

MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #185

Monday, October 8, 2012

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds

A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	WEBER, Jane (14)
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (13)	WEBLEY, Peter (14)
ALBERTSON, Leif (14) - audio	WINFREE, Cathy (13)
ALEXEEV, Vladimir (13)	YARIE, John (14)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (13)	Members Absent:
BROWN, Stephen (13) - audio	BANDOPADHYAY, Sukumar (13)
CEE, Vincent (14)	CHEN, Cheng-fu (14)
DAVIS, Mike (14)	CHAMBERS, Izetta (14)
FALLEN, Chris (13)	COOK, Christine (14)
FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)	HEATON, John (14)
GEORGE-BETTISWORTH, R. (13)	WINSOR, Peter (14)
GUSTAFSON, Karen (13)	ZHANG, Xiong (14)
HARDY, Cindy (13)	
HARDY, Sarah (13)	Others Present:
HEALY, Joanne (13)	Debu Misra
HENRY, David (13)	Mari Freitag - ASUAF
JENSEN, Karen (14)	Dana Thomas, VPAA
JOHNSTON, DUFF (13)	Provost Susan Henrichs
JOLY, Julie (13)	Interim Dean Alex Fitts
LARDON, Cecile (13)	Chancellor Brian Rogers - audio
LAWLOR, Orion (13)	Interim Registrar Libby Eddy
MARR, Wayne (14) – Jungho Baek	Lillian Misel, Asst. Registrar
MCEACHERN, Diane (13) - audio	Paul Layer, Dean, CNSM
MEYER, Franz (13)	Jon Dehn, RAC Chair
NADIN, Elisabeth (13) – Falk Huettmann	Dani Sheppard
NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)	Jean Richey – Core Review
NG, Chung-Sang (13) Brian Rasley	Joy Morrison
RADENBAUGH, Todd (13)	Eric Madsen
REYNOLDS, Jennifer	Georgina Gibson
SHORT, Margaret (13)	Carol Murphrey – RSS
VALENTINE, Dave	Scott Bell, Facilities

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #184

Meeting minutes for #184 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Motions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Delete the MAT in Biology Program

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer thanked all members who participated in the online discussion about Blackboard and alternative course management systems. In particular, both Orion Lawlor and Rob Duke were thanked for the information they contributed about Moodle. A summary of the comments will go to Faculty Alliance this Friday for their meeting. They will discuss the next steps that all three MAUs can take on this matter. Jennifer is working with Bill Wakefield at OIT to obtain new statistics on Blackboard usage for UAF and UAS. Further comments may still be added to the online discussion.

Jennifer also provided a heads-up about the Provost's request for Faculty Senate to work with Eric Madsen and look into electronic course assessment. There will be an initial meeting this week. The mandate is to look again at available options and decide whether there is a good one to use at UAF. The Senate had looked into this two years ago, and, not being pleased with what was available at that time, passed a motion to request more research be done and that the Senate be involved in any future choice of a system. The task has been assigned to the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee chaired by Franz Meyer. Share any comments, suggestions and concerns with him.

Jane W. asked if UAA and UAS are using electronic course assessment. Jennifer responded that UAA is; and, they hate it because of the horrible response rate which is so bad they put a disclaimer on the results indicating they are not statistically valid. UAS uses electronic course assessment in some circumstances (as does UAF), but not across the board. Jennifer noted we do want to utilize what UAA has learned in their process.

Franz M. asked for anyone with information from two years ago to please share it with him.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – David Valentine

David V. announced that the photo shoot planned for today has been cancelled as photographer Todd Paris is out due to illness.

Regarding Blackboard and course management systems, David mentioned that Carol Gering, director of e-learning, has met with him and agreed to help with getting more information about usability of the systems that are currently available (Blackboard, Moodle, Canvas, and Desire to Learn). This spring some of the e-learning instructors will run trials and gather input from both students and instructors about usability of those systems for distance education.

Carol has also volunteered to run some usability trials with faculty volunteers here at UAF, also in the spring semester. The trials would involve trying out specific tasks in the various systems. A report on both of these studies would come out later in the spring. David encouraged faculty to consider participating in these trials.

David also reported on a demo of Faculty180 software for electronic annual activity reporting that took place at Provost's Council. He was impressed with the fact that it was a potential time-saver for recordkeeping tasks during the academic year (to compile activities for future reporting). It also has some depth to it, such as the capability of attaching PDFs of publications and course syllabi, for example. He suggests that faculty try it out as the pilot is unrolled. He also cautioned faculty to be mindful not only of the capabilities that they like, but those that might cause them concern in terms of "mission creep" – more information being required for reporting purposes down the road.

Debu M. asked about a timeline for replacing Blackboard. David responded that the question was complex and does not have an easy answer. The current discussion is being driven by two things which include the affordability of continuing with Blackboard because its costs are increasing, and the potential desire of faculty and students to adopt something else. A lot depends upon what we decide we would like. The focus right now is to gather information and not act precipitously.

Brian R. asked about participating in the electronic activity reporting trial and the ability to reuse what is produced for next year's reporting. Provost Henrichs confirmed that those participating in the trial would be provided the full package of software and would be able to save the results for future reports.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

[The Chancellor called in via audio conference. His remarks followed the Provost's.]

Chancellor Rogers mentioned the Board of Regents November budget meeting which will be in Anchorage. He also mentioned the December meeting in Fairbanks and encouraged Faculty Senate members to attend and talk about issues that are important to them. The Board hears a lot about shared governance, and it's important that they see the faculty involved in shared governance. They need to hear about issues, performance measures, and how we carry out our mission and faculty tripartite missions, and the importance of research at UAF. Testimony would also be welcomed relevant to the Strategic Direction Initiative (SDI) as well as to the university budget.

He is finalizing appointments to the student diversity taskforce, and Alex Fitts will chair that group. Appointment letters should be out this week. He has not yet received all the nominations for the Women's Center permanent advisory council, but will be working on that this week.

Last month's Board of Regents meeting was favorable to UAF, allowing it to move forward on a number of projects. But, he shares some of the same concerns which Susan already shared, noting that the Board is consistently focusing on outcomes and speed to completion of what we do. We will hear more calls for accountability and productivity measures, which will be challenging particularly since we are a research university that is focused not only on students but also on the creation of new knowledge and creative activity. We need to find new ways to paint that picture so that the public and the Board understand the role of a land grant university. Telling that story is part of his role and he invited faculty to join him in this effort.

Chancellor Rogers expressed his thanks again for the work being done on General Education revitalization, reiterating that he sees this as the most important transformational process going on at the university right now. He acknowledges that it is a lot of work and he and the Provost wish to support it as much as they can.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs reported on the Board of Regents meeting held a couple of weeks ago, particularly noting the discussions in the Academic Affairs Committee. The statewide system has been working on the Strategic Direction Initiative with a particular focus developing on student success and achievement. This focus has been picked up in the Academic Affairs committee, while other issues such as community partnerships, K-12 partnerships, and research, for example, are not getting the same amount of attention. The chancellors and provosts are working to get more attention paid to these other areas because, while student success and achievement are important to everyone, these other issues are important to the university and its role in Alaska. However, the attention on student achievement right now is something that will require everyone to work on this aspect of what the university does in a variety of ways. The regents and the president have expressed concern about the role of remedial education, and while Provost Henrichs understands that what we do here is developmental education rather than remedial, there have been a number of national studies that came out recently which call into question the benefits of remedial education and the approaches universities have been using in the past. The studies have some merit as well as some deficiencies. What she urges at this point and will work with faculty to address, is how we can demonstrate to the Regents' and President's satisfaction that what is being done in this area is important, necessary and effective for students. And, if it's found by our examination that what is currently being done is not as effective and good as it could be for students, then she would hope that improvements would be made.

