

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #192
Monday, September 9, 2013
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – David Valentine
A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
ALBERTSON, Leif (14) - audio	RADENBAUGH, Todd (15) - audio
BAKER, Tori (14) - audio	SHORT, Margaret (15)
BARNES, Bill (15)	VALENTINE, Dave (14)
BERGE, Anna (15)	WEBER, Jane (14)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (15)	WEBLEY, Peter (14)
CEE, Vincent (14)	WINFREE, Cathy (15)
CHEN, Cheng-fu (14)	YARIE, John (14)
COFFMAN, Chris (15)	
CONDE, Mark (15)	
COOK, Christine (14)	Members Absent:
DAVIS, Mike (14)	CHEN, Cheng-fu (14)
DEHN, Jonathan (15)	DUKE, J. Rob (15)
FALLEN, Chris (15)	FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)
GIBSON, Georgina (14)	MARR, Wayne (14)
GUSTAFSON, Karen (14)	SHALLCROSS, Leslie (15)
HAN, Xiaoqi (15)	WINSOR, Peter (14)
HARDY, Sarah (15)	ZHANG, Xiong (14)
HEALY, Joanne (15)	
HORSTMANN, Lara (15)	Others Present:
JOHNSON, Galen (15)	Chancellor Rogers
JOHNSTON, DUFF (14)	Provost Henrichs
JOLY, Julie (15) – Glenn Juday	Libby Eddy
KIELLAND, Knut (14)	Brad Krick
LARDON, Cecile (15)	Mark Herrmann
LOVECRAFT, Amy (15)	Dani Sheppard
MCCARTNEY, Leslie (15)	Eric Madsen
MEYER, Franz (15) – Brian Rasley	Alex Fitts
MISRA, Debu (15)	Carol Gering
MOSER, Dennis (14) – Liz Humrickhouse	Joy Morrison
NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)	Martha Mason

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #191

Minutes for Meeting #191 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 the list of 2012–2013 degree candidates
2. Motion to approve continuation of the PhD in Mathematics and DMS PhD Revitalization Plan
3. Motion to approve a new Minor in Dispute Resolution
4. Motion to discontinue the Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement
5. Motion to approve the Fisheries Division Unit Criteria
6. Motion to amend the grading policy for C–
7. Motion to approve a new Graduate Certificate in Science Teaching and Outreach

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – David Valentine

David mentioned some housekeeping items, including his intent to keep meetings moving so they don't run overtime. But, he also stressed the importance of the faculty voice being heard and urged the members to share their comments. A reminder was given to speak into the microphones especially for the benefit of those participating via audio conference. With regard to committee chairs' reports which take place at the end of the meeting, David urged chairs to share noteworthy items which they would like to have recorded in the record; otherwise, the written reports included in the agendas will suffice. He shared some suggestions on being an effective senate member and noted that the Faculty Senate website should be bookmarked for easy reference. The site includes a huge amount of information for meetings and committees, including audio recordings of past meetings. He asked that senators be sure to look over Faculty Senate Handbook and Directory which is posted on the home page at www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate. The agendas are sent out before the meetings and David urged members to look them over and come prepared to participate. Much of the hard work happens at the committee level before a motion makes it to the full Senate. He asked that members be active in their committees and give their respective committee chairs their full support.

Because of the possible creation of a new committee today, confirmation of the Faculty Senate committees will be put off until the October meeting.

David mentioned that there is a draft report being finalized from the Interdisciplinary Issues Faculty Committee. The purpose of the report is to identify obstacles that faculty face with regard to interdisciplinary teaching, research and service. He hopes that the report will be ready for the October meeting.

A new committee has been formed by the Provost to examine the formal merger of the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and the School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences (SNRAS).

David noted the fact that he is a member of SNRAS and cannot serve as the Senate representative on this committee. He is participating as a faculty member of SNRAS. The Faculty Senate representative to the merger committee is Donie Bret-Harte.

The UAF Faculty Senate president, president-elect, and past president are members of the Faculty Alliance (referred to as FA or the Alliance). Their counterparts at UAA and UAS also make up the membership. The Alliance meets monthly to discuss issues of common concern. At their August retreat they planned several projects that they will be working on this year. One of these is to lay the foundation for creating the position of a Faculty Regent to sit on the Board of Regents. The FA has representation on System Academic Council (SAC). President-Elect Cecile L. is serving as the Alliance representative to SAC this year.

David reported that SAC has proposed a motion to adopt a minimum baccalaureate admission standard. This motion was brought to the Alliance and will eventually be discussed at the Faculty Senates of each of the three universities. The reason for the motion is that upon looking at success data of students, there are clear signs which show that students entering programs below a certain level of admissions usually don't make it in a four year baccalaureate program. Setting a common standard would help students apply more appropriately to programs. SAC is also recommending a common cut score for Math placement. A motion to do so will come to the Faculty Senates. They are also proposing more flexibility with regard to residency across the three universities.

The Alliance is working to develop principles and guidelines for managing the universities during tight fiscal times. They are discussing what kinds of input faculty want in the fiscal management process to ensure that the faculty voice is heard. The Faculty Affairs Committee will be tasked with taking the lead to look at this topic more closely.

The statewide General Education Learning Outcomes Committee (GELO) is meeting regularly and just had a teleconference this morning. They are moving toward adopting a statewide set of general education learning outcomes. UAF had adopted its own set of student learning outcomes in 2011, and these have been used as the basis for the statewide effort. GELO has so far only made minor changes to what UAF established for student learning outcomes.

David mentioned some seats which are open or have been recently filled on external committees. Peter Webley will fill the vacant seat on the Technology Advisory Board. Cecile L. will serve on the Facilities Naming Committee, and David will serve on the Usibelli Awards Committee (in keeping with Senate tradition for filling those committee seats). There is still an open faculty seat on the Parking Advisory Committee. There is a seat for a Senator from the Curricular Affairs Committee to serve as the liaison to GERC; and there is an expired faculty term on the Master Planning Committee. If interested in filling one of these seats, please contact David and Cecile directly.

