consideration of a Ph.D. Program in Leadership at UAF. Dr. Joseph Kan, Dean of the Graduate School encouraged those discussions. However, faculty concluded that without a single recognized expert in the field of Leadership Studies at UAF, we did not have the expertise amongst our faculty to support such a program.

Some faculty engaged in these discussions, along with Dr. Kan, came to the conclusion that a Minor in Leadership Development would prepare students for leadership roles in the north, and the Northern Studies Program was designated as an appropriate home for the program. Dr. Judith Kleinfeld and I shared a \$5,000 stipend for developing the program. We developed the proposal for the Minor, which drew upon courses in Political Science, History and Rural Development for its electives. We designed the introductory course: NORS 205: Leadership, Citizenship and Choice and the capstone course: NORS 486: Senior Seminar in Leadership and Civic Engagement. The capstone course placed students in internships and required readings that connected their internship experiences with theories in leadership.

Dr. Kleinfeld and I team taught Leadership, Citizenship and Choice twice with 15 and 13 students. I later taught the course with 10 and 5 students, the second time without compensation. I taught the capstone to 6 students as individual studies. All of them graduated with the Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement.

There has been low demand for the Minor and low demand for the courses. Moreover, we noted that many of the students who were attracted to NORS 205: Leadership, Citizenship and Choice were more interested in the social aspects of leadership than in serious academic analysis of leadership theory.

We determined after a few years that there was neither a demand for the Minor nor the resources available within the Northern Studies Program or the College of Liberal Arts to continue offering the program. The School of Management no longer requires the Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement for its Bachelor of Emergency Management degree program.

More information:

The School of Management is currently working on a (completely?) different Minor in Leadership to be 'housed' in SOM instead of CLA.

Key question: is there any reason to not go ahead and accept the request to delete??

Rainer asked for discussion to help explore if there would be any unintended consequences from approving this program elimination. The committee observed it had rested on the shoulders of only two faculty, one of whom has since retired. Cindy noted that deleting this minor is at odds with the GERC actions that include creating a new Civic Engagement designator.

Alex noted a troubling precedent of eliminating the program due to lack of funding and faculty resources. Ken A. observed that this minor was taught before the Northern Leadership Center was created at the School of Management. There would be a lot of support for such a minor in SOM. He suggested that language be added in any motion to eliminate this program that it will be replaced.

Cindy is going to talk with Mary E. about this matter. Ken will follow up with Kevin Berry and Nicole Cundiff. Alex will speak with Dean Sherman about the proposed elimination of the program.

We will act on this in two weeks

ATTACHMENT 191/17
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Faculty Senate Unit Criteria Committee

Members: Karen Jensen (Chair), Cathy Winfree, Christine Cook, Javier Fochesatto, Vladimir Alexeev, Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Jun Watabe, Mark Herrmann

Report for Academic Year 2012/13

Unit Criteria Committee Meetings held on:

9/19/12
10/10/12 (Joint with Faculty Affairs and Provost)
10/26/12
11/12/12
12/10/12
1/14/13
1/28/13
2/11/13
2/25/13

- Review of Criteria for Cooperative Extension Service. These criteria were submitted the previous Academic year, but too late for the approval process for that year. UC requested one set of revisions, which were done and returned to committee on Nov. 12th. CES Unit Criteria were approved by Faculty Senate on Monday, December 3rd, 2012, Meeting #187.
- Amendment of the Faculty Senate Bylaws for the Unit Criteria Committee, revising the list of units from whom Unit Criteria committee representation is drawn. This motion required several revisions and lengthy discussion. Bylaws change was approved by Faculty Senate on Monday, March 4, 2013, meeting #189.
- Review of Criteria for Library Science. Received January 22, 2013. UC requested one set of revisions, which were done and returned to committee on Feb. 11th. Library Science Unit Criteria were approved by Faculty Senate on Monday March 4, 2013, meeting #189.
- Review of Criteria for School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences. These criteria were received on Feb. 4th, 2013. UC requested revisions, a few of which were made and the rest rejected by the SFOS director. The modified criteria were received March 19, 2013. These were approved by majority of Unit Criteria committee members and submitted for consideration at the Faculty Senate meeting on Monday, May 6th, 2013.
- Revision of Blue book

The Unit Criteria and Faculty Affairs committees were charged with making major revisions to the faculty "Blue book." Unlike previous revisions, this update required combining the two existing documents constituting the "Blue book," including the

“Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty” and the “Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” which current reside on the UAF Provost’s web site.