Another issue coming up repeatedly at the Regents' level is that of transfer credit. The Regents understand the issue is about what transferred credit will count for in terms of degree requirements. The issue is extremely complicated. There will probably be some strong encouragement for the MAUs to work together to make movement of students between the locations more seamless and transparent than it is now.

The third issue coming up the Board of Regents meetings is the effective, efficient use of resources. The Regents are asking if program review is being conducted rigorously and effectively, and if it's being used to allocate resources appropriately. They want clear answers.

Todd R. asked how success is being defined and how programs are being assessed. Susan responded that a definition of success needs to be determined and that current definitions may need to be expanded. She explained that this is an opportunity to define how success is measured right now because the performance reporting system has changed at both the state budget and management office and the UA system office. While some of the definitions for success are fixed, additional reports may be added by the university. Current standards include freshman retention and rate of graduation. Satisfactory academic progress has been recently added - a measure also used for financial aid. Persistence could be added, particularly for rural campuses. Susan invited rural campuses to submit other measures they would like to have used for measuring their success.

Debu M. commented that faculty need time to come up with good solid measures. Their time should be utilized to make this kind of input into how student success is measured. Susan noted that allocating time in faculty workloads is the purview of the deans, and that the issue could be brought up in Dean's Council.

Cecile L. asked if there were any specific resources that the Regents were concerned about. Susan noted that two things that came up at this meeting: 1.) The regents wanted to know where freed-up resources resulting from program review were being reallocated; and, 2.) For every program offered, what is the ratio of student credit hours to individual FTE faculty. These requests indicate the kind of information they think is appropriate, although there are many ways to look at the value of programs. They mainly have business backgrounds and they look at financial metrics as the measure of success.

Cindy H. asked if the Regents were made aware of any of the Developmental Education department data showing developmental student success rates. Susan said they were not, but she has read the data and report for NADE. She would like to see a shorter report put together that illustrates the key points of that data. Cindy noted that they do have one and she will get it to Susan.

V Old Business

- A. Motion to amend the Bylaws requirement that all represented units have at least two Senators, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/1)

Jennifer provided some background on the motions concerning reapportionment. Franz M. shared reasons he thinks representation should not be decreased to less than two representatives per unit. He mentioned the fact that staggered terms of two representatives provide continuity from year to year, and a means for helping newer members learn the process. Many younger faculty are encouraged to join Senate and need the benefit of learning from older members. It benefits the unit, also. Franz spoke to the IARC and GI directors, noting they are interested in keeping two representative seats. Many faculty in these two large units do not qualify as Senate members because of their teaching appointments, even when those appointments are very small, but representation still affects them. Franz urged care in weighing the incentive for doing this vs. the effect on the units.

Cecile L. commented that faculty with small academic appointments are still represented through the academic units. Franz responded that representation, for example, through an academic appointment with CNSM is for the purpose of representing CNSM as a college, and not the GI as a research unit. Cecile noted that the larger concerns as a faculty would still be represented, though perhaps not concerns of the unit. Franz saw that as further reason for careful discussion.

Todd R. asked for clarification about how joint appointments are represented. Jennifer explained that term or tenure-track faculty with split appointments are counted in the academic unit where they are evaluated for promotion and/or tenure. Locus of tenure determines the unit through which one is represented. So, for example, faculty at the GI with teaching appointments are tenure-track in an academic unit and would not be counted for GI representation purposes.

Vladimir A. noted that researchers often travel, which is a practical consideration for having two representatives.

Ken A. commented on the fact that the two-representative minimum came about in 2006, and the basis for that minimum was to provide for staggered terms that could ensure good representation and continuity. He urged that the motion be voted down. Cecile commented that while that is a good point, it's not strong enough by itself. She thinks senators who are vacating a seat have the responsibility to communicate with incoming senators.

Julie J. clarified that the impetus of this motion was the difficulty of filling two seats at the smaller units. She asked about making this a choice by the units whether or not they fill two seats. Jennifer noted that

is always an option for the units, but what has tended to happen is that the directors recruit or appoint faculty to serve as the representative. What has happened in the past is that the unit faculty are not making a decision about their representation.

Orion L. commented that he will vote no on this motion because he doesn't want to see the research folks lose representation. He suggested that perhaps the way to fix this would be to use majority appointment as the rule for reapportionment purposes rather than locus of tenure for split appointments.

Debu M. asked how research or term faculty are represented by Faculty Senate, noting the Institute of Northern Engineering as an example for CEM. Jennifer recounted details from the last reapportionment. First, INE had been separated out from CEM in terms of faculty representation. But, then they were kept together because the INE director reports to the CEM dean, not the Provost. Debu responded that the research faculty are being disenfranchised by this.

Joanne H. spoke in support of two representatives because each brings their own perspectives on issues. Having a discussion after meetings and talking about what they will bring back to their units is a valuable process.

Franz M. commented about efforts to increase awareness at GI and IARC about the importance of being represented at Senate to ensure sustained involvement; and, that having two reps will increase likelihood of reporting back to the units.

Georgina G. (alternate for IARC) asked about the ramifications of this motion on IARC. They have two representatives and wish to keep both. Would they be reduced to one? Jennifer clarified that the smallest units (which include IARC and GI) would end up with one representative. Georgina voiced her support for keeping a minimum of two representatives for each unit.

A vote was taken and nays failed the motion, with one abstention.

- B. Motion to amend the Bylaws to increase the target number of elected seats in the Faculty Senate, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/2)

Jennifer explained that this motion had been necessary if the first one passed – to keep the total number of representatives steady at 39. Mike D. moved to table the motion and was seconded. It was unanimously voted to table the motion.

- C. Motion to amend the Bylaws with regard to non-voting members of the Faculty Senate, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/3)

Jennifer noted that this motion is basically a housekeeping motion to clean up the bylaws regarding ex officio members. Ayes passed the motion unanimously.

- D. Motion to conduct reapportionment of representation among the qualifying units at UAF, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/4)

Jennifer provided the background for the motion, reiterating that it is a response to the Library unit's request because they would like separate Senate representation now that they are no longer housed under the College of Liberal Arts. They do not have any joint appointments.

The Provost's Office would gather the data and the Faculty Affairs Committee would apply the calculation formula and determine results which would take effect upon spring semester elections. The motion was passed unanimously.

New business was conducted after a short break. The planned photo shoot was cancelled due to Todd Paris being out sick. (Rescheduling will occur for February's face-to-face meeting.)

VI New Business

- A. Motion to amend the Student Probation policy, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 185/5)

[Discussion of this motion occurred after the guest speaker.]

Rainer N. urged Faculty Senate to pass the motion. The motion adds clarification to the policy and how it's applied to the summer term (it does not change current practice). Rainer clarified for Orion that the Wintermester and Maymester are tacked onto the spring semester or summer term. The motion passed by majority with one Nay vote.

VII Discussion Items

- A. Commencement Schedule – Jennifer Reynolds

The May 2013 commencement will occur as scheduled. This discussion is about questions which would affect the May 2014 commencement. A decision needs to be made about it by the Chancellor in a couple of months or so. Faculty input is needed and there are two main questions to consider:

- 1.) Should the ceremony be moved to Saturday?
- 2.) Should there be a separate ceremony for hooding masters' degree recipients?

Jennifer summarized the pros and cons which will also be posted online for a more extensive Google discussion. There are two considerations for moving commencement from Sunday to Saturday. One is not to reduce faculty participation in the event, but rather increase it, if possible. Another main factor behind this proposal is that there is a heavy staff presence at commencement, and many are involved in working on the event the whole weekend. Travel is another factor, with a change to Saturday allowing travelers to return home on Sunday.