He also mentioned work on grade appeals over the past summer, with service by Chanda Meek and Ataur Chowdhury. Cecile L. and Terry Quinn served on a student appeals committee which concerned a program.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Cecile Lardon

One of the areas Cecile would like to work on is making Faculty Senate become more visible to the university. She is aware that word about what the Senate has worked on does not always get out. She and David are planning to attend college and school convocations this fall; and, they have invitations to

convocations for CLA, CNSM and SOEd so far. She attended the CRCDD gathering recently, and this made her more aware of the need for helping to make the Senate more visible. In this regard, they also want to attend research institute meetings.

Another area Cecile hopes to address is developing more ways to support the chairs of Senate committees and foster the development of leadership. Everyone is aware that it can be difficult to find members who will consider running for the office of president-elect. In part, members do not have exposure to what the office is about and it's hard to figure out if one has enough time and support to do it. If there is some support of leadership development early on for Senate members, the hope is that more members will be interested in taking on the leadership roles that are needed. Helping chairs and members see the value of their roles will help promote senate service as something more than an item to put on an activities report.

Cecile mentioned the Blue Book project which has been carried over from last year. The Joint Appointments ad hoc committee is meeting this semester and will have important input for the Blue Book. She hopes to have the final draft of the Blue Book to the Senate by mid-year.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

The Chancellor welcomed everyone back for the new semester. He commented on the slight gain in enrollment that was already being seen at UAF this year. This was not expected, and system-wide numbers are lower. One of the reasons UAF is doing better is that classes are starting later this year than in prior years. Comparisons are showing that headcount is up by 3% and credit hours are up by 1%. The increases reflect confidence in this university. He mentioned there are 50 new faculty at UAF this year, which is the highest increase he remembers since becoming Chancellor.

He appreciated coming into the meeting during discussion of differential tuition, noting there are deep philosophical as well as economic issues to be considered regarding the matter. Personally, his view is that differential tuition is appropriate when three conditions are met: high costs, high demand, and high wages. He thinks that the School of Management meets these conditions. The general mood at the Board of Regents and system-wide reflect the national mood that tuition has been escalating too rapidly. As Dean Herrmann pointed out, UAF is at the lower end among its peers for tuition for baccalaureate programs. The Chancellor also pointed out that UAF is at the higher end for tuition for community college programs. It's the challenge of UAF having multiple missions. That pressure is likely to keep tuition increases below what some of us would like to see, outside of considering such things as differential tuition. On the revenue side, our opportunity to make it up will have to be by attracting more students, particularly at the upper division level.

The current year's budget is tight, with the year starting at over \$8 million short. The expectation is to come out even by the end of the year by taking some one-time measures and managing non-faculty position vacancies (by not filling them for longer periods of time than they normally would). Measures include space management, energy conservation, and some vertical cuts. Given the tenor at the State of Alaska on the revenue side, with lower revenues expected in the coming year, the university budget will not likely see significant gains.

The UAF budget request has been submitted to the system office, but they have not yet seen what will go forward to the Board of Regents. One budget item he highlighted is that UAF has asked for incremental funds for faculty salaries above whatever the negotiated amount would be. This will actually have to be a negotiation with UNAC coming forward. But the fact is that the university has

been falling behind in the research-intensive areas and the annual salary increases have not kept up where they should be relative to the market. That reflects what has been the primary approach of the university system over the last two decades which is really a market comparison, trying to hit at least 90% of the median of peer institutions. He thinks 90% is a low number to shoot for, but even at that the university is below where it needs to be to attract and retain high-quality talent. He noted they have not gone in for an extra market boost for faculty salaries above the annual cost of living for two decades. The last one he could remember was in the early 1990s and it took over two years to sell it in the legislature. He hopes that through the collective bargaining process and then the legislative process, that they'll be successful again. However, success comes at a price, as noted earlier, since the legislature only funds 50% of salary increases.

They have a small amount in for fixed cost increases in the budget request, and one of the smallest new program requests that he can remember in over thirty years of working with the university budget. It's under 2% growth which he expects to be cut further.

On the capital budget side there are the funding requests for completion of the engineering building (\$33 million) and the replacement of the heat and power plant (\$200 million). These would be augmented by \$45 million of borrowing that UAF would do based on fuel cost savings. They've also requested some academic equipment replacement, and a series of five capital research initiatives. Last year they had three that went forward and one-and-a-half of those were funded.

Debu M. asked why the Alaska Legislature only funds 50% of salary increases. The Chancellor responded that when one looks at the university budget as a whole, roughly 42% of budget is state funded. Therefore, the Legislature already feels they are generous to the university and so the university should make up the difference with other revenue sources. But, the university's other revenue sources are not increasing. Some costs are covered, as in the case of faculty and staff who are charging to grants—their pay raises are charged to those grants, but this really just means there is less grant money to spread over the months ahead—there is no new money. The Legislature has said the university can only ask for 50% of salary increases. The Chancellor also clarified that capital budget items are separate appropriations and can only be spent for the projects for which the funds have been appropriated.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs spoke before the Chancellor's remarks since he was at a luncheon and would be arriving later. She noted he'll speak about the FY14-15 budget situation the university is facing.

The Provost spoke about the broader launch of the Faculty180 annual activities reporting software this year. Its use is not mandatory right now, but will be next year. The software is available to try out and may be used to submit reports this year. A Data180 company representative will be on campus from October 6-8 and will be attending the next Faculty Senate meeting on October 7. Susan recommended trying the software out beforehand so questions could be brought up at this visit.

The effort to evaluate and narrow down the choices for electronic course evaluation software is being led by Eric Madsen. Dr. Madsen and the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee (FDAI) have identified four leading contenders. There will opportunities for trying out the systems later this month, and they are recruiting faculty from across the campus to participate. She encouraged interested faculty to take advantage of this opportunity.

Mike D. asked the Provost how she envisions Faculty Senate being part of the process to evaluate and potentially prioritize and/or eliminate programs (referring to the program review process that took place last year). The Provost responded that every program which was reviewed last year will receive a memorandum outlining the outcome of their review. While there won't be a huge number of program eliminations, there will perhaps be some reorganization of programs. She quickly outlined the three steps that occur with program review. There is first a review by a representative faculty committee, then a review by deans and campus administrators, and then a final review by Chancellor's Cabinet which makes the final recommendations for program review outcomes. Any program elimination must go through the Faculty Senate. She reminded everyone of the example of the Math PhD program last year. While the program had been recommended for elimination, the process at Faculty Senate resulted in the program being retained with a plan put in place from the department to increase student enrollment over a trial period. She also noted that the Chancellor will speak to the budget situation the university is facing in light of declining oil revenues, and the need to take a harder look at all the things the university is doing on order to meet its financial challenges (e.g., review of research programs, student services, development activities – not just academic programs). Mike noted these are areas of concern for CRCO and its many term-funded faculty.