In order to ensure that both committees and the Provost were in coordination as to the scope and timeline of the revision project, a meeting was held on October 10th, 2012. The stated goals of this project included the combination of documents, incorporating suggestions made by the Provost’s staff, some suggestions from a previous working group, and ensuring that the final document be in compliance with both union collective bargaining agreements, and reflect actual current practices.

Chairs of Faculty Affairs (Cecile Lardon) and Unit Criteria (Karen Jensen), met on several occasions to outline a work plan for the committees. After substantial time, effort and many meetings by members of both committees, a near-final draft was submitted to the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee on March 20th. Sally Skrip then extensively formatted the draft. That document was shared with representatives of UAFT and UNAC on April 3rd; no suggestions have been received from UNAC. Some revisions were made incorporating language requested by UAFT. The document was also shared with the Provost on April 11th.

Draft documents and a document showing how the two sections were combined are located on a Google Site, which can be shared with future working committees or other persons as needed; Cecile Lardon has full edit control over this site and can add access as needed.

ATTACHMENT 191/18
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women

Minutes Friday, March 22, 2013; 10:30-11:30 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Diana Di Stefano, Jane Weber, Megan McPhee, Jenny Liu, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Nilima Hullavarad, Ellen Lopez

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Derek Sikes (on sabbatical), Shawn Russell

1. April 26th 10:00 am - 12:00 pm. Strategically Planning Workshop, BOR Conference Room

Panelists: Roxie Dinstel, Sine Anahita, Paul Layer, Ellen Lopez, Joan Braddock, Todd Sherman. Flyer is done. Jayne Harvie will send it out. Please post it. Jane ordered refreshments. Todd Sherman has also agreed. Kayt will moderate. We need help with Illuminate Live. We'll ask people to focus on their experience. Kayt will tell the panelists that the focus is on strategy.

2. Conversation Cafes –

Future Cafes: April 12 10:30-11:30. Topic: Leadership. Challenges and rewards of taking on leadership roles. Kayt may use some of the LeanIn organization. They provide information and guidance on creating/ promoting women in leadership roles.

3. Women's Center Advisory Board
Meeting again: Monday, March 22, 2013

4. Fall 2013 Luncheon
Can we do more? Paper invitations. Can we help Jayne more? Put that on our radar for end of September on a Tuesday. We need to choose a speaker or panel. Sheryl Frye? Claudia Lampman from UAA?

Upcoming CSW meeting: May 3, /10:30-11:30/Gruening 718

Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/>

Annual Report follows on next page.

Committee on the Status of Women 2012-13 Annual Report

The Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) met monthly during AY 2012-13 concerning issues affecting women faculty at UAF.

On September 25, 2012, CSW organized UAF's eighth annual Women Faculty Luncheon, which was webstreamed for faculty who could not attend in person. Over one hundred women faculty attended this event with Dr. Sharon Bird, Research Director for ISU Advance at Iowa State University, giving an inspiring keynote address. We gratefully acknowledge the financial support for this event from the Office of the Chancellor. Carol Gold and Jane Weber met with Vice Chancellor Mike Sfraga in December 2012 to secure the funding for future luncheons. Thanks to Vice Chancellor Sfraga these funds are now a line item in UAF's budget.

CSW facilitated a "Brown Bag Lunch" series which morphed into a "Conversation Café" series. These discussions on topics of faculty interest were held in the UAF Women's Center and via elluminate-live. Highlights this year were "Navigating Differences", "Mentoring" and "The Challenges & Rewards of Taking on Leadership Roles". CSW also facilitated lively discussions of Dr. Bird's presentations. Faculty are definitely energetic and eager for these "Cafes" and a topic that is generating much interest is "Surviving Within Peer Units" so this will definitely be scheduled for Fall 2013.

CSW submitted a Resolution of *Reaffirmation of Commitment to Shared Governance* to the Faculty Senate which was passed at Senate meeting #184 on September 10, 2012. This resolution urged the University administration to reaffirm its commitment to the principle of shared governance.

Chancellor Rogers formed a Women's Center Advisory Committee in Fall 2012. The committee charge is to advise the Women's Center, its manager, and the chancellor on how UAF can best meet the mission of the UAF Women's Center. Ellen Lopez and Jane Weber, CSW members, were invited to serve on the Advisory Committee.