Regarding a separate ceremony for awarding master's degrees, the goal is to give master's students more recognition for their degrees rather than just keeping them on par with undergraduate degrees. A number of ideas were discussed last year, but the current one is to hold a separate hooding ceremony earlier on Saturday, and then have the master's and Ph.D. degree recipients also march in the main ceremony. All the events associated with commencement would fit into one Saturday. Because UAF is a research university, the involvement of graduate degree recipients with the main (larger) commencement ceremony would be maintained. Recognizing graduate degree recipients in a separate

smaller ceremony would be a compromise to keep from lengthening the larger commencement ceremony.

Cecile noted there is no perfect solution and asked about when and how this would be done. Jennifer made a comment in response that the disincentives may be so large that this idea is not pursued in the end. [Unfortunately, Cecile's comments were almost completely obscured because an online caller put their phone on hold and the resulting "hold music" overpowered the audio recording during this section of the meeting.]

Julie J. asked for discussion to be broadened to look into other options. Jennifer responded that it was fine to submit more ideas in the online discussion.

David V. commented that faculty participation is central to this matter. He'd like feedback from the units about holding two ceremonies and whether or not faculty would attend both. The goal may be a noble one, but if the end result is a diluted faculty presence at commencement, that's not a positive outcome. Jennifer encouraged faculty to poll their graduate students, as well as their colleagues. She mentioned the option of keeping the hooding of Ph.D. students in the main ceremony, while the hooding of the master's students would take place separately. This would encourage the faculty to attend both ceremonies.

Debu M. commented about the exam schedule and the fact that exams may occur on Saturday. The schedule will need to be shifted to allow for both students and faculty to participate in a Saturday commencement. David H. commented that holding to the current length of the commencement ceremony is important for both faculty and student participation. He's found that the length of the ceremony is already a deterrent to student participation.

Lillian Misel, assistant registrar for graduation and curriculum, mentioned that there are students who work on Saturday and are glad that commencement occurs on Sunday. She also mentioned that staff have had many discussions about the fact they work on the weekend to help with commencement, and they are used to it and accept that fact. One idea they would like to see considered is to hold a separate graduation for the CTC graduates instead. It would be preferable to keep the master's and Ph.D. ceremony with the baccalaureate graduation to inspire the undergraduates who may be thinking about continuing on to Graduate School.

B. Update on General Education Revitalization – David Valentine

David commented about the GERC information sessions held this month. He noted that GERC members have also met at some of the colleges and departments to hear about concerns and ideas. He noted common concern about any kinds of changes to the allocation of resources.

GERC has only two of its original members from several years ago, so there is a certain amount of revisiting issues because of this. A survey poll is targeted to go out on or near October 15. He encouraged all faculty to fill it out. Alex Fitts also encouraged faculty to take the poll and publicize it. The poll has fields for comments and Alex urged faculty to include their comments.

C. Posting course syllabi online in a central repository

[This discussion item was not covered due to time constraints. An online discussion will be started and it will be carried over to the November meeting agenda.]

VIII Public Comments/Questions

Dani Sheppard of the Psychology Department introduced herself as the faculty athletics representative, a position which is required by the NCAA and appointed by the chancellor. NCAA tasks this position with three priorities, which include ensuring academic integrity within the Athletics program by making sure that policies and procedures allow for academic integrity to remain a priority in the athletics program; maintaining compliance with NCAA regulations as a member institution; and, looking out for the wellbeing of student athletes in the program to ensure they do not become tangled up in the politics surrounding athletics. She serves as a liaison between faculty and the Athletics department. Her position reports to the Chancellor and she is not a member of the Athletics department. She also works on behalf of the student athletes. She will bring her comments to the next meeting, in the interest of time.

IX Guest Speaker: Dana Thomas, VPAA Topic: Strategic Direction Initiatives (SDI)

Dana presented the Faculty Senate with what the next steps are in the SDI process and reasons that faculty should stay engaged in this conversation. He also had a couple of questions for the consideration of the Senate, in addition to making himself available to answer questions.

Since the completion of the approximately 80 listening sessions across the state, all comments have been compiled in a Word document. A group composed of governance leaders and alumni has met and tried to sort out the resulting themes and topics that occurred. In addition to what was gathered from the listening sessions, there is information from the Fisher Report, and the MacTaggart Report, as well as institutional data. From all of this have come a variety of themes and topics along with some thought provoking questions. A draft form of this will be sent to the three MAUs and all the governance groups around mid-October 15. Requested input from everyone includes identifying what items are priorities, which items to handle internally at MAUs, and which should be addressed system-wide.

Dana provided an example of an issue the entire system should address. He would like to see the system be able to communicate to potential students and their parents, as well as to state government and the general public, what we think are the entry level collegiate courses (particularly in Math and English) and what the required placement scores are to get into those courses. An example where he would expect to see something different at each MAU was how student advising is handled. Simply by scale, how UAA handles advising is going to be different than UAS.

Feedback is requested by November 30. Thought needs to be given on how to organize the feedback. After all the feedback is received from the MAUs, they'll sort it and identify commonalities between groups, paying attention to specific groups that bring up the same topics as priorities. This information will be again brought back to everyone in order to be addressed as major target areas. The conversation will then become what to do about what are identified as major target areas. A time for action would naturally follow that would include governance and administration.

Why play in this process? Dana noted that in the 31 years he has been here, this is the first time a president has listened to the entire state for feedback before laying out a strategic direction plan. He hopes the resulting plan will get buy-in through the process that is being used. It's an opportunity that may lead to real forward progress.

Why is change needed? Dana has sent Faculty Alliance a list of national ratings which put Alaska in a negative light. For example, the Washington Post in June of 2012 reported that Alaska has the lowest

completion rate in the nation for higher education – certainly not good press for recruiting students from outside. Federal IPEDS data show that Alaska has the highest cost per student. This is a bad combination that should catch our attention. This point leads back to the legislature and Board of Regents. SDI helps recognize and address these types of issues. We may not have full control over some of the issues (like completion), but we must pay attention in order to take action and change.

Dana spoke changes in higher education that get our attention, one being the “massive open online courses” or “MOOCs.” Stanford faculty offered a MOOC on artificial intelligence which had over 50 thousand students enrolled worldwide. He then offered another course which had over 160,000 students enrolled, of which more than 20,000 completed the course. Then, an article appeared in the Chronicle that the Gates Foundation has offered five million dollars to institutions to fund MOOCs of general education courses. Another major shift is that now other groups are doing this (Udacity, Coursera, for example). Colorado State University (with whom we share the veterinary medicine program) is now accepting credit for some of these types of courses. Should we do this too? We have an invitation from Coursera to start offering MOOCs. Faculty Senate needs to decide these sorts of issues.

With oil production declining, paying attention to the issues now before we get to budget issues is important. SDI is an opportunity to do that.

Dana brought up the fact that each of the MAUs has three levels of remediation for English and Math. UA data indicates that prepared students have a six-year graduation rate of about 35%. Students placed in the lowest level of remediation for a course have a six-year graduation rate of about 10%. Is it ethical to admit those students into baccalaureate programs, or should those students be given an intermediate goal? National research indicates that students with that lowest level of preparation have higher motivation and higher completion if they are instead engaged in coursework where the math and English content is content-driven. That’s very similar to the definition of our associates and associates of applied science programs which have embedded coursework.

Rainer N. asked what specific role Dana sees the Faculty Senate taking in the next 45 days. Dana reiterated the differentiation of issues as MAU specific or system issues, and prioritization of those issues. Rainer pondered how we can practically do this. Dana doesn’t think it will be too difficult because many of the issues on the list are ones already familiar to faculty and the Senate.

Cindy H. commented about remedial education, differentiating it from the developmental approach used at UAF which addresses the whole student. She noted that 56% of all students take some form of developmental education. The data she has suggests that success rates are higher for students who’ve gone through developmental courses when they take the college-level course, indicating that they’re being prepared for the next level. The data we have flies in the face of the national data because we’re measuring a different type of education. Dana made the distinction that he’s talking about degree completion rather than course sequencing.