David mentioned to Mike that he would welcome more faculty input about ways to approach the tight budget situation the university is facing.

V Guest Speaker: Dean Mark Herrmann
Topic: Differential Tuition

Dean Mark Herrmann (School of Management) spoke to Faculty Senate at the suggestion of the Chancellor. Many have heard that the School is seeking differential tuition—a tuition surcharge of 25% over current rates. Of that surcharge amount, 10% would be start in FY15 and the remainder added for FY16. There would be a 20% set aside for needs-based assistance. They went to the Board of Regents in Sitka last April to get permission, but the vote was then tabled. It will come up again at the BOR meeting in Juneau this month.

The reason the School is asking for differential tuition has to do with maintaining high quality programs. They are the only school in Alaska to have international accreditation by the AACSB for both their business and accounting programs. AACSB is the highest accreditation a school can have, and only 179 schools in the world have it—or just 1.4%. Each year all their graduating seniors take the educational testing service business field exams. Across the U.S. 700 universities do this; and, for the last ten years their undergraduates have averaged in the 92nd percentile and their MBA students in the 77th percentile. They have the highest pass rate in Alaska for their accounting students who take the CPA exam, also higher than the national rate.

They would not go to the students and ask them to pay more if they didn't have to. The financial pressures that have been mentioned by the Provost are not the School's alone; they are impacting every college and school at the university at every level. At the end of last year there was a three-year forecasted debt for UAF of about \$25 million. The \$8.5 million debt for this year has been reduced by measures that include moving offices out of leased space off-campus and eliminating the leases, and by doing energy savings. Those are the easiest measures to take, the low-hanging fruit. It's going to be harder in the coming years.

One of the problems the School of Management must face is how to fund the unfunded portion of annual salary increases. The majority of their budget, 94%, is for salaries. The 2010-to-2013 pullbacks totaling

7.6% of their general fund, along with the reduction in annual tuition increase rates from 7% down to 2%, along with the fact that their student credit hours have increased by over 80% – have all combined to be a perfect storm. Differential tuition is a tool that is commonly used to solve these types of problems in engineering and business schools where faculty have high salaries, and where graduating students are in demand and go right into high-paying jobs. All the Big 10 schools have it for engineering and business programs. Eight of 13 peer schools to UAF have it; 13 of the 21 UA peer schools have it; and approximately 37 states now have it. The pricing differential they are looking at would be only for 300- and 400-level courses and the graduate level courses. The proposal will end up costing their students an average of \$375 per semester; over a four-year period this is 3-4% of their total college costs. The School has reduced its operating budget by 40% two years ago and has been very responsible. After salaries, their school runs on \$300,000 – a very tight budget. They finance all their scholarships and extracurricular activities (of which they have a lot) for their students with private funds. They are also trying to meet their challenge without impacting any other school or college at UAF and have not asked for any reallocated funds. They have been proactive in tackling this issue within the School. Faculty, staff and student leaders and their advisory boards have been involved all along throughout the process of working on the problem. They agree that having a tuition surcharge is a responsible way to handle the financial challenges. Students will benefit by having high quality programs maintained. It will help them get a faster time to graduation. One example of this is their accounting students typically get job offers during their internships in their junior year. They get a second year of internship in their senior year. They have to get 150 hours in public accounting for their CPA, and are able to get an MBA in one year. So the School must get those students through in five years at most for the undergraduate degree and their MBA. For their other students, they're looking at jobs that will pay \$50-\$70,000 to start. Any semester delays can cost the students a job and increase their costs significantly more than the amount of the surcharge. They have taken the time to explain this to their students, and over 70% support the proposal, as well as all of their student leaders.

David asked Dean Herrmann about how the cap of 2% on raising tuition affects the School, and if it would be different if the percentage were 3% or higher. Dean Herrmann responded that the reduction hurts everyone (tuition raises went from 7% down to 2%). Without fees, average tuition is \$5,500, and, comparing this to six other comparable schools per the AACSB, our tuition rate is 27% lower – it's at rock bottom. If tuition increased more than 3%, SOM would still need differential tuition, though not as much. To really help the situation they need 100% funding of salary increases, no more annual pullbacks, and a decent amount of tuition coming in to the School.

Cecile congratulated the School and its students on their accomplishments. She shared some philosophical thoughts about proposed differential tuition, asking if instituting differential tuition will get the university on a slippery slope of signaling which programs are more valuable than others. As a counterpoint, she noted there are institutions at which all faculty earn the same amount regardless of their field. It's another model of looking at this without going to extremes of market value of a degree or faculty member. Dean Herrmann responded his school is competing with other business schools, and that it's not about the school's value, but rather about what it costs to offer their programs. He used the analogy of the supermarket, where items are priced differently though one is not necessarily better than another. He noted there is another philosophical discussion on this which says students who go to less expensive programs and who will earn less coming out of those programs are actually subsidizing higher cost schools by paying the same amount of tuition. It's an argument for students attending higher cost programs, who can expect higher wages upon completion, to pay higher tuition.

Jon D. asked if enrollment would go down with an increase in tuition. Dean Herrmann responded that their tuition would still be very low compared to other business schools and enrollment would not be

affected significantly. They are the only school in Alaska with dual accreditation for accounting and business. Their six peer institutions cost a lot more, especially with non-resident tuition rates. While they might lose a few students, across the nation schools with differential tuition are not losing students, and they are happy to let the market work.

Chris C. asked about the long term growth of salaries for the School's graduates. She cited an article by Alexander Beecroft of the University of South Carolina, from the July 3, 2013 Chronicle of Higher Education, which reports that those with undergraduate professional degrees who start out with relatively high pay rates upon graduation, have relatively flat pay scales later on. How much have the long term pay rates been taken into account in the argument for differential tuition? Dean Herrmann said their surveys show students making about \$58,000 upon graduation and three years later earning six-digit salaries. Finance students are starting out at about \$75, 000 and moving up to six-digit salaries very quickly. They are not seeing salary compression with their students.

