DRAFT MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #181
Monday, March 5, 2012
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds for Cathy Cahill

    A.   Roll Call

Members Present:	Members Present (cont'd):
Abramowicz, Ken	Reynolds, Jennifer
Baek, Jungho	Short, Margaret
Baker, Carrie (Jun Watabe)	Valentine, David
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar	Weber, Jane
Barboza, Perry (audio)	Winfree, Cathy
Bret-Harte, Donie	
Brown, Stephen (audio)	Members Absent:
Cahill, Cathy (Travel status)	Alexeev, Vladimir
Davis, Mike (video)	Arendt, Anthony
Fallen, Chris	Lardon, Cecile
George-Bettisworth, Retchenda (audio)	Metzger, Andrew
Golux, Stephan	Zhang, Xiong
Gustafson, Karen	
Healy, Joanne	
Henry, David	Non-voting/Administrative
Himelbloom, Brian (audio)	Members Present:
Horstmann, Lara	Melanie Arthur
Jensen, Karen	Mike Earnest
Johnston, Duff	Susan Henrichs
Joly, Julie	Paul Layer
Jones, Debra	Brian Rogers
Lawlor, Orion	Dana Thomas
Mathis, Jeremy (audio)	Eric Madsen
McEachern, Diane (audio)	Jon Dehn, Past President
Meyer, Franz	Robert Kinnard
Moses, Debra (Cindy Hardy)	Mari Freitag
Nadin, Elisabeth	
Newberry, Rainer	
Ng, Chung-Sang	
Radenbaugh, Todd (video)	
Renes, Sue	

B.		Approval of Minutes to Meeting #180

The minutes were approved as submitted.

C.		Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with a change to the order of items under New Business. Item F was moved up to follow item B.

II	STATUS OF CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE ACTIONS
A.	Motions Approved:
1.	Motion to Define the Academic Credit Hour Requirements for Laboratory Instruction
B.	Motions Pending: None

III	A.	President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer gave an update regarding the Strategic Direction listening sessions that were held in February. She also mentioned the feedback form available to everyone on the Statewide web site.

The eLab task force, set up by Faculty Alliance to look at science labs offered by distance delivery, has completed their recommended draft policy. It's being sent out to deans, directors and department chairs, as well as the Faculty Senate members for feedback. Please look at it and share it with other faculty and collect feedback. The intent, if feedback is positive, is to have Faculty Senate consider adopting the policy. While it's directed at science labs, Jennifer urged those with non-science labs to examine it as well, since it could be adapted later on for application to non-science labs.

Faculty Alliance has not addressed the Stay on Track and Complete College America programs that have been put forward by Statewide. But, with eLabs policy now at the three Faculty Senates, they are now the top priority for discussion. Jennifer will update everyone at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

IV	A.	Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

The Chancellor reported on his work in Juneau on budget related issues. Generally, the mood toward the University was positive. On the operating side, the university's budget had the smallest increase requested in years. Last year, the Legislature had asked that the university come up with non-state funds to cover half of its requests, and the university came up with more than half of those funds. This has favorably impressed the legislators. To reward that effort, when the budget is moved forward in full committee they will add the academic advising increment (our top priority), and funding for the College of Engineering and Mines, back into it. The Senate expects to add to the House request for the university, so there may be some programmatic growth in the budget. Between now and the April Faculty Senate meeting, most of the action in Juneau will be concerning the operating budget. The capital budget will be addressed in the first half of April.

Mentioning a significant item of concern, the Chancellor said the House Finance Committee took up a supplemental appropriation bill which included funding for all legal claims against the state, including the ORP settlement. The Committee has split non-controversial items to a "fast track" and controversial items to a "slow track." State funding for the ORP1 settlement is in the "slow track," which is unexpected and raises some concern. An appropriation funding the settlement agreed to by the union and the university is needed this year. Chancellor Rogers will return to Juneau to work on this issue. He'll know more next week about the situation.

The Chancellor heard the Strategic Direction listening session for Fairbanks faculty. A concern brought up at that session was smart classrooms funding. He explained that not all the money had been spent because the classrooms couldn't be ready by the beginning of the school year; but the money is set aside and ready to be spent during the next construction season.

Debra J. asked if Listening Sessions topics have been posted online. The Chancellor mentioned the email summaries he's received for external sessions; and, he was able to get a tape which he asked for. Jennifer R. stated that only a selection of comments has been shared in the newsletters which are being posted on the Strategic Directions web site.
http://www.alaska.edu/shapingalaskasfuture/updates/

Dave V. asked what happens to the ORP settlement if an appropriation to fund it isn't secured. The Chancellor can't speculate, but he hopes not to reach that bridge. Jennifer R. mentioned the statement from the union lawyers that if the legislature doesn't pass the appropriation, then the lawsuit will resume.

      B.   Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs reported on the recent Board of Regents meeting. Academic Affairs approved the Baking and Pastry Arts Certificate. They discussed program review at the three MAUs, and Regents remain interested to see a diligent and frequent program review process. Regents are also interested in looking at the new degree and certificate programs passed in the last five years to see how they're doing, and requests for information about those will be made in the near future.

An update was given on the program review outcomes. Letters have gone out to every program, and if a recommendation for discontinuation was made, the program has an opportunity to appeal. Appeals are heard by the Chancellor's Cabinet. If no appeal is made, then the appropriate paperwork for the Faculty Senate is filed to eliminate the program. Whether or not there are students in the degree program is an issue, however, as they must graduate any currently enrolled students. Admission to the program would be suspended in the meantime. All programs recommended for deletion are within departments that already have other offerings. There will be no loss of departments.

      C.   Vice Provost's Remarks – Dana Thomas

Work continues on the Accreditation Steering Committee to refine the core themes, objectives and indicators. The UAF mission statement is being revised. A survey will be distributed with four draft mission statements which respondents can rank, as well as suggest changes. Please watch for that survey.