Todd commented about occupational endorsements which could be used to provide more pathways into careers. He noted it sidesteps the core; but that can be picked up for returning students. Dana acknowledged Todd’s point and that it would play well into the conversation that always happens about workforce development with the legislature. Statewide would have no problem with having more OEs, and they don’t need approval by the Board of Regents. But, he noted his philosophical beliefs that a higher education is about a lot more than just getting a job.

Cecile L. commented that a lot of universities, including ours, have gotten themselves into a corner because of the pressure to increase revenue by bringing in more and more unprepared students – then finding themselves surprised when they don’t finish programs. The more people we bring in from all walks of life, the more will not finish a four-year degree. Dana agreed that perhaps a baccalaureate degree is not for everybody, but that there is something for most everyone whether it’s an OE or an associate’s degree. Dana recalled that when he recently attended outside training that other institutions were also saying that 50-60% of their students were different and unique (non-traditional, unprepared). What is unique for Alaska is our geographic distribution across the state. Jane W. commented that we are unique in that we don’t have a system of community colleges throughout the state like other states; we just have the one community college, Prince William Sound. So, most everyone who might go to community college first has to come to this university. Dana asked if we are redirecting unprepared students well if they are not ready for a four-year program.

Debu M. asked for clarification about the open source classes, whether or not they are a good thing. Dana stressed he doesn’t know how these types of courses will work out. He urged people to find out more about it, mentioning a web site called “Epic” which lays out a pretty amazing plan. Debu responded that his question is more about why are faculty here locally (what is their role) if things like accepting credit for MOOCs and offering of MOOCs comes into play.

Falk H. commented that when we compare ourselves as an arctic institution with other arctic nations facing similar issues, we are in the lead and have much to offer in this respect. He also expressed an interest in examining institutional data regarding graduate students and GRE scores.

Dana noted other institutions which have signed on with Coursera, including Brown University, Emory University, Ohio State University, Columbia University, University of British Columbia, University of California Irvine, University of Florida, University of London, among others. He noted Coursera has extended an invitation for us to join also.

Jennifer thanked Dana for speaking to the Senate. She noted this conversation about SDI will be ongoing and invited online discussion.

X Governance Reports
A. Staff Council – Claudia Koch

A report from Staff Council was not available.

B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag

Mari reported that ASUAF is focusing this year on student outreach and soliciting as much feedback from students as possible. Other items she mentioned included:

- ASUAF has been hosting debates by candidates for state legislature.
- They have allocated \$50,000 to the Nanook training park from their carry-forward account and some funds from donors.
- Mari is involved with reorganization of the Office of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity (OMAD). She will sit on the task force for this and to help find a location for students affected by the recent changes.
- They are encouraging more student participation in campus events.
- She also reported details about the reorganization of the ASUAF Senate and its committees.

C. UNAC – Debu Misra

Debu stated his support of the Chancellor's comment that Faculty Senate members should get more involved with the Board of Regents' meetings and bring faculty issues before them.

He mentioned a health care questionnaire being circulated by Abel Bult-Ito to faculty and encouraged their participation. The questionnaire has 14 questions and is accessible online.

Debu invited faculty to ask him questions at any time and shared his office phone number.

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane announced the statewide Joint Health Care Committee will be meeting for two days next week. They will be discussing the rates for health care next year.

XI Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

B. Committee Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 185/6)

Faculty Affairs – Cecile Lardon, Chair (Attachment 185/7)

Unit Criteria – Karen Jensen, Chair (Attachment 185/8)

Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair

Core Review Committee – Latrice Bowman, Chair

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair
(Attachment 185/9)

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair
(Attachment 185/10)

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
(Attachment 185/11)

Research Advisory Committee – Jon Dehn, Chair (Attachment 185/12)

XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 PM.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection B (page 14). This amendment removes a requirement that all represented units have at least 2 Senators.

EFFECTIVE: November 2012

RATIONALE: Apportionment of representatives on the Faculty Senate is calculated based on the number of qualifying faculty in the unit. Units with as few as 9 faculty now qualify for representation, and for the smallest units the “minimum 2 senators” rule (plus 1 alternate) requires participation by up to one third of their faculty at all times. This is likely to result in unwilling and/or unrepresentative Senators, serving neither the interests of the unit nor of the Faculty Senate.

This amendment to the bylaws would drop the “minimum 2 senators” rule, so that the smallest units would be represented by 1 senator rather than 2. It would not change whether or not a unit qualified for representation on the Faculty Senate.

This change would go into effect with the upcoming reapportionment in November 2012 and would affect elections in Spring 2013.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

B. Representation shall be by academic or research unit and based on the number of qualifying faculty in each unit as described below.

[[7. Each unit will have at least 2 representatives.]]

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsections A and B (pages 13-14). This amendment increases the target number of elected seats in the Faculty Senate.

EFFECTIVE: November 2012

RATIONALE: The Bylaws specify a target number of 35 elected senators, to be apportioned among the units according to the number of qualifying faculty in each unit. In practice, because of the “minimum 2 senators” rule that is addressed by a separate motion the UAF Faculty Senate has had 37 senators for approximately a decade until reapportionment in Fall 2010. This reapportionment added two small units and increased the size of the Faculty Senate to 39 elected members. That is the current size.

The Faculty Senate functions well with 39 elected senators, and it is easier to fully staff the Standing and Permanent Committees with this larger number of senators. If the Faculty Senate removes the rule that all units have a minimum of 2 senators without making other changes to the Bylaws, the number of senators will drop to the Bylaws’ target level of 35 senators. This amendment would enable the Faculty Senate to remain at its present size if the “minimum 2 senators” rule is removed. All seats would be distributed proportionately, according to the number of faculty in each unit.

This change would go into effect with the next reapportionment and would affect the first elections thereafter.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

- A. The membership of the Faculty Senate, hereinafter referred to as "Senate," shall consist of approximately **45** ~~[[41]]~~ members plus one non-voting presiding officer. Approximately **39** ~~[[35]]~~ members shall be elected by and from the faculty and will have voting privileges.
...
- B. Representation shall be by academic or research unit and based on the number of qualifying faculty in each unit as described below.
...
- 4. Each unit will elect the number of representatives to the Senate equal to the number of qualifying faculty in that unit divided by the total number of qualifying faculty at UAF, multiplied by **39** ~~[[35]]~~ and rounded to the nearest integer.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection A (page 13). This amendment modifies the bylaws regarding non-voting members of the Faculty Senate to conform with recent and current practice.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately.

RATIONALE: The Bylaws provide for nine non-voting members of the UAF Faculty Senate. These bylaws have not been followed in recent years. The following amendments to the bylaws change the number of non-voting members to seven and adopt recent practices as official Faculty Senate policy.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

- A. The membership of the Faculty Senate, hereinafter referred to as "Senate," ... **FOUR** **[[Six]]** non-voting members will be selected by and from other university constituencies as follows: one **[[non-graduate student and one graduate]]** student selected by the ASUAF; one **DEAN OR DIRECTOR SELECTED BY THE PROVOST** **[[professional school dean and one college dean selected by the Deans' Council]]**; one staff representative from the registrar's office; and one additional staff member selected by the Staff Council. **[[If the staff representative from the registrar's office is APT, the second staff member must come from the classified staff ranks. If the staff representative from the registrar's office is classified, the second staff member must be APT.]]** Three additional non-voting members will be selected by and from the **FACULTY** unions as follows: one elected official each from United Academics-AAUP/AFT, UAFT, **AND** Adjuncts (United Academics)-AAUP/AFT.

ATTACHMENT 185/4
UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to conduct reapportionment of representation among the qualifying units at UAF.

EFFECTIVE: November 2012.

