MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #196

Monday, February 3, 2014 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:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (14)	VALENTINE, Dave (14)
ALBERTSON, Leif (14) – **Julie Cascio**	WEBER, Jane (14)
BAKER, Tori (14) – (audio)	WEBLEY, Peter (14)
BARNES, Bill (15)	WINFREE, Cathy (15)
BERGE, Anna (15)	YARIE, John (14)
CEE, Vincent (14)	ZHANG, Xiong (14) – **Rorik Peterson**
COFFMAN, Chris (15)	
COOK, Christine (14)	Members Absent:
DAVIS, Mike (14)	BRET-HARTE, Donie (15)
DEHN, Jonathan (15)	CHEN, Cheng-fu (14)
DUKE, Rob (15)	CONDE, Mark (15)
FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)	FALLEN, Chris (15) - excused
GIBSON, Georgina (14)	LOVECRAFT, Amy (15)
GUSTAFSON, Karen (14)	RADENBAUGH, Todd (15)
HAN, Xiaoqi (15)	WINSOR, Peter (14)
HARDY, Sarah (15)	
HEALY, Joanne (15)	Others Present:
HORSTMANN, Lara (15)	Chancellor Rogers
JOHNSON, Galen (15)	Provost Henrichs
JOHNSTON, DUFF (14)	Cindy Hardy
JOLY, Julie (15)	Brad Krick - audio
KIELLAND, Knut (14)	Eric Madsen
LARDON, Cecile (15)	Alex Fitts
MCCARTNEY, Leslie (15) – **L. Humrickhouse**	Linda Hapsmith
MEYER, Franz (15)	Erik Williams – guest speaker
MISRA, Debu (15)	Falk Huettmann (UNAC)
MOSER, Dennis (14) – **Liz Humrickhouse**	Libby Eddy
NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)	Dani Sheppard - Athletics
SHALLCROSS, Leslie (15) – **Julie Cascio**	Joy Morrison
SHORT, Margaret (15)	

B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #195

Minutes for Meeting 195 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 amend English Placement Policy

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – David Valentine

(Attachment 196/1 *Memo re Report on PhD – Mathematics*)

David announced that Faculty Senate elections will be getting underway soon. A formal memorandum about annual elections has been distributed to the deans and directors. Wayne Marr's resignation from the School of Management (thus Faculty Senate) was announced. Neither one of the alternates was available to step up so SOM held a special election. Ken Abramowicz was elected to fill the vacancy. David noted Ken has served on the Faculty Senate before and welcomed him back.

President-elect nominations will open at the March meeting. David encouraged interested members to nominate others or themselves. Outstanding Senator of the Year nominations will be opened in March, also.

David described the Budget Options Group (BOG), noting the Governor's proposed budget is substantially smaller and revenues for the university are unlikely to increase. BOG has been charged with doing some initial investigation and developing potential ideas for ways the university can save money. The target goal is to save $11 million. Both David and Cecile are serving on this group. He invited comments and suggestions from Senate members and faculty. They are a little over half-way done in this work; but, new ideas are sought at every meeting. [**Correction:** The target goal was actually $14-15 million.]

After the Budget Options Group has identified potential savings, the Provost will convene the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC). PBC prioritizes and make recommendations to the Chancellor's Cabinet about ways to save money. Normally the Faculty Senate leaders sit on the PBC committee; but as they are currently serving on the BOG this year, David invited interested senators to let him know if they would like to serve on PBC.

David reported about a recent retreat held by the UA Board of Regents and President Gamble. They have been discussing alignment among the three universities that comprise the UA system. Proposals have been generated to ask the three faculty senates, through Faculty Alliance, to come up with a common set of general education requirements (GERs) in Math and English. This would include common course numberings, common placement scores and common entry levels. Faculty Alliance is considering these proposals and the faculty senates can expect to hear from them.

The General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO) Committee had a meeting in Anchorage recently. Their initial objective had been to finalize the learning outcomes. However, upon hearing the new information through Faculty Alliance, they started rethinking what parts of learning outcomes would

still be considered part of general education and what might be achieved some other way. This will facilitate common alignment later on.

David noted the memorandum (Attachment 196/1) responding to the Department of Mathematics and Statistics' report on the revitalization of the PhD program in Mathematics. The Administrative Committee was positive about the report. The memo asks that the department provide an update in late spring to confirm numbers of students who have committed to matriculation in the program.

In December the Provost invited input from Faculty Senate regarding the draft Strategic Plan. The 2012 draft had been delayed with the hope of completing it following the outcome of the Strategic Directions Initiative (SDI). SDI has now become Shaping Alaska's Future (SAF) and the process is not yet finished. However, there is still a need to have the Strategic Plan to use with the accreditation report this year. David thanked those who have already provided feedback. Senate leadership has also reviewed it, and a memo of response is being written to summarize the feedback. Essentially, the feedback is that the draft plan reads like a series of noble aspirations and goals rather than a strategic plan with action items. They are asking that an update be provided to the Faculty Senate for a resolution of support at a future meeting.

Debu M. reported that he had shared the plan with CEM, but did not receive any feedback. He suggested that a taskforce be appointed to review it. Provost Henrichs responded that she will work with the original planning committee to draft any revisions. Faculty are included on that committee. They are already knowledgeable about the report and will have the opportunity to provide more feedback.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Cécile Lardon

Cécile mentioned an item from the Statewide Academic Council concerning the potential replacement of the university's learning management system (LMS) – currently Blackboard. She reminded everyone about the eLearning pilot project comparing different LMS products which David and Carol Gering had spearheaded. One of their goals is to have a single LMS for all three universities so that students basically have the same experience when they access that system, particularly those who take courses from the three universities simultaneously. Karl Kowalski (OIT) would like to move forward with this project, which would require the three faculty senates to move along quite a bit faster and choose a product. However, it's recognized that guiding policies need to be put in place to help make a decision about the next LMS. So, the leadership of the three universities have been tasked with providing some guiding policy. A subcommittee of the Faculty Senate may be needed soon to look at the various products and make recommendations about which would be a good choice – a product which provides continuity with the LMS we have had, as well as flexibility with other technologies. Part of the incentive is to bring faculty in on this technology who haven't used it in the past because they did not like Blackboard.

Both David and Cécile have been talking with the eLearning folks. The broader goal of eLearning now is to work with faculty to develop innovation in teaching. They want to collaborate on projects with Faculty Senate, and will give a presentation at the next Administrative Committee meeting. She invited faculty to share ideas with her.

Jane W. asked who requested the same LMS across the system. Cécile said the request is coming from statewide.

David described the new Summit Team which has been formed at statewide. It's made up of UA President Gamble, Vice President Dana Thomas, and the three chancellors and provosts from each of the universities. They are the source of some of these ideas that are currently being promulgated, including the common LMS.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

Provost Henrich's comments preceded the Chancellor's, as he arrived after the Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce meeting. The Chancellor noted the Chamber was talking about their support of the combined heat and power plant project for UAF before they go down to Juneau and lobby the legislature.

With regard to the Shaping Alaska's Future report, the Chancellor noted that the statements of issues and effects are being completed. He thanked those who participated in the process. The current document sets reasonable and achievable goals along with some 'stretch' goals for the University of Alaska. The report will be reviewed by the Board of Regents at the upcoming meeting here in Fairbanks. He anticipated the BOR would take action at the April meeting in Kodiak. He reiterated that what was heard at the public meetings around the state centered on how we serve our students systemwide, and about the challenges students face who take courses among the three universities. The Summit Team will look at areas of collaboration between the three universities.

There are several issues the Summit Team has identified to move forward and start addressing. The Chancellor and Provost continue to be mindful about involving faculty through shared governance. One issue the Chancellor highlighted is the academic calendar and class schedules. They are headed toward a uniform academic calendar across the system with uniform course start and end dates, breaks, as well as a uniform class schedule. Some interesting issues that will need to be worked on by the three faculty senates include the fact that UAF operates on a schedule of classes five days a week, with 800 minutes per credit. This is different than Anchorage which mostly operates on a four-day schedule with fewer minutes per credit. This is also why the Chancellor hasn't signed the motion from the Governance Coordinating Committee for the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic calendars. These issues will need to be addressed by the three faculty senates with the aim of presenting one or more proposals to the UA President for what a combined calendar would look like.

Other issues identified by the team included the alignment of Math and English requirements, and common financial aid rules among the three universities. Simplification of the administrative procedures for students across the system would then allow better focus on the academic enterprise.

The Chancellor will be in Juneau this week for initial meetings with the legislature. The legislature has just started hearings on the operating budget and he does not expect much change from the Governor's request for the university. On the capital side of the budget, however, he does expect change both on the heat and power plant and potentially on several of our research projects. He will update everyone next month.

