

MINUTES - DRAFT
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #180
Monday, February 6, 2012
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Catherine Cahill

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Abramowicz, Ken
Alexeev, Vladimir
Arendt, Anthony
Baek, Jungho
Baker, Carrie (Jun Watabe)
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar
Bret-Harte, Donie
Brown, Stephen (audio)
Cahill, Cathy
Davis, Mike
Fallen, Chris
George-Bettisworth, Retchenda
Golux, Stephan
Gustafson, Karen
Healy, Joanne
Henry, David
Himelbloom, Brian (audio)
Horstmann, Lara
Jensen, Karen
Johnston, Duff
Joly, Julie
Jones, Debra
Lardon, Cecile
Lawlor, Orion
Mathis, Jeremy (audio)
McEachern, Diane
Meyer, Franz
Nadin, Elisabeth
Newberry, Rainer
Ng, Chung-Sang
Renes, Sue (Christine Cook)
Reynolds, Jennifer
Short, Margaret

Members Present (cont'd):

Valentine, Dave
Weber, Jane
Winfree, Cathy

Members Absent:
Barboza, Perry
Metzger, Andrew
Moses, Debra
Radenbaugh, Todd
Zhang, Xiong

Others Present:

Joy Morrison
Cindy Hardy
Josef Glowa
Peter Webley
Anita Hughes
Linda Hapsmith
Jon Dehn

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Melanie Arthur
Mike Earnest
Anita Hartmann
Susan Henrichs
Paul Layer
Brian Rogers
Dana Thomas

Guest Speaker:

Claudia Lampman (UAA)

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #179

The minutes for Meeting #179 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to approve a Certificate in Baking and Pastry Arts
2. Motion to amend the title of the General Education Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes Motion of May 2, 2011

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – Cathy Cahill

Cathy reminded everyone that the Board of Regents meeting is in Fairbanks next week, inviting everyone to come and see how things are run. She noted it's a good opportunity to meet administrators and regents face to face, as well as make comments about the university.

The Strategic Direction listening sessions were announced. Fairbanks campus will have listening sessions held for students, staff, and faculty on February 14. She encouraged all faculty to attend and make their voices heard about what is working and what needs work at UAF. The Community and Technical College will have listening sessions on February 16. Kuskokwim Campus will have listening sessions on the 21st, and Northwest Campus on the 28th.

The eLab taskforce met and will get their recommendations to Faculty Alliance. A working draft will come to the Faculty Senate soon for comment. Cathy thanked Orion Lawler, Rainer Newberry and Rich Collins for their efforts to meet with and discuss distance delivery of labs with UAA and UAS.

Registrars from the three MAUs met to discuss common issues. These included issues of credit transferability, the need for common general education requirements, as well as a common grading system (two MAUs use plus/minus grades, one does not). Common numbers for courses was also discussed because the Board of Regents is pushing the issue. A legislator had complained the university needs to be doing more for the military, but the university was able to demonstrate that it is doing a lot toward accepting credits brought in by military and the complaint was backed off from.

Faculty Alliance is looking at the Stay on Track and America Completes programs because faculty have raised issues with how they've been rolled out and who they are targeting. Cathy encouraged each Faculty Senate committee to look at these and talk about them. Please share comments with Cathy so she can bring them to Faculty Alliance.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer announced that Faculty Senate elections are coming up and memos regarding that will go to the deans and directors soon. While the elections are run out of the dean's or director's offices, the faculty are responsible for nominating each other. Elections should be concluded by the end of March.

President-elect nominations will be opened at the March meeting and are kept open up to the actual election at the April Faculty Senate meeting. Cathy encouraged senators to think about serving.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers reported the governor's budget request for the university is pretty minimal this year. The operating budget includes essentially half of the funding for pay raises, and that's it for governor's increases in the operating budget. The Legislature is more pleased with our budget and is making noises about some increases. The message from the legislative fiscal staff was that the Board of Regents held the line on the total request and should be rewarded for so doing, and that the Governor's budget doesn't recognize the belt-tightening we have done. Whether that translates into actual increases in the budget remains to be seen.

There are several pieces of legislation affecting the university. One addresses military and military transfer credit, but we're already doing about half of what it proposes, so there will be minimal impact on us. The issue of transfer credit is still generally a significant issue, however; it is recurring at the legislature and at the Strategic Direction listening sessions. In-depth study of the data to understand what the issue is and what the complaints are needs to take place in order to find appropriate solutions.

The BOR has also been pushing the university on safety issues and risk management. UAF will report to the Board on efforts to keep the combined heat and power plant running now and through its replacement. An ad hoc safety committee has been appointed for the campus to examine all areas of the university concerning general safety.

Cecile L. asked about the plans for replacing the power plant. Chancellor Rogers said they're working on the necessary permitting process now for a replacement plant, as well as plans. He described the ideal timeline, with the goal to have construction start in 2015. Points of failure in the old plant have been identified and there has been considerable effort to make sure it keeps going until it can be replaced.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

The Provost reminded everyone that the BOR agenda is posted on their web site. She noted that public testimony usually taken at 9 or 10 am, and individuals are allotted three minutes to speak. The regents like to hear about interesting new projects or stories of student successes. Generic reports or many people saying the same thing do not hold their attention and is not the best use of the time.

Susan noted it's now budget season, with the university's budget being considered at the legislature right now. The Governor did not include any new university requests in his budget for UA. Upper administration feels he did that because he expects that the legislature will fund some university items, and the Governor wants it to be their choice. It's our job to convince legislators that our projects are worthy of their support.

Susan also mentioned it's time to gather the budget item requests and evaluate them with regard to the FY13 Performance Based Budgeting (PBB) internal reallocation process, with items on the order of \$100-200K (total \$1.7M). It's also time to gather potential items for the FY14 budget for the legislature. Those tend to be larger requests, at least \$100K and up to \$1M. Deans and directors should be sending out information soon about submitting items for these processes. New this year: the university budget process must now be tied in with the Core Themes' objectives – a fact that came out of the accreditation review. Every unit submitting budget requests will be expected to tie them to core themes and objectives; in particular, to indicators of improvement. Her office will send out a short report to faculty, probably through the Faculty Senate and other avenues, explaining how budget reallocations and requests have been related to the core themes and objectives. There are 19 objectives, so this will be a challenging process this spring.