CSW invited Dr. Sine Anahita to discuss a summary of salary data by rank and gender from Spring 2012. The data and statistics were prepared by Institutional Research. Results indicate that women's salaries are now 89-99% of men's. The greatest disparity is at the Associate Professor rank but the five year trend shows a positive reduction in disparity. The report on total UAF faculty (n=1034, 55% men) shows that 16% of full professors are women, 39% of associate professors are women, and 52% of assistant professors are women. CSW is continuing discussion about why the percentage of women is still low at the higher ranks.

CSW is in the process of formulating a rationale for a faculty/administrative position focusing on the issues of women faculty. We are looking at peer institutions that have such a position. One of the benefits of such a position would be the prevention of loss of university funding due to the non-retention of women faculty. CSW is working on a rationale to be supported by empirical evidence that there are institutional problems holding women back at UAF.

CSW is still working on a proposal for a UAF Spousal Hire Policy. UAF has no such policy in place but having a policy and a corresponding budget is on the Chancellor's list of goals for 2012 and on the Vision 2017 Plan. We are trying to update a 2003 Senate draft that was based on concerns of violation of fair hiring regulations and are looking at the AAUP best practice

recommendations. CSW will invite Mae Marsh, UAF's Director of Diversity and Equal Employment, to meet with us about a Spousal Hire Policy.

In April 2013, CSW again organized a two hour comprehensive tenure and promotion workshop, *Planning Strategically for Promotion and Tenure*. The workshop highlighted strategic planning for promotion and tenure and faculty attended both in person and via webstream. This extremely useful workshop, which we facilitate annually, provides an informal venue for faculty to discuss strategies, file preparation, mentoring, effectively preparing for tenure and/or promotion, fourth year reviews, and other issues related to the T&P process for both United Academics and UAFT. Invited panelists this year were Roxie Dinstell, Sine Anahita, Ellen Lopez, Paul Layer, Joan Braddock and Todd Sherman.

In Progress:

- Discussion of the issue of term-funded and adjunct faculty, especially as these issues differentially affect women
- Gathering and analyzing historical data information with gender on time to tenure and promotions, rank, nonretentions and salary information for faculty at UAF for at least the last ten years – Is there a gender bias?
- Promotion workshop specifically for Associate Professors moving to Full Professors
- Examining structural, rather than individual, issues contributing to women being “stuck” at the Associate Professor level
- Facilitating mentoring of new, mid-career, and senior women and allied men
- Strengthen liaison relationships with women staff members at UAF, the UAF Women's Center, and with faculty at the other MAUs
- UAF Spousal Hire Policy.

ATTACHMENT 191/19

UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee Meeting Minutes for March 21, 2013

Attending: Sarah Stanley, Sandra Wildfeuer, Curt Szuberla, Cindy Hardy, Alan Morotti, Dana Greci, Gabrielle Russell, David Maxwell, Linda Hapsmith, Libby Eddy (guest)

Conversation with the Registrar:

The majority of this meeting was devoted to a conversation with Libby Eddy, UAF Registrar, about questions that have come up in meetings throughout the year.

The first question we asked was about linking related courses together in the course schedule on UAOnline (i.e.: Math/DEVM). Libby noted that because UAOnline is linked to Banner, that changes to the course listings there would have to be done statewide; however this could be done on Coursefinder, which is done separately and is accessed through the main UAF webpage.

We also asked about how students can access synchronous distance classes taught on the CRCD cross-regional schedule. We noted that UAOnline has a drop-down box to choose type of delivery, but the synchronous distance courses are not listed. Libby gave us a bit of the history of E-learning at UAF, starting with the UA Learning Consortium in the 80s. She noted that E-Learning is growing and that they changed the coding on their classes a year ago. She also noted that part of the problem of finding the Cross-regional classes is that Banner tries to make us into one statewide system, which we're not. We also noted that many students are now taking UAA and UAS online courses, which makes advising and planning difficult.

Libby stayed on for the rest of the meeting, and we appreciated her input.

Statewide course alignment:

Math—David reported that the Math Department doesn't see statewide alignment of placement scores as necessary. They are looking into possibly using ALEKS as an alternative placement method instead of Accuplacer. They have begun discussion on this with Dana Thomas.

English—Sarah reported that English 111X Accuplacer scores are now aligned for the Spring 14 semester. The ENGL and DEVE faculty are working toward further changes and alignment.