The Chancellor announced that he signed a memo this morning to formally merge the School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences with the Cooperative Extension Service. The unit will now be called the School of Natural Resources and Extension (SNRE). The proposal for the structure and naming of the merged unit now goes to the February BOR meeting.

Everyone was reminded of the Chancellor's reception for Faculty Senate.

Rainer N. asked Chancellor Rogers if he had any idea how UAF would find a compromise with UAA on the prospect of not holding classes on Fridays. The Chancellor responded that the "compromise" would be that classes will be held on Fridays. Rainer then asked if UAA faculty have agreed to that. The Chancellor said that if the three faculty senates do not agree, and more than one proposal goes to the UA President and BOR, the proposal that includes using facilities five days a week will win out. The Chancellor noted that he thinks the bigger issue is the 800 minutes per academic credit (UAF) vs. 750 minutes per credit (UAA). A related issue is the 60-minute class period (UAF) vs. the 50-minute class period (UAA). He and the Provost will support UAF policy in this regard.

Jane W. asked about common winter and spring breaks at the three universities, noting it hadn't happened before because of air travel schedules. The Chancellor responded that it will create air travel issues; but, ultimately it comes down to the situation where students are not getting a spring break if they take courses at more than one university.

Several senators asked about the effects of this uniform calendar on alignment with the school district schedules for break times. The Chancellor acknowledged that alignment with school districts will be a challenge for faculty and staff, and UAF would not be able to align with the local school district each year. The failure to align the universities has been a bigger issue for the students.

Ken A. noted many of the students have children. Not aligning with the school district will be an enormous problem for them as well as for faculty and staff. Ken asked if incorporating the UAF WinterMester and MayMester into the uniform calendar will be possible. He noted the difficulty in aligning the UAF calendar with the Mesters in the past. The Chancellor acknowledged that Mesters will have to be addressed and he has talked about it with the Summer Sessions director. Right now it looks like it will be more of an issue with the WinterMester – it may have to start during break in order to keep it. The Chancellor also noted that another issue involves the potential need for make-up days due to changing weather patterns.

Anna B. commented that she doesn't see that the efforts at alignment will necessarily take care of all the issues for the students in the long run. She said there could be some advantages with non-alignment in the system, and it would be nice if the BOR would be open to considering this.

David reminded the senate that there is always opportunity for public comment at the BOR meetings, and the upcoming meeting is here in Fairbanks. The Chancellor also mentioned that any changes which require action by the Board of Regents go through a proposal process that is shared with governance before it goes forward. He also mentioned that over the thirty years or so that he's been involved with the university and the BOR, there have always been regents who think we should be one university. However, part of what they've done in the Summit Team is to be clear that they don't favor a one university model. We are one university system, but three universities. The language change in BOR policy is moving away from "MAUs" to "three universities." To the extent that we are resistant to some of the things the Board perceives as making life easier for students, we exacerbate the tension toward one university. From his vantage point as chancellor, he thinks it's far better to ease the burden of differences of the three universities on the students, while preserving what's important to us in terms of the mission of this university and the separate missions of the three universities. It's much more important than some of the administrative support issues (like financial aid) that being unified would create.

Julie J. commented that while she agrees that we should be making life as streamlined as possible for students, this approach eliminates one problem while creating another. We have more and more non-traditional students every year who have children in the school district. By not aligning with the school district in order to align with UAA, a whole new set of problems is being made for students who have children. In her own classroom experience, the number of traditional students is going down, while non-traditional numbers are going up. She asked why we should invent a perceived idea of what a student needs as opposed to what actual students really need.

David invited feedback from faculty because he will go to the BOR meeting, noting it would be a lot more effective if other faculty showed up as well. Rainer asked what the most effective action would be, and wondered about including students. David responded that having data to back up statements such as Julie made about student numbers would be helpful for the BOR to consider. Rainer asked Libby E. if she could come up with numbers, and she indicated she could.

Anna B. commented that focusing on only one population, the students, alienates the faculty and staff who must provide the services of higher education to those students. She noted this topic warrants further discussion in Faculty Senate: that while it's all well and good to make life easier for students, we need to also consider the needs of faculty and staff. If we do not align with the local school district, who will help faculty and staff care for their children during spring break? The university is not just about providing services to students; it's about academics and higher learning. It's not just about one population. She felt we're forgetting that the university is not just a corporate model or a consumer model. By focusing on only the one population, we're making it very difficult for those who must provide the services of the university.

A comment was made by teleconference reminding everyone that earlier in the meeting they had heard about the tight budget situation the university faces and the need to increase revenues. So, while we need to think about the comments just made, we also need to consider our students and make sure we are capturing those who wish to come to here – which supports our salaries.

Bill B. asked if there is any evidence or data to support the idea that aligning calendars across the universities will actually be better for students. Provost Henrichs responded that she has information about how many students take classes at more than one location and she will make that information available. She provided the example of the undergraduate fisheries program which has had difficulties because of the non-alignment between calendars. She agreed that it would be prudent to do some systematic research about it so they aren't just making changes that do not improve the situation for the majority. She also encouraged some outside of the box thinking, such as having a two-week spring break and perhaps shortening the winter break. She encouraged constructive thinking on the matter.

Rainer asked if someone might come up with a more representative strategy for this upcoming BOR meeting. If just a few faculty show up, they could easily be ignored. David asked Chancellor Rogers how effective it was when many staff came to the BOR meeting to show concern about the tuition waiver benefit. The Chancellor said it was effective that staff showed up in numbers because it demonstrated the intensity of their position on the matter. David urged faculty to show up at the BOR meeting and speak about their concerns.

Debu M. asked what happened to the Faculty Regent position that had been mentioned at an earlier senate meeting. David said that the Faculty Alliance still has it on their wish list and they're still developing a proposal for it.

Ken A. asked the Chancellor, regarding the matter of schools with differential accreditations across the three MAUs, if he could discuss how unification will affect accreditation and the pressure to take different courses from other universities (affecting future accreditation efforts). The Chancellor responded that he didn't think it would affect accreditation. Courses are either accredited or they're not, and if they're not they won't count toward a degree from an accredited program. Ken noted that he knew of efforts at UAA and UAS where there was pressure to take courses from one MAU to avoid harder courses at the other, and it affected success in courses down the line. It made him wonder when students take courses at different MAUs whether it's to enhance the quality of their education, or for other purposes. The Chancellor didn't think there was a sense of what the reasons are that students choose to take courses at other universities. They do not have data on that topic.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs expanded on President's Valentine's comments about the new Summit Team. It was formed by President Gamble in response to a very strong message from the UA Board of Regents who wish to see the three universities collaborate more in an effort to reduce costs. They also believe this will better serve students at the same time. Therefore, the Summit Team is focusing on efforts to show system-wide collaboration which positively benefit students. This will demonstrate to the BOR that the three universities are serious about improving the student experience and work effectively together to do so. While not everyone will agree that the right changes are being made or that this is the right time to make them, this effort will help keep the BOR from taking more forceful actions themselves. The Shaping Alaska's Future initiative is related as some aspects of the revised document emphasize collaboration. That document will be finalized over the next month. The Faculty Alliance is coordinating input from the faculties. The document has been improved greatly from the earlier version of last October. With the broad input from many constituencies, not all will be equally pleased about compromises made to meet the highest needs and priorities of the groups. The BOR was pleased with the improved report at its January retreat.

The Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) will have a different charge this year: to rank and prioritize the suggestions to reduce expenditures or increase revenues which they receive from the Budget Options Group (BOG). The Legislature would prefer to see the university increase its revenue as opposed to providing more funding; and this is something the BOG, PBC and Chancellor's Cabinet will be considering seriously. The Provost invited faculty participation and input with the BOG and PBC, noting there will be some opportunities to ask for new monies even in the current budget environment.

Vacant faculty positions are not necessarily being approved for immediate re-filling as they open up. This doesn't mean those positions won't be approved. However, there are a couple of factors that must be considered first. One is that a lot of the actions to be taken with revenue increases and budget cuts won't be effective right away. This means they must take some steps right before or during FY15 to make ends meet. So, she's holding some positions until later for reconsideration when the budget picture becomes clearer, or which could be reconsidered when funds are freed up as a result of other budget cuts. Priorities are being weighed and taken into account as some positions may be filled sooner than others.