RATIONALE: According to Faculty Senate Bylaws, “Re-apportionment will be done in the year of accreditation review of UAF, expected to be every seven years, or upon two-thirds vote of the Senate.” The Libraries faculty have requested that the Faculty Senate conduct reapportionment under the second option, requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Until recently Library faculty were academically housed in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and the Libraries faculty were represented on the Faculty Senate as part of CLA. In the past year the Libraries have become an independent unit and their dean now reports directly to the Provost. They also wish to have separate representation on Faculty Senate.

Reapportionment will be conducted by the Faculty Affairs Committee with October 2012 data provided by the Provost’s Office, and the results will take effect with the Faculty Senate elections in Spring 2013.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the academic policy regarding undergraduate probation.

Effective: Fall 2013

Rationale: Adding the summer session to the undergraduate probation policy will help clarify this policy. No change is intended to the disqualification policy which would remain as it is (referring to fall/spring and spring/fall semesters).

NOTE: The current printed version of the Catalog contains an error to the first sentence of this policy. However, the online version of the Catalog contains correct wording, which is used below.

Current *UAF Catalog* language from the online version, page 50:

PROBATION

Undergraduate students -- Students whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after each fall and spring semester will be put on academic probation. Students on probation may not enroll in more than 13 credits a semester, unless an exception is granted by the appropriate dean. Probation may include additional conditions, as determined by the dean of the college or school in which the student's major is located. Students on probation will be referred for developmental advising/education and/or to an advising or support counseling center. The student will work with an academic advisor to prepare an academic plan for achieving a higher GPA; the advisor is responsible for forwarding this plan to the appropriate dean. A student on probation will not be allowed to register unless the academic plan is on file. Removal from probation requires the student's cumulative and semester GPAs to be at least 2.0.

CAPS = Additions

[[]] = Deletions

Proposed *UAF Catalog* policy language:

Undergraduate students -- Students whose semester and (or) cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after **ANY SEMESTER INCLUDING THE SUMMER SESSION** will be put on academic probation.

...

Curricular Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes for 10 Sept. 2012 (with attachments)

Voting Members present: Ken Abramowicz; Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy; David Henry; Rainer Newberry (convener); Todd Radenbaugh (audio).

Voting Members absent: Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Diane McEachern.

Non-voting members present: Donald Crocker; Libby Eddy; Doug Goering; Linda Hapsmith; Lillian Misel; Andrea Schmidt from Advising.

Non-voting members absent: Carol Gering; Ginnie Kinne. Jayne Harvie present to take notes.

1. Elect a chairperson

Rainer Newberry noted that earlier in the year he had emailed the membership, asking if anyone would be willing to chair so he could take on the chairship of the General Ed Revitalization subcommittee of CAC. No one has stepped forward. He offered another opportunity, but no takers. Rainer was unanimously approved to chair the committee, much to everyone's relief.

2. Approve Rainer Newberry as CAC representative to (and chair of) Curriculum Review Committee

Rainer explained that Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) is another subcommittee of CAC, and its function with the college/school curriculum councils. The committee unanimously approved Rainer to continue as the CAC representative (and chair of) Curriculum Review Committee. He was sincerely thanked by the committee members for being willing to continue in that role, as well.

Future meeting times and locations were discussed. Monday afternoons were suggested and tentatively agreed upon, depending upon faculty schedules.

3. Approval of GERC 'action plan'

Rainer provided some background about the formation of GERC as a CAC subcommittee, and its continuing work. He described the General Education Revitalization Committee's (GERC) action plan (attached to the agenda) noting the need for its approval by the committee as an overall approach to changing general education (emphasizing that the details of the plan would remain fluid in that they are still being discussed at GERC). He also noted that GERC needs a chairperson as well as representation from CAC.

The approach that GERC wishes to take by means of this plan is to get faculty involved early on in this change process. They do not wish to merely devise a new core and then just foist it on the rest of the faculty.

One of the key parts of this action plan is that faculty will be formally surveyed to see if they wish to move from a Core of 39 credits to one of 34 credits. GERC also wishes to provide faculty with

opportunities to contribute to general education changes by means of campus-wide discussions, along with discussions at the department level.

Rainer noted that GERC needs a CAC member to attend its meetings and report back to CAC. This would also serve to provide Faculty Senate representation on the committee. Cindy H. requested to have a member of the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee on the GERC. Rainer concurred that this was a good suggestion and would be acted upon.

Rainer reported that the action plan had been examined and approved by Faculty Senate leadership, Dean's Council, and the Chancellor. The Chancellor will mention the project in his convocation tomorrow.

With regard to the position of Dean of University Studies mentioned in the action plan, Cindy asked if this position would replace the existing dean of general studies. Rainer provided some history on general studies (which concerns students who have not yet declared majors) and noted that the new position of dean would preside over "university studies": the baccalaureate core and all related requirements for graduation (i.e., "W" and "O" courses). The long-term position would not be a vice provost. Alex Fitts, now interim vice provost (and former GERC chair), has general studies along with university studies as part of her assignment, but without the accreditation piece.

Ken A. expressed concerns over just rubberstamping the action plan. He noted several items of concern on the action plan, particularly II.e. which is both time-consuming and involves talking to new students who are unfamiliar with the core. He noted that speaking with juniors and seniors would make more sense because they understand what the core means. Rainer agreed that this item could be taken out and that there were many details of the action plan that could be further discussed. But he stressed the overall need to approve the overall concept of the plan so the committee could move forward and approach all the faculty. The details would be refined further down the road. CAC members agreed that the overall concept of the plan could be endorsed, but not necessarily every detail of it at this time.

The committee next discussed item 5 on the agenda.

4. Proposal for revision in probation policy

Current wording: Students whose semester and cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after each fall and spring semester will be put on academic probation.

New suggested wording:

Students whose cumulative and (or) semester GPA falls below 2.0 after any semester including the summer session will be put on academic probation.

Note that, the disqualification entry would remain as it is now, and would refer to fall/spring and spring/fall semesters (two terms in a row).

Doug G. mentioned that Dean's Council had looked at the revised wording and thought it was appropriate.

Ken A. asked how the Mesters and summer session are figured in. Donald C. clarified that Wintermester is rolled into spring semester, and that Maymester and Summer Sessions are rolled into one. Donald asked if a student could be put on probation after Summer Sessions, could they be pulled off as well? Libby responded that probation could occur following Summer Sessions, but not disqualification. There isn't enough turnaround time between summer and fall.

It was clarified that the changed wording of the policy means that probation can occur because of one term with a semester GPA below 2.0, or an overall (cumulative) GPA below 2.0. But disqualification would only be determined on fall/spring or spring/fall semesters. Donald asked about a scenario where the GPA is below 2.0 in spring, OK in summer, and then below 2.0 in fall. The result would be probation (not disqualification). Disqualification occurs on the basis of two semester below 2.0 and an overall GPA below 2.0. A student might be on probation for two semesters, but with a GPA above 2.0 they would not be disqualified.

A discussion occurred about this change being a correction to the existing Catalog because of a “cut and paste” error made last year that shows in the printed Catalog. The online addendum is correct and in line with current practice.

Donald asked about how financial aid is affected for summer. Libby will check on that.

The need for academic advising in the summer session was noted. Dean Goering noted seeing some bad examples resulting from students not being advised about the summer courses. Everyone seemed to agree the ramifications of this change needs to be addressed by further discussion, and that the Summer Sessions Office should be included (as far as it affects degree-seeking students).

Rainer proposed carrying on this discussion to the next meeting and that financial aid and other ramifications (e.g., being put on probation at the end of the summer; advising and registration issues) be looked into further between now and the next meeting. Libby will look into the financial aid issues.

5. Calendar revision for AY 2013-2014

Proposed change: grades required by TUESDAY NOON Dec 24 instead of the Usual Weds noon (Dec 25). This would give the AR folks a bit of a holiday...