Work by the General Education Revitalization Committee continues. Alex Fitts, committee chair, just returned from a national conference, and five committee members will attend a general education institute in June to learn more about what is happening nationally on the topic. A Faculty Senate motion to revise the core is planned for late next fall.

V   New Business
      A.   Call for Nominations for President-Elect of the Faculty Senate, 2012-2013

Jennifer issued a call for nominations. Voting will take place at the next meeting. Nominees should send a personal statement to the Faculty Senate office for sharing and distribution in advance of the voting.

B.   Motion to Amend the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science
        Degree Requirements, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/1)

Rainer N. explained the reasoning behind the motion, noting an attempt to pass a similar one several years ago that was stalled to gain more support from CLA. This time there is more involvement and support from CLA. The motion permits a very limited amount of double-counting of credits, which mainly affects the B.A. degrees and counting "excess" credits in a major to count toward the 18 credits of Social Science and Humanities requirements. Linda Hapsmith commented on the effect the motion will have in Academic Advising. Jane W. asked if this information will be in the advising manual; and Linda noted it will be in DegreeWorks in the fall. Mike Earnest gave some examples of how this policy would actually be applied.

A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

C.   Motion to Amend the Educational Effectiveness Policy, submitted by
        Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/2)

Note: Item F was addressed before this item, as per the approved amendment to the agenda.

Rainer brought the motion to the floor with the simple explanation that this needs to be done. Jennifer noted the primary change in the motion is to require programs to report every two years on student outcomes (educational effectiveness).

A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

D.   Motion to Approve an Updated Procedure for the Program
        Review Process, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 181/3)

Jennifer asked Dana Thomas to outline the motion. Dana reminded the Faculty Senate that the proposal had come before them in fall 2010, providing some history and explaining the need for it. The cycle of review will continue to be a five-year cycle, as per BOR policy. The principle changes include the set of questions which follow the BOR policy, the evaluation form, and confirmation of the five-year cycle of review. Jennifer asked if it was fair to say this is an evolution of the questions and methods used in the current year, and makes the current process permanent. Dana affirmed that the procedure is much cleaner and is an evolution from what had been proposed in 2010.

A vote was taken on the motion, and it carried unanimously.

E.   Motion to Clarify the Academic Honors Policy, submitted by Curricular
        Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/4)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor, stating it's a simple clarification, changing "and" to "or" to avoid the misunderstanding that students have had about whether or not they can make both the Dean's List and the Chancellor's List. It's one or the other, not both.

A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

F.   Motion to Approve a New "Directed Study" Category of Registration,
        submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/5)

Rainer introduced the motion, stating it's a great idea. In the past, faculty have taught courses as Individual Study to students who missed registering for an existing course, or couldn't take the course in its usual offering sequence.   This often requires petitions later on when students need to get the course on their transcripts. The motion makes it possible to offer existing courses as Directed Study, and the course shows up on the students' transcripts with its usual designator and a notation showing it was taught as "DS" (for Directed Study).   Dana noted the course would also show up in DegreeWorks as fulfilling requirements.

Margaret S. asked about why courses are offered in this manner. She has had requests by students for Independent Study courses, and it's a very time consuming task to take on. Will the creation of Directed Study make it more difficult to turn such requests down? Rainer responded that it's not meant to add pressure on faculty to do this for students. The matter is really between the instructor, the department chair and the dean because faculty workload is impacted. It's intended that the form will require the dean's signature because of the workload issue. From time to time there is a legitimate need for these types of courses because students need a course that's only offered every other year or every third year, for example.

Todd R. noted that there are rural students who need a course that is not offered at a rural campus. Having this mechanism would be beneficial for them.

Elisabeth N. expressed concerns about the ease of transferring credit for such courses. Mike E. said having Directed Study actually will make it easier for his office to respond to inquiries from other universities who have questions about the course, because it will already exist in the catalog and will not require the documentation they must provide for Independent Study courses. He noted a very high percentage of Independent Study courses are actually existing catalog courses.

Dave V. emphasized that the intent is not to take the place of any existing courses, but to take the place of Independent Study courses where it's appropriate.

Linda H. noted that it would help eliminate a significant number of petitions of Independent Study courses.

Ken A. asked about the matter of course equivalency. Rainer responded that they are still working on the requirements on the form, but the intent is for the faculty signature to allege/guarantee/affirm that such offerings are equivalent to normally offered courses.

Stephen G. commented that he's offered Independent Study courses and feels that they are rather lightweight, which seems appropriate for a true Independent Study course. With regard to Directed Study, however, he asked if there would be a different mechanism to address the faculty workload, and, if that mechanism needs to be included as policy in the motion under consideration. Rainer said this was discussed at Curricular Affairs, and they had decided that discussion about workload could be handled separately from the motion.

Susan Henrichs noted this part of the discussion is potentially a CBA matter, and it must be handled separately. Two routes this workload discussion can take include: 1.) the substantive academic judgment of the dean (which means there can't be a universal policy); and 2.) an agreement that is reflected in the CBA (or memorandum of agreement added to it).

Sukumar mentioned the usefulness of having Directed Study courses in graduate level programs where student enrollment can be too low for a regular course.

Ken A. asked if there are any restrictions on which faculty can teach a course. Since this gets around the petition process, is there anything to stop a faculty from teaching any course he chooses? Dana and Rainer responded that the plan is to require the department chair and dean signatures on the form.

Melanie A. asked if requiring the department chair's signature is because the course will have to go on the workload. Rainer noted requiring department chair signature serves a number of reasons, including the fact that the department chair is responsible for ensuring qualified faculty teach courses. Dana noted that the department chair can choose not to approve the Directed Study offering, if, for example, it's felt the course is otherwise available to the student and will not hold up their progress.

Elisabeth N. asked about Directed Study being used as a means to teach new courses, and it was clarified that is not the intention. DS can only be used for teaching existing courses.

David H. asked about expected student contact hours for Directed Study. Rainer affirmed that if it's a three-credit course, those contact hours are expected with DS courses.