Mike D. asked about the composition of the planning and budget committee and described his recent trip to Juneau. He spoke about the large legislative cuts planned for the next year's budget and asked if the PBC will look at this scenario. Provost Henrichs responded that the PBC will be given as much information as they have on what's pending before the legislature in terms of potential cuts. They need to know the environment in which they're making their recommendations. However, BOG is more of

an idea group looking at all possible good ideas, and is not working toward any particular financial target. The PBC and Chancellor's Cabinet will be paying really close attention to the legislative actions regarding the university's FY15 budget. David reiterated that it's a three-step process. The BOG is working on ideas to be forwarded to the PBC. PBC will consider those ideas and many other things with respect to coming up with a series of recommendations and prioritizations. These will focus on ways to save money and will be ranked, and then forwarded to the Chancellor's Cabinet for final decisions.

Torie B. asked about the membership of BOG. David responded the Chancellor had appointed this group of eight, and he (David) and Cecile were invited to serve as the leaders of Faculty Senate. Others include the vice chancellor for Administrative Services, Director Dan White; a representative from Facilities Services, and other leaders from campus. Cecile noted they are also looking at how to increase revenues, not just make reductions. They are in agreement on what needs to be protected in terms of central functions of the university, and they are willing to think about unintended consequences of any of the ideas on the table. They are thoughtfully entertaining all ideas brought forth to them.

Lara H. asked who is making the decisions about prioritizing the vacant faculty positions. Provost Henrichs responded that it's her decision right now to delay approving vacant positions. She is taking input and advice from the deans about which positions are more crucial to fill for their respective units, so it is a combined administrative decision. Once the processes with BOG, PBC and Chancellor's Cabinet are complete in terms of cuts, revenue options and priorities, the priorities for filling faculty positions will be a lot clearer. Then, the Provost will go back to the deans with a more systematic process for deciding which positions will be opened in light of the priorities.

Karen G. asked how the membership is determined for the Planning and Budget Committee. The Provost responded that the positions on the committee were established by Paul Reichardt, her predecessor. Membership includes a total of five faculty. Two are chosen by Faculty Senate, and three are formerly appointed with advice from the deans. There is a specific Staff Council representative and some other staff chosen by the vice chancellors for administrative services, and university advancement. She also appoints some deans to the committee.

Karen also asked about the membership of Chancellor's Cabinet. The Provost noted it's comprised of administrators: a core group consisting of the vice chancellors and the chancellor, and a broader group that includes administrators from among the associate vice chancellors. Karen observed that only five to seven faculty are involved throughout this entire process. The Provost responded that the BOG and PBC are open to input from all faculty.

Jane W. asked the Provost about the prioritization of hiring faculty. Does it include tenure track, research, and term positions? The Provost said it includes all faculty positions. However, soft-funded positions are being approved since they're tied to grant funds. All term funded positions are being filled at this time, also. Most of the delays are focused in the tenure track positions.

Ken A. asked about the updated Shaping Alaska's Future document. The Provost reported that Robert Boeckmann has the latest copy as of yesterday. She will forward it from Faculty Alliance to David, and he'll make it available to the Faculty Senate.

V Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Brad Krick

Brad spoke about the recent Staff Council meeting in January. Elections were finished and a lot of new members were welcomed. The core of their meeting was spent with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regarding the FY15 budget. There were questions about the Budget Options Group which coalesced into a resolution that was passed requesting a Staff Council seat on BOG.

B. ASUAF – Brix Hahn

No report was available.

C. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

Dani reported for Athletics in her capacity as the chancellor-appointed Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR). The former Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC) has been disbanded in order to put together a new committee called the Nanook Athletics Advisory Committee (NAAC). NAAC will be housed under the Chancellor's Office and members have been appointed by Chancellor Rogers. The committee will be comprised of two faculty, two staff, two students and two members of the community. The FAR (currently Dani) will be an additional faculty on the committee and serve as the chair.

The Athletics Department is undergoing their mandatory five-year self-study as required by the NCAA. Dani is serving on the self-study committee.

The national organization for university FARs recently had their large meeting in November. One of the big topics currently is concussions and related research about the neurological and physiological damage and the need for reduced cognitive load in the initial days or weeks following injury. They're looking at putting together a panel to present on this topic to the campus.

Dani reported that the latest GPA reports for the sports teams were very exciting. The department GPA is up to a 3.23; and for the first time every single sports team (ten teams total) was over 3.0.

Dani is currently putting together a faculty advisory committee for athletics. She noted she could use some additional input from faculty to help her accomplish some of the tasks of her position. There are two faculty on the committee so far, and she invited anyone interested to contact her.

The hockey team has joined new conference. She was the only FAR at the annual spring meeting last year, and she has worked to get that formally changed so that all the university FARs will be included in this meeting which makes important conference policy decisions. Her efforts were successful and now faculty have a louder voice at the conference level.

David asked Dani whether in addition to efforts to reduce learning after concussions, there were efforts to reduce concussions. Dani responded that conference rules are being changed in order to help reduce concussions at the games. There is also stronger enforcement of those rules. Technological advancements are also helping to improve safety. She mentioned that here at UAF they have only had one or two minor injuries per year, and only one major injury in the past five years.

Lara H. expressed concern over the idea of students not attending classes and giving priority to the sport rather than schooling. Dani responded that the issue is broader than athletics and involves anyone who suffers concussion due to things such as falls or car accidents. Lara agreed, but still noted this sounded

like special excuses are being made for student athletes. Others don't choose to engage in sports activities that put them at risk.

Debu M. asked if these types of injuries are covered by the American Disabilities Act. Dani responded that she didn't have an immediate answer, but has asked the question of Don Foley and it's under discussion.

D. UNAC – Falk Huettmann
UAFT – Jane Weber

No reports were made by Falk or Jane (both were present in the meeting).

VI Public Comment

An unidentified UAF faculty from IARC commented about the required campus safety trainings. He noted that much of the training is not necessarily related to the professional duties of many faculty and takes a large amount of time to complete. He suggested finding a different format for offering training, rather than basing it on exams as it is now. He also mentioned that research faculty at IARC are paid out of different funding sources than most of UAF. David responded that most faculty would probably agree with these comments, and noted that next month Frances Isgrigg, the director of Environmental Health, Safety, and Risk Management, will speak to the Faculty Senate about how safety training will be changed.

Georgina G. commented that IARC faculty are not paid out of Fund 1 monies, and so must take the training on their own time. She would be behind the training if she felt it actually improved safety, but given the nature of a lot of the questions, she doesn't think it does.

Registrar Libby E. mentioned students were dropped this week for non-payment of tuition (not including those who made arrangements in advance or set up a payment plan). Faculty will be sent an email regarding students dropped from their courses so they can remove them from their Blackboard courses.

Libby also announced that this fall they will roll out a new program called College Scheduler. Students will be able to access it from UA Online. The program allows students to input their personal schedules and then find courses that fit into that schedule. They will do a soft roll-out this summer. Cecile asked if courses like those with writing and oral intensive designations are included. Libby said not yet, but they will be able to expand it to accommodate such courses later on.

Jane W. asked if students will still need an advisors signature. Libby said yes, they would. College Scheduler is just a helpful tool for them to use for planning. Jane also asked if those students who were dropped are able to get back in or appeal being dropped. Libby noted they have until close of business on Friday to pay, and this action of being dropped will be the fifth communication they have been sent about their fees.

Debu M. announced that on February 14 he will have an open discussion for faculty on some topics instrumental to the strategic plan. Topics will include discussing whether we are moving toward a corporate structure as a university; and, viewpoints of online education in light of recent studies about its impact. He will make a presentation from the AAUP position on these topics.

VII Discussion Item

A. FS Committee Missions – Cécile Lardon

[This item was removed from the agenda at the meeting.]

VIII BREAK

IX New Business

A. Motion to amend graduation walk-through policy, submitted by Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

John Y. brought the motion to the floor on behalf of the GAAC. He noted the policy was being clarified rather than changed, and explained the purpose of the policy and why clarification was needed.

Falk H. asked what impacts are of being strict or not about this matter. What are the pros and cons for this matter? John gave the example of students who wish to walk through the graduation in order to share the experience with their family and friends. They couldn't do this if they graduate in the summer. While they're recognized at the graduation, they do not get their diploma until they're actually finished.

David asked if there were any objections to this motion. There were none and the motion was carried.

B. Motion to approve a new minor in Leadership, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 196/3)

Rainer N. brought the motion to the floor, urging support and noting it's harmless. He clarified there are no new courses involved in the creation of the new minor.

Debu M. asked about the recreation courses included in the minor. Rainer explained the tracks contained in the minor, and that the recreation courses were only included in one of the tracks.

David asked if there were any objections. There were none and the motion was carried.