C. Vice Provost's Remarks – Dana Thomas

Vice Provost Thomas thanked Alex Fitts, chair of the General Education Revitalization Committee, and all its members for their work. They have reported good progress with considering sample core curriculum models.

Dana shared about the experience that he, the Provost and the Chancellor had at the January 11 meeting in Seattle with the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. They met with 24 commissioners who grilled them for an hour about why they're not doing better on outcome assessment processes. Thus, faculty can expect to hear more about outcomes assessment from them as a result. This pressure is being passed along by the Commission because of current politics. The federal government is considering a testing policy along the lines of "No Child Left Behind" for higher ed. Rather than have to follow a political mandate from the federal government, the accrediting commissions are pressing universities on outcomes assessment. Dana noted that we are still waiting on the final letter from the Northwest Commission about our accreditation, and when we have to report on the three recommendations that were made (one of which was concerning outcomes assessment).

He mentioned the motions on the agenda today about the UAF mission statement, the core themes, and educational effectiveness. He invited everyone to share their thoughts. At the next meeting in March he will bring a revised motion on program review and a proposed schedule of program review to begin next year.

Lastly, effort was mentioned concerning the reviews of electronic annual activity reporting software. Faculty Affairs committee is involved. Of the two vendors mentioned, Data180 looks the best so far. It was written by faculty members and is used by 40 institutions and connects well with software we already use. The revised Digital Measures software has not yet been reviewed.

Cathy asked Dana what the other two recommendations of NWCCU were. He responded they were connecting the core themes and objectives to planning and budgeting.

V New Business

- A. Motion to Define the Academic Credit Hour Requirements for Laboratory Instruction, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 180/1)

Rainer explained the need for the motion with regard to existing UA regulation and how lecture and lab credit hours are defined. This motion addresses lab credit hours. Traditional 3-hour-per-week science and engineering labs are meeting the lab regulation requirement, but non-science departments have traditionally been using two hours per week for labs. The amendment effectively addresses the two-hour labs to bring them up to regulation for new courses and current course changes by stating that an hour of study or preparation outside the lab time is expected. The motion is not retroactive.

A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

VI Discussion Items

- A. Draft of New UAF Mission Statement –Dana Thomas (Attachment 180/2)

Dana presented draft mission statements from the Accreditation Steering Committee. He described the statements, which have gone back and forth at Chancellor's Cabinet, and invited suggestions.

Mike D. asked about the “lifelong learning” phrase and its placement in the statement. Dana clarified that the idea of the statement is that we prepare students for lifelong learning. Dave V. liked the second statement better because it explicitly includes education, which is our core mission.

Sukumar B. asked how lifelong learning would be quantified or assessed. Dana responded it could be reflected in the numbers of non-degree seeking students, and through CES workshop attendance and other types of similar opportunities.

Cecile L. supported the second statement also, with education being the point she wanted to stress more than a statement about preparing students for careers--which sounds like job training. Dana mentioned the Prepare core theme, which includes career preparation. Cecile stressed that higher education is the most important mission. Dana mentioned that about half our headcount is for certificates and applied associate programs. David and Cecile noted these still fall under the purview of education and Dana agreed.

Patrick M. noted the mission statement seems focused at the undergraduate level. What about graduate level education and programs? Dana said he will take the comment back to the committee and invited suggestions.

Ken A. asked for clarification on the wording about lifelong learning. Dana said it means both how to learn throughout life and to have opportunities to learn throughout life.

Jennifer R. noted that the mission statement should be readable and understandable to someone who is not familiar with the university. The buzz words “lifelong learning” have special meaning for administration and the university community, and need to be reconsidered. Jennifer also mentioned problems with the statement to “educate students for careers” because we do more than that: we educate for life, and a career is just one outcome of education.

Lara H. said the statement is too generic and could be any university. Alaska is unique and special, and having the phrase “circumpolar north” doesn’t adequately address that fact.

Orion L. suggested a comma follow the word “educate” then continue with phrasing like “preparing them for careers...” Patrick also made a suggestion about “educate for life.” In the interest of time, Cathy asked for comments to go to Dana and the steering committee.

B. Draft modification to Accreditation Core Themes –Dana Thomas (Attachment 180/3)

Dana recapped the core themes, noting that the *Discover* theme has been replaced with *Research* by the Accreditation Steering Committee and the Chancellor’s Cabinet. He invited feedback on the change.

Stephen G. mentioned concern for the wording about artistic work and creativity in the changed theme, asking that care is taken so that wording does not drop out. Dana responded that the committees wanted to be sure that all types of scholarly work were recognized and unified under the Research theme. Jennifer R. reiterated that Faculty Senate had made its recommendations clear when these themes were originally brought before them, that scholarly works embrace both science and the arts under the common research theme. She noted the new change does not separate them and that only the theme title has been changed.

Cecile was concerned that the Prepare theme was too narrow because it left out mention of the circumpolar north and only mentions Alaska. Jennifer noted that we’re a state institution and our role is within that context. Dave V. noted the education statement is still very broad.

Ken A. commented that he sees a conflict between the mission statement and the core themes. The mission statement uses the phrase “emphasizing the circumpolar north and its diverse peoples” which qualifies the earlier part of the statement concerning teaching, research and engagement. But, in contrast, the core themes limit this emphasis to Research. He noted, however, that our primary focus is to serve the needs of the people of Alaska.

Lara H. stated again that she doesn’t want too generic of a statement. Alaska needs to be emphasized.

C. Proposed Motion to Amend the Educational Effectiveness Policy, with draft model assessment templates (for discussion only) –Susan Henrichs and Dana Thomas.
(Attachment 180/4)

Susan opened the discussion, explaining the reasons that model assessment templates were being made available. They could be used unless a program has more specialized accreditation. Programs with specialized accreditation already do a good job with assessment. If a program has a working assessment plan in place, they don’t have to change what they’re doing. The templates are examples for those who are not doing assessment well and want to improve. They are provided in response to several requests for good examples or models to follow. The templates are not actually part of the motion itself.