Mike E. added that by creating the Directed Study category, they are not advocating that it happen more often. They just want to make it easier for advising, and for degree audits to work better. Jennifer noted her impression that this motion does not make it easier for these courses to happen, but it makes it easier to report the course in the student's transcript, and, ideally, to show in the faculty workload.

A vote was taken on the motion to create Directed Study as a registration category, and the ayes carried the motion (with five abstentions, no nays).

> G.   Motion to Amend the Student Academic Development and Achievement
>   Committee Definition in the Faculty Senate Bylaws, submitted by the
>   Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee (Attachment 181/6)

Cindy H. brought the motion to the floor, explaining its housekeeping aspects and noting the large committee membership. They added the wording "at large" to the CNSM membership, and removed a redundant sentence.

A vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

BREAK

VI   Public Comments/Questions

No public comments were made.

VII   Guest Speaker
>   A.   Eric Madsen and Dana Thomas
>   Topic: Electronic Annual Activity Reporting Software
>   See Handout: "Data180-DigitalMeasures_SideBySideComparsion" at:
>   http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#181

Dana described his and Eric Madsen's efforts to identify software packages for electronic faculty activity reporting. He shared that his primary motivation is accreditation information gathering, related to both institutional and specialized accreditation. They get requests for many state reports along with ad hoc reports. This requires multiple requests for information to faculty, and other excessive efforts to assemble information from individual activity reports.

Dana and Eric arranged for the demonstration of four packages to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Two packages, FolioTek and TaskStream, were quickly eliminated. He described the two remaining software packages (Data180 and Activity Insight), and brought the handout to everyone's attention. OIT is assessing data security on the two packages. He urged the Faculty Senate to consider presentations from each of the vendors so that a choice isn't made by just a small handful of people.

Eric thanked those faculty who had participated in the vendor presentations to date. He suggested holding presentations that are longer than one hour to allow for discussion and questions.

Jennifer noted the two very different needs that these software packages must address: the university's need for information, and the faculty's need for performance evaluation through reporting their activities. Who has access to the information is also of concern. The primary need is software that will accomplish both needs in a manner that works well for all concerned.

Dana responded that both of the software options being considered allow access to the database to be applied and filtered to safeguard it, and reports can be specialized and run to collect aggregate data. There would be agreements among all the users about implementing different types of reports and potential uses of the data.

A request was made to have vendor's handouts shared in advance of their presentations. This request will be accommodated.

Elisabeth N. wanted to know if implementing electronic activity reporting is imminent and if it's too late to object. Jennifer responded that it's not too late to make concerns known, but that specifics about those concerns need to be shared so that it can be determined if they can be addressed by the software or not. Elisabeth wanted to know what benefits there might be to adopting new software. Dana responded that the current method of using the Word document, while electronic, still produces 678 individual reports that are not conducive to pulling out data needed for reporting purposes. Jennifer noted the benefit to the faculty as well, including the ability generate their own reports (CVs, for example), and entering the information once into the system and not having to do it again. Some of these systems can link to external databases, such as the Web of Science. She saw this as a means of reducing the work involved for faculty to do reporting.

Lara H. mentioned her concern about formatting issues, and having the ability to use copy and paste functions. Dana responded that copy and paste works very well in the new software, which is not as clunky as it was several years ago. Publications can be hyperlinked in the reports, or fed into online CVs. Eric commented about the difference between creating static documents (as we do now) and creating a database that can generate many kinds of useful reports for a wide variety of purposes. It was noted that course enrollment information could be loaded from Banner rather than hand-entered.

Jon Dehn mentioned positive features such as the availability of the database to the faculty 365 days of the year, the ability to automatically update one's web page, creating a variety of reports like bios and CVs, and helping with Banner entry for grants. He noted that a current problem with Banner exists for those who have a multiple investigator grant. Banner only shows the principal investigator and leaves

out the co-PIs. Using either of the new systems, Banner could be gradually updated to include all co-investigators.

Dave V. asked, regarding Digital Measures, if its course evaluation option would also be adopted. Dana said that's a separate issue and still to be determined whether it would be included.

Donie B. commented about the software testing with Digital Measures several years ago, recalling that faculty concluded that using the software just took too long. Will there be testing this time, too? Dana said the vendors could be asked. Susan H. said they'd need to ask for a trial version before purchasing it. She also said that using the software would be phased in gradually. Faculty could choose to use it the first year, or not. Lara H. asked about workload adjustments for the first go-around. Jennifer said it's not clear that it will take longer and suggested discussing it with one's dean if that turns out to be the case.

Ken A. said either software package would work. Data180 only has five employees, though, and he wondered what the impact would be if something happened to the CEO, for example. The Activity Insight software is produced by a larger organization with some Ivy League institutions using it. He thinks there might be more institutional support available from the vendor. Implementation is not what he's concerned about, however. Rather, his concerns are more at the macro-level, by having a faculty evaluation function taken over by an administrative concern. He doesn't want a numbers game promoted by the change. UAF is more like a private school than a big school that turns on numbers. Being able to include more qualitative aspects of working with students is one of the strengths of UAF, and he worries about that being lost. The possibility of behavioral implications affecting the units was mentioned, using the example of what has occurred with the 60% tuition kickback type of effects.

Lara asked if this software will work for MAP agents or other types of faculty. Eric and Dana both noted that the ability to customize the software was looked at in both cases. Both packages are very customizable for different types of faculty reporting needs.

Eric noted that the vendors have produced bids based on numbers of varying types of faculty and units that we have. The vendors made that part of their cost structure in order to cover all the university's differences. The software also accommodates specialized accreditations.

Karen G. expressed concern, from what she observed of just one software package, that the creative arts, creative writing, and the performing arts were not well accommodated. She doesn't want these areas to be marginalized in a numbers game. Dana said the software must have the same inclusiveness that they have now in the current process, stressing they want to move in a better direction, not backward.