GERC Update:

Sandra and Sarah reported that the GERC subcommittees have met and put together a document reporting on their work and have sent it to Curricular Affairs (CAC) for comments. Sandra noted that the LEAP outcomes are not oriented toward specific courses, so the committee is not clear at this point if students will be checking off outcomes within courses or courses. Sarah noted that it's important for the committee to talk to folks who know the system really well and for it to be widely talked about. Libby asked if students will have to take specific courses or if they will be able to transfer courses in. Dana G asked if GERC has talked about what assessment of LEAP outcomes would look like. Sarah and Sandra listed some outcome measurements such as e-portfolios or signature assignments. This is very much a work in progress.

Learning Commons Update:

Dana G noted that a handout on the Learning Commons has been drafted, inviting students and faculty to reserve rooms. Suzan Hahn will be sending this out. Linda H asked if areas could be reserved for an entire semester, and Dana G noted that this is the goal, and encouraged us to ask for this so that it would be more likely to happen.

DEVE Course changes:

We considered the course change request to change DEVE 060 to DEVE 100 and DEVE 070 to DEVE 104.

Linda noted that the rationale is along the lines of having the course at 100-level will allow them to be used as elective credit. Sarah asked if this would affect Vets, since the GI bill pays for as many 0-level classes as needed, but sets strict limits on courses taken toward a degree. Linda noted that Donald Crocker in Advising might know since he has dealt with a similar case. We noted that currently CRCD students often take ABUS 170 or DEVS 104 instead of DEVE 070, and that this change would clarify the pathways for these students. Gabby noted that students get elective credit for RECR classes, so why not DEVE classes?

Cindy asked if there was an issue with the use of the word “preparatory” in the course title.

Gabby asked if DEVS 104 would still count as a prerequisite for English 111X.

We discussed the stigma some students feel in DEV classes—would the change to 100-level motivate students?

We agreed that we needed to discuss this further either by e-mail or at the next meeting. We also need more information on the following questions:

What effect will this change have on military students on the GI bill?

What courses will substitute or transfer for these classes?

Is there a concern with the word “preparatory” in the BOR regulations?

Will the department put together a flyer explaining the changes?

Next meeting: April 18, 3:00-4:30.

ATTACHMENT 191/20

UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 26, 2013**

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 11:09 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Izetta Chambers, Cindy Fabbri, David Fazzino, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Eric Madsen, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison

Excused: Stephen Brown, Mike Castellini,

Absent: Trina Mamoon, Amy Vinlove

III. Report from Joy

Joy informed us that six faculty members went to the Lilly West Conference in southern California, joining a higher-than-average turnout for the 25th anniversary of Lilly West. Joy stated that the innovations presented were very interesting and speakers were excellent. The evaluations she has gotten so far from participants have been very positive.

Joy has been meeting with all new faculty and reports that the mentoring program seems to be going well. Nearly all have met with their respective mentors and are finding the program helpful. She will continue to meet with new faculty all month.

She has been meeting with candidates for positions in various departments in order to show them what OFD provides for faculty development. She does this to let candidates know what they can expect from her office if they accept a position at UAF.

There is no particular college focus this month, just general presentations. Next month will feature CLA. She notes that Maggie Griscavage from the Office of Grants and Contracts will be presenting a session on grants administration on April 2. CLA asked specifically for a panel discussion on different ways of assessing student learning and she is putting together a panel for this. There are also several eLearning and Distance Education presentations in April. Joy reminded us of Walt Gmelch's upcoming leadership presentation "Managing Conflict in the Ivory Tower" on April 11 and reports that over thirty people have signed up. Bob Lucas' upcoming workshops on scholarly writing and grant writing are filling up as well. Izetta asked if there was any chance of video conferencing these presentations. Joy replied that these guest speakers are reluctant to be recorded and that some of the interactive workshops are difficult to video conference. However Joy will email Walt Gmelch's presentation slides to Izetta in advance and ask him about the possibility of having the three-hour workshop video conferenced. There is also a possibility it could be audio conferenced.

Due to construction beginning soon and rooms in Bunnell closing, the research "Speed Dating" event has been postponed until fall semester at the request of OIT.

Joy also reminded us of the new Magna Commons subscription and will send out email reminders to faculty once a month with instructions on accessing their videos.

