

MINUTES (Revised 2/7/2011)
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #171
Monday, December 6, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 3: 10 p.m.
Wood Center Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn

Faculty Senate President Jonathan Dehn called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call for 2010-11 Faculty Senate

Members Present:

ALLEN, Jane

ARENDT, Anthony

BAEK, Jungho

BAKER, Carrie

BARBOZA, Perry

BARTLETT, Christa

BROCIOUS, Heidi

CAHILL, Cathy

DAVIS, Mike

DEHN, Jonathan

DEHN, Lara

GANGULI, Rajive - audio

HANSEN, Roger

HIMELBLOOM, Brian - audio

JENSEN, Karen

JOLIE, July

JONES, Debra (Leif Albertson)

KADEN, Ute

KERR, Marianne - audio

LARDON, Cecile

LAWLOR, Orion

MCEACHERN, Diane (Bethel)

MCINTYRE, Julie (Chung-Sang Ng)

METZGER, Andrew

NEWBERRY, Rainer

PALTER, Morris

RENES, Sue

REYNOLDS, Jennifer

THOMAS, Amber

Members Present (cont'd):

ROBERTS, Larry - audio

VALENTINE, Dave

WEBER, Jane (Cindy Hardy)

WILSON, Timothy

Others Present:

Linda Hapsmith

Mike Castellini

Lillian Misel

Michelle Bartlett

Members Absent:

ANGER, Andy

DONG, Lily

FOWELL, Sarah (Fall Leave)

HOCK, Regine

HUETTMANN, Falk (Sabbat.)

ZHANG, Xiong

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Brian Rogers

Susan Henrichs

Dana Thomas

Anita Hughes (Assoc. Registrar)

Eric Madsen

Doug Goering

Maria Russell - audio

Jordan Titus

Josef Glowa

Latrice Laughlin

Cindy Hardy

GUEST SPEAKER:

Patrick Gamble, UA Pres.

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #170

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved: None

B. Motions Pending:

1. Motion to Approve the DANSRD Unit Criteria
2. Motion to Specify the Minimum Grade for Baccalaureate Core Courses

Chancellor Rogers commented that he agrees completely with the motion regarding the minimum core course grade, but must make sure it's not at odds with BOR policy on transfers. He has asked the provost at UAA and the chancellor at UAS to see if they would be interested to share the same quality standard as UAF in this matter, and they will discuss it with their faculty senates. If they do not agree, then the matter would need to go before the BOR to allow for a different standard at UAF.

The Chancellor is going to meet with the Department of Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development on their peer criteria to discuss a couple of issues before he will sign that motion.

III Public Comments/Questions

No public comments were made.

IV A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

The draft of the Academic Master Plan will be given to President Gamble on Wednesday. He'll update the Board with it, and then share it with the faculty senates. He wants to hear feedback from faculty when the draft is distributed.

With regard to the motion coming up this meeting about the grade of Incomplete, UAA and UAS do not currently change the Incompletes to an "F" after one year as UAF does. The subject is being discussed at Faculty Alliance with the goal of aligning the grading policy at the three MAUs.

Jon is serving on the accreditation steering committee and hopes to have some items to share with the senate in the spring.

B. President-Elect's Comments – Cathy Cahill

Cathy reported on the Tuition Taskforce, noting the announcement memo that recently went out to everyone regarding the 7% increase across the board for undergraduate tuition rates, and 3% for graduate tuition. President Gamble will take these numbers to the BOR this week.

The taskforce plans to continue meeting next semester, and your ideas are welcomed.

V A. Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers

The recent ice storm was of such a magnitude that the need for better communication procedures regarding classes became apparent. An improved plan is being developed, and faculty are invited to share their concerns and ideas about impacts of these types of events on classes and research activities and how to better handle them.

The BOR meets this week, and the Chancellor provided information about open comment time on their agenda. The tuition issue will be one of the primary items on the agenda. He thinks that the President's proposal for a 3% increase in graduate tuition will work better for graduate students than a 12% increase in non-resident tuition. It separates the non-resident surcharge between undergraduate and graduate tuition, where it had previously been the same amount charged per credit hour. The non-resident surcharge for undergraduate tuition will be higher than that for graduate tuition, recognizing our market competition on the graduate side.

The impacts on our students of three specific issues need to be considered. They are: 1.) Consolidated fees for tuition. By capping tuition at 15 credits, would students then take a sixth course (free) and thus graduate sooner? 2.) Differential tuition rates by program. Some new programs charge super-tuition to get the programs started, but it's not necessarily been tied to what the student will earn in that field. Should high-cost programs charge higher tuition? 3.) Should the tuition rates be decoupled between the three MAUs? Should students pay more for the quality they receive here, or will they go where it's cheapest? Should our peer institutions in the western states continue to be the market reference? Their undergraduate tuition rates are still rising.

Other items on the Board of Regents' meeting agenda were mentioned. Health care costs continue to dominate their discussions. Construction activity anticipated in the spring was noted.

Rajive G. asked the chancellor what impacts he sees to UAF with the loss of funding to the supercomputing center. Chancellor Rogers noted the loss of the Department of Defense (DOD) contract has significant impacts on the university. He met with ARSC staff last Friday to get their feedback on how to move forward. An email that misrepresented parts of that discussion went around and resulted in the recent article in the local newspaper. They're still assessing the ramifications of the contract loss. A trail-off contract from DOD had been sought earlier this year in order to have time to make longer-term funding plans. A funding increment requested in the university budget process was not forwarded on by the BOR. PBB reallocations over the next several years will be insufficient to keep ARSC going with its current staffing level. The surviving entity will have to be smaller and they'll be working on the necessary changes in the upcoming months.