Rainer described the need to amend the 2013-14 academic calendar because the due date for grades would fall on a holiday or the day after a holiday if left unchanged. The problem affects both faculty and staff. He suggested the committee approve a change to that semester so that the due date would be December 24. The committee agreed that the due date should not be delayed because it adversely affects students, as well as faculty and staff.

Libby E. brought up the problem of Wintermester dates during AY14. There is not enough time to hold Wintermester between Jan. 2 and the first day of spring semester classes. The problem was acknowledged by Rainer, but more time is needed to resolve it. A subcommittee will be specifically examining it. Mid-October would be optimistic for having this problem resolved. Libby will let Marketing know they need to wait on this one before they can publish the calendar.

Ken A. noted problems with Maymester in the past and with when spring semester starts (before or after Alaska Civil Rights Day). This problem is different in that it affects the period of hard closure. Cindy H. asked about holding class on Saturdays and Rainer responded that is one potential solution.

6. Proposed modification of excused absence policy (Catalog pg. 49)

Current. You are expected to attend classes regularly; unexcused absences may result in a failing grade. You must have prior written approval to miss the first class meeting or your

instructor may drop you. You are responsible for conferring with your instructor concerning absences and the possibility of making up missed work.

New suggested wording: Students are expected to adhere to the attendance policies set by their instructors. Students must have prior written approval to miss the first class meeting; otherwise, they may be dropped. Students are responsible for conferring with their instructors in advance concerning absences and the possibility of arranging alternate ways of learning the missed course material.

Further discussion on this item was postponed until the next meeting.

7. Proposed modification of absence notification (Catalog, pg. 49)

Current: You must notify your instructor(s) of all scheduled UAF-required absences for the semester (e.g., travel to athletic events) during the first week of classes.

Suggested modification: You must notify your instructor(s) of all scheduled UAF-required absences for the semester (e.g., travel to athletic events) by the end of the second week of classes (the deadline for late registration).

Note: the above is apparently what happens now, in violation of the catalog. But should it be further changed????? (Reference the copy of Sine Anahita's memo which was attached to the agenda).

Ken A. asked the committee to strongly consider not changing the notification by the student to the instructor to the second week of classes, but instead it should remain notification to the instructor on the first day of class. The second week can bring students too close the drop date and create more problems for both students and instructors. Rainer stressed the need for the committee members to look this over for the next meeting.

Karen G. noted that the first day of class for individual courses can vary.

Rainer requested the committee members have at least one sleepless night considering the issues at hand and come prepared for more discussion. He also suggested that online discussion could occur on these issues. He will try to get Athletics involved in the discussion with the committee.

8. OLD business that will be rearing its ugly Head.....Wintermester and etc.

(This item was rolled into the academic calendar discussion earlier in the meeting.)

Meeting was adjourned shortly after 10:00 AM.

ATTACHMENT 185/7

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee

September 21, 2012 Recap of Meeting

1. Cecile Lardon was elected as committee chair
2. The committee will meet on Mondays from 1 - 2, dates to be decided. The next meeting will be on October 15th. We will meet on lower campus this semester. (Jayne, could you see if the Kayak room is available for the 15th? And reserve the call-in code for that time? Thanks!!)
3. Revision of Blue Book: The committee will hold a joint meeting with the unit criteria committee and the provost to clarify what needs to be done to revise the Blue Book. This meeting will be on October 10th after 3:00 pm. Jayne Harvey will let us know what time the Provost is available. Cecile will make the necessary documents available to the committee.
4. The committee will resume work on the non-regular instructor project but will seek clarification from the Admin committee as to the specific goals for this project at this time. Cecile will send out info to committee members.

ATTACHMENT 185/8

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Faculty Senate – Unit Criteria Meeting Meeting Minutes for September 18, 2012

Members Present: Karen Jensen, chair; Christine Cook, Vladimir Alexeev, Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Javier Fochesatto, Jun Watabe, Cathy Winfree (audio)

Will work on Cooperative Extension Service (CES) unit criteria today, but also the Blue Book information throughout the semester

CES Revisions for discussion:

Page 4: B. Criteria for Instruction - 1 (Effectiveness in Teaching)

b. express positive regard for students, BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THEIR PUBLIC, develop good rapport with students AND CLIENTELE, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject; - **what does PUBLIC mean? Is it student public or community public?**

Page 4: 2 (Components of Evaluation)

a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms OR LETTERS, - **what is meant by LETTERS; are they recommendations letters, testimonials or letters of support from students, other professionals, etc.; need to clarify**

Page 5: 2 (Components of Evaluation)

F. REPEATED INVITATIONS TO TEACH – **explanation is needed; further clarification as to why this is showing effectiveness**

Page 5: C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FACULTY HAVE LIMITED OPPORTUNITIES TO CONDUCT TRADITIONAL RESEARCH AND VERY LIMITED ACCESS TO LABORATORIES AND GRADUATE STUDENTS. ADDITIONALLY, BIPARTITE FACULTY MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE A RESEARCH OBLIGATION. – **this paragraph is a general statement versus a criteria; it should be added to the end of the first paragraph in this section**

Page 6: 1 (Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity)

d. They must be judged to make a contribution AND BE RELEVANT TO CURRENT ALASKAN ISSUES. – **why only current issues; recommend deleting current**

2. Components of Research, Scholarly

Page 6: 2 (Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity)

f. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations AND CES PUBLICATIONS. – **why are the CES publications singled out? Are they also peer reviewed and/or refereed? Possible say AND IN-HOUSE CES PUBLICATIONS**

Page 7: D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is a 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 assumes a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service." – clarify with the chancellor regarding the term "free of charge" as this implies there will be no charges to the participant

* CES FACULTY WORK IS COUNTED AS PUBLIC SERVICE EVEN THOUGH THE UNIVERSITY MAY CHARGE A FEE FOR SOME ACTIVITIES. THESE FEES ARE NECESSARY TO RECOVER COSTS SUCH AS THOSE FOR ROOM RENT, PRINTED MATERIALS PROVIDED TO PARTICIPANTS, EQUIPMENT, AND OTHERS AND ARE NOT PAYMENT FOR FACULTY TIME NOR ARE THE FEES EVER RETAINED BY INDIVIDUAL FACULTY. – differentiates between faculty being paid on top of their original salary versus charges to the participant; do not feel this paragraph is necessary unless there is a specific reason for inclusion; clarification needed

Page 8: 1 (Public Service)

b. Service on or to government or public committees, COLLABORATIONS & PARTNERSHIPS ESTABLISHED WITH AGENCIES AND GROUPS AND UTILIZATION OF DISTRICT OR REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARDS, TASK FORCES, FOCUS GROUPS OR PUBLIC SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS TO IDENTIFY RELEVANT ISSUES AND PROBLEMS. – very wordy; might be beneficial to combine section b with l as there does not seem to be the necessity for both (L. ENGAGE THE PUBLIC IN ASSESSING RESEARCH NEEDS – AND COMMUNICATE THOSE NEEDS TO THE APPROPRIATE RESEARCH UNITS.)

Page 8: 1 (Public Service)

f. Consulting INCLUDING FACE TO FACE IN THE OFFICE OR OFF-SITE USING THE TELEPHONE, OR E-MAIL, (I.E. PRESSURE-GAUGE TESTING, INTERPRETATION OF SOIL TEST RESULTS, OR IDENTIFICATION OF INSECT, DISEASE OR WEED SPECIMENS). – the examples in the parenthesis are not necessary as they could be limiting; recommend taking the entire parenthesis out; also, is the clarification of face-to-face, in the office, or off-site using telephone, or e-mail necessary? Explain why this is specified; Just saying Consulting may be sufficient, or Consulting as Appropriate to the Unit; it would be beneficial to include a definition of consulting in the preamble to that section that is located on the bottom of page 7 with the introduction to Public Service

Page 9: 1 (Public Service)

M. MANAGING AN EFFECTIVE PARAPROFESSIONAL AND/OR VOLUNTEER PROGRAM TO HELP EXTEND CES RESOURCES OR DEVELOP LEADERSHIP SKILLS. – how do you know if they are effective? This appears to be more of an outcome measure versus criteria

N. EXEMPLARY RESPONSE IN EMERGENCY SITUATIONS RENDERED IN AN EXTENSION ROLE, TO CLIENTELE WHICH FACED THE EMERGENCY. – what is meant by exemplary? How would you measure whether it is exemplary? There need to be criteria in place to measure it

Karen will talk with CES to discuss some of these aspects and get clarification on some of the recommendations; she will ask Jayne who the chair of the CES Unit Criteria is to help get started.