Concerns were expressed about implementation issues such as who would generate reports and how they would be used, and Dana assured faculty that these types of issues would be discussed with Faculty Senate.

Jennifer asked about the level of interest in the room for seeing vendor presentations, noting that all faculty are welcome to be involved. A show of hands indicated broad interest in having vendors do presentations. Rural senators also expressed interest in having the presentations.

VIII   Governance Reports
      A.   Staff Council – Pips Veazey

Jennifer read the following report submitted by Pips on behalf of Staff Council:

UAF Staff Council Governance Report for Faculty Senate Meeting #181 – March 5, 2012
Staff Council is working on a number of important issues this semester:

- Staff Council recently passed a motion requesting the University of Alaska re-examine current geographic differentials in light of more recent cost of living surveys. This action will be formally presented to Staff Alliance in March.
- UAF Staff Council is reviewing its internal structure to assess whether or not restructuring of the organization is needed for Staff Council to become a more effective organization.
- Staff Council officers are working with Vice President of Academic Affairs Dr. Dan Julius and other statewide governance leaders including Dr. Cahill to ensure that, in the wake of Pat Ivey's retirement, the System Governance office has a smooth transition to new leadership.
- The Council is working to support its ad hoc Staff Appreciation Day Committee in planning and preparing for 2012 Staff Appreciation Day, which is scheduled for Wednesday, May 16.

      B.   ASUAF – Mari Freitag, Robert Kinnard

Mari shared about their trip to Juneau, where along with 25-30 students representing all three MAUs, they met with many legislators. They talked about the Governor's budget, particularly the operating budget which had a cut to it of six million dollars. This concerned the students a lot because of its effect on funding for initiatives for improved graduation rates, and the 2+2 veterinarian program. They advocated for needs- and merit-based scholarships as well as deferred maintenance. The speaker of the Coalition of Students and the speaker pro tem spoke before the House finance subcommittee. Representative Faircroft was receptive to their testimony, and she's proposing some amendments to the budget. Because of that ASUAF is rallying students to testify on Wednesday at the Legislative Information Office regarding some issues. She, Robert, and another student leader will return to Juneau during spring break and follow up with their contacts.

The Strategic Direction student listening session went pretty well. They had good comments for Statewide.

They may reduce their ASUAF senate to 14-16 members instead of 20. They will hold elections during SpringFest at the end of April.

Mari described a recent open house they held to increase their student outreach.

      C.   UNAC – Melanie Arthur
                  UAFT – Jane Weber

Melanie reminded the members that at the last meeting she mentioned two remaining hurdles for the ORP settlement: the class members had to agree to the settlement, and it had to be funded. The class members have agreed to the settlement; but, as the Chancellor noted earlier, now the funding for that has to happen.

The Representative Assembly nomination process is now underway. Anyone interested in running should collect 20 signatures from full members and submit it by March 13 at 5 PM to the elections committee.

The Joint Health Care Committee (JHCC) is looking at next year's employee health rates right now. Currently there is the weird situation where, according to the updated projections, the University will save $5.5 million this year compared to their original projection based on the changed deductibles. But,

at the same time the employees are running a $3.5 million deficit which is the underpayment for benefits received this fiscal year. How much can be paid immediately in the next fiscal year is being wrestled with at the Committee. The bottom line is that rates will go up either a lot or outrageously in July.

A general membership meeting is taking place on March 26 to talk about the preventive health care benefit and how to use it.

Jane W. noted the JHCC is only advisory and can only make recommendations to the university. The four unions represented on that Committee are in agreement with each other and working together. They have asked for more information and have not received it yet, so they have to meet again once they get that. Melanie noted that there are not a lot of good choices for them to look at in terms of the rates that will be set. The question is mainly how much rates will go up.

IX   Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements
     A.   Announcements

Jennifer announced that nominations are open for Outstanding Senator of the Year Award. Send nominations to Jayne. Any volunteers to serve on the OSYA selection committee may also email Jayne. The Committee makes its decision at (or by) the next Administrative Committee meeting which is on March 23.

Dean Layer commented on the student grades appeals policy. The current policy is very clunky and poorly conceived, as well as very frustrating for students. The Faculty Senate needs to look for a better way to craft the policy so that appeals are dealt with more effectively and more quickly. Jennifer said she will discuss it at Administrative Committee. She would like more information, and to get feedback from students who've gone through the process as well as from the faculty and deans who've been involved.

Cindy H. announced that SADA Committee met with the Veterans Service Office. As a result, they are planning to have a brown bag lunch for faculty to address needs and issues of veterans as returning students. The second week in April is when the brown bag lunch will probably take place.

Linda H. described the advising appointment and notes function that the Banner Student group is working on. It will be a function in UAOnline, and there will be training provided. Faculty wanting to use this will need FERPA certification first. Notes entered by this function will not be visible to students (they are visible in DegreeWorks).

     B.   Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)
          Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 181/7)
          Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Chair
          Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair (Attachment 181/8)
          Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 181/9)
          Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair

          Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
             Rainer noted the hard work of the committee members in reviewing more than 100 curriculum submissions this year, so far. He also thanked Jayne Harvie for her organizational skills and the time spent on behalf of the committee's efforts, capping it off with a round of applause. He acknowledged the curriculum council chairs as unsung heroes for their units, and encouraged faculty to personally thank them (and

find out who they are, if they don't know). Jennifer also commented positively and called for applause for the Curriculum Review Committee, as well.

Faculty Appeals & Oversight
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair
    (Attachment 181/10)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair
    (Attachment 181/11)
    Orion also extended his thanks to Jayne on behalf of GAAC, echoing Rainer's remarks. They have handled over 30 curriculum submissions, so far. He commented on the need for a more automated process for handling curriculum submissions and reviews online. It's still a very paper-intensive process. Mike Earnest offered the prospect of building an OnBase workflow to handle curriculum electronically. Lara H. suggested a system that would furnish many of the boilerplate parts of syllabi.