B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

The recent ice storm made the necessity of communicating efficiently with students (especially those who are off-campus) about class cancellations quite apparent. Faculty are encouraged to plan ahead in order to have a means of reaching their classes in situations where students or the instructor can not make it to campus. For example, Blackboard courses provide the means for emailing all students in a class; or, faculty might use course web sites or devise another means to communicate in situations where the instructor or students can not make it to campus.

Activity in academic affairs is quite extensive at the upcoming BOR meeting. Distance Education has been focused on for more than a year since the legislative audit. One of the audit's findings was that it's not easy for students to find information about distance courses and what they needed to take those courses (e.g., equipment, fees, type of electronic connectivity). A task group has been working on

better coding to more accurately characterize distance ed courses in the Banner system. It simplifies the way that Banner info is entered into the system and updates the course entry system.

A major Banner upgrade is coupled with this effort, and will create a better search function. The first step in the works is to update all course information currently in Banner, which involves about five or six thousand active courses. So, at the start of spring semester, course updates will be requested from faculty. Please be alert for that request and respond in a timely manner.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Maria Russell

Maria announced that the FY12 budget includes two salary increases for staff: 2% in July, and 1% the following January. Current discussion topics include: more layoffs and layoff rumors; impacts of soft closure on staff; along with emergency closure concerns affecting staff, and health care cost issues.

Staff Appreciation Day planning continues and they are looking forward to faculty assistance during the event.

Nichole Kloepfer's departure from the Staff Council Office to take a job at IAB was mentioned, along with well wishes for her success at the new job.

Cecile L. asked if Maria had gotten a response regarding the concerns about staff being treated differently during the ice storm. Maria commented that she'd received a wide variety of concerns from both research and non-research staff that faculty and students were encouraged to stay home, yet offices were open and had to be staffed. Staff Council is working on recommendations to forward on to positively deal with any future situations in a clearer manner.

B. ASUAF – Nicole Carvajal

No one was available to report for ASUAF.

C. UNAC – Jordan Titus

Union negotiations continue at a glacial pace. There will be a general membership meeting to get a report from the chief negotiator, tentatively scheduled for December 14 late in the day – it's a study day – so that faculty may attend.

Mike D. reported on the meetings with legislators held recently at both UAF and UAA. At UAF, he met with newly-elected Representative Steve Thompson, Senator Thomas, and Representative Dave Guttenberg. Members of the representative assembly and others attended, affording a good opportunity for legislators to learn about faculty concerns. The second part of the meeting was postponed for January and will focus on navigating the legislative web site and its resources.

No one was available to speak for UAFT.

VII Guest Speaker

- A. Patrick Gamble, UA System President
Topic: Impressions thus far, and a look to the future.

President Gamble shared about the past six months since he came on the job. He's been on the road an average of about 15 days a month doing campus visits and a wide variety of university and community functions, in addition to the everyday university business (including the budget). He's visited about three-quarters of the campuses out in the field and is working his way back in to the interior.

The university budget has gone through the Board of Regents, and strategy is being considered for getting the budget through the legislature. Budget strategy for this year is markedly different from that used in the past decade. The system focus has been to increase enrollment and keep students, and those goals have been met. With those increases the budget must also grow, and there's been a decade of steady growth. This year, however, the governor said he wants a flat budget or a low- to no-maintenance budget. So, the president's effort was to come in with a flat budget in response to the governor – but come at it differently by declaring war on deferred maintenance. While he believes they can address reduction of deferred maintenance costs very effectively, the rising health care costs are another matter and could potentially offset that progress. They're currently looking at health care costs in depth.

The goal is to reach a sustainable level of funding for facilities. The current effort encompasses an eight-year period. The first four years will wipe out the top maintenance projects across the system and break the cycle, and the next four years (with the cooperation of the legislature) will help the university reach that sustainable level. By reaching a sustainable level, much of the guesswork will be eliminated from the current budgeting process, allowing the university to be more programmatic and predictive while maintaining its facilities, fixing and repurposing older facilities and bringing the new ones online and paying the bills.

President Gamble complimented Chancellor Rogers on the amazing job he's done to help UAF cut down the must-pay fixed-costs by being efficient and effective.

Cecile L. asked the president how programs and departments fit into his thoughts on the university budget. He responded by giving an example about the request for an engineering building at Anchorage. He looked at the old building and then asked some questions about how the program determined what they want in a new building. They had gauged the request on the number of new students beating on the door. But through his questioning, they came to the fact that half their majors change majors in the first two years, and then only 10 percent of the remaining majors go on to graduate in the next three years. At that point the discussion came to a screeching halt, because the engineering study done by Facilities had not taken these facts into consideration. His point is that the programs drive the requirement for facilities. We need to transition over to a discussion of mission enhancement in department areas. There's an array of components that go into the program, only one of which is the building. There are also hidden costs to consider such as what will be done with the old facility being vacated. All these components need to be discussed and analyzed. Statements of need to expand a mission area get into the average student load and the attrition rate. Statements of requirements have to match the needs, only one of which is the building involved.

The president commented about the interesting process of looking at the student load. He noted that when they stop asking "what" and start asking why, the topic of attrition surfaces. From the example he gave earlier, why are half of the students changing their major and only 10 percent graduating later on? If the attrition rate can be reduced, it can make a big difference in dollars saved. He believes dollars saved by reducing attrition are a lot easier to get than dollars brought in by raising tuition rates.

By working attrition issues, cash flow can be increased in the system while reducing student debts and other costs. The fall-out rate among even our scholars is unacceptable. Getting them out the door needs to be thought through and addressed, not just getting them in the door.

Cecile L. noted that students notice when technology in the classroom doesn't work and the faculty are struggling with getting equipment to work. An environment conducive to their learning is not being addressed. We need this investment to maintain our students.