X Guest Speaker

A. Erik Williams, Student Liaison
Topic: UAF Sustainability Master Plan

Erik described the sustainability master plan (SMP) which UAF is developing. It will be a detailed plan of where UAF is going in matters of sustainability, including strategies and action steps. It will measure progress for certain topic areas. The topic areas include energy, waste, recycling, transportation, education curriculum, dining services, and more. The SMP will help build on progress already made at UAF thus far, and help it become a top sustainability performer. They are looking for dedicated individuals to help with this effort.

They also are accepting faculty proposals right now to increase sustainability in the curriculum. There is an RFP which includes some funding monies.

David asked about Erik's role with the sustainability committee. Erik clarified that he is the liaison for UAF and the Brendle Group (a sustainability consulting group).

David has asked faculty member David Fazzino to serve on the SMP Committee as he already serves on the RISE Board. He also invited anyone present who has an interest in this to let him know.

Debu M. asked for a definition of sustainability. Erik replied that for UAF sustainability is the ability to carry forward and continue to succeed in the future.

XI Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

Mike D. spoke about his leadership course and recent time in Juneau. He stressed that the situation in Juneau with the budget is very serious. He spoke about the chart he had passed out, which came from a briefing that David Teal had provided to the Finance Committee. The chart shows that by 2024 only three programs, which do not include the university, will take the entire budget. He also shared a chart depicting the total revenue picture for the future without the passage of the oil tax bill. He noted that $2 billion shortfalls were being projected for the next five to ten years. The House is looking at more significant cuts than the Senate. The Commissioner of Revenue has said throughput will drop in the future rather than increase, thus the $2 billion shortfall in revenue projections. He and his students came away very sobered about the budget picture for the future.

PDFs of the handouts have been posted on the Faculty Senate meetings web page.
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2013-14-fs-meetings/#196

Ken A. asked Mike to discuss the voter referendum on SB 121 and how it is likely to affect the situation if voted up or down, and the long-term consequences. Mike said that right now, according to David Teal, it doesn't make a difference. But, the reason why we have a $17 billion surplus now is because of the progressivity of the tax. That will go away. If the oil taxes go up we will continue to see a decline in the future. When asked if the throughput will increase, David Teal said no. Mike noted that he sees the budget situation as a more broad concern across the state into the future, and there will be significant challenges to run the programs we have right now.

B. Committee Chair Comments
Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 196/4)
Faculty Affairs – Knut Kielland, Convener
Unit Criteria – Chris Coffman, Chair (Attachment 196/5)
Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 196/6)
Core Review Committee – Miho Aoki, Chair
Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair (Attachment 196/7)
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair (Attachment 196/8)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair (Attachment 196/9)
Research Advisory Committee – Peter Winsor, Chair

XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM.

ATTACHMENT 196/1
UAF Faculty Senate #196, February 3, 2014

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
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

FEBRUARY 3, 2014

TO: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

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

SUBJECT: Annual report to the senate concerning revitalization of the PhD program in mathematics

The Faculty Senate Administrative Committee has received and reviewed your "Report to the Faculty Senate and Provost: Revitalizing the Mathematics Ph.D.", submitted in December 2013 pursuant to a motion passed by the Faculty Senate at its May 6 2013 meeting (reference http://www.uaf.edu/files/uafgov/12-13_FS-191-Motion-supporting-continuation-of-PhD-Math-and-revitalization-plan_signed.pdf). The report identifies several areas of progress toward revitalizing the Mathematics Ph.D., and the Administrative Committee unanimously accepted it as demonstrating adequate progress to this point toward a sustainable program. Of course, it is too early to gauge how your efforts will translate into increased numbers of students in the program. We therefore request an update later this spring—before April 23, if possible--to the Faculty Senate and Provost of how many students have committed to matriculation in the Mathematics Ph.D. Program.

Thank you for your work and responsiveness in this matter.

cc: Brian Rogers, UAF Chancellor
Susan Henrichs, UAF Provost

ATTACHMENT 196/2
UAF Faculty Senate #196, February 3, 2014
Submitted by Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend walk-through requirements for graduate students as shown below.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor's Approval

RATIONALE: The Graduate School requested that the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee review the current policy along with a new form.

****

CAPS - Addition
[[ ]] - Deletion

Graduation "Walk-Through" Policy

To meet the definition of having "essentially completed all degree requirements" (current policy) to "walk through" graduation ceremonies, a student must have met the following requirements:

a. successfully completed all required tests, course work and thesis/project defense **BY THE MONDAY PRECEDING COMMENCEMENT**; and

b. submitted to the Graduate School by the date set for filing a thesis/dissertation in Spring Semester, [[a memorandum]] **THE REQUEST FOR COMMENCEMENT WALK-THROUGH FORM** signed by the student, [[and]] the major advisor**, ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS, DEPARTMENT HEAD AND DEAN**, [[certifying]] agreeing that any required revisions to the project/thesis/dissertation can be completed by [[July 31]] **AUGUST 1** of the same year. For a thesis/dissertation, the student must submit the final copy to the Graduate School by **AUGUST 1** of the same year **TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR SUMMER GRADUATION.** If the student is a Ph.D. candidate, the major advisor or designated committee member must also agree to participate in the graduation ceremonies; and
c. for Ph.D. candidates, filed a $\leq$ 50 word abstract of the dissertation research along with the signed [[memorandum]] **REQUEST FOR COMMENCEMENT WALK-THROUGH FORM**.

NOTE: Individuals who "walk through" graduation ceremonies will NOT be listed in the graduation program. These students' names, and if Ph.D. recipients, descriptions of dissertation research, will appear in the program of the academic year in which the degree is formally granted.

ATTACHMENT 196/3
UAF Faculty Senate #196, February 3, 2014
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new minor in Leadership (housed in the School of Management).

Effective: Fall 2014

Rationale: There is high student interest and strong support across programs for this new minor which will be housed in the School of Management. See the program proposal #1-UNP on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

****

Overview:

The purpose of the Leadership minor is to strengthen the abilities of UAF graduates to lead and contribute effectively in both the public and private spheres, especially in the Alaska business community. The minor consists of a choice of two out of three LEAD/BA courses and an additional three courses from among a choice of electives across multiple disciplines.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

Leadership

School of Management
Northern Leadership Center
907-474-5401
www.uaf.edu/som/programs

The minor in leadership and management is administered by the Northern Leadership Center. Its purpose is to strengthen the abilities of UAF graduates to lead and contribute effectively in both the public and private spheres, especially in the Alaskan economy.

Minor

1. Complete 2 of the following: (6-credit hours)
   *LEAD/BA 470 –Leadership Theory and Development--3 credits
   *LEAD/BA 472 —Leading Change--3 credits
   *HSEM/LEAD 456 – Leadership and Influence During Crisis

2. Complete 9-credit hours from one of the following "tracks" OR with the written approval of the Director of the Northern Leadership Center, any three 3-credit hour courses from any combination of tracks.

Business Administration

- BA F280 – Sports Leadership
- BA F307 – Introductory Human Resource Management
- BA F460O – International Business

Military Science

- MILS 101 – Foundations of Officership
- MILS 102 – Basic Leadership
- MILS 201 – Individual Leadership Studies
- MILS 202 – Leadership and Teamwork

Political Science

- PS 212 - Introduction to Public Administration
- *PS 301 – American Presidency
- *PS/PHIL 412W – Modern Political Theory
- *PS 437 - United States Foreign Policy

Communication

- COMM 330 – Intercultural Communication
- COMM 331O – Advanced Group Communication
- COMM 335O – Organizational Communication
- *COMM 475 – Applied Communication in Training and Development

Outdoor Leadership

- NRM 161 – Introduction to Wilderness Leadership (required for this track)
- *NRM 361 – Advanced Wilderness Leadership (required for this track)

Select from the following skills courses for the remaining required credits

- RECR F140H Beginning Rock Climbing
- RECR F140K Advanced Rock Climbing
- RECR F170G Intro to Ski Mountaineering
- RECR F170N Intro to Winter Camping
- RECR F140L Technical Climbing
- RECR F140Y Kayaking
- EMS F150 Wilderness Emergency Care

3. Minimum credits required--15 credits

*These courses have prerequisites that need to be taken into consideration. Consult with the Leadership Minor coordinator.

ATTACHMENT 196/4
UAF Faculty Senate #196, February 3, 2014
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for 11 November 2013 1:15-2:15 pm Kayak Room

Present: Rainer Newberry; Cindy Hardy; Rob Duke; Margaret Short; Karen Gustafson; Dennis Moser (audio); Todd Radenbaugh (audio); Doug Goering; Alex Fitts; Jonathan Rosenberg; Carol Gering; Libby Eddy; Jayne Harvie
Absent: Sarah Hardy

1. Approve Minutes of last meeting

Minutes for the October 28 meeting were approved as amended (added Alex Fitts' name to attendance).