Dana went into more detail about some of the issues. The educational effectiveness policy has been in place since about 1997. He’s asking for a change on the second page of the motion, regarding the timing of the report so that it’s due every two years instead of four years. Doing so will mean every department chair (typically serving two-year terms) will need to address program assessment as one of their responsibilities. This will also help provide sufficient evidence of implementing outcomes assessment over time, which will make it easier to satisfy the requirements of the accreditation process and fulfill the recommendations made by the accreditors at their last visit.

Susan reiterated that the templates are meant to be helpful to programs who want a model to follow. They are not part of the motion. With planning and organization, assessment should not be an overwhelming task. It does, however, require an assessment coordinator in each program to provide organization and planning. She has talked with deans about making appropriate faculty workload considerations for program assessment. Programs, of course, vary in size and complexity, so there are great differences in how much time and effort it may take in a given area.

Sukumar B. asked what Susan’s time estimate would be for an engineering program. Susan acknowledged she wasn’t in the best position to know in terms of engineering, but that her impression was that the ABET accreditation effort probably would benefit from a staff member who supported the effort part-time to do some of the information collection and organization, and, probably at least one workload unit for a faculty member in each department to carry it out. Sukumar noted they’re spending more time assessing themselves than teaching students. Susan agreed that ABET specialized accreditation is much more complicated than most. That said, an average program is probably going to consume one workload unit of a faculty’s time (about a week’s worth), but it will vary according to the program size and complexity. Susan reiterated that assessment is an external requirement for accreditation, but that it can yield useful information to improve programs and help demonstrate value to our constituents.

Donie B. commented about the tremendous task of tracking students over time once they leave the university. She asked if the university’s central statistical unit would track them for the university. Dana T. responded that they’re looking at the Alaska Department of Labor to see if they can help with this. There are UAF programs that track their students, notably statistics and chemistry.

Cecile L. asked for a summary of why they want to move from four to two years. Dana noted the need to make it clear that it's the responsibility of every department chair during their two-year term; and, the need to demonstrate a periodic implementation of assessment during the seven-year accreditation cycle. He explained the Commission's viewpoint on this. Only 60% of our programs can demonstrate that they're improving through assessment, and the accreditors have said this is far too small. They want documented curricular improvement at a much higher rate within more programs. Provost Henrichs emphasized they want evidence of continuous and regular efforts to assess programs.

Rainer N. reminded everyone that the plan is to vote on this at the next meeting in March, and stressed that senators need to discuss this at their departments. Chancellor Rogers commented on the fact that the Northwest Commission is requesting that we do a better job. It's not only a request by university administration. Rainer commented that the two-year timeframe in the motion, however, is not a requirement by the Commission. Provost Henrichs noted past history does not support the likelihood that departments will do this better on their own; thus, the need for addressing policy to implement regular assessment more strenuously. The bottom line is the success of the institution and its accreditation.

Dana noted his own observations as an evaluator of other institutions for the Commission. Other universities ask for an annual program assessment.

Ken A. asked about a more "carrot" type of an approach, and suggested something along the lines of tuition sharing with a sliding scale – to get the full tuition-sharing benefit you must have shown assessment progress. Patrick M. commented that it could be even more positive, they get 65% for showing assessment. Ken thought incentivizing the deans in this way could be most effective in getting the task done well, rather than just having the task occur more frequently.

BREAK

VII Public Comments/Questions

No public comments were offered.

VIII Guest Speaker

- A. Claudia Lampman, Professor of Psychology, UAA
Topic: Student Incivility, Bullying and Aggression

Dr. Lampman, a UAA professor of 20 years, spoke about her own experiences ten years ago, at which time she realized there was no research about this topic. She began talking to her colleagues and learned that other faculty had experienced similar situations. She did her first study on the topic in 2005. Her initial effort yielded results from 75% of the faculty. She then interviewed 50 faculty, both men and women, who had had bad experiences. On her sabbatical she did a national study. In her presentation, she shared some of the highlights of that study, noting that at today's seminar, more in-depth details would be presented.

A handout of Dr. Lampman's PowerPoint presentation is posted online at the Faculty Senate Meetings page:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#180>

IX Governance Reports

- A. Staff Council – Pips Veazey

Pips reported about issues they're currently addressing:

- Staff Council and Staff Alliance responses to proposed changes to the tuition waiver benefit;
- Smoking and associated health care changes;
- Listening Sessions for staff about UA strategic direction (Feb 14);
- Pips and Juella are looking at different ways of representing staff to get more effective participation;
- Staff Appreciation Day in May;
- Orientation for new members at the next SC meeting.

Jane W. asked about the vote on the tuition waiver benefit and Pips reported that staff do not want to see any changes to the benefit. Jane suggested that FS discuss it, too. President Gamble wants this to come from System Governance (which it now has) and Cathy reported they did pass a motion supporting the recommendation made by Staff Council.

B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag, Robert Kinnard (Ann Williamson)

Ann Williamson of ASUAF read a statement from Mari and Robert who are in Juneau this week. They are setting up a governance forum for students, faculty and staff to get together this semester to discuss issues of common interest. Academic advising and the Stay on Track program are two of their areas of interest.

Mike D. commented the faculty would like to hear from Mari and Robert about their trip to Juneau at the next meeting.

C. UNAC – Melanie Arthur

Melanie is filling in for Debu Misra who is on sabbatical this semester.

She reported that the class action lawsuit regarding ORP Tier 1 members is progressing toward settlement. All the class members have been notified.

Membership meetings will be held this semester. The first meeting is related to the Joint Health Care Committee (she is a member). The preventive health care benefit is the topic because it has been found rather tricky to actually use.

She called for volunteers for the representative assembly, noting the election is coming up this spring. They will provide training for new members.

Lara H. asked for details on the settlement; but Melanie didn't have that information. She mentioned that members involved in the lawsuit have received letters.

Cecile L. spoke favorably of some training she got recently about reading and writing contract language and legal issues. She encouraged participation by faculty.

Donie B. asked for an update on health care. Melanie mentioned the health care rate setting meeting comes up in a month to talk about next year's rates. More information about costs will be coming up at that meeting. The tobacco surcharge has been cancelled. Regarding the tobacco issue, an alternate plan outside purview of committee is being discussed by administration. Announcements will be made soon about opportunities for wellness activities outside of the programs directly sponsored by WIN, for groups of ten or more who wish to arrange (and get reimbursement for) their own wellness activities.