The president responded he's made this similar argument to the legislature, that education is an investment, not an expense. The system funding process can become a bureaucracy over time, but one must continue to ask for exactly what is wanted. He also noted he looks at what is not funded as well as what is funded, and takes a broader approach rather than just funding what is at the top of the list.

Mike D. commented that the legislators he met with recently brought up the attrition topic. He is putting on a legislative workshop in Juneau in February and he'll copy the president on the info and agenda.

Cindy H. noted that 30% of incoming students are nontraditional students. Those students are working full-time jobs and raising children and are not stepping into the university from the high schools. Who the students are needs to be addressed as much as their learning environment. The president responded that they need good data on nontraditional students, as well as attrition. He wants a clearer problem statement to more effectively talk about and find solutions.

The president noted that professionally, we are obligated to do the best that we can to make sure the university gives all its students a fair shake. He noted that in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* there was a list of about 50-60 universities looking at attrition rates. Alaska was sixth from the bottom on the list, so not the worst, but very low. We have many incoming students with scholarships, not to mention the new program by the governor; but further down the road the outcome or graduation rates may not look good. Legislators are not going to question their program; rather, they are going to look at success rates, at the university and ask what was done for these students. He sees addressing these issues as a challenge and an opportunity.

Cecile L. asked what the president sees as the greatest opportunity and the greatest threat to the university system. He responded that the greatest opportunity is the faculty. Faculty figured out how to keep their institutions going in spite of large budget cuts. The faculty pull together and make it work. The biggest threat is the state's economy. The economy needs some predictability for the state to function. He sees different aspects of sophism in the media about the economic condition of the state, noting the recent article in the newspaper about the state being in the best economic condition it's ever been. He gave the example of how one might technically be able to say they're in the best financial condition they've ever been in, without taking into account the future conditions that are looming which they will have to face. It's like floating down the tranquil river with headphones on and music playing, not hearing the roar of the waterfall around the bend. Each year the state has to see higher oil prices in order to meet its budget. It's not sustainable.

The president mentioned the UAA chancellor search which is beginning. He then mentioned that the Fisher report is on his desk and will go to the BOR this week. He'll distribute the 116-page report online as soon as the BOR allows. He'll look at the commonalities and differences in both the MacTaggart and Fisher reports, which should prove useful for the strategic planning process. The Academic Master Plan, along with other plans like the teacher education plan, will be gathered and looked at to update the strategic plan. He noted that Governance groups will have numerous opportunities to be involved.

He also noted that the hard decisions will start to come out soon. But, he's committed to governance and group input is important to him. He wants credibility with the legislator and governor, and he wants to show output so they'll listen to him down the road. He doesn't want to face budget cuts because the university can't demonstrate its progress or how they're accomplishing their mission. We have lots of support in the state, but we have to show that we listen and get it, and are moving forward.

BREAK

VIII New Business

- A. Motion Recommending Amendment of Regents' Regulation
R10.04.090.C.11 on Grade Definition of "Incomplete", submitted by
Curricular Affairs (Attachment 171/1)

Rainer N. brought the motion to the floor, noting that we're in conflict with BOR regulation and the President can change that if we ask him nicely. Jon D. noted that at the other institutions, the "I" grade is permanent, having no impact on GPAs; but, at UAF it turns into an "F" after one year. This needs discussion at the other MAU senates. The motion was called to question and seconded. Ayes passed the motion unanimously.

- B. Motion to Publicize Grading Policy, submitted by
Curricular Affairs (Attachment 171/2)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor and commented on the need to make the grading policy known among both students and faculty as well. The motion requests information on grading policy be publicized to both students and faculty each semester.

Jon noted that the effective date was tweaked at the presenate meeting so it coincides with the earlier grading motion when that is approved – it's still pending. The chancellor expects it to happen, but it needs to happen in the proper order and after other campuses have discussed it.

Orion L. asked when the change applies. Rainer responded that students choose their catalog and that determines the policy they fall under. This isn't retroactive. Cindy asked who's going to keep track of it all, and Rainer noted that the registrar's office does that. Advisors need to know what catalog their advisees are under. The change is not effective until the new catalog in the fall.

Some discussion followed about the motion and its effective dates. Regardless of what will happen with grading policy itself, it was agreed that the senate still wants the publicizing to occur. An amendment on the floor was agreed to, changing the effective date to Fall 2011 rather than Spring 2011.

Carrie B. spoke to changing the word "urges" in the motion to "requires". Discussion followed, with Cathy noting that the Administrative Committee already discussed changing the word.

Rajive G. commented that advisors should be trained on this, rather than putting this in the syllabus. Rainer noted that the motion is not about adding this information to the syllabus. Carrie noted advisors are clearly not communicating effectively about this, and faculty themselves aren't all on board with the information. Rajive noted student and faculty need to be trained about the grading policy, but that students and faculty advisors need to handle this outside of the classroom. Rainer responded that it

does not have to take any class time to write on the board or pass out a sheet of paper. Jon noted the motion did not preclude training faculty advisors or other approaches outside the classroom, but that publicizing in the classroom provided the widest delivery of the information.

The motion urging faculty to publicize grading policy was called to question and seconded. There were two nays, no abstentions, and the ayes passed the motion.

IX Discussion Items

A. Update on the General Education Revitalization Subcommittee – Curricular Affairs

Rainer used the time to share about a suggestion from Dean's Council that was presented to Curricular Affairs. A motion has been suggested to accept AA and AS degrees from regionally accredited institutions as fulfilling the baccalaureate core requirements. Currently, we allow anyone who's completed their school's core requirement in total to waive our core requirement, and our AA and AS degrees require the core already. This would make it easier for students to enter baccalaureate programs. Dana T. pointed out this is exclusive of upper division requirements for ethics and "O" and "W" requirements.