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
    (Attachment 181/12)
    Cindy described current work of her committee which is examining data on student success and related topics.

Research Advisory Committee – Peter Webley, Orion Lawlor, Co-chairs
    (Attachment 181/13)

C.   Other Comments

X   Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:01 PM.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degree requirements as indicated below:

      EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

      RATIONALE: There are many cases in which a course might be required for a major or a minor (example: PSY F101 for a BA in Psychology) but that course also carries a General Education designator (such as "S" for Social Sciences). Strictly interpreted the way it's written, the PSY F101 could not be counted toward the required credits in Social Sciences and Humanities, no matter how many PSY credits were earned (say, 36). This would have the unintended and unfortunate consequence of requiring well over 120 credits for a B.A. degree and well over 130 for a B.S. degree if the language is not altered. This is something that has been broadly misunderstood in the advising community for many years (ever since the inception of the Core, as far as we can tell). This was brought before Curricular Affairs in 2009 and both the Registrar's Office and the Academic Advising Center was under the impression this change had already taken place.

      Note that with this change, no credits used toward the major could be used toward GERs until they have gone over 30, or for a minor over 15.

                      ****

CAPS = additions
[[   ]] = deletions

2011-12 *UAF Catalog*: Pages 136, Beyond the Core:

Under Bachelor of Arts, first column, paragraph after "Minimum credits required for degree":

Of the above, at least 39 credits must be taken in upper-division (300-level or higher) courses. Courses beyond 30 credits in a major complex and 15 credits in a minor complex **[[**that are not in the primary discipline of that major or minor**]]** may be used to fulfill the B.A. degree requirements in humanities, social sciences or mathematics. Courses used to fulfill **[[**minor degree**]]** requirements **FOR A MINOR** may be used at the same time to fill major or general distribution requirements if so designated.

Similarly, under Bachelor of Science, second column:

Of the above, at least 39 credits must be taken in upper-division (300-level or higher) courses. Courses beyond 30 credits in a major complex and 15 credits in a minor complex **[[**that are not in the primary

discipline of that major or minor**]]** may be used to fulfill the B.S. degree requirements in mathematics or natural science. Courses used to fulfill **[[**minor degree**]]** requirements **FOR A MINOR** may be used at the same time to fill major or general distribution requirements if so designated.

MOTION

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 two 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.

<div align="center">*************************</div>

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.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve an updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regent policy and regulations (10.06).

    EFFECTIVE: Immediately

    RATIONALE: The existing program review process (Meeting #102, May 2001) does not fully meet Board of Regents policy and regulations on program review (10.06). The proposed process aligns with the new accreditation cycle, is a more efficient process, i.e., it is less burdensome on programs, and is intended to a yield more consistent quality of review. The process is intended for a program review cycle of 5 years, in accordance with Board of Regents policy.

<p align="center">*********************</p>

The new program review process will be completed as follows:
1. An initial brief review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit supplied two-page narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere in UA, and any special circumstances that explain features of the centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary (see attached program review template for more details). The information reviewed meets the requirements set by Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; attached). A single Faculty Program Review Committee comprised of one tenured-faculty member from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus five CRCD representatives will review the materials and make one of the following recommendations:
   - Continue program
   - Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
   - Continue program but improve other specific areas or
   - Discontinue program.

   The committee will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review.
2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and 4 administrative representatives from CRCD will review the recommendations of the Program Review Committee, may request additional information from about the program, and will state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.
3. The Provost will review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:
   a. Program continuation is confirmed until next review cycle
   b. Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.

c. Recommend to discontinue program. Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, when appropriate admissions may be suspended pending action.

Handouts:
1. Program Review Instructions
2. Program Review Evaluation Form
3. Program Review Example

Handouts are posted online at:

http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#181

ATTACHMENT 181/4
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Academic Honors policy as indicated below:

> EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012
>
> RATIONALE: The current catalog language is vague enough that some students might expect to be on both lists, when the intention was that they are on one or the other, but not both.

****

CAPS = additions
[[ ]] = deletions

Page 49, 2011-12 *UAF Catalog*:

ACADEMIC HONORS

Undergraduate and certificate students -- To be eligible for academic honors at the end of a semester, you must be a full-time undergraduate degree or certificate student who has completed at least 12 UA institutional credits graded with the letter grades A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D- or F. If you have received an incomplete or deferred grade, your academic honors cannot be determined until those grades have been changed to permanent grades. Academic honors are recorded on your permanent record. You will make the chancellor's list with a semester GPA of 3.9 **[[and]] OR** the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5 to 3.89. UAF announces the students who have earned honors each semester. Students with incompletes or deferred grades that are changed after publication of honors will not be announced separately. If you've requested that information not be released about you (under FERPA), your name will not be released to the media.

ATTACHMENT 181/5
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new category of registration, "Directed Study," to allow a student to contract with an instructor to enroll individually in a course that exists in the catalog, outside of the regularly-scheduled sections of the course in a given semester. The difference between "Directed Study" and the current "Individual Study" would be that "Individual Study" would be reserved for contracted 1:1 courses that do not exist in the UAF catalog. Courses taken as Directed Study would be transcripted with the existing subject and course number from the catalog and the suffix (D.S.*).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: The majority of current Individual Study enrollments are actually for courses that exist in the UAF catalog. The student contracts with an instructor to take an individual section of the course outside of the regular course schedule. These are posted to the student's transcript as a -97 course number. It then raises questions about course content for transfer credit to other institutions; does not meet prerequisites in Banner; and does not automatically feed into degree requirements in DegreeWorks. Reserving the -97 "Independent Study" designation only for courses that do not exist in the UAF catalog would minimize these problems for students and advisors.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E, Permanent Committees.2. This amendment updates terminology in the bylaws and removes redundant language from the committee definition.

> EFFECTIVE: Immediately
>
> RATIONALE: The current definition of the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee is out of date. This amendment corrects an outdated campus name, removes an unnecessarily convoluted and redundant sentence, and refines the definition of committee membership.