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane noted her comments about health care had been covered.

- X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements
 - A. Announcements

Jane W. announced the CSW Brown Bag Lunch on “Negotiating with Deans.”

Mike D. commented about his return from a trip to Juneau with students who met with legislators. He encouraged faculty to speak with their legislators now. There are many proposals to spend the surplus money in the state’s budget.

- B. Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)
 - Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 180/5)
 - Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Chair
 - Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair
 - Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 180/6)
 - Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair
 - Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
 - Faculty Appeals & Oversight
 - Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowka, Chair (Attachment 180/7)
 - Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair (Attachment 180/8)
 - Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair (Attachment 180/9)
 - Research Advisory Committee – Peter Webley, Orion Lawlor, Co-chairs
- C. Other Comments

- XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 PM.

ATTACHMENT 180/1
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to more clearly define the academic credit hour requirements for laboratory instruction at UAF and include this definition in the UAF Catalog (currently found in the 2011-2012 UAF Catalog, page 247).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: Redefine the academic credit hour requirements for laboratory instruction to bring UAF academic policies in line with **UA Regulation 10.04.090** (emphases added below):

Evaluation of Student Performance and Course Level Definitions.

- F. Course Numbering system
- 2. Academic Credit Courses

Courses with these numbers count toward undergraduate and graduate degrees and certificates as described below. Each course includes a component for evaluation of student performance. Student effort is indicated by credit hours. **One credit hour represents three hours of student work** per week for a 15-week semester (e.g., one class-hour of lecture and two hours of study or **three class-hours of laboratory**) for a minimum of 2250 minutes of total student engagement, which may include exam periods.

[] – Deletion

CAPS – Addition

Underlined – Faculty Senate action from Meeting #175 (May 2, 2011) to be incorporated into the next Catalog.

From the 2011-2012 UAF Catalog, page 247:

Course Credits

One credit represents satisfactory completion of 800 minutes (**1 HOUR/WEEK**) of lecture, 1,600 or 2,400 minutes of laboratory (or studio or other similar activity), whichever is appropriate. (It is understood that an average student will be expected to spend 1,600 (**2 HOURS/WEEK**) minutes of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.)

LABORATORY CLASSES REQUIRE A MINIMUM OF 2400 LAB MINUTES/CREDIT (3 HOURS/WEEK/CREDIT), OR THEY REQUIRE A MINIMUM OF 1600 LAB MINUTES (2 HOURS/WEEK/CREDIT) PLUS 800 MINUTES (1 HOUR/WEEK) OF STUDY AND/OR PREPARATION OUTSIDE OF CLASS. A COURSE SUBMISSION WITH A LAB

COMPONENT MUST INCLUDE A JUSTIFICATION (IN TERMS OF REQUIRED STUDENT WORK MINUTES OUTSIDE OF LABORATORY) IF THE LABORATORY DOES NOT REQUIRE AT LEAST 2400 LAB MINUTES PER CREDIT.

The following standards establish the minimum requirements for an academic unit of credit:

1. 800 minutes of lecture (plus 1,600 minutes of study)
2. 1,600 or 2,400 minutes of laboratory (or studio or other similar activity) + **800 OR 0 MINUTES OF OUTSIDE STUDENT WORK.**
3. 2,400-4,800 minutes of supervised practicum
4. 2,400-8,000 minutes of internship (or externship, clinical)
5. 2,400-4,800 minutes of supervised scholarly activity

Credit hours may not be divided, except half-credit hours may be granted at the appropriate rate. For short courses and classes of less than one semester in duration, course hours may not be compressed into fewer than three days per credit. Any existing semester-long course that is to be offered in a "compressed to less than six weeks" format must be approved by the college or school's curriculum council and the appropriate UAF Faculty Senate committee (Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee, Core Review Committee, Curriculum Review Committee, or Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee). Any new course proposal must indicate those course compression format(s) in which the course will be taught. Only approved course formats will be allowed for scheduling.

Following the title of each course, the number of credits is listed for each semester. Thus "3 credits" means three credits may be earned. Credit may not be given more than once for a course unless the course has been designated as repeatable for credit. Figures in parentheses at the end of course descriptions indicate the number of lecture; laboratory; and practicum, internship or scholarly activity hours the class meets each week for one semester. The first number represents lecture hours; the second, laboratory; and the third, practicum, internship or scholarly activity. For example (2+3) indicates that a class has two hours of lecture and three of laboratory work each week. A designation of (1+0+6) indicates that the course meets for one hour each week of lecture and 6 hours each week of practicum, internship or other scholarly activity.

ATTACHMENT 180/2

UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012

Submitted by the Administrative Committee

1. Draft UAF Mission Statement:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks integrates teaching, research, and engagement, emphasizing the circumpolar north and its diverse peoples, as it prepares students for careers and leading roles in their communities.

2. Revised Draft UAF Mission Statement:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks integrates teaching, research, and engagement, emphasizing the circumpolar north and its diverse peoples, as it educates students for careers, leading roles in their communities, and lifelong learning.

Current UAF Mission Statement:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks, the nation's northernmost Land, Sea and Space Grant university and international research center, advances and disseminates knowledge through teaching, research and public service with an emphasis on Alaska, the circumpolar North and their diverse peoples. UAF-- America's arctic university--promotes academic excellence, student success and lifelong learning.

ATTACHMENT 180/3
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

Draft Modification to Accreditation Core Themes:

Educate: Undergraduate and Graduate Students

REPLACE

Discover: Through Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity including an Emphasis on the North and its Peoples

WITH

Research: Create and disseminate new knowledge, insight, technology, artistic and scholarly works, with an emphasis on the circumpolar north and its peoples.

Prepare: Alaska's Career, Technical, and Professional Workforce

Connect: Alaska Native, Rural, and Urban Communities through Contemporary and Traditional Knowledge

Engage: Alaskans via Lifelong Learning, Outreach, and Community and Economic Development

ATTACHMENT 180/4
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

DRAFT MOTION for discussion only

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness policy as indicated below:

EFFECTIVE: Upon approval by the Chancellor

RATIONALE: UAF institutional and specialized accreditation requires outcomes assessment reporting and assessment is important for the continuing improvement of curricula. To ensure that outcomes assessment information is collected regularly, with no long gaps, each program is asked to prepare a report every 2 years. This is consistent with the typical two year commitments that department chairs make so each department chair will know a report must be filed during their service. In addition, this change will provide timely information to summarize the implementation and results of assessment practices reported annually to the Board of Regents as required in policy P10.06.020.