Christine will type up the feedback to provide to Karen; Karen will talk with CES; if they have changes prior to October 1st, then the Unit Criteria Committee can review and if approve then

provide to the Faculty Senate for the October 8th meeting

Blue Book Review

Need to review the Blue Book to make sure it is in line with the Collective Bargaining Agreement; the Unit Criteria Committee is to meet with the Provost after 3pm on October 10 or sometime on October 11th to discuss what to address in the Blue Book; members reviewed their scheduled and decided on October 3rd. Karen was to determine a specific time and send the meeting information out to the committee.

Karen will also send the link to the Collective Bargaining Agreement so all committee members can be familiar with that document.

Committee Meeting Schedule

Members agreed that we will meet every two weeks and as demand warrants; a doodle poll will go out for the next meeting date and time, but then we will try to set a regular meeting schedule.

ATTACHMENT 185/9

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 26, 2012**

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 1:03 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Castellini, Izetta Chambers, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Amy Vinlove

Excused: Stephen Brown, Diane Erickson

Absent: David Fazzino

III. Changes to the FDAI team

We discussed adding Cindy Fabbri from the School of Education to the committee and decided that she would be a good addition. Franz will talk to her about becoming a member.

IV. Report from Joy

Joy reports that there have been many well-attended social events for new faculty members. She notes that there are several more planned and that our new faculty are getting out into the community.

Travel awards have been granted for the fall semester with a smaller amount given to more faculty members in UNAC. She notes that UAFT faculty members will need to work with their union to get faculty development funds raised to a top priority.

Joy is gearing up for October's presentations for CNSM and passed out a schedule of events. She also continues to work on the Lilly West conference and says that seven faculty members will be attending along with her. Because the conference occurs during spring break, travel arrangements are proving to be difficult and expensive.

Regarding postdocs, Joy has started collecting email addresses for adjunct faculty and TAs, noting that it is proving difficult to get a list of adjuncts from various departments.

She reports that last Friday's Blackboard pedagogy presentation at the eLearning and Distance Education Center was excellent and well-attended, and that there will be a presentation on eLive pedagogy this Friday.

Franz brought up his concern that the CNSM faculty had not yet heard about the schedule of faculty development presentations tailored for their college and feels that postdocs should be included. He will forward an email invitation from Joy to people at GI who may not be on the notification list from the Dean. This led to a discussion on how SOE faculty found out about the presentations tailor-made for them this month. Amy noted that she did not receive any emails early on but that faculty members did attend many sessions. Joy noted that SOE faculty did not attend the session last Friday on Blackboard

pedagogy despite requesting the session. After some discussion it was discovered that several issues came into play: 1) there was some confusion regarding communication of scheduling; 2) SOE faculty wanted a higher-level presentation than the basic level; and 3) the 3-hour block of time is too long for most teaching faculty. Joy noted that she is willing to present on Saturdays, but there is concern that faculty may not show up. Franz noted that there should be some encouragement in the form of a reminder to faculty that these development sessions are a part of their tenure process. Izetta mentioned that rural campus faculty members find it difficult to join in the faculty development opportunities. Joy pointed out that audio conferences are easy to set up if faculty from the rural campuses request it, while video conferencing – which is sometimes necessary for visual-intense presentations – is more difficult due to the limited number of available video conferencing rooms.

V. Discussion of including postdocs in the FDAI activities

Mike noted that he will be meeting with John Eichelberger next week and will talk with him about unifying postdocs. He will report back to our committee after their discussion. Mike mentioned that he recently attended two national-level postdoc meetings and can share the latest information. Andrea explained the postdoc situation at his previous institution, the Medical College of Wisconsin, and shared their Office of Postdoctoral Education website showing us the impressive various support features in place. Our committee decided to include postdocs in our activities in order to help them become organized since they are at a pivotal crossroad in their careers. Joy feels that postdocs should be invited to attend the informal teaching training that Laura Connor will be offering for CNSM faculty.

VI. Other business

CNSM will be hosting a New Faculty Lunch with Dean Paul Layer on October 25 from 12:45 – 2:15 p.m. in the Runcorn Room (Reichardt Building)

VII. Upcoming events

Administrative Committee meeting: Friday, September 29. Franz says he will remind faculty to attend development opportunities and try out the tailoring effort.

Faculty Senate meeting: Monday, October 8.

VIII. Our next meeting will be Wednesday, October 31 (costume optional) from 1:00 – 2:00 p.m. in Bunnell 222.

VII. Adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 185/10

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes 8/30/12**

Present: Donie Bret-Harte*, John Yarie*, Mike Daku*, Franz Mueter* (on the phone), Vince Cee*, Lillian Misel, Laura Bender, Cheng-Fu Chen*, Tim Bartholomaus, Lara Horstmann* (on the phone), Libby Eddy, Larry Duffy, Jayne Harvie, special guest Cathy Hanks

* Voting members

4 agenda items:

- 1) choose Chair of GAAC for fall
- 2) Department of Petroleum Engineering Master's theses (Cathy Hanks)
- 3) Biology Department termination of MAT program (in email from Jayne)
- 4) Biology Department trial course

1) GAAC votes to confirm Donie Bret-Harte as Chair of GAAC

2) Cathy Hanks presented about the M.S. program in Petroleum Engineering. In this program, a student can get an M.S. with either a thesis or a project. The requirements for thesis and project, and the level of oversight, are different. She reported a desire for greater vetting of projects, and a concern that confusion arises because the same degree can have different requirements (project vs. thesis), with no way to distinguish them other than the number of credits on the transcript. This does not serve the students well. She asks that Faculty Senate consider a resolution to distinguish M.S. degrees if they can have either a project or thesis.

--GAAC is generally in favor of a motion to distinguish master's of science with project vs. thesis where the potential for confusion exists; Donie will draft a motion and distribute to GAAC before the next meeting

--Donie will seek input from the Administrative Committee on this topic

--Larry recommends that we invite dean and faculty of unit for discussion at Faculty Senate meeting where this is discussed. He feels that, because this program is already approved, we should tread cautiously. It is best if program requirements are generated by the faculty, rather than by the Senate.

3.) After discussion, GAAC votes in favor of discontinuing Biology MAT.

4.) Falk Huettmann's trial course: the description needs some work. There are no prerequisites, the course description is too long, the extent of overlap with current courses is not clear. How the course builds on previous courses is not clear. Shouldn't GIS be required as a prerequisite? The laboratory part of the course needs more description. The impacts for other departments and biology (both positive and negative) need to be specified, no library collections (Lara agrees to be the lead, Franz will also read)

Larry will turn over to John Eichelberger as graduate Dean at next meeting

--Larry cautions us to be aware of strong individuals imposing vision well on everyone; all faculty work best on the local level.

ATTACHMENT 185/11

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 20, 2012**

Attending:

Sarah Stanley , Cindy Hardy, Allan Morotti, David Maxwell, Gabrielle Russell, Joe Mason, Sandra Wildfeuer, Curt Szuberla, Linda Hapsmith, Andrea Schmidt

Not attending: Nancy Ayagarak, Diane Erickson, Dana Greci, Amy Barnsley

Approval of May minutes: Approved

Election of chair and co-chair: Cindy Hardy was re-elected as chair; Sandra Wildfeuer as co-chair.