<p align="center">**************</p>

CAPS = Addition
[[   ]] = Deletion

Section 3 (ART V: Committees), subsection E., Permanent Committees:

2.   The Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee will include one representative from each of the following units of the College of Rural and Community Development: Bristol Bay Campus, Chukchi Campus, Interior-Aleutians Campus, Kuskokwim Campus, Northwest Campus, and **[[**Tanana Valley Campus**]] COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE**. One or more of these should be from rural campus student services. The committee will also include one representative from the Department of Developmental Education; two **AT LARGE** representatives from the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics: one from the Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, or Physics) and one from Math; one from the College of Liberal Arts English Department; and one each from Rural Student Services, the Academic Advising Center, and the Student Support Services Program.

The Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee shall consider policies concerning student development and retention. This committee will function as a curriculum **[[**council**]]** review committee for all developmental education courses and other courses facilitating student progress. **[[**Discipline based developmental education courses and other courses facilitating student progress will be reviewed by the appropriate college curriculum council before submission to this committee for review and coordination.**]]**

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 25, 2012

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry (chair); Jungho Baek; Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Brian Himelbloom (phone); Diane McEachern (phone); Todd Radenbaugh (phone); Dave Valentine; Jun Watabe.
Voting Members not present: Anthony Arendt; Debra Moses.

Non-voting Members present: Lillian Anderson-Misel; Donald Crocker; Mike Earnest; Libby Eddy; Carol Gering; Linda Hapsmith; Susan Henrichs (for Dana Thomas); Pete Pinney; Michelle Stalder.
Not present: Doug Goering.

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

A. **OLD Business**
  1. Is this an ok day/time?? If not….suggestions?
        This item was not discussed, though mentioned briefly. [Wednesdays from 2-3 p.m. accommodates the most members, based on the Doodle Poll results.]
  2. Recent GERK issues and such —comments by Dave
        Dave reported that GERC is meeting weekly this semester.
        They are hearing about faculty frustration with the lack of writing skills being exhibited by students in upper division courses. Is ENGL F111X enough preparation for upper division courses? The idea of utilizing TAs from the English Department as a resource in writing-intensive courses was discussed. It was noted, however, that English graduate students are working on creative writing, not scientific writing. Rainer suggested bringing the English department into the discussion.
        Jun asked if the issue of student plagiarism is being discussed at GERC. Dave indicated it's not been brought up.
        Susan Henrichs asked if the frustration with student writing skills is echoed in the arts and humanities and social sciences, as well. The consensus was that that this frustration is shared there, as well.
        Pete and Carol mentioned strategies they are using at their units to address reading and writing skills in various courses. Linda asked how such courses might translate to the Core requirements. Dave mentioned that GERC is reviewing several Core models and how learning outcomes will be identified for Core. Susan stressed the need for a Core structure that is identifiable and transferable.
        Pete mentioned that Mike Koskey can not serve on GERC and wanted to know what procedure to use to replace him. It was agreed that Miranda Wright will follow up and see that a statement of interest is submitted by a candidate to fill the CRCD seat.
  3. 'Stacked' courses -- comments by Tony? [Item postponed. Anthony was traveling.]

B. **NEW Business**
  1. **Proposed motion #1**
  Change this:
  One academic credit hour of non-laboratory instruction at UAF will consist of a minimum of 800 minutes of instruction" (FS meeting #3, March 25, 1988). It is understood that an average student will

be expected to spend 1600 minutes of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.

The number of minutes required for one credit of laboratory (1600 or 2400) depends on the amount of instruction given during the lab.   For typical science and engineering labs where students work with teaching assistant guidance performing preset exercises, 2400 minutes (3 hours/week/credit for a 14 week semester) is used. For labs in which a faculty member interacts with students and provides feedback throughout the laboratory period (clinical labs, art studio, automotive technical labs) 1600 minutes (2 hours/week/credit for a 14 week semester) is used. A course submission with a lab component should include a justification for the number of minutes of lab per credit employed."

To THIS:
   "One academic credit hour of non-laboratory instruction at UAF will consist of a minimum of 800 minutes (1 hour/week) of instruction. It is understood that an average student will be expected to spend 1600 minutes (2 hours/week) of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.
     Laboratory activities invariably require students to spend AT LEAST ONE HOUR OF STUDY OR PREPARATION time before and (or) after the lab PERIOD, outside of the lab. Traditionally, credits for lab activities in science and engineering ignore this and use 2400 lab hours/credit (3 hours/week/per credit for a 14 week semester). Conversely, lab hours for fields outside of science and engineering traditionally use 1600 hours of lab activities per credit (2 hours/week/credit).   A course submission with a lab component should include a justification (in terms of student work hours) for the number of minutes of lab per credit employed."

OR POSSIBLY THIS…. for 2nd paragraph…

"Laboratory classes may require a minimum of 2400 lab minutes/credit (3 hours/week/credit), or they may require a minimum of 1600 lab minutes (2 hours/week/credit) AND 800 minutes (1 hour/week) of study and/or preparation outside of class. A course submission with a lab component should 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."

Justification: brings UAF policies in line with BOR
R10.04.090. 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

          There was consensus that the second version was preferred by the committee with a change in the last sentence: "A course submission with a lab component [[should]] **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 effect should bring UAF in line with UA regulation without changing the traditional science / non-science labs at UAF. The committee agreed to bring the revised motion to the Administrative Committee.

2. Proposed motion #2 on Educational Effectiveness

Susan spoke to the committee about the motion. The cycle of assessment needs to be addressed because of the recommendation by the NWCCU accreditation team. Student learning outcomes assessment must be continuously performed, not sporadically (as has been the case). While many units are gathering data, there is no evidence to demonstrate that data results are being applied. Many surveys are being used which are too generalized (e.g., student exit surveys). The two year interval is proposed by this motion because department chairs serve two-year terms, and aligning the cycle with the term will help ensure that assessment is regularly addressed and not skipped over. Susan has also encouraged the deans to put assessment duties into workloads.