CAPS = Additions
[[]] = Deletions

UAF EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS POLICY

In accordance with its mission, the University of Alaska Fairbanks has a continuing responsibility to review and improve performance of its students, faculty, and programs. The UAF therefore establishes the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation to describe the effects of curriculum, instruction, and other institutional programs.

The process will be useful for curricular and institutional reform and will be consistent with UA Board of Regents Policy and institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

The university shall ensure the academic freedom of the academic community in the development and maintenance of this process.

The data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty. Furthermore, no student shall be denied graduation based solely upon information gathered for the educational effectiveness evaluation process.

Each faculty member's activities in developing and/or implementing programmatic and institutional educational effectiveness efforts may be summarized in the instructional section of annual evaluations and promotion and tenure files.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

- 1) Student Information
Students shall be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.
- 2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum
Evaluation of the CORE curriculum shall include course assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.
- 3) Programmatic assessment
Each degree and certificate program shall establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.
- 4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning
An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of activities and student support services will be conducted.

The chair of each department (or equivalent as identified by the Dean or Director) shall prepare a report at least **EVERY TWO YEARS** [[four years]] summarizing the Educational Effectiveness program for each certificate and degree program offered by that department. The report shall include a summary of the following:

- A. Student outcome goals and objectives of the program,
- B. The methods and criteria used to evaluate whether the goals and objectives are being met,
- C. A description of what information is collected annually, and
- D. How the results of such information are being used to improve the curriculum.

The report shall be presented to the dean or director's office **AND THE ACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT ASSISTANT IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE BY THE END OF 9-MONTH FACULTY CONTRACTS IN MAY** [[during the month of May]]. At least some information gathering for this process shall occur annually.

Once an educational effectiveness evaluation program has been implemented for the core, the core review committee of the faculty senate shall prepare a report, at least biannually, summarizing the educational effectiveness of the components of the core curriculum. This report shall be similar in content to the report described above for individual programs but shall provide a summary for the components of the core curriculum. The components of the Core may be summarized in the report on a rotational basis, but at least some information should be gathered annually.

		OR 3. Comprehensive assignments of other types, such as a report, a construction project or meal preparation (or....), can be evaluated by a standard rubric.	
	Prepared for career {Optional: Returns tend to be low}	Alumni survey addressing employment, and sufficiency of preparation to carry out job. (Should be specific as to weaknesses and strengths.) OR Written assessment of employers or employer group about skills of employed graduates. (The information can be collected orally...e.g., at an advisory committee meeting... and written down by program faculty or staff.)	Distribute at regular intervals, but at least every two years recommended except for very small programs; must maintain contact with alums to improve response rate. OR Collect information from employers at least every two years.

<date revised and by whom >

Important: At least once per year, the faculty responsible for the program must collectively review the information and decide (1) whether there is an area or area(s) where learning outcomes need improvement and (2) what changes need to be made to bring about the improvement. These could be changes in curriculum (e.g., a new course), but they also might be smaller changes. For example, there could be agreement to add additional reading or writing assignments to a given course, or to change the subject matter covered in part of a course. (3) Any changes made should be documented in the Assessment Summary Report. (4) Further, assessment information should be examined after the change(s) are implemented, to see if they have been effective.

Review is facilitated if the faculty or staff members who are primarily responsible for assessment reporting summarize the information collected before the faculty meet to consider it.

Programs with specialized accreditation that must follow an assessment plan different from this model are free to do so. Programs that have other special needs can request to use a different plan. Programs that want to collect any sort of additional information above and beyond this model are free to do so. Finally, programs that have consistently implemented a different plan for at least three years may continue with that plan if it meets basic requirements (see program review).

Note that for large programs or classes, it is fine to subsample; it's not necessary to collect or review every paper or exam from a class of 100 students; a sample size of 10/year should be adequate and more than 20 per year of a particular assignment is probably not going to add a lot of additional information. Consider culling the work of "F" students from the sample, since by definition it's not expected that they have met the intended learning outcomes.

	be low for surveys.}	employment, and sufficiency of preparation to carry out job. (Should be specific as to weaknesses and strengths.) OR Written assessment of employers or employer group about skills of employed graduates. (The information can be collected orally...e.g., at an advisory committee meeting... and written down by program faculty or staff.)	every two years recommended except for very small programs; must maintain contact with alums to improve response rate. OR Collect information from employers at least every two years.

<date revised and by whom >

Important: At least once per year, the faculty responsible for the program must collectively review the information and decide (1) whether there is an area or area(s) where learning outcomes need improvement and (2) what changes need to be made to bring about the improvement. These could be changes in curriculum (e.g., a new course), but they also might be smaller changes. For example, there could be agreement to add additional reading or writing assignments to a given course, or to change the subject matter covered in part of a course. (3) Any changes made should be documented in the Assessment Summary Report. (4) Further, assessment information should be examined after the change(s) are implemented, to see if they have been effective.

Review is facilitated if the faculty or staff members who are primarily responsible for assessment reporting summarize the information collected before the faculty meet to consider it.

Programs with specialized accreditation that must follow an assessment plan different from this model are free to do so. Programs that have other special needs can request to use a different plan. Programs that want to collect any sort of additional information above and beyond this model are free to do so. Finally, programs that have consistently implemented a different plan for at least three years may continue with that plan if it meets basic requirements (see program review).

Note that for large programs or classes, it is fine to subsample; it's not necessary to collect or review every paper or exam from a class of 100 students; a sample size of 10/year should be adequate and more than 20 per year of a particular assignment is probably not going to add a lot of additional information. Consider culling the work of "F" students from the sample, since by definition it's not expected that they have met the intended learning outcomes.