[The Chancellor's Remarks were next after guest speaker Mark Herrmann. The Chancellor explained his lateness was due to attending a luncheon where he introduced the key speaker and needed to stay for that presentation.]

VI Old Business

A. Recap of Action by Administrative Committee concerning Sun Star sexual harassment issues (Attachments 192/1, 192/2)

David reported about the actions taken by the Administrative Committee since the May 2013 meeting where the sexual harassment issues were originally raised. The issues had resulted in Faculty Senate passing a resolution to follow up with the matter. He briefly described those issues which involved the *Fun Star* edition of the *Sun Star* which had spoofed a quote attributed to the Director of the Women's Center (but without that person's permission to do so), published a copyrighted photograph, and a serious article that followed in another edition about a Facebook page called "UAF Confessions" (which is not formally affiliated with the university). The article about the Facebook page included screenshots of potentially offensive comments from the site, which included the commenters' names.

The Administrative Committee subsequently met with Mae Marsh, Don Foley and Robyne (faculty advisor to Sun Star). The first attachment to the agenda contains a summary of that meeting. The second attachment is a letter sent to the editorial board of the *Sun Star* from the Faculty Senate president and president-elect. The letter requested the removal of the spoofed quote attributed to the faculty member without their permission from the online version of the student newspaper; and, to redact the names of the students from the screenshot used in the serious article about the "UAF Confessions" Facebook site. (The copyrighted picture used in the *Fun Star* had already been removed from the online version of the newspaper.)

The *Sun Star* editor's response to the letter has, so far, only been verbal. Written response has been requested and is forthcoming. They acknowledged they should have more clearly identified the *Fun Star* article as a spoof and its related quote as more clearly a made up one. But, other than that, they did not want change anything else. Regarding the Facebook article, they stated they would not redact the student names because the Facebook page was already a public site. Cecile noted that the *Fun Star* editions have had a similar recurring theme in past years, and that the most recent edition was in response to that history. David added that they were definitely not trying to assert authority over the *Sun Star* or compromise their First Amendment rights – but rather to appeal to a higher journalistic standard regarding what they saw as decisions in poor taste. David noted that the Facebook page is still online

and they have asked Don Foley to follow up and and ask that “UAF” be dropped from the name. There is also an ongoing investigation by Mae Marsh’s office which cannot be reported upon yet. To the extent it’s possible to report back, David will do so at a later date.

Debu thanked David and Cecile for their efforts.

2:00 BREAK

VII New Business

- A. Reaffirmation of Resolution in Support of Allowing Candidates for Promotion, Tenure, or Comprehensive Review to Opt for “Open” Meetings – submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 192/3)

David noted that for the last several years, the Faculty Senate has encouraged each of the units on the campus through this resolution to hold open meetings for review of candidates’ files for promotion and tenure. He reminded everyone that a resolution registers the opinion of the Faculty Senate and makes it known, but is not binding (whereas a motion indicates authority over its own bylaws or some other aspect of university life in which it has shared governance responsibilities). There were no objections to the resolution and it was passed unanimously.

- B. Motion amending Bylaws to create new Faculty Senate Administrator Review Committee – submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 192/4)

David explained that last year the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee (FAOC) was dissolved and its roles transferred to the Administrative Committee which is comprised of the chairs of all the standing and permanent committees of the Faculty Senate. With Group A and B administrator reviews coming due in March each year, it was realized over this past summer that the Administrative Committee would become severely overtaxed at the most busy time of the academic year. This new permanent committee is being proposed for this reason, and would be formed of the chairs of the ad hoc administrator review committees. It would serve the role of being the committee to which results of evaluation reviews are reported in March (along with the cognizant supervisor of the administrator); and, provide a supporting role throughout the year allowing committee chairs to communicate with other to help ensure that some semblance of best practices is occurring with review procedures. So, this motion establishes the new permanent committee and how it’s constituted. The related motion about the Group A and B administrator review guidelines goes hand in hand with updating the bylaws to include this potential new permanent committee.

Ann B. asked for clarification about the constitution of the new committee. Being comprised of the chairs of the ad hoc review committees, might not the new committee be too inbred to perform its functions? Wouldn’t you want a committee comprised of individuals more removed from the process to do the overall review? David responded that the committee would be chaired by a Faculty Senator who is not a member of any of the ad hoc committees. Cecile also pointed out that the overall reviews performed by the new committee are not of the individual administrators, but rather of the processes used to do the reviews. There are requirements for how the reviews are to be carried out, and the committee ensures these have been followed.

Georgina G. asked if the function to review processes shouldn't occur before a particular review gets underway. David responded that the policies and procedures are already laid out, and what the committee does is a final review of the procedures that were used (as required by the policy).

Knut K. commented about the possibility for infinite regress of reviews with the policy. David responded that a reporting mechanism is needed to handle the work results of the ad hoc review committees in order to review the procedures that have been used. The new committee takes on what FAOC used to do, but in a slightly better defined manner.

Georgina G. asked if the committee can make an ad hoc committee go back and re-do a procedure. David answered that he hoped this would not be necessary because of how the new committee is comprised, which would allow issues to be addressed as they come up in the process. Cecile commented that the new committee can meet as they need to throughout the academic year with the understanding that they make sure a quality control process is happening at the end of the review cycle.

Glenn J. commented that if one of the intended benefits is to capture ways to improve the process, then the regularly-changing ad hoc committee membership from year to year would potentially cause loss of information instead of fostering institutional memory about best practices. David noted that they have considered how to go about creating some institutional memory of the learning that takes place longitudinally throughout the process, and he has asked General Counsel about what types of information could be retained from review cycle to the next for use by future committees. Of course, they want to be careful not to run afoul of confidentiality requirements. He has not heard back yet.

Debu M. proposed reconstituting the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee because it could be useful in handling non-CBA-related faculty appeals. He also asked what the impact of the administrator reviews really is. Provost Henrichs responded that the input she receives from the evaluation committees is incorporated into her performance evaluations. Usually the input is used to help address weaknesses in an administrator's performance, but in a few instances administrators have been let go.

David added a comment regarding what Glenn J. had brought up regarding institutional memory. He would like to see past reviews referenced in subsequent reviews of administrators, much like what is done with faculty evaluations. Current reviews could then be tailored around the previous review results.