2. GERC update via Jonathan Rosenberg ± Cindy Hardy–SEE GERC WEBSITE:

gerc.community.uaf.edu

Jonathan mentioned that three meetings will be coordinated to share information and invite feedback (one on lower campus, one on upper campus, and one to involve rural campuses). Rainer assigned Todd R. and Karen G. to look over the new web site, and all CAC members were asked to review it as well. Provide any feedback to Jonathan.

GERC is keeping GELO apprised of their work. The issue of transferability is being kept in mind. A resolution will be going to the Faculty Alliance, and routed to each of the three Faculty Senates, to propose changes to general education requirements in the current UA Regulations.

The issue of transferability will be added to the new GERC web site.

Libby E. noted that the Office of Admissions and the Registrar would need some rules and guidance on what will be the new recognized equivalencies for transferring courses between universities in and outside of Alaska.

Formal rubrics are needed to connect student learning outcomes to LEAP outcomes.

3. OLD BUSINESS: Due to time constraints, old business was put off until the next meeting in order to discuss item C – Academic Calendar.

A. global removal of 'or instructor permission' for course prerequisites?

So far the electronic discussion has mostly been of the variety 'we need to keep this because potential students need to know that I'm just kidding about the prerequisites and will allow them into the course if they just ask'.

I propose we go ahead and create a motion…..

B. request to modify Committee-related bylaws OUR ASSIGNMENTS:

1. Craft better description of the charge for each committee to be included in the Senate bylaws.
2. Write policies applicable for the areas of functioning that apply to all committees.

3. Write policies applicable to standing and permanent committees and, where necessary, for specific individual committees.

FIRST TASK: Each committee will draft the scope and nature of their work as they understand it. This should include current information available in the bylaws.

Some Of The Issue We Need To Address:

1. Membership rules for **all committees**: review special policies in place (e.g., unit criteria) and add where necessary (e.g., minimum/maximum number of members, representation from different units, junior/senior standing, etc.).
2. How are non-Senate members elected or appointed? Can a non-Senator chair the committee?
3. Do we need a paragraph on conveners for the first meeting?

PROPOSED REVISED WORDING (THANKS TO ROB DUKE!!!!!!!!!!!)

" STANDING

1. The Curricular Affairs Committee will deal with undergraduate curricular and academic policy changes ~~on all levels except the graduate level~~. ~~In addition to the non-voting ex officio member(s) appointed by the provost, the committee may add non-voting ex officio members for one-year terms as deemed necessary~~."

MEMBERSHIP AND EX OFFICIO MEMBER APPOINTMENTS

1. Members are appointed by the Administrative Committee.

2. Non-voting ex officio member(s) may be appointed by the Provost;

3. In addition to the non-voting ex officio member(s), the committee may add non-voting ex officio members as deemed necessary.

MEETINGS AND APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

1. The Chair at the end of the academic year will represent the committee on the Administrative Committee over the summer break, or will appoint a continuing committee member to be his or her representative.

2. Upon convening of the first meeting each academic year, the committee shall consider nominations for Chairperson with the previous chair or appointed representative acting as the Chair. If neither are available, the senior committee member will preside until a new Chair has been selected.

C. OLD OR NEW??? ACADEMIC CALENDAR APPROVAL… SEE ATTACHED

Libby noted that the Summer I session in 2017 will only be 5 weeks long; however, it will include all the required contact time of a normal 6-week session.

This version of the academic calendars now includes eLearning dates.

Rainer noted the lack of a study day in spring of future years because of final exams schedule. He also mentioned the tight dates for turning in grades.

Doug G. mentioned UAF courses have more contact hours than those at UAA, which makes UAF calendar harder to put together.

CAC approved the academic calendars for 2015-16 and 2016-17.

Meeting adjourned with everyone's sanity seemingly intact.

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for 11 November 2013 1:15-2:15 pm Kayak Room

Present: Rainer Newberry; Cindy Hardy; Rob Duke; Margaret Short; Karen Gustafson; Dennis Moser; Todd Radenbaugh (audio); Doug Goering; Alex Fitts; Jonathan Rosenberg; Carol Gering; Libby Eddy; Caty Oehring, Jayne Harvie

1. Approved Minutes of last meeting

2. GERC update via Jonathan Rosenberg + Cindy Hardy Website has example courses for most proposed designators for most categories including designators. Faculty will be notified about the site and two open meetings will be held during week of Dec 2.

3. OLD BUSINESS:

A. global removal of 'or instructor permission' for course prerequisites?
No update from Registrar (and Vice Provost Fitts?). Not sure where to go with this.

B. request to modify Committee-related bylaws OUR ASSIGNMENTS: PROPOSED REVISED WORDING (THANKS TO ROB DUKE!!!!!!!!!!!)

__" STANDING

1. The Curricular Affairs Committee will deal with undergraduate curricular and academic policy changes ~~on all levels except the graduate level~~. ~~In addition to the non-voting ex officio member(s) appointed by the provost, the committee may add non-voting ex officio members for one-year terms as deemed necessary~~.

MEMBERSHIP AND EX OFFICIO MEMBER APPOINTMENTS

1. Members are appointed by the Administrative Committee.

2. Non-voting ex officio member(s) may be appointed by the Provost;

3. The committee may add non-voting ex officio members as deemed necessary.

MEETINGS AND APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

1.The Chair at the end of the academic year will represent the committee on the Administrative Committee over the summer break, or will appoint a continuing committee member to be his or her representative.

2. Upon convening of the first meeting each academic year, the committee shall consider nominations for Chairperson with the previous chair or appointed representative acting as temporary Chair. If neither are available, a senior committee member will preside until a new Chair has been selected.

This wording was unanimously approved.

4. NEW BUSINESS

➔ **A. SADA MOTION (Enclosed) WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

B. Motion to change transferability of 'core' courses BASICALLY effects making transfers of "Perspectives on Human Condition" courses more flexible. All in attendance approved the concept, although some members had reservations. We agreed to move this forward as a discussion item to the FAC SENATE and to revisit with specific modifications at next meeting.

C. Motion to change BOR Core Soc Sci requirements

BoR regulation R10.04.040A.6.. requires cores for the Social Science requirement:
*"Courses that fulfill this requirement are **broad survey** courses which provide the student with exposure to the theory, methods, and data of the social sciences." Request that the words "broad survey" be removed.*
THIS IS A PLACEHOLDER FOR THE PROBLEM OF MIS-MATCH BETWEEN THE PROPOSED GER REQUIREMENTS AND BOR REGULATIONS. GER REQUIREMENTS CANNOT BE IN VIOLATION OF BOR REGULATIONS. CHOICES ARE TO MODIFY ONE OR THE OTHER.

We agreed that this is a problem that needs to be addressed with all the pieces at once.

MOTION:
The Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following changes to the 2014-15 Catalog that update the Writing placement sections and clarify catalog language on placement and prerequisites.

Effective: Fall 2014

Rationale: This motion amends the current (2013-14) catalog to incorporate changes that result from Statewide alignment of English111X and DEVE placement (see placement table below). It further addresses reading placement, making reading classes a co-requirement with DEVE placement at the DEVE 060 and DEVE 104 level.

The motion also reflects changes in the Placement section amending language in the recently passed Math placement motion (but not amending the Math placement portion of that motion), changes in language that have accumulated in the catalog over time, and language changes that clarify current practice in student placement.

CAPS and **Bolded** – Addition [[ ]] – Deletion Page 34 of current 13-14 Catalog:

PLACEMENT REQUIREMENTS
Many UAF courses require placement. All students planning to take courses with specific placement requirements must meet those requirements prior to registering for those courses.[[Students who meet basic skills standards in reading, writing and mathematics should enroll in the appropriate 100-level or above courses. Those whose scores place below these standards
must enroll in the appropriate developmental education courses. Once these students have satisfactorily met the criteria for these courses, they may register for 100-level courses.]] Specific writing, reading, and math placement requirements are listed in the section **S** below. [[However, many courses have additional prerequisite requirements that are listed in the catalog course description.]]

COURSE PREREQUISITES

Course prerequisites indicate what previous preparation is needed to enroll in a course. An instructor has the right to drop any student from the course if he or she does not meet the prerequisite or has not received a grade of C- or better in all prerequisite courses. An instructor also has the right to waive a course prerequisite if the instructor [[has documentation]] **DOCUMENTS** that the student possesses **SUFFICIENT** background [[required]] to succeed in the class**. STUDENTS WHO TAKE A COURSE AT A HIGHER LEVEL THAN A CORRESPONDING PREREQUISITE COURSE REQUIRED FOR A DEGREE PROGRAM ARE NOT EXEMPT FROM TAKING THAT REQUIRED COURSE.**[[Students need English placement at ENGL F111X or above (including reading) in order to enroll in perspectives on the human condition core courses.]] Students need mathematics placement at DEVM F105 or above, and ENGL F111x placement [[(including reading),]] to register for **CORE** science courses.