She explained the larger picture which includes higher education accountability and standards, and the fact that if universities do not take the initiative in the near future, it could become mandated by government down the road. Currently, UAF must take the NWCCU recommendation very seriously, and the report due to the accreditors next fall must show some positive effort and change.

It was noted that many programs which have specialized accreditation are using capstone courses for their senior students. These courses fit well with assessing student learning outcomes for programs.

The issue of Faculty Senate wishing to separate the matter of program review from outcomes assessment was discussed. Susan explained that all that is being changed right now is the frequency of required reports. Dave mentioned the need for training department chairs and faculty how to do the assessments, considering there is such a wide variation in how well it's being done across campus. Susan agreed. She noted they are looking at model assessment templates and promised to share those with Faculty Senate. Rainer reiterated that faculty are concerned about the workload involved in doing assessments, and Susan reiterated that they are looking for a process that will require reasonable amounts of work. Time is a great factor, both for faculty doing the work of assessments, and for the university to respond to the accreditation recommendation.

Curricular Affairs Committee agreed that this topic would be discussed at the February Faculty Senate meeting with the goal of a vote on the motion in March.

3. Core science labs—update from meeting in Anchorage - Jan 15 & 16.

Report / discussion on this topic was postponed to the next meeting due to time constraints.

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for 8 February 2012

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry, Chair; Anthony Arendt; Jungho Baek; Retchenda George-Bettisworth (phone); Brian Himelbloom (phone); Jun Watabe.
Voting members absent: Diane McEachern; Deb Moses; Todd Radenbaugh (traveling); Dave Valentine.

Non-voting members present: Donald Crocker; Mike Earnest; Libby Eddy; Carol Gering; Doug Goering; Linda Hapsmith; Dana Thomas.

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

OLD Business
1. Approval of previous meeting minutes.
   January 25 meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Recent GERC issues

Comments postponed for next meeting.

3. 'Stacked' courses
    Anthony gave a brief report, reporting that results are in from the surveys of faculty and students. He
    and Lara Horstmann are compiling the results and writing a report.

4. Proposed motion to amend the Educational Effectiveness policy:
    (A copy of the motion is included at the end of these minutes.)
    Jun asked how the assessment data are used, and if reporting is required or just recommended. Doug
    G. commented on the fact that assessment is required and why. He noted how ABET accreditation
    drives the review of their undergraduate programs, vs. the review of their graduate programs which is
    much looser. Senior capstone courses were mentioned as a means that NWCCU recommends for
    ongoing assessment because it's easier to tie assessment to those courses.

    Rainer commented that the ultimate test is after the student leaves. Doug noted it's harder to
    document then and that external factors start to drive the results (the job market, for example).
    Rainer also commented that the work not only involves improving programs, but documenting the
    effort to do so.

    There was agreement that there needs to be faculty buy-in in the process. It seems to be driven by
    administration, rather than faculty driven. All agree that no one wants to do it if it's not useful to
    them. Dana commented on its need as a feedback mechanism to faculty to have real knowledge of
    how well students are doing in their courses and programs. Dave Veazey's name was mentioned as a
    potential guest to speak to the committee on this topic. In the meantime, Rainer urged that an
    electronic discussion of the matter be initiated.

    The CAC passed the motion and it will move on to the Administrative Committee.

NEW Business:
1. *Proposed motion to amend Catalog language to clarify the difference between the Dean's List and
    the Chancellor's List:*
    Currently, the catalog states that dean's list is for students with a GPA of >3.5 and chancellor's list
    for >3.9. Presumably, then, this logic means that a student with >3.9 is on both Dean's List AND
    Chancellor's List. The intention was that dean's list would be 3.5 to 3.89, and chancellor's list > or =
    3.9.

Current catalog language (Under "ACADEMIC HONORS" on page 49)
You will make the chancellor's list with a GPA of 3.9 and the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5 or higher.

CHANGE TO:
You will make the chancellor's list with a GPA of 3.9 or higher, ~~and~~ **or** the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5
    to 3.89.
EFFECTIVE: **Fall 2012**
RATIONALE: The current catalog language is vague enough that some students might expect to
    be on both lists, when our intention was that they are on one or the other, but not both.

The committee passed this motion and it will move forward to the Administrative Committee.

2. Mike Earnest brought the topic of a new category of registration called Directed Study before the
    committee. It would be similar to Independent Study courses (numbered -97), except that the course

already exists and would retain its catalog number. A flag in Banner could be used to indicate that the student took the course as Directed Study (as opposed to taking it in a normal class setting). Some workload and core course issues were discussed. The item will be discussed further at the next CAC meeting.

3. Item: *X wants to teach microbio BIOL F240 next semester because there is a high local demand. However, most of those students already take A&P 112, and experience says that they can't handle 2 such big classes in one semester. So X hopes to can teach microbio 240 spread out over 2 semesters instead, fall 2012 and spring 2013. X has taught the class before in a traditional 1-semester setting so X is already approved as an instructor, but what process would be needed for a 2-semester format?*

In effect, students would register for the 4 credits in Fall 2012, but the lecture and lab would be spread over the September to May time frame, with a grade not being posted (or credit earned) until May.

The committee discussed this question, noting the issues of faculty workloads, the pace of the course not being equal to a semester course, and Financial Aid issues, as well as grading issues. It was agreed that the easiest approach would be to split the course in half at 1.5 credits each.

Copy of the Educational Effectiveness motion (from Item 4 under Old Business):

DRAFT **MOTION**

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 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.