Jon D. commented about the usefulness of having the ad hoc committee chairs meet more regularly throughout the process, rather than just at the end of the review cycle. They could help each other avoid problems and provide each other with common useful items (e.g., surveys) used in the past.

Debu M. again brought up the idea of reconstituting the FAOC and how that could be done. David said the matter would need to be referred to a committee, but asked why they would revive something that had been found wanting before. He would rather think deliberately about what is needed and see something new created with potentially more effective results. The new proposed committee would keep lines of communication open between all the ad hoc review committees.

Anna B. asked about the reasons for creating the FARC as opposed to leaving the responsibilities with the Administrative Committee. Provost Henrichs commented about the challenges under current policy of pulling together ad hoc committees with two senators on each committee. Adding the FARC and only requiring one senator on each ad hoc committee would be a very effective way to address both the time constraints on Senators as well as communication issues. Cecile reiterated that it's difficult to

populate the senate committees as it is, but the FARC would still involve one senator, as would each of the ad hoc review committees.

Debu commented that only putting one senator on each ad hoc committee would be giving away control for this serious business of reviewing administrators. He would like the senate to think about reviving the FAOC.

Rainer N. moved to bring the motion to the floor and it was seconded. A vote was taken verbally and by show of hands, with the ayes carrying the motion.

C. Motion to approve Guidelines for the Review of Group A/B Administrators – submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 192/5)

David introduced the motion, addressing the change to require one senator on each ad hoc review committee instead of two. Lara H. commented about the need for tenured faculty involvement. It could be potentially awkward for untenured faculty to play a role in reviewing administrators. David did not want to exclude potential faculty from serving, including term faculty. The Provost commented that she looks for tenured faculty to appoint to the committees as appropriate, but in cases such as the review of research administrators or Cooperative Extension, it is not always possible to fill the seats with tenured faculty from those units.

The motion was moved to the floor and seconded. The ayes carried the motion to approve the revised guidelines.

VIII Discussion Items

A. General Education Revitalization – Jonathan Rosenberg (Handout)

See report: www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2013-14-fs-meetings/

Jonathan R. noted that an executive summary of this report was provided at the last Faculty Senate meeting in May 2013. He pointed out this report is the first attempt by GERC and its five breakout working groups to operationalize the new student learning outcomes by creating a new set of attributes and generally suggesting a new distribution of coursework to satisfy the learning outcomes (but not specific courses, yet). They looked at being able to assess the entire program, not just specific courses, which has been very difficult to do with the present core curriculum.

GERC has been working within the parameters established by the existing UA Regulations for general education requirements. Regulations stipulate certain numbers of courses must be taken in certain disciplinary areas, which is the most challenging aspect of their work, along with the stipulation that most of the classes that satisfy those disciplinary general education requirements are lower division survey courses. There are dueling philosophies here which, though different, are not necessarily incompatible: the more traditional education approach that is represented by the university regulations, and the more holistic integrative approach from the LEAP learning outcomes. So, they have done their best to find some areas of compatibility.

Jonathan mentioned that the new “C” attribute (or, designator) is meant to replace the current “O” and “W” for fulfilling the Communication requirements. There needs to be a conversation within GERC and among the faculty at large about “C” courses and how they would fulfill oral, written and visual communication requirements. He’s had some feedback about the new Diversity attribute, that it should include gender and sexual identity as elements of diversity. Thus far, the GERC has not gotten far in

addressing the methods and processes for assigning attributes to courses, though it would likely be a committee review function much as it is now for the core curriculum. There is more to be fleshed out, including rubrics for courses.

There is new information in Appendix 2 regarding the General Education Learning Outcomes Committee (GELO). GELO is looking at system-wide reform of general education requirements. He mentioned the meeting in Anchorage attended by some of the GERC members as well as Rainer from CAC. The meeting was facilitated by members of AACLU. The LEAP outcomes were presented and there was fairly common agreement that the LEAP outcomes are a useful set of guidelines for the three universities which will help them reach the goal of full GER transferability among the three systems. Assess-ability of learning outcomes is also an attractive feature of LEAP. Membership on GELO is currently faculty, but later will include registrars as they begin to discuss the technicalities of implementing changes that are made.

Jonathan invited feedback from Faculty Senate. GERC will be working on a more formal proposal to bring to the Senate at a future meeting. David commented about one of the advantages of GELO, which is that the agreement between the three universities makes it easier to bring proposed changes concerning general education requirements before the Board of Regents.

Brian Rasley asked if the civic engagement requirement will be mandatory for every student. Jonathan answered yes, as that is what GERC has been considering; but, he acknowledged that this could be done more academically rather than out in the community as a service type of project where one necessarily represents the university (particularly if a student was unwilling or unable to do so).

Chris C. asked if the committee has decided on the total number of required credits. Jonathan responded that 36 credits were favored over the current 39 required by UAF. The UA regulations require credits.

B. Status of Learning Management System Project – David Valentine

David reported quickly on the status of the LMS project, stressing that Blackboard is not going to go away, nor are they trying to implement any specific system.

IX Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Brad Krick

Brad commented that he and Ashley Munro are looking forward to being involved with faculty and students this semester. They will plan to attend Faculty Senate and share about what they are doing. He mentioned he would like to see the Governance Coordinating Committee plan to meet regularly and discuss issues of shared governance between faculty, staff and students. Issues mentioned included the employee tuition waiver, sharing of sick leave, and the issue of a smoke-free campus.

B. ASUAF – Ayla O'Scannel

No report was available.

C. UNAC – Tony Rickard

No report was available.

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane mentioned the JHCC will next meet on Sept. 19.

X Public Comment

Eric Madsen shared information about Faculty180 and mentioned the launch memo that has been sent out. A copy of it is on the Provost's web site. He also mentioned training webinars coming up soon. Faculty180 is voluntary this year and mandatory next year. He invited feedback from everyone who is trying it out. There is mention in the launch memo of an advisory committee being formed by the Provost to address problems and concerns.

He mentioned the work that he and Franz Meyer had done last year on reviewing course evaluation systems. Demos for four of those systems are scheduled, and the schedule is posted on the Faculty Senate web site. There is also a link to the summary report prepared by Franz last spring. As Franz pointed out, the "why" of such a system needs to be discussed and identified so the system ultimately selected provides what is needed by the university.