Cindy H. asked for clarification that this suggestion was for the AS and AA degrees, but not the AAS degrees. Rainer confirmed AAS degrees do not have core requirements.

Dave V. noted how this will help transfer students from two-year degree programs transfer in to our four-year programs. It opens the way for articulation agreements with other institutions.

B. Math placement test expiration date – SADA Committee

There will be a motion for the next meeting from SADA committee. (Jayne will forward a version for them to finalize.)

X Committee Reports

A. Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 171/3)

B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair

C. Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Ute Kaden

Perry reminded units they need to get their criteria in to them since they plan to only meet four times during the spring semester.

D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair

E. Core Review – Latrice Laughlin, Chair

F. Curriculum Review Committee – Rainer Newberry, Chair

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks, Chair

- H Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair
(Attachment 171/4)
- I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee –Ken Abramowicz, Chair
(Attachment 171/5)
- J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
Minutes were included as a hand-out at the back table.
- K. Research Advisory Committee (ad hoc) – Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen,
Co-Chairs (Attachment 171/6)

XI Members' Comments/Questions

Mike D. reported that he went to the AAUP shared governance conference in Washington, DC with 75-80 universities in attendance. He offered a detailed report in February.

Jon asked for a web link, and for information to share for the next face-to-face meeting. Mike will bring materials to handout.

XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:05 PM.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend the amendment of Regents' Regulation R10.04.090.C.11 as follows:

[[]] – Deletions
CAPS and Bold – Additions

Regents Regulation R10.04.090.C.11:

C. Grades Definitions

11. I, or Incomplete

A grade of "I" indicates that a student has not completed the coursework by the end of the course. A final grade and credit will be withheld without penalty until the course requirements are met within an approved time, not to exceed one year. After one year, the "I" **EITHER** becomes a permanent grade **OR CHANGES TO "F" ACCORDING TO MAU FACULTY SENATE POLICY.**

EFFECTIVE: Following the approval of the Motion to Specify the Minimum Grade for Baccalaureate Core Courses (currently pending), this motion would be effective immediately upon UA President approval.

RATIONALE: UAF Faculty Senate policy (approved Spring 2006) is for an 'I' to become an 'F'. This conflicts with the BOR Regulation (which the UA President can modify) which states 'I' becomes 'permanent I'. Our request is to make UA Regulation in line with UAF Faculty Senate Policy without affecting the other MAUs.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate urges instructors of letter-graded, undergraduate courses to publicize and distribute to students on the first day of class UAF regulations with regards to the grades of 'C' and below, as applicable to the course taught. These include the material in the table listed below.

Grade	Definition and academic implications	Grade Points
C+	Satisfactory to Fair: satisfactory level of performance, with some mastery of material	2.3
C	Average: satisfactory level of performance and level of competency in the subject. A minimum grade of C (2.0) is required for all prerequisite and major courses.	2.0
C-	Barely satisfactory: Minimum grade required for all Core (X) Courses. A grade of C- (1.7) in a class which is a prerequisite for another class or in a class required for a student's major will result in the student being required to retake the class.	1.7
D+, D, and D-	Below Average: Fair to poor level of competency in the subject matter. A grade of D+, D or D- in a Core (X) class will automatically require the student to re-take the class to receive core credit, starting Fall 2011.	1.3, 1.0, 0.7

EFFECTIVE: Following the approval of the Motion to Specify the Minimum Grade for Baccalaureate Core Courses (currently pending), this motion would be effective Spring 2011.

RATIONALE: Specifying the minimum passing grade for prerequisite, degree major, and core courses will help eliminate grading policy confusion for instructors and their students.

Meeting Minutes for the Curricular Affairs Committee Nov. 2, 2010

Present: Diane McEachern (by phone), Anita Hughes, Dave Valentine, Rainer Newberry, Carrie Baker, Libby Eddy, Anthony Arendt, Christa Bartlett, Jungho Baek, Jayne Harvie, Linda Hapsmith (by phone)

Approval of minutes from previous meeting, as amended.
Accept minutes as amended.

2. Discussion of charge to the core revitalization committee. Proposed language:
The 2010-2011 [[Core Revitalization]] **General Education Revitalization** Committee is constituted as a sub-committee of the Curricular Affairs Committee. The charge of the current Core Revitalization Committee is to develop objectives and Student Learning Outcomes for UAF's [[Core curriculum]] **General Education Curriculum**. This committee is expected to present its proposal to Faculty Senate during the Spring 2011 semester. The committee's charge at this time does not include [[general education requirements core curriculum development or development of assessment for that core curriculum]] **curriculum development or assessment**.

Discussion re proposed charge. Dean Lewis raised the following issue: with current language the assumption is that core will look similar to how it is now. Current charge means core could be completely different. Committee likes that the charge also includes what it is not-and agree with proposed language change. Looking for guiding language as well as specific outcomes. Discussion regarding Philosophies vs Outcomes. Outcomes must be measurable. How do we know if we're succeeding in achieving our objectives? Pg 134 core curriculum references are vague. Question-is the charge to create objectives and outcomes?

Objective-competency in written English

Outcome-ability to write text in various forms with a specific purpose

3. Response to ADComm's turning back two of our motions from last meeting. They're given below as sent to ADCOMM

A. The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend the amendment of Regents' Policy

R10.04.090.D.2.a. as follows:

[[]] - Deletions **Boldface** and underlined - Additions

REGENTS POLICY R10.04.090.D.2.a.

2. GPA Computation

a. Grade points for each course are computed by multiplying the numerical value of the academic grade awarded, according to the chart below, by the number of credits attempted for the course.