		<p>according to rubric; this should be somewhat specific as to any deficient areas.</p> <p>2. OR Thesis/project + oral defense evaluation; this should be somewhat specific as to any deficient areas..</p>	<p>2. Thesis/project committee</p>
	<p>Prepared for career in field {Optional: Returns tend to be low}</p>	<p>Alumni survey addressing employment, and sufficiency of preparation to carry out job. (Should be specific as to weaknesses and strengths.)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Written input from local employers or employer organization on specific strengths and weaknesses. (Might be gathered orally and summarized in writing by a faculty or staff member).</p>	<p>Distribute at regular intervals, but at least every two years recommended except for very small programs; must maintain contact with alums to improve response rate.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Seek input at least every two years.</p>

<date revised and by whom >

Important: At least once per year, the faculty responsible for the program must collectively review the information and decide (1) whether there is an area or area(s) where learning outcomes need improvement and (2) what changes need to be made to bring about the improvement. These could be changes in curriculum (e.g., a new course), but they also might be smaller changes. For example, there could be agreement to add additional reading or writing assignments to a given course, or to change the subject matter covered in part of a course. (3) Any changes made should be documented in the Assessment Summary Report. (4) Further, assessment information should be examined after the change(s) are implemented, to see if they have been effective.

Review is facilitated if the faculty or staff members who are primarily responsible for assessment reporting summarize the information collected before the faculty meet to consider it.

Programs with separate accreditation that must follow an assessment plan different from this model are free to do so. Programs that have special needs can request to use a different plan. Programs that want to collect any sort of additional information above and beyond this model are free to do so. Finally, programs that have consistently implemented a different plan for at least three years may continue with that plan if it meets basic requirements (see program review).

ATTACHMENT 180/5
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

**Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes
Nov 23 2011, 3:30-4:30 pm Kayak**

Voting Members present: Anthony Arendt, Jungho Baek, Carrie Baker, Retchenda George-Bettisworth (audio), Diane McEachern (audio), Debra Moses (audio), Rainer Newberry, Todd Radenbaugh (audio), Dave Valentine. Voting Members absent: Brian Himelbloom.

Non-voting members present: Linda Hapsmith (audio), Carol Gering, Pete Pinney, GERC Chair Alex Fitts. Non-voting members absent: Doug Goering, Mike Earnest, Lillian Anderson-Misel.
Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

- **OLD Business**

- **Approval of November meetings minutes**

November 9 minutes were approved as submitted.

- **Recent GERC issues report¹ and related-- Official approval of GERC membership? Approval of Bethany Marx as Carrie's spring 2012 replacement?²**

Alex Fitts submitted notes (attachment #1) for the Committee's information. Discussion followed regarding representation on the GERC for CEM. Rajive G. does not wish to continue, but a replacement has not been identified. The seat will be noted as "vacant" until filled. Mike Koskey will represent CRCDD; and Bethany Marx (attachment #2) will fill in for Carrie Baker who is going on maternity leave in Spring 2012.

GERC next meets on December 2 and 16.

- **Stacked courses report (Anthony Arendt)**

Anthony reported that online surveys have been sent to faculty who've taught stacked courses. The next step will be to send surveys out to students who've taken stacked courses.

- **CHANGES IN 'I' POLICY.... Change form, not requirements !?!**

Feedback from faculty included the common theme that no one wanted more hoops to jump through. A shorter time frame for completion (one full semester following the semester where the Incomplete was granted) was generally favored. Revising the actual form was discussed and possibly adding checkboxes on it for different time frames – but there's no way to police that. Still, a paper record was favored over an electronic one. Carol G. mentioned their CDE database notifies students about their incompletes. Rainer wants to meet with the Registrar's Office and discuss some sort of grade report to help track them better. Linda H. commented that the departments need a list of their Incompletes from the Registrar's Office.

How to educate faculty about a change was discussed. Rainer suggested that the information come to faculty at the department level, via deans to chair council meetings to department meetings. Faculty Senators could also be asked to report to their departments but should not be the only means of getting the word out. Rainer will talk about this at Administrative Committee and Faculty Senate.

Ideas for disincentives to students to help discourage them from asking for an incomplete were discussed. They included charging money for it, putting a limit of I's one could get in their

academic career, and charging points against their grade for an extension. The problem of repeat offenders was mentioned.

- **Proposed motion:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered wholly or in part by **ASYNCHRONOUS** distance delivery, and all existing courses adapted or converted to **ASYNCHRONOUS** distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the Faculty Senate -- continue sitting on this puppy???

Several committee members noted that their faculty feel this is a departmental issue and departments should police it. Rainer noted the issue had actually come up because of an undergraduate course being offered by a department that doesn't have an undergraduate program. Currently there's nothing to trigger a review of courses that is associated with delivery mode changes. It's not obvious from looking at the catalog descriptions, for example, what various modes of delivery exist for courses.

(This topic was the last to be discussed right before it was time to adjourn the meeting.)

- **Review of BOR policies lab credit hour distribution --we're not in compliance!!**
Transfer policies -- not in compliance? A+??? **ANYTHING ELSE????**

B. NEW BUSINESS:

1. SUBMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF: Baking and Pastry Arts Certificate

Rainer provided background on the program and the fact that it's not technically a new one but has been split out of an existing certificate where it had only been a concentration. By splitting it out it can better fulfill demand. It articulates easily into the A.A.S. for Culinary Arts. The committee approved moving it on to the December 5 Faculty Senate meeting.

2. Motion to Faculty Senate:

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the title of the general education objectives and student learning outcomes adopted by the UAF Faculty Senate at Meeting #175 on May 2, 2011 to clarify the undergraduate degrees to which the objectives and learning outcomes apply.

Proposed new wording: General education objectives and learning outcomes for the undergraduate students seeking Baccalaureate, AA, and AS degrees at the University of Alaska Fairbanks:

EFFECTIVE: Spring 2012

Rationale

In May 2011, the General Education Revitalization Committee proposed a new set of objectives and student learning outcomes intended to be used for all of UAF's baccalaureate degrees and two of UAF's associate degrees. These were adopted by the UAF Faculty Senate at meeting #175, held May 2, 2011, for the purposes of developing the next general education strategy and the strategies to be used in assessing it. Through unintentional oversight, only BA and BS degrees were listed, omitting the six other baccalaureate degrees offered at UAF. The proposed amendment brings the wording in line with the intended scope of the general education objectives and student learning outcomes.