David announced that the company representative from Data180 will be at the October Faculty Senate meeting to give a presentation, followed by an information session after that meeting.

XI Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

There were no announcements made.

B. Committee Chair Comments

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Convener

Faculty Affairs – Knut Kielland, Convener

Unit Criteria – Chris Coffman, Convener

Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 192/6)

Core Review Committee – Miho Aoki, Convener

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Convener

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Convener

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Convener

Research Advisory Committee – Convener to be named

XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 PM.

ATTACHMENT 192/1
UAF Faculty Senate #192, September 9, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

Faculty Senate Administrative Committee

Special Meeting – May 10th, 2013

Summary Notes

Committee Members Present: Cécile Lardon (chair), David Valentine, Rainer Newberry, Cindy Hardy, Syndonia Bret-Harte, Kayt Sunwood (for Jane Weber)

Guests: Sine Anahita, Don Foley, Mae Marsh, Robyne

This meeting was scheduled in response to a Faculty Senate Resolution (see May meeting) charging the committee to address issues of sexual harassment on campus. Sine Anahita had brought the issue to the Senate in response to two articles in the Sun Star (both April issues, one was in the Fun Star issue). Summary of Sine Anahita's argument: Both articles, plus the image and the title (a play on sexual slang for a woman's genitals) accompanying the Fun Star article were offensive and created a hostile work environment. They constitute sexual harassment. Faculty and students have a right to an environment free of sexual harassment. This falls under Title IX and could create problems for the university.

Robyne provided information as the faculty advisor to the Sun Star, particularly background and context information for the two articles in question. The second article grew out of a class project that wanted to bring light to the kinds of negative exchanges and postings on social media, especially a Facebook page named UAF Confessions.

Mae Marsh, Director of the Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity (D&EO), had contacted the Sun Star editor after the Fun Star edition appeared and was invited to write a letter to the editor – which she did. In response to both pieces she has communicated with UA General Counsel, the police chief, and others. The attorneys told her that neither article was illegal, although the image violated copyright and has since been removed. Marsh has appointed a Title IX Coordinator, and D&EO is preparing training materials on Title IX. Her office has also initiated training for faculty, staff, and students, as well as the production of brochures and posters related to sexual harassment.

Don Foley, Dean of Students, had participated in many of the same discussions and meetings as had Mae Marsh and agreed with her assessment and actions. Foley suggested that the timing of the Sun Star articles at the end of the semester constrained what could be done immediately. He would like to talk about the issues proactively in new-student orientation and in classes in the fall.

Kayt Sunwood had an additional issue with the Fun Star piece as it included a fake quote attributed to her. She is concerned with reports from people who say they looked her up on Google and thought this was a legitimate quote. Dr. Sunwood felt the continuing appearance of this false "quote" online

constitutes harassment and belittlement of the Women's Center and Women's Center Manager's position at UAF.

The committee then discussed the issue without the guests. While everyone agreed that the Fun Star article was offensive and that some of the things posted on UAF Confessions were offensive, hostile, threatening, and even illegal there was no clear agreement on what the response of the Faculty Senate should be. The committee decided on the following action items:

1. David Valentine, on behalf of the Senate, will send a letter to the Sun Star editorial board requesting to remove the Fun Star article from the website and to redact the names of the students whose posts are included in the second article.
2. We will ask Don Foley to have UAF removed from the title of the UAF Confessions website.
3. We will provide a brief report to the full Senate in the fall outlining our actions. A resolution on the responsible use of social media and a condemnation of sexual harassment could follow.
4. In the meantime, the summary will be distributed to the committee, guests, as well as the Provost and Chancellor. In the fall we will also inform the full Senate and all faculty.



UAF Faculty Senate

312B Signers' Hall, University of Alaska Fairbanks, P.O. Box 757500, Fairbanks, AK 99775-7500 • (907) 474-7964 • Fax (907) 474-5213

www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate

MEMORANDUM

June 7, 2013

TO: The UAF Sun Star Editorial Board

FROM: David Valentine, President
Cecile Lardon, President-Elect
UAF Faculty Senate

Two handwritten signatures in black ink. The top signature is 'David Valentine' and the bottom signature is 'Cecile Lardon'. Both are written in a cursive, flowing style.

SUBJECT: Articles from April 2013

We are writing to let you know about complaints we recently received about two articles appearing in April editions of the UAF Sun Star, and, because they may adversely affect the educational environment at UAF, to request that they be deleted from the Sun Star website or redacted.

The first complaint concerns the April 2 “Fun Star” article about construction of a new vagina-shaped building on the UAF Campus. We understand that the article was a satirical spoof and in large part a reaction to a phallic focus of prior years’ “Fun Star” editions. However, the women who brought the complaint to us reported that they saw both the article and the accompanying picture as perpetuating a “rape culture” through depiction of women in a very vulnerable position and thereby compromising their learning environment. Dr. Sine Anahita, Associate Professor of Sociology, reported that her class objected to the picture depicting the proposed building with a woman’s legs spread as if for a gynecological exam. Dr. Kayt Sunwood, Manager of the UAF Women’s Center, objected to the made-up quote attributed to her concerning the world being “a giant penis building”; she felt sexually harassed when people reported searching for her name online. Seeing this “quote” online led them to believe Sunwood had uttered these words.

The second complaint concerns the April 23 article, “UAF Confessions harbors hate speech”, which included several screen shots from a publicly accessible Facebook account, “UAF Confessions”. The screen shots included the full names of several people who were either being discussed or were the discussants themselves. We understand that one named person, Liz Wallace, specifically authorized reprinting of her name. We also understand that this Facebook page is highly public, so commenters have no expectation of privacy. Nevertheless, the complainants argued that including the names in the Sun Star article reached a different public and in a more permanent way. Whereas at least one of the comments has since been removed by the moderator and all the others have essentially scrolled into oblivion, the Sun Star reproductions preserve into perpetuity the identities of those who were unfortunate or foolish enough

to appear ephemerally on UAF Confessions. We are not convinced that inclusion of names in the screen shots is justified, and ask that you redact the on-line article so that the names are no longer legible.