[[Reading and w]] **W**riting placement exams must be taken within two calendar years prior to the start of a course; mathematics placement exams must be taken within one calendar year prior. Students enrolling in developmental or lower division core courses must have completed any prerequisite courses within two calendar years of their enrollment. [[Academic advisors will assist with proper course placement for incoming and continuing students.]]

Students who enroll in [[a developmental or core]] **ANY** course without meeting placement or prerequisite requirements may be withdrawn from the course through the faculty-initiated withdrawal process.

[[READING AND]] WRITING

Placement into writing [[and reading]] courses requires **EITHER PREREQUISITE COURSE CREDIT ORA STANDARDIZED PLACEMENT TEST WHICH MEASURES ACADEMIC SKILLS SUCH AS CRITICAL THINKING AND READING. THE SCORE FROM ANY OF THE TESTS (SEE TABLE) PLACES THE STUDENT IN THE APPROPRIATE WRITING CLASS. A WRITING SAMPLE, GIVEN ON THE FIRST DAY OF CLASS, MAY MODIFY THIS PLACEMENT. DEGREE OR CERTIFICATE SEEKING STUDENTS PLACED INTO DEVELOPMENTAL WRITING OR READING COURSES SHOULD REGISTER FOR THEM DURING THEIR FIRST SEMESTER. THESE COURSES ARE DESIGNED TO HELP STUDENTS GAIN COMPETENCIES NECESSARY TO SUCCEED IN COLLEGE-LEVEL COURSES.** [[a scored writing sample: SAT, ACT Writing, ASSET, COMPASS, ACCUPLACER, or a UAF –generated writing sample. Minimum scores for placement into English and Developmental English courses are listed in table 3 and table 4. A student will be placed in English F111X if the student's ACT writing test score is 7 or above, the ACT English score is 18 or above, or the ACT reading score is 22 or above (or the student's SAT writing score is 430 and SAT critical reading score is 510 or above, or your score on another university-approved placement test is equivalent).]] If the student's standardized test scores are below the[[se]] minimums **IN THE PLACEMENT TABLE BELOW** and if the **STUDENT'S** high school cumulative GPA is 3.0 or higher, the student may **BE GIVEN PERMISSION TO** enroll in English F111X [[with permission of]] **BY** the Director of Composition or rural campus English/Arts and Letters faculty.
[[On the basis of test scores, students may be required to take Developmental English or Developmental Studies (Reading) courses. These courses are designed to help students gain competencies necessary to succeed in college-level courses. Students who earn a C- or higher in DEVE F070 place into English 111X automatically and do not have to re-test]]

MATHEMATICS
Mathematics course placement varies according to the type of degree the student is planning to pursue and the corresponding math course(s) needed. (see the degree program requirements for more detail.)The UAF mathematics placement test used to determine math placement. Minimum test scores for placement into math and developmental math courses are listed in Table 2.

Students who have limited access or limited experience with the internet should contact the department of mathematics and statistics or the department of developmental education for assistance**.**

Page 44 of the 2013-14 Catalog:

PLACEMENT TESTS
Test results are required for first-time degree or certificate students, transfer students with fewer than 30 [[acceptable]] **TRANSFER** credits, or students planning to take 100-level English, reading, mathematics, natural sciences [[core]] and [[perspectives on the human condition core]]**GENERAL EDUCATION** courses. UAF mathematics placement test results must be on file with the office of admissions and the registrar or the local regional campus registration office before you can register for DEVM, Math, or [[core]] **GENERAL EDUCATION** science classes. Results from American College Testing Program (ACT) or the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or, for associate degree or certificate students, the ASSET, ACCUPLACER or COMPASS test must be on file with the Office of Admissions and the Registrar before you can register for classes. Your ability to register may be blocked if you have not submitted required test scores.

Test results for English and composition must be less than two years old; for math, less than one year old.

Note: Registrar's Office will also need to update applicable sections including (for example): "Applying for Admission: Certificate or Associate Degree Programs"; "Applying for Admission: Bachelor's Degree Programs."

ATTACHMENT 196/5
UAF Faculty Senate #196, February 3, 2014
Submitted by Unit Criteria Committee

UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
MINUTES: Tuesday, November 5, 2013—1:30-2:30 PM at Rasmuson Library 502

Attendance: Chris Coffman, CLA (English), Steve Sparrow – Interim Dean of School of Natural Resources, Christine Cook, SOE Counseling, Javier Fochesatto (audio), CNSM, Torie Baker (audio), School of Fisheries (Cordova), Cathy Winfree (audio), Allied Health CNA program at CTC, Leif Albertson (audio), Co-Op Extension – (Bethel), Debu Misra (audio), CEM; Kathy Butler, Music (guest); Absent – Mark Conde

I. Housekeeping

1. Approval of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes from 10/22/13 Meeting. – need to add Christine Cook to minutes, otherwise approved

3. Upcoming Project: Development of Bylaws.
Proposed process: Chris will draft language and bring to meeting on 11/19/13. – Chris will come up with Bylaws language; suggested to talk with David Valentine or Cecilia Lardon to make sure we are within the guidelines that they are thinking; mentioned that we do not want students to be present on this committee (question #2 under Some of the Issue We Need to Address)

4. Process Question (for Bylaws)
Decide by vote or consensus? – prefer a vote rather than consensus as it gives freedom to express different perspectives; Chris will write-it up in the Bylaws – need to make sure that we allow enough time for discussion and letting everyone have time to express their views and reservations; voting is important, but is it simple majority or 2/3? People are to think about it and work out the details over email

5. Use underlining rather than all Caps in revisions – Bryan Rogers suggested; agree with underlining (all caps seems to be shouting); no objections to the change

II. Dept. of Music, Proposed Revisions to Unit Criteria
Guests from the Music Department – Dr. Kathy Butler-Hopkins – in attendance
Had originally had many charts in the unit criteria and now they took those out as they are not as easy for others to read – no more charts or wordy language, simplified the document; still working on unit criteria for theory and music ed. – this is the criteria for performance faculty (creative faculty in the department);
Need to clarify that this is only for performance faculty; is there going to be a separate document for the theory and music ed. faculty, or incorporate these faculty into this document? – Kathy was

unsure at this time, but thought Theory and music ed. faculty may go through the blue book; will more than likely incorporate some criteria into this document for them

Concern with statement on page 3 regarding typical workload – brought up that it could be a problem in the future as it impacts ability to negotiate your workload with the dean, as well as the differences in what 70% teaching means (6 classes, 4 classes, etc.); the language does not necessarily add anything; Kathy agreed to take it out

Concern with statement on page 6 regarding the satisfactory research or numbers of significant performances/creative activities; possibly include some more flexible language; discussion of terms for promotion to the rank of associate – is it only satisfactory or is it good? – this was in reference to the blue book language. Kathy agrees with concerns, so will take the comments back to the faculty and see if they want to revise it (although it has already been passed by the faculty)

Concern with statement on page 6, letter f – concern because in the past sometimes performances have not been reviewed and it is to protect faculty as it is out of their control; could be misconstrued – maybe could be some way to clarify that they are looking at press or external peer review, or something to that extent, versus reviews by other faculty or Deans (as opposed to Dean external review letter, which is already a requirement); Kathy is thinking they will take out the statement as a whole, or to add the statement of press reviews to help clarify; possibly take out "external evaluations" and exchange for "press reviews"; independent evaluations – Kathy will take it back to the Music faculty and determine wording

Also added that on page 6 – need to add a statement that indicates that it is the activities beyond the associate level to be promoted to full

Also some statement saying those with different workloads would be evaluated based on those workloads

Page 9 – explain and clarify word adjudications (letter g)

Kathy will take it back to the Music department and bring it back again for revisions – Debu moved and Javier seconded

Definitely meeting on December 3rd for Fisheries information;
November 19th to review Bylaws and Kathy will shoot for bringing it back to the committee at that time

Adjourned at 2:15pm

UAF FACUTLY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
Minutes for Tuesday, November 19, 2013---1:30 to 2:30 PM at Rasmussen Library 502

Attendance: Chris Coffman, CLA (English); Steve Sparrow-Interim Dean of School of Natural Resources; Javier Fochesatto (audio), CNSM; Torie Baker (audio), School of Fisheries (Cordova); Cathy Winfree (audio), Allied Health, CTC; Debu Misra (audio), CEM; Mark Conde (audio), GI.