Numerical Equivalencies for Grades

A+ = [[4.0]] **4.3** A = 4.0 A- = 3.7

B+ = 3.3 B = 3.0 B- = 2.7

C+ = 2.3 C = 2.0 C- = 1.7 D+ = 1.3 D = 1.0 D- = 0.7 F = 0.0

EFFECTIVE: The first fall semester after approval by the UA President

RATIONALE: Students who do exceptionally well in a class are currently not rewarded with an A+ , but students who do 'well' can be 'punished' with a grade of A-. It seems only fair that a student who does exceptionally well be materially rewarded.

ADMIN COMMITTEE NOTE: This will first have to be approved by the fac senates of the other MAUs...and requires Jon to take the lead in moving it to the other MAUs. Might tack on some proviso like 'will be awarded to no more than 1 student (small classes) or 5% of the students (large classes) for any given class.

Admin committee wants more data on the +/- system and more justification

They asked that CAC consider moving to a grading system that is A, AB, B, BC, etc.

Concern that this will lead to more grade inflation

Provost to ask for data from PAIR-how many A+ grades do we award?

B. MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that course instructors must add to their syllabus or otherwise publicize to students on the first day of class UAF regulations with regards to the grade of 'C-'. These include: a minimum grade of 'C' = 2.0 (not C- = 1.7) is required for any course used as a prerequisite for another. A minimum grade of 'C' (not C-) is required for all courses in the student's major. A grade of C- = 1.7 will potentially cause a student's GPA to fall below 2.0. (and if motion on C1 Core Course grade passes: C- is the minimum grade allowed for a core course to count towards the core requirements.)

EFFECTIVE: Spring 2011

RATIONALE: Specifying the minimum grade of C- for core courses will help eliminate confusion, particularly with regard to complying with a common grading policy across the UA System.

Admin Committee wants the word 'require' removed from this motion. They would prefer 'encourage'. Get rid of syllabus. They prefer that 'you inform your students about minimum passing grade'. Each instructor must specify clearly the minimum grade for course to be accepted.

IE, C grade required in ENGL 211/213 b/c they are pre-requisite courses for upper division writing intensive courses. Wait to see outcome of next faculty senate meeting.

What will proposed changes to catalog look like? Pg 46 of catalog needs to be looked at.

Table 10 needs to include + and - examples. What is the overall impact for students?

Anita will send language from UAF transcript legend to Jayne and Rainer by Thursday (11/4) at 5.

4. Update on 'prereqs for 100-level courses designed primarily for high school students
Not discussed at this time. Adjourned at 3:07

Attachment 171/3 continued:

Curricular Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes for November 16, 2010

Present: Lili Anderson-Misel, Anthony Arendt, Jungho Baek, Carrie Baker, Anita Hughes, Libby Eddy, Linda Hapsmith, Jayne Harvie, Rainer Newberry (Chair), David Valentine

Audio: Brian Himelbloom, Diane McEachern

1. November 2 meeting minutes were revised and approved. References to the “core revitalization” committee in item #2, discussion of the committee charge, were changed to General Education Revitalization Committee.

2. Old Business:

A. Revised Motion to Publicize Grading Policy to Students

Rainer submitted a revised draft for the committee to discuss.

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that course instructors publicize to students on the first day of class UAF regulations with regards to the grades of ‘C’ and ‘C-’. These include: a minimum grade of ‘C’ = 2.0 (not C- = 1.7) is required for any course used as a prerequisite for another. A minimum grade of ‘C’ (not C-) is required for all courses in the student’s major. A grade of C- = 1.7 will potentially cause a student’s GPA to fall below 2.0. Finally: C- is the minimum grade allowed for a core course to count towards the core requirements, assuming that it’s neither a prerequisite for another class nor in the student’s major.

Effective: Fall 2011

Rationale: Specifying the consequences of grades <C will warn students (and faculty!) in advance of the minimum grade needed for the course. Students and faculty might still suffer from UAF’s C/C- policies, but at least they’ll do so KNOWING the consequences of their actions.

Dave V. suggested using “minimum passing grade” language in the motion, but this doesn’t address the situation of the minimum grade to pass and not have to repeat a course. The phrase “non-Pass/Fail instructors” was suggested, which would eliminate some of those having to respond to the request. Linda H. asked about necessary vs. sufficient grades. It was suggested a table of C and D grades be included, which specifies the ramifications of those grades. There was some discussion on wording of “distribute” vs. “publicize” the information. It was also suggested that **the Marketing and Communications faculty listserve be used to disseminate the information each semester**, along with putting it on the Syllabus Requirements checklist. Rainer will send the committee another revised version and see if it’s possible to have it finalized for the November 29 Administrative Committee meeting.

B. General Education Revitalization Committee

Rainer has sent names or requested names (as needed) for the committee membership to all the deans. So far, only two or three responses have been received. (CNSM and SOEd have responded.)

The committee looked at a draft appointment letter to the GER Committee. It was noted in reference to paragraph three of the draft that Carrie was not on the original committee appointed by Dana Thomas. Anne Armstrong had been on that original committee. Some revision to that paragraph will be necessary.

C. Update on ‘prereq’s for 100-level courses designed primarily for high school students:

Rainer reported that the Curriculum Review Committee discussed this and recommends that a.) junior high school standing; and, b.) cumulative GPA of 2.0, should both be required of the students allowed into the courses. These courses are delivered at the high schools, and assurance from FNSBSD has been given that prereq’s will be checked for the students enrolled. The current discussion applied to a trial course for Spring 2011 at Curriculum Review, but additional biology courses will be affected for the Summer 2011 semester.

Dave V. commented: the higher the group GPA, the higher the likely level of the class. More motivated students are likely to raise the overall class participation. Lillian mentioned that high school counselors would be guiding students into the courses, which would help ensure a good GPA. Libby noted that the courses can be specially coded, making evaluation of them easier later on. Rainer noted that we should bring this to Fac Senate...but not right away.