The UAF Sun Star is not answerable to the UAF Faculty Senate, and we harbor no conceit that we can demand the changes we request. Even if we could, such an undertaking might raise real and important concerns about freedom of speech and of the press. Faculty at UAF cherish academic freedom, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech. We understand and honor the Sun-Star's rights to these freedoms as well. We see our requests as in line with our mutual goals for a vibrant campus newspaper with high standards for journalistic excellence that serve the educational interests of the UAF community.

If you would like to discuss these requests further, please contact David Valentine at dvalentine@alaska.edu or (907) 474-7614.

ATTACHMENT 192/3
UAF Faculty Senate #192, September 9, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

Background:

The following resolution was first passed at Faculty Senate Meeting #146 in November 2007, and was endorsed by a letter distributed to the UAF faculty in Fall 2008. Since then the Provost has annually provided this resolution to all Faculty Review Committees. The Faculty Senate reaffirmed this resolution at Meeting #176 in September 2011, and at Meeting #184 in September 2012. For academic year 2013–2014, the Administrative Committee submits an updated resolution to the Faculty Senate Meeting #192 on September 9, 2013.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the members of Faculty Committees are called upon under the concept of shared governance to provide professional review of other faculty candidates undergoing Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Review (Pre and Post-tenure),

WHEREAS the faculty portion of the review process must be fair and reasonable in order to maintain the reputation of the University, and the integrity of the academic process,

WHEREAS open and transparent Committee deliberations facilitate fair and reasonable review,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly requests that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an “open” meeting, and that “mandatory closed” meetings be avoided, including during the 2013-14 review cycle.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty Committee meetings are “open” at the request of a candidate and are consistent with all other relevant UAF rules and procedures.
2. Open meetings provide strong incentives for fair and reasonable review, including the oversight of the candidate.
3. The Committee can query a candidate for clarification of the file, which will greatly reduce the number of false assumptions and errors during deliberation.
4. Open meetings are educational—candidates who opt to attend their review have the opportunity to learn about academic traditions and practices.
5. Attendance can reduce candidates' anxiety, and make them feel like a part of the process.

ATTACHMENT 192/4
UAF Faculty Senate #192, September 9, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the Faculty Senate Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E, to establish the Faculty Administrator Review Committee (FARC) as a Permanent Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: One of the responsibilities of the discontinued Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee was to approve the processes used to review Group A and B administrators. Without this committee the responsibility falls to the Administrative Committee. Approximately 5-6 administrator reviews need to be completed per year. The reports are due in March which, of course, is a particularly busy time for the Administrative Committee. The newly formed Faculty Administrator Review Committee would take on that oversight function while also providing some structure and support to the individual Ad Hoc Administrator Review Committee chairs.

BOLD CAPS = Addition
[[]] = Deletion

Faculty Senate Bylaws, Section 3, Article 5: Committees, subsection E:

E. The standing and permanent committees of the Senate are:

...

PERMANENT

...

- 8. THE FACULTY ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE (FARC) WILL FACILITATE THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS IN GROUPS A AND B. THIS WILL INCLUDE ENCOURAGING THE TIMELY COMPLETION OF ALL REVIEWS AND RESULTING LETTERS, AS WELL AS PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF EACH REVIEW TO THE PROVOST, CHANCELLOR, VICE-CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH, OR OTHER SUPERVISOR IN MARCH. THE FARC WILL ALSO APPROVE THE PROCESS WHICH EACH AD-HOC ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE UTILIZES.**

THE FACULTY ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE SHALL BE COMPOSED OF THE CHAIRS OF ALL INDIVIDUAL AD-HOC ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEES PLUS ONE FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATIVE APPOINTED BY THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT WHO SHALL CHAIR THE COMMITTEE. THE AD-HOC ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIRS MAY, BUT DO NOT HAVE TO BE, MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE.

ATTACHMENT 192/5
UAF Faculty Senate #192, September 9, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the Guidelines for the evaluation process for administrators (Groups A and B) to reflect the establishment of the Faculty Administrator Review Committee as a Permanent Committee (FARC) of the UAF Faculty Senate.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The guidelines need to be formally updated to reflect the establishment of the Faculty Administrator Review Committee.

BOLD CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Group A:

1. Within the first three weeks of the fall semester, the supervisor of the administrator to be reviewed will appoint an Ad Hoc Administrator Review Committee consisting of five members. **[[]]** At least three **[[of whom]]** **MEMBERS** must be faculty, **AND AT LEAST ONE MUST BE ON THE FACULTY SENATE (INCLUDING ALTERNATES)**. (It is recommended that staff be included on the ad hoc committee as appropriate.) **[[The chair and one other member of the committee shall be appointed from the Faculty Senate (including alternates).]]**

In the case of evaluation of the Dean of the Graduate School, the Provost will appoint an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of two faculty drawn from the UAF Faculty Senate's Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee, one other **[[Senate]]** **FACULTY** member **[[(including alternates)]]**, one dean/director, and a graduate student representative.

The Ad Hoc Committee will solicit input from all relevant constituencies on- and off-campus, including faculty, staff, and students. This may be accomplished through various instruments, e.g., a standard questionnaire completed anonymously and returned to the committee chair.

2. The administrator to be evaluated will prepare a narrative self-evaluation of activities performed during the three-year period (academic years) prior to the year of evaluation or since the last evaluation. This narrative should include reflections about how adequately s/he has fulfilled responsibilities of leadership consistent with his/her own performance expectations and those of faculty, staff, and students in the unit. Major or otherwise significant accomplishments should

be highlighted. Any issues raised in the last evaluation should be referenced with a view to what progress has been made on those items. Finally, the self-evaluation should identify a limited set of reasonable goals for the unit over the next three years, with some discussion about specific strategies that may be undertaken through his/her administrative leadership.

3. The Ad Hoc Committee will interview a select sample of faculty, staff, students and others as relevant for further evaluative comments about the administrator's performance.
4. The Ad Hoc Committee will interview the administrator either in person or by conference call. The interview shall proceed on the basis of a set of questions which reference the administrator's self-evaluation, the results of returned questionnaires, and the interviews of faculty, staff, and students.
5. The Ad Hoc Committee will prepare an evaluative summary, and submit its report to the Provost (in the case of evaluation of deans) or to the Chancellor (in the case of evaluation of the Provost or any other administrator who reports directly to the Chancellor). The Ad Hoc Committee shall work as expeditiously as possible in completing its report and submit it to the Provost or Chancellor as the case may be by March 15 of the spring semester.