I Housekeeping
A. Agenda approved as written
B. Minutes of 11/5/13 approved as written.

II School of Management: Reaffirmation of Existing Unit Criteria
Need to clarify the following criteria:
1 Effectiveness in Teaching-pg. 6
H--how would they document this section
I-- mentor instead of mentoring-pg. 7
C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and creative Activity
SPECIFIC SOM CRITERIA FOR REAEARCH PERFOMANCE: pg. 9
clearly describe the two tracks
formatting of paragraphs last page: pg. 11
SPECIFIC MANAGING CRITERIA FOR SERVICE
B. Professor: look at language on line 5 "and" should it be "or"
Chris will ask a representative of the Department of the SOM to attend the meeting in January to discuss the unit criteria and specific areas of concern.

III. Ongoing Project: Development of Bylaws.
Chris presented a proposed draft of updated bylaws.
Discussion held on how unit criteria committee will decide matters by vote, ie simple majority or a 2/3 vote and should ex officio members vote.
Vote will carry by simple majority, >50%. Cathy moved and Javier seconded.
Ex officio members should attend and share information but not have a vote. Javier moved and Cathy seconded.
Discussion held on how often departments are required to have their unit criteria reviewed and approved. Chris will research and get back to committee with the current answer.

No New Business.
Next Meeting: December 3, 2013.
Meeting adjourned at 2:15.

UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
Tuesday, December 3, 2013—1:30-2:30 PM, Rasmuson Library 502

Attendance: Chris Coffman, Christine Cook, Steve Sparrow, Mark Conde
On Audio - Torie Baker, Leif Albertson, Debu Misra, Brenda Konar (guest from Marine Science and Limnology); Dr. Kathy Butler-Hopkins & Dr. Karen Gustafson (guests from Music)
Absent: Javier Fochesatto, Cathy Winfree

III. Housekeeping

6. Approval of Agenda

7. Approval of Minutes from 11/19/13 Meeting. See attachment. – approved minutes

IV. Graduate Program in Marine Science and Limnology, Proposed Revisions to Unit Criteria

See attachments. – first chapter took out unit (GURU) that no longer exists; just started a minor (rather than only graduate) so changed wording to include undergraduate and graduate students; Torie moved to approve and send to faculty senate and Christine seconded; all approved

Guest from Marine Science and Limnology:

- Dr. Brenda Konar (left at 1:40 after discussion – very few questions/concerns)

V. Dept. of Music, Proposed Revisions to Unit Criteria

See attachments. – no one had any concerns as the criteria seemed to address all the concerns submitted; Christine proposed to submit them to the Senate; Tori and Debu both seconded; all in favor of passing for consideration by the Senate

Guests from the Music Department: - guests showed up after passing, and we did not have any concerns, so they were good with it all

- Dr. Kathy Butler-Hopkins
- Dr. Karen Gustafson

- Question: MUSIC FACULTY ARE EXPECTED TO CONSISTENTLY PERFORM IN THEIR AREAS OF EXPERTISE. THE STATURE OF THE PERFORMANCE VENUE OR THE LEVEL OF REVIEW IN ATTAINING THE PERFORMANCE WILL BE CONSIDERED. – is this deliberately vague regarding the "consistently perform"? It was purposely vague because when the numbers were in on the previous draft then it was a concern with limiting faculty; Chris C. mentioned that other units have set numbers, so if in the future this comes up you can add specific numbers in later; Music faculty said that at times this does come up (i.e., is 3 enough, versus 5, etc.) – it can be a double edge sword with giving specific numbers – you want a criterion, but do not want to be so specific as to limit promoting people who have not had a number of performances in a particular time frame; have sent to the faculty with the numbers and had no response/concerns, then sent without the numbers and again had no response/concerns; they looked at Art criteria and they have no numbers either; no other concerns and criteria moved forward

General discussion on meaningful criteria – including language to provide better guidance to faculty in making determinations; difficult situations may have problems with the vague language in some of the unit criteria standards

VI. Continued Discussion of Committee Bylaws - See attachment. – currently 8 voting members; Debu mentioned a quorum is usually 2/3 of the committee, but will check on Robert's Rules; After review, we are thinking that to pass anything a majority of the membership needs to be present – 50%; in the current case with 8 voting members, to

conduct business you need 4 present; but, to pass a vote there needs to pass by the total of **all** committee members; so in this case – at least 5 need to be present to make a vote

VII. Spring Meetings: Doodle poll will be sent out by Jayne in early January to determine a meeting time for the spring semester
Last meeting for this semester

2:10 – Mark motioned to adjourn and Christine seconded

ATTACHMENT 196/6
UAF Faculty Senate #196, February 3, 2014
Submitted by Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women,
Minutes Wednesday, December 11, 2013; 9:15 am to 10:15 am pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander. Derek Sikes, Ellen Lopez, Megan McPhee and guest Sine Anahita

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Shawn Russell, Nilima Hullavarad, Jenny Liu, Diana Di Stefano

1. Women's Center Advisory Board

They met on December 5, and it was very positive. There is a need to advocate for the funding. The plan is to move to Wood Center next fall. A subcommittee of the Advisory Board will be working on a needs assessment: How can women's center help the stakeholders? Carol Gold and Jane Weber co-chair. There is more engagement in the Women's Center this year. The move to Wood Center has had a very positive effect.

2. Conversation Cafes

March 11, 12:30 to 2:00pm. Kayt will reserve the room from 12:30 to 2:30. Subject will be on mentoring. Different tables focused on different topics. Tea, water and cookies.
We will call it Conversation Café on Faculty Mentoring. We are inviting all faculty: men and women. Brainstorm topics: Formal vs. informal mentoring. What I wish somebody told me. Mentors outside your department. Faculty mentoring students. How to be a good mentor. Definitions/ Best Practices table. When mentoring goes sour. Paper invites- include brainstorm ideas. RSVP by Feb 7. Key things that come from each table summarized and shared later. Who will be the discussion leader at each table? Ellen will work with Jane for list of faculty, write up flyer and brainstorm how this will work. Kayt will try to get waiver for food and we should look on a website for prices. Goal 50-60 people.

3. Promotion & Tenure Workshop Panel

April 25, 10am to 12noon. Panel: deans and directors or just faculty? What is our goal? Planning strategically is our goal. Is it redundant with the other workshop? Brainstorm: Roxie, Ellen, Inna Rivkin, Steffi Ickert-Bond, Mary Ehrlander, Amy Barnsley, Sine, Diana Brian, Nicole Molders, Diane O'Brien, Karen Gustafson. After note: Steffi agreed.

4. Fall 2014 Luncheon Speaker

Date not chosen yet.

5. Spring meeting times

Wednesday 9:15-10:15 am.

6. Upcoming CSW meetings:

January 22, 9:15 to 10:15 am., February 26, March 26, April 16.

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley
These minutes are archived on the CSW website:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/13-14-csw/

ATTACHMENT 196/7
UAF Faculty Senate #196, February 3, 2014
Submitted by Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Minutes of the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
December 13, 2013

Attending: Curt Szuberla, Gordon Williams, Sarah Stanley, Brandon , Cindy Hardy, Sandra Wildfeuer, Colleen Angaiak, Joe Mason, Alex Fitts (ex-officio), Libby Eddy (Registrar)

The committee met and discussed the following items:

Math and Writing placement motions: These have both passed the Faculty Senate and have been approved for Fall 14. Students can begin taking ALEKS PPL for placement in March for Fall 14 registration. Brandon noted that he will be taking over the Advisor roundtable meetings and would like to have information on the placement changes for the next roundtable, February 5.

Learning Commons: This has been an ongoing agenda item for our committee. We reviewed the history of SADA's involvement with this project, going back to the 2009 motion to establish a Learning Center. At that time, it looked like the library was going to have space available and wanted to explore the idea of a learning commons. They have set aside conference rooms for students to study or meet in small groups, and have space that faculty can reserve for tutoring sessions. However, this is only part of the original concept set out in the motion.

Do we want a sub-committee of SADA to work on the Learning Commons? The members of the original subcommittee are no longer on SADA, so we could form a new subcommittee. We noted that space in Lola Tilly Commons may be opening up, so we could put in a proposal; however, we can't assume that this space will be available.

We discussed the point of a learning commons. Cindy agreed to send out the original motion and the subcommittee's proposal to the Library Dean. WE discussed the benefits of localized tutoring centers such as the Math Lab and the Writing Center. For example, students going to the Math Lab on the 3rd floor in the Math Department can get math help right in the department, and they know where math faculty offices are, and they can ask them questions. Compartmentalization serves a purpose.