Linda Hapsmith of the Academic Advising Center has 50 one-way railroad tickets for faculty advisors to travel to the regional advising conference being held in Anchorage in late April/early May. Linda will also be awarding \$750 travel grants for 25 faculty advisors.

IV. Progress on analysis of electronic student evaluation options for UAF

Eric and Franz met with Faculty Senate leadership to discuss our next steps and have outlined a two-step process of a short summary report and a longer full report. The preliminary summary written by the core group that has attended almost all of the vendor demonstrations describing our approach and evaluation criteria and outlining the content for the full report has been presented to the Administrative Committee and was well received. It will be presented to Faculty Senate for their feedback at their April meeting. The full report will be written in April after the core group can meet to discuss items to ensure that the report will reflect the views of the whole core. The final report will be sent to FDAI committee members when it is finished. The core group consists of Franz, Eric, Andrea, and Kelly, as well as Sally Skrip (Provost's Office), Mike Koskey (ANSRD), Brenda Konar (SFOS), Chris Beks (OIT), and Nathan Zierfuss (OIT).

Franz reports that both Faculty Senate leadership and Provost Henrichs are satisfied with the approach we have taken and that what we have done is in line with what was expected of us. We have emphasized that we are not making a decision but are providing Faculty Senate with enough information so that a decision can be made.

Our last vendor demonstration is this Friday, March 29 at 9:00 am in Rasmuson 503.

V. Other Business

Joy requested that we each take some New Faculty Mentoring Program fliers back to our respective departments to share with faculty members and candidates.

Franz noted that at the Administrative Committee meeting there was some discussion regarding the expansion of eLearning and distance delivery at UAF. The discussion focused on ways for the eLearning Center to address some concerns that linger amongst the faculty about the expansion of eLearning activities on campus. Joy suggested that Faculty Senate invite Carol Gering to talk to them. Franz said that YouTube videos were mentioned as a way to demonstrate what their instructional designers can do to help faculty.

Izetta brought up the fact that she never sees the results of her student course evaluations whether they are paper-based or electronic and noted that there needs to be some standardization and training for new faculty. Joy stated that she is not alone in this and went on to clarify that it is Izetta's unit's responsibility to ensure that she gets evaluated and receives the results of her student course evaluations.

VI. Upcoming events:

Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, April 1, 2013 from 1:00 – 3:00 pm in Wood Center

VII. Next FDAI Meeting: Tuesday, April 30, 2013 from 11:00 am to 12:00 pm.

IX. Adjourned at 11:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for 3/20/2013**

Participants: Stacy Howdeshell, Lillian Misel, Tim Bartholomaus, Mike Daku, Libby Eddy, John Yarie, Vince Cee, Donie Bret-Harte, Cheng-fu Chen, Chung-sang Ng, Franz Mueter, Elisabeth Nadin, Lara Horstmann, Wayne Marr, Hope Bickmeier (standing in for Laura Bender)

I. Minutes Approved

II. Discussion of residence credits. Confusion between Alaska State residency and resident credits (through UAF)

Proposed Text: change to say “Resident credit is any credit earned through UAF”

Action item: change wording to say classes from UAF. We will work with Libby and Lily to develop wording, then make a motion. This would require Board of Regents approval, so the wording needs to be exact, and it may be a long process.

III. Discussion of thesis formatting.

Tim Bartholomaus presented that the graduate students are interested in updating the thesis format so it is less bulky; would be cheaper to produce, would look nice, would be easier to give to colleagues. They would like to be able to include published papers, and format the thesis in journal format.

There was some discussion about how important this really is in the age of pdfs, when one can send papers electronically. There was also discussion about why theses are formatted the way they are now. It is probably largely historical: it has always been done this way. There was discussion of advantages and disadvantages of the current format, and the need for standards. Tim expressed that standards are good, but they should be more modern. It was agreed that we need to find out what the constraints of the library and the graduate school are. This can be revisited at a future meeting.

IV. Numerous courses were discussed; most were still pending further revisions by the instructors. GAAC passed the following courses

23-GNC: New Course: [ATM F610 - Analysis Methods in Meteorology and Climate](#)

V. New courses were assigned, as described in the Table of Assignments.

Due to conflicts, the next meeting will be held April 17

Additional set of minutes continued next page:

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for 4/17/2013**

Attending: Vince Cee, William Post (guest), Karen Jensen, Tim Bartholomaus, Laura Bender, Cheng-fu Chen, John Eichelberger, Donie Bret-Harte, Lara Horstmann, Elisabeth Nadin, Wayne Marr, Franz Mueter

The minutes from our previous meeting were approved.