3. New Business:

The new A.A.S. in Paramedicine was explained by Rainer and discussed. The program is being broken out from the Emergency Management concentrations, making it “new” though it’s actually been in existence. Minor corrections to the proposal have been requested by Curriculum Review. CAC members had no objections to it as long as those corrections are made.

Linda H. asked if corresponding changes to the B.E.M. have been considered. Jayne has seen some B.E.M. paperwork which does mention that the A.A.S. would fit with the bachelor’s. CAC meets again just after the Administrative Committee, so has one more opportunity to discuss the proposal.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 PM.

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for November 16, 2010**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Julie Lurman Joly, Joy Morrison, Channon Price, Larry Roberts

Excused: Alexandra Oliveira

Absent: Mike Castellini, Eric Madsen

III. Report from Joy

The 35th Annual POD Conference in St. Louis, “Gateways to New Directions,” consisted of four days of great sessions and panels. Next year Joy is willing to take one or two FDAI Committee members (those who plan on continuing on our committee) to the POD conference which may be held in Vancouver. This conference is typically held in late October or early November. Some information that Joy brought back from POD that she has in her office for faculty to access is as follows:

- Helping Students Develop Their Critical Thinking Skills
- Effective Lecturing
- Promoting Deep Learning
- Integrated Course Design
- Appraising Teaching Effectiveness Beyond Student Evaluations
- To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development (book), vol. 29 (vol. 28 is also available)
- 5” x 8” note cards with short classroom exercises on them from Central Michigan University

Next Joy was in Washington, DC for a National Science Foundation meeting where they are writing a final report on the status of STEM women faculty at UAF. This will be presented to the Provost and Deans as part of Academic Leadership on November 29, 2010. Joy will also be meeting with Dan Julius to recommend a retreat in Anchorage for 30 faculty members to discuss submitting another NSF ADVANCE grant request. The future of statewide sharing/collaborating looks promising.

Joy then attended a Fulbright Scholars meeting as a Fulbright Campus Representative. She will be actively working to bring Fulbright Scholars and Specialists to UAF as well as working to get sabbaticals for UAF faculty who apply and become Scholars and Specialists. Fulbright Specialists travel to present workshops and seminars in their area of expertise (e.g. Joy is a Fulbright Specialist for Faculty Development), and Joy wants to see more UAF faculty added to the roster.

Finally, Joy requested that while she is on sabbatical, the FDAI committee members should help promote upcoming Faculty Development opportunities and ask their colleagues what they would like to see offered. She reports that Eric Mazur’s presentations were well-attended.

IV. Old Business

1. Update on electronic student evaluations

Josef followed up on the documents forwarded on to Provost Henrichs and Jon Dehn and discovered that while both had received said documents, they have not yet had time to look into them. He asked the committee if we felt FDAI should formulate a motion regarding electronic student evaluations. After some discussion, we decided that the motion should state that no decision should be made to implement electronic student evaluations without input from Faculty Senate, and that research on this issue needs to be done at the administrative level. The FDAI committee recommendations should accompany this motion. Larry suggested that we should ask Provost Henrichs to come to our meeting so we can present our recommendations to her and to have her be cognizant to our findings. Josef will work on a draft of the motion and send it out to committee members for input.

2. Faculty Forum for spring 2011

Committee members will read chapter three (teaching) in Kennedy's book so that we can begin planning the discussion for next year's Faculty Forum.

V. New Business

1. Libby Roderick's talk on Friday, November 19 in the Wood Center

There was some confusion as to the time and place of Libby Roderick's talk this Friday. Joy said she would look into it and send out an email clarification.

2. Comment sheets and IAS scores

Josef shared an email from Katrin Iken (Marine Biology) regarding her concern for student anonymity in small classes. Faculty can either recognize students' handwriting or sentence structure, or could even determine a student's identity from the nature of a particular complaint. Students do not feel they can be honest and frank. This adds another concern for the committee regarding student evaluations. While anonymity will always be an issue for small classes, the committee feels that it might be necessary for Faculty Senate to appoint an ad hoc committee to deal with these concerns regarding student evaluations (problems with electronic format *and* student anonymity issues).

3. March 3-5, 2011 for the 6th annual Lilly Arctic Institute on Innovations & Excellence in Teaching

Larry sent out a detailed invitation to FDAI committee members to read through. He asks that we let him know if we have any comments or questions.

4. Another template for improving teaching strategies?

After a very brief discussion to determine where we are on this issue, we decided we could drop it until any new requests come up.

VI. Next Meeting: Thursday, December 2, 2010, 3:00 – 4:00 pm in Bunnell 222.

VII. Adjourned at 4:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

**Graduate Academic Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 25, 2010
9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.**

Voting members present: Ken Abramowicz, Donie Bret-Harte (audio), Lara Dehn, Regine Hock, Anita Hughes, Orion Lawlor, Sue Renes, Jen Schmidt, Amber Thomas (audio).

Ex-officio members present: Larry Duffy.

Guests: Jayne Harvie.

The meeting called to order at 9:33.

1. The proposed meeting agenda was approved without any modification.
2. Unfinished business from 9-27-10 meeting.

Trial MSL F694 and Trial BIOL F694 Update: BIOL F694 / MSL F694 - Communicating Science - Laura Conner has recombined the two courses back into one course with the approval of SFOS and CNSM. The course is no longer repeatable for credit. GAAC approved this revised trial course without any further modification.

3. Discussion of new GAAC proposals.

#17-GNC: FISH F628 - Physiological Ecology of Fishes - Orion acknowledged the changes the Curriculum Review Committee made to the course prerequisites. Lara noted that Animal Physiology may be a more appropriate prerequisite for this particular course. Laura will ask that the syllabus be revised to change the pre-requisites to FISH 301 or BIOL 310 (Animal Physiology) and ask to add "graduate standing" as a pre-requisite for the 600-level part and GAAC will review this again next meeting.