Rainer and Dave explained the need for the changed wording – to more correctly capture all baccalaureate degrees at the university. The committee approved the change and recommended putting it forth to the senate as presented above.

3. Suggested change in FS Bylaws:

Add to CAC's one-sentence membership statement in the bylaws, the sentence:

"In addition to the ex officio member(s) appointed by the Provost, the committee may add ex officio members for one-year terms as deemed necessary."

The committee agreed to add the statement to their bylaws. Rainer will take a motion to the Administrative Committee and then to the Faculty Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 PM.

¹Nov. 23, 2011 GERC Notes

Committee members Fall 2011:

- Dave Valentine, SNRAS
- Leah Berman, CNSM
- Anne Armstrong, SoED
- Alex Fitts, CLA – Chair
- Greg Goering, SOM
- Dana Thomas, Vice Provost
- Mike Koskey CRCD ?
- Carrie Baker, CLA (Bethany Marks SP 2012?)
- Derek Burleson, CLA
- Gerald McBeath, CLA
- Sarah Fowell, CNSM
- Linda Hapsmith, Academic Advising Center
- Mahla Strohmaier, CRCD
- Still no member from CEM

The committee's charge for this year is to implement the Student Learning Outcomes and Objectives that were passed last year. We are beginning by looking at a few different models of how some other institutions have handled this (mainly schools that have also adopted LEAP objectives). This could take the form of a strict core, a distribution model, a series of designators, a hybrid model, or even something entirely different. We have also discussed the possibility of a first-year experience and/ or a capstone experience. For the next meeting, committee members have been asked to come up with a draft of what a model that would work at UAF might look like, given Board of Regents policy, degree requirements, deans' recommendations, and ramifications for transfer students from within the UA system and from elsewhere.

²Bethany Marx is an Assistant Professor of Theatre in her third year at UAF. She is willing and able to serve as Carrie Baker's replacement on GERC for Spring 2012. During her time at UAF, Bethany has revised existing courses and designed many new courses for the Department of Theatre and served as the point person to the appropriate committees for those curricular changes.

ATTACHMENT 180/6
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes for Tues, Dec 13, 2011
1:30-3:00 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Melanie Arthur, Ellen Lopez, Shawn Russell, Derek Sikes, Kayt Sunwood, Jane Weber, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Nilima Hullavarad
Members absent: Jessica Larsen, Jenny Liu, Johnny Payne

- **BOR Policy and Regulations**

CSW has been assigned the task to review some of the Board of Regents Policy and Regulations, details found on website: <http://www.alaska.edu/bor/policy-regulations/>.

Shawn mentioned at the last meeting that only some sections have mention of 'sexual orientation', whereas some sections have left it out. Changes were suggested to various sections including:

P04.01.020 to improve the treatment of the term 'discrimination' and make it consistent with usage throughout the Policy and Regulations. To reduce redundancy this section was referred to from other sections rather than repeating the text, which originally was often not identical.

P04.01.061 to strike the requirement for prior written request by employees to see their files.

P04.02.024 'Consensual Sexual Relations' appears to lack any negative consequences other than a determination that the behavior of the supervisor is unprofessional and/or an abuse of power. Should this section be strengthened?

Brown Bag Committee - topic: "Negotiating Workloads" Paul Layer & Johnny Payne will participate. Feb 16th, 1-2pm; March 22, 1-2pm "Career Development Mapping" with Susan Henrichs. Location TBD.

Next Meetings - Friday Feb 17th, 10-11AM; Friday March 30, 10-11AM.
Meeting was adjourned at 3:20

Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

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

ATTACHMENT 180/7

UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Minutes of the Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee

November 15, 2011

Attending: Cindy Hardy, Dana Greci, Sandra Wildfeuer, Amy Barnsley, Sarah Stanley, Curt Szuberla, David Maxwell, Deseree Salvador

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

BOR Policy: Cindy e-mailed the portions of the BOR policy we have been asked to review for the Faculty Alliance. We will address these at the next meeting.

Learning Commons Update: The Learning Commons subcommittee met with Bella Gerlich, Dean of the Rasmuson Library. She suggested that the Learning Commons might be more appropriate on the 4th floor rather than the 3rd floor, as we had been discussing. She noted that the Learning Commons is on the Library Strategic Plan, which will be discussed in January. She also wants to evaluate student needs, though the subcommittee did a needs assessment last year before she arrived. She does not want to rush the process, though she acknowledged all that we have done in this process.

Gerlich has offered us two tables and dividers to be set up on the third floor next semester. These can be reserved for tutoring and may be used by students when they are not reserved.

We discussed the delay of the learning center/learning commons process—and this means more delay since the original Faculty Senate motion mandating the establishment of a learning center. We discussed strategies for moving this process along. Some frustration was expressed.

SADA Committee definition: We looked at the committee definition in the Faculty Senate Handbook. It needs to be updated to fit the current name of CTC, at least. We also looked at the committee description and considered changes. We reviewed the representation of interested groups in committee membership. Cindy will draw up a draft motion to change the committee definition and bring it to the next meeting.

Data requests: Dana Greci reported on data being requested by the Department of Developmental Education. They will be looking at incoming students placing in DEV courses and their enrollment, grade distributions in DEV classes, pass rates in subsequent classes, grades at 24 credits, and grades in next college-level course. David suggested that we look at the entire incoming class to look for high rates of failure and repeated failure. Sarah is also interested in learning factors impacting students receiving D, F, I, W, or NB grades. We discussed what data may already exist and what we can do with the data. We are primarily concerned with finding out who are the students who need the most help. We also discussed how to generate data on what outside the classroom impacts students.

We considered that the Advising Center and Dana Thomas' office may be tracking some of this data. Cindy will contact Dana to invite him to a meeting next semester.

We continued the discussion, ranging across topics such as what the data could reveal about pedagogy, the impact of tuition waivers on success, comparison of this data at UAF and similar universities, the possibility of putting together a faculty development workshop that addresses this data, and the

possibility that—at least in math classes—failure is often simply a matter of lack of skills. We will continue this discussion and develop action items at the December meeting.

Next meeting: December 13, 12:30-2pm.