Most of the hour was devoted to a discussion with William Post of the Music Department about their proposal to develop a Master's of Music degree, which is performance-based, and to discontinue the existing Master of Arts in Music degree. GAAC had previously heard from two faculty in the music department who have concerns about this change. This discussion allowed us to explore the reasons why the change has been proposed. We did not vote on these proposals at this meeting.

The 2013 Usibelli Award winners are:

Teaching: Dr. Jonathan Rosenberg, Professor, Political Science
Research: Dr. Jeffrey Freymueller, Professor, Geology & Geophysics
Service: Dr. Catherine Cahill, Associate Professor, Chemistry & Biochemistry

Usibelli Award Nominees 2013

Category/Nominee	Title	Discipline	School/ Department
Teaching			
Mason, Charles	Professor	Journalism	CLA
Meritt, Patricia	Professor	Early Childhood Education	UAF CTC
*Rosenberg, Jonathan	Professor	Political Science	CLA
Thompson, Joseph	Associate Professor	Philosophy & Humanities	CLA
Research			
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar	Professor	Mining Engineering	CEM
*Freymueller, Jeff	Professor	Geology & Geophysics	CNSM / GI
Mollett, David	Associate Professor	Art	CLA
Palter, Morris	Associate Professor	Music	CLA
Ruess, Roger	Professor	Biology & Wildlife	CNSM / IAB
Sassen, Kenneth	Professor	Atmospheric Sciences	CNSM / GI
Walter Anthony, Katey	Assistant Professor	Environmental Science	INE
Service			
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar	Professor	Mining Engineering	CEM
*Cahill, Catherine	Associate Professor	Chemistry & Biochemistry	CNSM / GI
Ralonde, Raymond	Professor	Marine Advisory Program	SFOS
Tannehill, Linda	Professor	Extension	CES

*Award recipients

2013 UAF Emeriti Recipients

Name	Current Rank	Highest Degree	Title
Barnhardt, Carol	Associate Professor	PhD	Associate Professor of Elementary Education, Emerita
Barnhardt, Raymond	Professor	PhD	Professor of Cross Cultural Studies, Emeritus
Crapo, Charles	Professor	PhD	Professor of Seafood Science, Emeritus
Irish, Joel	Professor	PhD	Professor of Anthropology, Emeritus
Kowalik, Zygmunt	Professor	PhD	Professor of Oceanography, Emeritus
Lee, Jonah	Professor	PhD	Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Emeritus
Lewis, Carol	Professor	PhD	Dean of School of Natural Resources & Agricultural Sciences and Professor of Resource Management, Emerita
Motyka, Roman	Research Professor	PhD	Research Professor, Emeritus
Schweitzer, Peter	Professor	PhD	Professor of Anthropology, Emeritus
Stitt, Jan	Creative Director		Creative Director of Marketing and Communications, Emerita
Stortz, Peter	Professor	MS	Professor of Extension, Emeritus
Walsh, Daniel	Professor	MS	Professor of Mineral Preparation Engineering, Emeritus

ATTACHMENT 191/24
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following calendar for its 2013-2014 meetings.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Dates must be firmed up for the meeting schedule to allow for advance planning, and Wood Center room reservations must be scheduled well in advance.

UAF Faculty Senate Meetings

Location is the Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom, unless otherwise noted in the meeting agenda.
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/>

Fall 2013 Semester				
Meeting #:	Date	Day	Time	Type
192	Sept. 9, 2013	Monday	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
193	Oct. 7, 2013	Monday	1-3 PM	Face to Face
194	Nov. 4, 2013	Monday	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
195	Dec. 2, 2013	Monday	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
Spring 2014 Semester				
196	Feb. 3, 2014	Monday	1-3 PM	Face to Face
197	Mar. 3, 2014	Monday	1-3 PM	Video/Audio Conference
198	Apr. 7, 2014	Monday	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
199	May 5, 2014	Monday	1-3 PM	Face to Face

ATTACHMENT 191/25
UAF Faculty Senate #191, May 6, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to authorize the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate on all matters within its purview, which may arise until the Senate resumes deliberations in the Fall of 2013. Senators will be kept informed of the Administrative Committee's meetings and will be encouraged to attend and participate in these meetings.

EFFECTIVE: May 6, 2013

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