#16-GCCh.: FISH F626 (stacked as F426) - Behavioral Ecology of Fishes – GAAC approved the course with minor modifications (changing the pre-requisite to FISH 301 or BIOL 271), and adding "graduate standing" as a pre-requisite for the 600-level part.

#19-GNC: ATM F666 - Atmospheric Remote Sensing – The syllabus was vague with respect to the policy related to plagiarism and the timing of the readings and dates. The syllabus was also missing information related to make-up exams, late homework assignments, and class attendance. The consensus was that the syllabus should be revised to include missing information. Concern was also expressed about the impacts on other programs. Donie will follow up on these concerns for the next meeting.

#22-GNC: MSL F612 - Early Life Histories of Marine Invertebrates – GAAC approved this course with minor modifications to be requested for its description. Jen will follow up to request that these be made.

24-GNC: FISH F631 - Data Analysis in Community Ecology - Amber will follow up on adding some missing syllabus elements (specifically a statement about plagiarism). Lara noted a department concern with the prerequisite of STAT F401 for fisheries courses. She will follow up on this for the next committee meeting.

6. Discussion topics.

Graduate Grading Policy

The +/- issue with the "B" grade was discussed. The issue parallels the +/- issues with "C" at the undergraduate level. A "B" must be earned for courses in a student's graduate study plan.

Otherwise a course only counts toward number of credits and the GPA. There was consensus for the committee to address the +/- issue with a motion about grading policy in the near future.

Courses being Cross-listed

Larry commented on the common issues with cross-listing which include which department counts the enrollment and gets the tuition revenue. On Banner reports the enrollment may appear artificially low for a department because of cross-listing with another department; but in many cases, enrollment is actually increased for a course due to cross-listing.

New GAAC Proposals

It was noted that GAAC has as a set of degree revisions for the Special Education program coming up and a new Master's program in Political Science. Sue Renes and Amber Thomas volunteered to work on the Special Ed revisions, with Sue taking the lead. Ken agreed to take the lead on the new Master's program in Political Science.

The next meeting is November 15, 9:30-10:30 AM at the Joint Conference Room, 341 Rasmuson Library.

The meeting adjourned shortly after 10:30.

Meeting Minutes (Approved) **Graduate Academic Advisory Committee** **November 15, 2010** **9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.**

Voting Members Present: Ken Abramowicz (Chair), Lara Dehn, Regine Hock, Orion Lawlor, Sue Renes, Jen Schmidt, Amber Thomas (phone), Xiong Zhang (phone).

Ex-Officio Members Present: Laura Bender, Anita Hughes, Lillian Anderson-Misel.
Also present: Jayne Harvie (note-taking)

The revised October 25 meeting minutes were approved.

The proposed agenda was approved with a change of order to accommodate discussion on the +/- grading policy resolution.

Backup meeting dates of November 29 and December 13 were adopted by the committee. (Time: 9:30-10:30 a.m.; Location: 341 Rasmuson Library)

Discussion of the resolution on the +/- grading policy issues:

Orion introduced the resolution addressing the +/- grading policy and the “B” minimum grade guidelines (needed for graduate students to pass courses and for their Advancement to Candidacy). The resolution recommended that instructors not give grades of C- (for undergraduate students) or B- (for graduate students).

Regine commented on the double standard of this current system. She gives +/- grades in her classes, while Lara noted she did not. A student passing Lara’s course might not pass Regine’s course with the same grade percentage because of the +/- effect.

Laura B. reiterated that it’s the overall GPA of 3.0 which is needed to graduate and for advancement to candidacy. Amber commented on the need to clarify the language of the policy.

The committee supported the idea of a full senate discussion. Ken noted that the resolution contradicts current policy passed by the Faculty Senate. No action was taken on the resolution and further discussion was postponed for the next meeting.

Curriculum Process:

Ken proposed that the committee review the very straightforward course proposals (such as #97) via email, using a negative confirmation process. The lead and readers will email among themselves to discuss concerns, and then email Ken if something should be held for further group discussion. If no comments are received, then these straightforward proposals will be automatically approved.

It was hoped that the following courses would be discussed via email if needed.

- 1-GCCh. – BIOL F618/F418 (cross-listed with Geography): The course was OK with Jen, but Xiong hadn’t reviewed it recently. With Donie absent, Ken asked for comments to be sent via email.
- 3-GPCh. – Certificate of Completion for the Post-Baccalaureate K-12 Special Education Licensure Program. Regine OK’d it; Ken to review it further.
- 4-GPCh. – Program Change to the Master’s in Education. Regine OK’d it; Ken to review it further.

Proposals Approved:

The following courses/programs were approved by the committee:

- 2-GCCh. – PHYS F645
- 15-GPCh. – K-12 Art Licensure Program
- 17-GNC – FISH F628 (with minor changes)
- 20-GCDr. – MSL F611
- 21-GCDr. – MSL F616
- 23-GCDr. – MSL F617
- 97-GPCh. – MS Statistics

Proposals Needing Further Review:

The following courses/programs were held for further follow-up and review:

- 19-GNC - ATM F666 (Further committee review needed.)
- 24-GNC – FISH F631 (Further committee review needed.)
- 26-GCCh. – WLF F625 (Further committee review needed.)
- 36-GNC – EE F614 (To be returned to the faculty for major revision.)
- 37-GNC – EE F643 (Syllabus needs additional information.)

Assignments for Upcoming Proposals:

Committee members volunteered to take the lead or serve as readers on the course proposals through 43. Discussion of the 53 new course proposals from Construction Management will be delayed. Assignments for these 53 proposals will be determined later.

Lara D. volunteered as reader on 41, 42, and 43.

Orion volunteered as leader on 38, 39 and 40.