(a) At a date to be set by the Provost, the Provost or administrator's supervisor shall meet in joint conference with the Ad Hoc Committee and the Faculty Senate **FACULTY** Administrator **REVIEW** Committee (**FARC**) for final review, recommendations, and disposition of the Administrator's evaluation. The specifics of the content of the report of the Ad Hoc committee shall not be discussed if the Administrator's supervisor deems that inappropriate under Board of Regents' Policy P04.01.062. and Alaska Statute. In particular, the Administrator must give written consent for the specific content to be discussed. However, the **FARC** [[Administrative Committee]] shall be provided information on the process followed by the ad hoc committee, excluding the names of persons interviewed unless they have waived confidentiality. The supervisor of the administrator will thereafter provide his/her formal evaluation taking into account the Ad Hoc Committee's report.

(b) At a date to be set by the Chancellor, the Provost (or other administrator reporting directly to the Chancellor) and the Chancellor shall meet to discuss the Ad Hoc Committee's evaluation of the Provost (or other administrator reporting directly to the Chancellor). During this meeting the Chancellor and Provost (or other administrator reporting directly to the Chancellor) shall identify performance priorities for the next review period. The Chancellor shall meet in joint conference with the Ad Hoc Committee and the UAF Faculty Senate's **FARC** [[Administrative Committee]] to summarize the evaluation process. The specifics of the content of the Ad Hoc Committee evaluation shall not be discussed if the Chancellor deems it inappropriate under Board of Regents' Policy P04.01.062. and Alaska Statute.

The following statement is included with guidelines when distributed to units:

P04.01.062. Confidentiality of Personnel Records.

- A. Dates of present and past employment with the university, position title, type of employment, campus, and salary are public information. The university adopts the policy of AS 39.25.080 so that all other personnel records, including but not limited to applications, leave records, home address and telephone number, performance evaluations and disciplinary matters, relating to any

past or present employee of the university are not public records and are not accessible by the public. Personnel records will be released only under the following circumstances:

1. upon receipt of written authorization from the employee, former employee, or applicant, as directed in the authorization;
2. to the employee's supervisors and to university supervisors to whom the employee or former employee has applied for promotion, transfer or rehire;
3. to a state agency authorized by statute to review such university documents upon receipt of a subpoena issued by a competent authority and upon execution of an agreement that confidential information will not be made public;
4. upon receipt of an order of a court of competent jurisdiction;
5. for internal university operations, to persons having a need to know as determined by the regional personnel officer or the custodian of the record.

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Group B Administrators:

In addition to being reviewed annually by his/her immediate Supervisor, "Group B" administrators are to undergo a 3-year comprehensive review. At a time designated by the Supervisor during the fall semester of the academic year of comprehensive review, the "Group B" administrator will submit a self-evaluation report to his/her Supervisor. The self-evaluation shall include: (1) comments on the annual performance evaluations; (2) a summary of his/her notable activities/accomplishments in the previous years; and (3) a statement of relevant goals/objectives relative to assigned or planned administrative duties for the upcoming years. The Supervisor's evaluation shall include faculty and/or staff opportunities for comment on the "Group B" administrator's performance. Comments received shall be referenced in anonymous and aggregate summary in the written evaluation provided to the "Group B" administrator. The Supervisor will include, as part of the written evaluation, an appended workload assignment and/or statement of performance expectations for the "Group B" administrator for the subsequent review period. A summary statement of the process used to assure faculty/staff input into the evaluation will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office by March 15 of the academic year the "Group B" administrator is scheduled for review. The Faculty Senate **FACULTY** Administrator **REVIEW** Committee shall review the evaluation process in order to perform their oversight function in administrator review.

The following criteria will be used to determine which administrators are placed on or removed from the "Group B" list. As vacancies and appointments occur, changes to the list shall be determined annually by the Provost in consultation with the Faculty Senate President.

- "Group B" administrator responsibilities must be administrative in nature. ("Group B" administrators must not be Union members, UNAC or ACCFT).
- "Group B" administrators report to "Group A" administrators. ("Group A" administrators report to the Chancellor, Provost, or a Vice Chancellor.)
- "Group B" administrators supervise faculty and are involved in faculty performance reviews.

ATTACHMENT 192/6
UAF Faculty Senate #192, September 9, 2013
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

**Committee on the Status of Women,
Minutes Friday, August 30, 2013; 11:30-1:00 pm, Gruening 718**

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Diana Di Stefano, Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Ellen Lopez, Derek Sikes

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Shawn Russell, Nilima Hullavarad, Megan McPhee, Jenny Liu

1. Women's Center Advisory Board

Women's Center has been realigned under University and Student Advancement. More information to follow about a physical relocation. Advisory committee recommended the Women's Center Director be a full time, salaried position. Chancellor added \$5000 for programing.

2. Women Faculty Luncheon, October 1, 2013, 12:30 to 2:30

Joan Braddock will be speaker. Diana, Derek, Ellen, Kayt, Mary, Jane and Amy will go early to help set up. Ellen, Derek and Kayt will help stuff envelopes.

3. Conversation Cafes

Attendance could be better. Pick end of day times. 2 hours. Less structured. Kayt, Mary, Nilima and Ellen will be on committee. Draw on the topics of the luncheon. Advertise at the luncheon. This committee will choose a fall date and maybe a spring date. Put 3x5 cards on tables at luncheon for suggestions for topics.

Fall: Two weeks after luncheon. Follow up topic from luncheon.

Spring big event: Topic: Mentoring.

4. Ex officio representative

Michelle Bartlett. Derek will ask Michelle if she wants to continue on this committee.

5. Chairs

Ellen has offered to co-chair this committee. Amy will do notes. Derek will be back up.

6. Other

In light of the Sun Star activities this spring, they have been asked to change their policies. Faculty Senate asked the names (April 23 issue) and the satirical article (April 2 issue) be redacted.

7. Meeting Dates

Wednesday 9:15-10:15 or Tues 2:00-3:00. We think Wednesdays' work best.

Upcoming CSW meetings:

Wednesday, October 16, 2013, 9:15-10:15 am

Wednesday, November 13, 2013, 9:15-10:15 am

Wednesday, December 11, 2013, 9:15-10:15 am
Meeting was adjourned at 1:00 pm

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/>