We noted the advantages of the Learning commons model in the Library. It is a space where students can gather, and a centralized location is nice for students so they don't have to pack up all their stuff to go to writing lab to print, then to Chapman to get to the math lab, etc. Furthermore, the Learning Commons model would also make other services available, such as advising, in a central location. However, it wouldn't take the place of other labs; it would be an outreach of those labs. It would be a combined area for focused teaching and learning, including faculty development, TA training, a place for faculty and students to mix.

We discussed issues the current departmental labs face. One of the problems with math lab in Chapman is the building fights us. Math wants it to be a student center with offices around it.
Instead, they have a closet at one end of the building and faculty and students have to make an effort to have interaction. On the other hand, the foreign language lab is in the middle of building and provides a social space for faculty-student interaction.

We agreed that there is a need for a new kind of space similar to the Learning Commons model. We also agreed (it was nearly lunch time) that a good coffee shop and decent food should be part of the model. We noted that the physical space, including the type of furniture and technology would be important in setting up a learning commons.

We agreed that there is energy on the committee to pursue this and to develop a social interaction space that facilitate human to human interaction among students, tutors, faculty, and advisors. We also agreed that this model should involve outreach to rural campuses. We also noted that the UAF Budget is dismal and that this is being termed "the year that changed everything." However, we should still plan for future .

Cindy will send out the Learning Commons motion that passed the Faculty Senate as well as the proposal the former subcommittee submitted to the Library Dean. Sarah and Brandon indicated that they would like to be on a subcommittee to pursue this.

Committee definition: Cindy noted that our work on committee definition may come back to haunt us. Cecile Lardon is gathering committee definitions from all faculty senate committees to look at areas of overlap and areas that need to be addressed by committees. She will bring the committee definitions to the Administrative Committee in the spring and may, at that point, ask for changes in committee definition. All the definitions will go to the Faculty Senate together as a motion.

Obstacles to student success: This has been an ongoing agenda item. Do we want to do a survey on this? Sine Anahita, who developed the Faculty Work/Life Survey for the Committee on the Status of Women, is willing to help us with this. Sarah noted that her original idea was to look at institutional factors that lead to student success. She noted a study in Thailand that approached this topic by looking at common features of students who struggle then looking at students with those features who succeed anyway, highlighting the strengths and resolve of these students. We noted that this would not be easy data to identify—but that the easy data may not be useful data—it's easy to find students who fail , for example, but not those who might have failed but didn't.

We noted some resources that might lead to demographic data that would be useful in this. Advising center used to ask for such things as whether student commute, work, care for children, etc. Student Support Services serves students who are first generation, low income and they may be able to identify students who are succeeding that should be failing. We noted that the Comprehensive Advisor model serves students that are nontraditional and who need someone to talk to about more than just scheduling classes.

We noted that good study design is hard, especially accounting for researcher bias. We should look at what UAF has done to develop a baseline study of struggling populations, and see if we can identify the three largest hurdles to student success. It may turn out that it's not any of the things we think of. Alex noted that the TRIO intake sheets list 30 risk factors. Cindy suggested inviting Sine Anahita to discuss a study design.

Sandra noted that IAC has set up a Student Success Corner where students can talk about their goals with a staff member who has skills in life coaching. Sarah noted a study she plans to look at patterns of students who repeat English 111X through questions and an interview process.

We will continue to discuss this in the new year.

Next meeting: After the first day of class!

ATTACHMENT 196/8
UAF Faculty Senate #196, February 3, 2014
Submitted by Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for December 5, 2013

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Bill Barnes, Mike Castellini, Mike Davis, David Fazzino, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Franz Meyer, Channon Price, Leslie Shallcross, Amy Vinlove
Excused: Cindy Fabbri, Trina Mamoon, Joy Morrison

III. News and Notes

No one had any news or special notes.

IV. Welcoming C.P. Price to the committee

C.P. introduced himself and the rest of the committee briefly introduced themselves to him. C.P. has served previously on this committee for about 20 years. He took last year off while he was on sabbatical in South Africa. Welcome back!

V. Renaming the FDAI committee

Our email discussion from a few weeks ago produced a suggested new name of Faculty Professional Development Committee. C.P. voiced concerns over deleting "Assessment" from the moniker since this committee has always over-seen the assessment of faculty and been involved with policy questions and implementation. He feels that we should make it clear that this committee will continue to have a say in faculty assessment. Franz decided we would postpone voting on the motion and continue to discuss the issue via email.

VI. Discussion on review committee appointment procedures

Franz informed us that a recent Promotion and Tenure Unit Peer Review Committee brought four major concerns to the attention of the Faculty Senate. The concerns are 1) lack of unit criteria for research faculty; 2) how committees are formed; 3)lack of care when assigning committee membership; and 4) lack of guidance regarding evaluation procedures. They reported that lack of unit criteria has made it difficult to justify non-appointment of tenure, that committee members seem to be randomly chosen by the Provost's office, some appointees are no longer with the university, and that faculty of equal rank as the candidate were being appointed to these review committees. C.P. pointed out that this is common in small units, but that the lack of collegiality is a problem. After some discussion it was decided that our committee should be involved in helping to solve these issues, but since we do not have any research faculty serving on our committee, we should not take the lead.

VII. Other Business

a. How to solicit input to the FDAI from the faculty community

We discussed that FDAI committee members send emails out to their units explaining the FDAI committee's role and to ask that any concerns be sent our way. We also discussed the possibility of including a link on Joy's OFD webpage as well as the Faculty Senate webpage for faculty to submit concerns to our committee directly and anonymously.

b. A note on the ELearning Department and their Faculty Development offerings

A recent ELearning presentation in which the words "faculty development" were used copiously has lead Franz to suggest that Chris Lott join us for our next committee meeting to explain the opportunities that ELearning offers faculty at UAF. Franz stated that our committee needs to understand how FDAI, the Office of Faculty Development, and ELearning should work together and what our roles are. It was pointed out that ELearning is always communicating with Joy, and that their offerings tend to be focused on instructional development.

Other – Mike D. asked if we had made a decision on the current Mission Statement, to which Franz responded that we had discussed it and it was sent to the Administrative Committee, so there could be slight, but not major, changes made.

VIII. Upcoming events

a. Scheduling FDAI meetings for the Spring Semester

Thursdays from 4:00 – 5:00 PM seem to work for those present, so our next meeting is set for January 23, 2014. See you next year!

IX. Adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 196/9
UAF Faculty Senate #196, February 3, 2014
Submitted by Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for 11/11/2013

Attending: Donie Bret-Harte (by phone), Amy Lovecraft, John Yarie, Christina Chu, Karen Jensen, Laura Bender, Sophie Gilbert, Wayne Marr, Franz Mueter, Elisabeth Nadin, Mike Ernest, Lara Horstmann

I. Minutes from our meeting of 10/23/13 were passed.

II. GAAC passed the following course proposals and program changes:
4-GPCh: Program change**: PhD - Natural Resources and Sustainability**
10-GCCh.: Course Change: **BIOL F615 - Systematic and Comparative Biology**, pending correction of disabilities services number
11-GCCh.: Course Change: **FISH F411 - Human Dimensions of Environmental Systems**
15-GNC: New Course: **FISH F681 - The North Pacific Fishery Management Council: A Case Study**
17-GNC: New Course: **EE F648 - VLSI Design**
18-GNC: New Course: **CE F660A - Project Management Boot Camp**

Four new course proposals and program changes were assigned for review

III. GAAC discussed the reactions of the faculty senate and the administrative committee to our motion to change GAAC's by-laws to make graduate student representatives voting members. The motion was referred back to committee, with a request for greater specificity in how graduate student representatives would be selected, and how conflicts of interest would be handled. In addition, some members of the faculty senate felt that it was inappropriate to have graduate student representatives on a faculty committee at all; it is unlikely the motion could be modified sufficiently to attract the support of these senate members. Laura Bender pointed out that the student regent is a voting member of the University of Alaska Board of Regents.

GAAC members felt that graduate students are valuable members of our committee, and provide important input on policies and procedures, as well as course and program proposals. In terms of selection of representatives, it was pointed out that departments across the university differ in how formally their graduate students are organized, so we can't necessarily count on having graduate student organizations find representatives to GAAC. Laura Bender noted that normally it is difficult to find graduate students who are willing to serve. She suggested that the graduate school publish an annual announcement of vacancy to which graduate students could apply, then the Graduate Dean appoint up to two graduate student representatives. This proposal was supported by several members of the committee. Amy Lovecraft felt that it is important to assess how the faculty that she represents would feel about having graduate students be voting members. GAAC will continue the discussion of this issue, and how to handle conflicts of interest, at our next meeting.