ATTACHMENT 180/8

UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for December 13, 2011**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 10:05 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Castellini, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Julie Joly, Alexandra Oliveira, Channon Price

Excused: Stephen Brown, Joy Morrison

Absent: Franz Meyer

III. Report from Joy

Joy will be gone for December and January.

Diane reported that Libby Roderick's presentation on Difficult Discussions was well attended: over 20 faculty members came and enjoyed the hands-on workshop. There were a lot of questions, and faculty indicated further interest in this topic.

UNAC will be sponsoring the next faculty development opportunity in February on the topic of bullying.

IV. Old Business

1. Faculty survey

Josef met again with Cyndee West to discuss UNAC putting together the survey on faculty development, but Cyndee requested that our committee provide a list of topics to include on the survey. We discussed the issue of restricting the survey to UAF faculty only and including UAFT faculty as well. Mike reminded us that we need to include all UAF faculty, not just those that are present in Fairbanks. As the future UNAC VP, Melanie Arthur will be helpful in creating the survey. She has a lot of experience developing surveys, and she has a lot of experience with our committee as a former member.

We discussed including the following topics on the survey:

1. What kinds of sessions do faculty want?
2. What kind of feedback is there on recent sessions?
3. How are faculty meeting their development needs?
4. Sessions on globalization – what do international faculty members need, and how can we be more aware of these needs and therefore more helpful?
5. What are the needs of more experienced faculty?

The FDAI committee also discussed whether Joy can have a ranking system based on need since junior faculty have the greatest need and can no longer be given preference for funding based on their newness.

Josef indicated that Cyndee brought up the accountability issue as well – that faculty are seeking travel funding for relevant conferences, not just their particular favorites.

Special guest Melanie Arthur was unable to make our meeting today due to time conflicts. We look forward to having her join us in a future meeting.

2. Policy and Regulations Review

Mike sent out a repaired spreadsheet since many of the links in the original did not work correctly. We discussed the difficulty of finding “red flags” since so much of the information is out of our committee’s purview. Within the realm of our various experiences, however, we did not find any red flags and do not feel that any changes are necessary, but we are thankful for the opportunity to serve.

V. New Business

Channon started a discussion of the CLA workload changes. Teaching is going from 5 courses per year to 6 courses per year. This represents a 20 per cent increase. What is being taken off the workload to compensate for this adjustment? Some of the points we discussed were a reduction in the areas of scholarly activity, service, advising, and graduate student committees. Will there be hires of academic advisors at the college level, and how will those advisors keep current with all the subtle details of how to satisfy degree requirements? How will these changes affect evaluations for faculty tenure? Our committee voiced much concern over these questions.

VI. Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 31, 2012, 8:15 – 9:15 am, Bunnell 222

VII. Adjourned at 10:56 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 180/9
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate
2011-12-06 Meeting Minutes**

Voting Members: Orion Lawlor, Sue Renes, Donie Bret-Harte, Elisabeth Nadin
Guest: Lillian Misel

We continue to work our way through our curriculum list.

FISH 645, 670, and 672 (2-4 GNC) are approved.

16-GPCh is approved.

The counseling internship III and IV courses 29-GNC and 30-GNC are approved, even without an instructor assigned yet.

Discuss policies for post-baccalaureate certificates: are these under the purview of the graduate school? There are currently only three such programs, in [Construction Management](#), [Statistics](#), and [Education](#).

- Pro: students already apply to the graduate admissions process, pay graduate tuition, get graduate financial aid, and are taking 600-level courses. If they weren't under the graduate school, where would they go?
- Con: students don't file advancement to candidacy like more typical Master's degrees, and some may not even have Bachelor's degrees yet.

The graduate school added a new requirement for an exit survey, asking graduating graduate students their opinions on UAF. Some have wondered how an anonymous survey can be required for graduation; the way this works is students print the end-of-survey page and turn it in to the graduate college.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Jan 24 at 3pm.

**GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate
2011-11-22 Meeting Minutes**

Voting Members: Orion Lawlor, Vincent Cee, Chung-Sang Ng, Sue Renes, Donie Bret-Harte, Elisabeth Nadin, Xiong Zhang
Ex officio: Timothy Bartholomaeus, Anita Hughes, Karen Jensen, Larry Duffy
Guest: Lillian Misel

We worked our way through all the courses ready for approval on [our curriculum list](#).

Approved this meeting:

- 8-GNC: New GEOS 436/636 – Programming and Automation for Geoscientists, a 2 credit pass/fail course on using matlab and shell scripts for automated data analysis.
- 10-GCDR: Drop GEOS 434/634 – Remote sensing of Cryosphere, an elective that was rarely offered after the instructor left UAF.
- 11-GPCh: Rename the Wildlife PhD as Wildlife Biology & Conservation, instead of being a concentration within Biological Sciences.

- 21-GNC: New GEOS 431/631 Foundations of Geophysics, a single-course replacement for 620 and 602 proposed by those courses' instructors.
- 23-GNC: New GEOG 6xx: Sustainable Livelihoods and Community Well-Being, a new elective on sustainability.

GAAC approved the mouldy course drops from ED, CEM, Biology, Chemistry, and Wildlife, all listed at the [bottom of the GAAC curriculum page](#).

President Gamble has asked the faculty senates to review the [UA Policy & Regulations](#) for readability, relevance, and consistency with the law and our [collective bargaining agreement](#). GAAC has been assigned [Chapter 09.05. Employment of Students](#), and (once the Provost's office has reviewed it) [Chapter 10.02. Academic Administrative Organization](#). Step one is to flag anything we think may need changing by mid January; by the middle of spring semester we should be finished with our review, at which point we'll trade sections with UAA's faculty senate.

CNSM Dean Layer would like to adjust the Annual Report of Advisory Committee requirements, to make them every year (not just the second year) and always include a plan (not just those within two years of the graduation limit). Many departments do file these every year already; probably a majority of students already do these. Some departments have vociferously opposed the more frequent reporting in the past. It might be difficult for a first-year PhD students to produce a plan; or for overworked advisors to produce more reports. Nonetheless, GAAC recommends accepting Dean Layer's plan.

Discuss policies for post-baccalaureate certificates: are these under the purview of the graduate school? There are currently only three such programs, in [Construction Management](#), [Statistics](#), and [Education](#). Discussion will continue online.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Dec 6 at 3pm.