Review of committee membership definition: Jennifer Reynolds, current Faculty Senate President, has been looking over committee definitions and membership and asked that we review how members are selected for SADA among other committees. We discussed the history of the committee, originating as a Developmental Studies committee and broadening its definition after the formation of the Department of Developmental Education. Currently the committee membership definition allows for sixteen members, including one from each rural campus, plus several “members” who attend meetings out of interest but have not gone through any selection process, and others who are elected or appointed by their colleges or departments. We considered the possibility of voting and ex-officio membership, perhaps moving those not in the committee definition or those in staff or administrative roles to ex-officio membership. The discussion led to an interest in widening the membership of the meeting to include one further representative from a core area of Liberal Arts beyond the current English Department representation and an ex-officio member from the registrar’s office. We agreed to return to this discussion at the next meeting. Cindy will draw up a proposal and run it by Jennifer to see if we are addressing her concerns, then bring it back to SADA.

SADA members on GERC committee: We are requesting that a SADA member join the GERC committee this year, to ensure that concerns of entering students, including rural and developmental students, are part of the discussion of revising the Core. We had a representative on the original committee two years ago, but were not asked to provide one last year. We approved Diane Erickson to represent SADA on the GERC committee. Cindy will take this request to the Curricular Affairs Committee (GERC is a subcommittee of CAC) for approval. (This was done 9/24—approved by CAC). We noted that Sarah Stanley and Linda Hapsmith are also on GERC, representing their areas. They reminded us of GERC’s Town Hall information sessions, Wed. Oct. 3:30-4:30 at CTC and Thurs. Oct 4 1-2 in the Library Media Classroom. GERC will also be sending out a poll to gather opinions and ideas on the core.

Status of Complete College America and other national initiatives: We did not discuss this topic at this time, but will continue to circulate articles and data as it arises. Pres. Gamble has forwarded our recommendation that Alaska not participate in CCA.

NADE summary data: Dana was unable to attend this meeting. She will present a summary of this

data at our next meeting.

Brown bag student/faculty discussions: We will take this up at the next meeting. We are gathering ideas for this.

Celebration of Writing: Sarah S. announced the Celebration of Writing to be held Oct. 20 (National Day of writing). It will be similar to a science fair, but about writing. She invited committee members to attend a planning session on Friday at 4pm.

Other discussion items:

Sandra W. noted that IAC is implementing E-live math tutoring for all math students in IAC classes. They are also hiring full-time math and English tutoring and faculty support positions as part of a 2-3 year Title III grant.

Linda H. raised the issue of student movement between DEVM 105, DEVM 106, and Math 107. The CRCD Academic Council approved a change in prerequisites from a C or better to B or better in order to move to the next class. She asked that there be an alert to advisors when such a change takes place. She noted that this has caused a difficulty for students who registered for a class before the prerequisites have changed. We discussed drafting a motion requiring an alert to advisors and departments when a prerequisite changes after the catalog is complete. Linda agreed to draft a motion for the next meeting.

Next meeting: Those attending agreed that Tuesday or Thursday afternoons work best. Cindy and Sandra will collaborate on times they are both available and will send out a Doodle poll for the best time. Cindy will work with Jayne to set future meetings.

Research Advisory Committee Meeting Notes – Sept. 17, 2012

Rather than formal minutes a summary in the form of an outline is given, because the meetings are not strictly according to Robert's Rules. All are encouraged to correct or edit the summary before we submit it formally to the senate. Any motions we make will be posted here as drafts for consideration as well. The current meeting only will be on this page, past meetings will be linked at the bottom.

September 17, 2012 14:00-15:00

Present were: Dehn, Healy, Heaton, Hundertmark, Koch, Lawlor, Webley

An informal agenda was adopted:

- > 1. Nomination and election of a chair
- > 2. Past business updates, review of last years actions
- > 3. Accounting of F&A, and re framing the impression of what the research engine does for UAF
- > 4. Role of the RAC and VCR office, how we can be helpful
- > 5. Research Foundation at UAF, what sort of needs would the research community have

1. Jon Dehn was nominated and elected as Chair of the RAC for this academic year

2. Past business was discussed, led by Webley

a.) the FAQ for researchers at UAF, is a living document, Lawlor forwarded the document. We will host it here and suggested a home for it at the VCR's website. We should make sure the document stays current. I suggest it be on the agenda regularly for the RAC. Next meeting when all have access to it, we'll take a closer look. (<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1u4-DvbjNefwKURNTLGyZzIEAWqEWqAS6-HdhdWkK1iw/edit>)

b. URSA, and how to have it work better for the research enterprise at UAF. Many ideas were suggested, including having undergrad research mentored by graduate students as well as faculty, and having more faculty involved in the courses URSA offers. Dehn will invite and engage Barbara Taylor and our new Grad School Dean, John Eichelberger.

(diversion from agenda with flow of discussion)

3. Role of the RAC at UAF

- a.) We should address the bylaws and see if they are fitting the committee's evolution, now in it's 3rd year.
- b.) How can we assist the VCR a few ideas were discussed
 - i.) act as a review board for top-down research ideas, to help the VCR stay in touch with the faculty
 - ii.) act a vehicle to spread information to the research community at UAF, too much now it works clique-like
 - iii.) assist and create research policy at UAF, much of which is now located in many different places, and sometimes conflicts (see policy review discussion below)
 - iv.) act as an appeal review body for research conflict (see below)

4. Research Foundation Overview

a.) what it is, an organization at UAF that moves at the speed of business (Adam Krynicki) to help get private businesses and foundations to support research, run mostly from Dan White's shop (AVCR)

- i.) uses university's status as a charitable organization (501c3)
- ii.) limited or no overhead on grants, though direct costs are ok and encouraged to help research entities recover costs
- iii.) hopes in increased revenue for grants, though at a lower cost recovery rate, yielding more over \$ for UAF an application of the Laffer Curve (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Laffer_curve)
- iv.) UAA already has one, as do many other universities, UAF is a little behind the curve on this one
- v.) must be approved by the Regents, they vote on it on September 27 at their meeting Juneau
- b.) discussion on how it may help, not just for commercialization, but also to pool many smaller resources (often charitable) into a larger useable fund

5. F&A study at UAF

- a.) a positive tone to show how research supports a lot of other things at UAF, to help us get the credit we deserve
 - b.) large scale most of this is known (<http://www.uaf.edu/osp/policies-and-procedures/facilities-administrative/>)
 - c.) but what about how each institute, center, college or school handles it (posed by Winsor via email), we'll formulate a request for next meeting to circulate
6. Followup on policy review at UAF
- a.) the committee looked at Regent's policy as one of many groups tasked to look for inconsistencies with funding agency policies, laws and practices at UAF
 - b.) a list of these was produced, the question rose as to what has or will be done
 - c.) the impression is that some of these will be acted upon at Regent's level, some not, we may not hear to much about it anymore
7. RACs role to serve as an arbiter for disputes with IACUC (<http://www.uaf.edu/iacuc/>) and IRB (<http://www.uaf.edu/irb/>) idea posed by Hundertmark
- a.) currently there is little recourse if one runs afoul of either of these bodies
 - b.) we should research the potential impacts of this on RAC, is it a large workload?
 - c.) there used to be a mediation group at UAF, Dehn was an active member with training, perhaps that body is a good place, or we should have trained mediators on RAC?
8. Future meeting schedule and communication
- a.) monthly may be sufficient, be prepared for more often as warranted
 - b.) try to keep meetings focused an efficient
 - c.) judicious use of online media, spawned this Google Site at UAF for RAC, please make avail of it and add info and tidbits!