Regine volunteered as reader on 27, 28, 29, and 30; and as leader on 41, 42 and 43.

Jen volunteered as reader on 27, 28, 29 and 30 and as leader on 33 and 34.

Amber volunteered as leader on 31, 32 and 35.

Sue volunteered as reader on 31, 32 and 35.

Handout at Meeting #171:

Minutes of Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

October 15, 2010

2:00- 3:30 pm

Attending: Cindy Hardy, Jane Allen, Lili Misel, Deseree Salvador, Joe Mason, Suzan Hahn, Dave Veazey, Rheba Dupras, Gabriel Russell, Kate Quick, John Creed, Amy Keith

General Comments: Jane Allen wants to raise awareness that deadlines for the CRCD calendar are different than the deadlines for general UAF calendar.

Developmental designators:

In response to a question raised at the previous meeting, Margaret Short reported back that the Math Department is strongly opposed to changing the DEVM designators to MATH. Further, those she polled questioned why DEVM classes were at the 100-level. We noted that some students perceive 0-level classes as punitive. This led to a general discussion of Developmental Education concerns.

We noted that 60% of students nationwide enter postsecondary education at the DEV level, thus making it “college-level.” We also noted that there are different course numbers used at UAF, UAA, and UAS. We agreed that it would be nice to have the same designators at the three MAUs. We suggested approaching Faculty Alliance to open dialogue on class comparisons, including numbering, designators, and content. Lili will also talk to Mike Ernest in the Registrar’s office about this.

Cindy noted that Curricular Affairs is forming a Core revitalization committee, which needs a member from SADA. Amy and Kate Quick volunteered. Cindy will talk to Jayne Harvey and get us more information.

Student Learning Commons:

Suzan Hahn and Rheba Dupras joined us for a discussion on the progress on the Student Learning Commons. A Faculty Senate motion on this was passed in May 2009. Suzan reports they are focusing on space in Level 3 for the Learning Commons. They are slowly moving periodicals out of that space as they switch to digital-only format. Although the library has had budget and leadership changes in the last year, Naomi Horne, Office of Development, has interest from donors in this project. However, there is no concrete timeline. Suzan also noted that the Library is updating its computers to include Open Office and might be able to install the online homework program (ALEKS) that DEVM uses.

Rheba reported that she is working on organizing focus groups and doing direct observations to determine how the library is currently being used. We know, for example, there is not enough small group study space.

Rheba wants an action plan with steps and goals, now that we have a mission and vision. We agreed to form a subcommittee to work the action plan consisting of Lili, Cindy, Amy, Rheba, and Suzan.

Mandatory placement:

Reading placement will be on Banner in spring for Fall 2011 registration.

Developmental math will be collecting placement data after 2010-2011 because there will then be three years worth of data.

Gabriel pointed out that WritePlacer favors longer writing samples. Deseree said she sees many students placed too low with WritePlacer. Cindy noted that we need to pass this information to Dana Thomas. Kate and Deseree said about 25% of students placed this way seem to place too low. Jane Allen says that, because WritePlacer is timed, the Bethel test administrator advises their students to choose a prompt and outline their response on paper before making the first keystroke. The rural campuses are also hand scoring, using the "ASSET" writing sample.

Kate noted that some students seem to be advised into reading classes who don't need them. This is all a work in progress, and we will continue to track these issues.

Next meeting: November 12, 2-3:30pm.

**University of Alaska Fairbanks *ad hoc* Research Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes, 2010-11-04**

In attendance: Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen, Margaret Darrow, Sarah Hardy Peter Webley
Absent: Anita Hartmann, Mike West, Tom Weingartner, Bernard Coakley, Kris Hundertmark

Committee Business:

(1) Discussion of our official bylaw lines, to go into the Faculty Senate Bylaws. These are in addition to our own bylaws adopted in September, and if accepted will make the Research Advisory Committee an official permanent committee, not *ad hoc*.

"8. The Research Advisory Committee consists of up to ten voting members, a chair and co-chair, along with *ex officio* members. The committee shall serve researchers at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, and exists to provide reports and recommendations for researchers and to suggest resolutions to the UAF Faculty Senate. The Research Advisory Committee will provide a connection between the faculty and the UAF Vice Chancellor for Research, and advise the VCR on developing productive relationships with the different research facilities across UAF."

Committee co-chair Roger Hansen agreed to compare these bylaws with the bylaws of other faculty senate committees, and ensure that the duties and responsibilities of the committee are clear.

(2) Discussion of the proposed tuition increases, currently estimated at 10% per year for the next two years. The board of regents is trying to plug a projected \$8M deficit at UAF next year. UAS and UAA are pushing for a substantial increase in graduate tuition, which is a good match for their mostly professional self-paid graduate students. However, a substantial increase will further price UAF graduate students out of new research grants, which will hurt UAF research in the long run. The UA BOR meets shortly before Christmas to decide future tuition. RAC approved the following motion for consideration by the full faculty senate.

Whereas:

Anything exceeding a single digit year to year percentage increase in tuition harms UAF's ability to compete for new research funding, a primary tool to attract and retain graduate students. Many UAF graduate alumni become UAF collaborators, faculty, administrators, and board members.

Dramatic increases in tuition harm currently funded years-long grants, impacting ongoing university research.

Therefore:

UAF tuition shall increase by less than 10% per year.

(3) Decide how to help incoming Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Dan White, and schedule a meeting with him. In particular, we would like to discuss:

- Graduate students: Tuition raises, future of TA funding

- Intellectual property and outside employment / collaborations: CBA vs policy

(4) Brief update on the UAF PI FAQ. Peter has added some useful information on NSF and grants.gov. Orion will add some discussion of outside employment and the blue form.

The next RAC meeting is tentatively scheduled for December 2.

Meeting adjourned.