Unit Criteria Committee
Meeting Minutes for Friday 3 February 2012

Attending: Cathleen Winfree, Vladmir Alexeev, Stefan Golux, Mark Hermann, Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Debra Jones, Perry Barboza

Minutes prepared by P. Barboza

1. BOR document comments on 04.04
   - Some redundant passages that could be clarified regarding fractional appointments (P040403. G).
   - No other comments regarding conflicts with governance and unit criteria

2. SOE criteria
   - Format CAPS BOLD ITALIC per template
   - Comments and suggested edits were discussed and added to a word document.
   - Return to SOE for amendment. Committee will consider modified document for vote by e-mail.

3. CES criteria
   - The document diverges from the established template in length and scope
   - Additions to the preamble must be shortened to only describe how this unit differs from what is already described in general terms for all units.
   - The unit should review approved criteria for CEM and Fisheries that are posted on the FS site.
   - Invite a representative of CES to meet with Unit Committee

4. Pending criteria and other issues
   - Barboza will meet with Music Faculty on 14 February to discuss revisions to Criteria
   - Next meeting tentatively scheduled for 9:30 am Friday 10 February

ATTACHMENT 181/9
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012
Submitted by Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women,
Meeting Minutes for Fri, Feb 17, 2012; 10:00-11:00 am, Gruening 718

Members Present: Melanie Arthur, Derek Sikes, Kayt Sunwood, Jane Weber, Ellen Lopez, Nilima Hullavarad

Members absent: Jenny Liu, Johnny Payne, Ellen Lopez, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Shawn Russell

1) Difficult Dialogues Workshop with Libby Roderick recap. Valuable issue.

2) Brown Bag - "Negotiating with Deans" 2/16 Good event and discussion on a rarely addressed topic. Paul Layer enriched the discussion with much appreciated information.

"Career Development Mapping" 3/22 brown bag in preparation.

3) Speaker for Women Faculty Luncheon, Sep 2012. Possible - Peggy Shumaker, Wendy Redmond, Jennifer McBeath, Sherri Modrow, Elena Sparrow (Others?). Ellen suggested maybe focusing event around a theme that could turn the luncheon into a large discussion / workshop?

4) Panelists for Promotion / Tenure Workshop, April 27. Discussion of possible panelists: Roxie Dinstel, Sine Anahita, Paul Layer? Paul has always been good in the past. Suggestion that maybe the panel should be only faculty? Avoid redundancy with Provost's P&T workshop by not having Paul Layer (who gives identical talks?). Fourth year review suggestions: Andres Lopez, Andrea Bursamin? Recently promoted suggestions: Either Melanie Arthur or Steffi Ickert-Bond? Steffi might address the challenges of being a mother with young children. Suggestion for a research professor: Elena Sparrow?

5) Melanie Arthur proposed agenda item for next time: UAF spousal hire policy. Ten years since faculty senate dealt with this. In Chancellor's list of goals for 2012. Draft of policy that we could work with - Melanie will send it around by email. Also information on best practices from other institutions.

Next Meeting - Thurs 29 March 2012, 11:30AM - 1PM (to accommodate guest Mae Marsh).

Meeting was adjourned at 10:50;   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/

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 31, 2012

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:15 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Julie Joly, Franz Meyer, Channon Price
Excused: Mike Castellini, Stephen Brown, Joy Morrison, Alexandra Oliveira

III. Report from Joy

Joy was unable to attend as her flight was delayed.

Travel proposals were due January 31 at 5:00 pm. Duff and CP volunteered to assist in evaluating the proposals on February 1 at 3:30 pm.

There is an upcoming seminar on Student Incivility, Bullying, and Aggression on Monday, February 6 from 3:30 – 5:00 pm in the Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom. Dr. Claudia Lampman, UAA Professor of Psychology, will present. This is jointly sponsored by UAF Faculty Senate, UNAC, and the UAFT.

IV. Old Business

1. BOR Review

The BOR review by the Faculty Senate has concluded.

2. Faculty survey

The five question areas that our committee discussed at our last meeting are as follows:

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?

We discussed how we can advance this, and Josef will ask Melanie Arthur to join us for our next meeting to lend her expertise. It was pointed out that some new faculty members are not aware of the OFD and what services it provides. We decided to split our five question areas up amongst committee members to focus on in more depth.

Types of sessions/presentations were discussed and it was agreed that practical sessions vs "information dumps" are more attractive and helpful for faculty. We also discussed the possibility of encouraging and facilitating a bottom-up, grassroots approach by inviting current faculty members to present sessions in their area of expertise or have them share their viewpoints and techniques that they are using. These sessions could be limited to the professor's department or opened up for all faculty members. What are the possibilities of having such sessions scheduled through, and sanctioned by, the OFD? There are small groups of faculty members meeting already.

Josef informed us that Dana Thomas indicated that the accreditation report suggests that we need a stronger focus on Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment. A new Educational Effectiveness program should be implemented in the future. However, the draft motion submitted for discussion to the faculty senate states that the "data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty.'

V. Next Meeting (tentative): Tuesday, February 28, 2012, 8:15 – 9:15 am, Bunnell 222

Committee members are encouraged to utilize Google Calendar so convening our upcoming meetings will be more easily facilitated.

VI. Adjourned at 9:17 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate
2012-02-10 Meeting Minutes

Voting Members: Orion Lawlor, Susan Renes, Donie Bret-Harte, Elisabeth Nadin, Vincent Cee, Chung-Sang Ng
Non-Voting: Tim Bartholomaus, Laura Bender, Larry Duffy, Lillian Misel

Curriculum progress:
- The construction management 1-credit courses are withdrawn, pending updated syllabi.
- The program change in geophysics (5-GPCh) is fully approved, after the new math admission requirements were double checked.
- ED 682 (25-GNC) is approved, with updated 2012-02-09 syllabus.
- Program changes in the education post-baccalaureate and M.Ed. degrees (18-GPCh, 19-GPCh, and 20-GPCh) were approved.
- PETE/GEOS 608 (31-GNC) was approved.

The ad-hoc stacked course subgroup surveyed all UAF faculty listed as in Banner as teaching a stacked course. We sent a personal email plea to 82 instructors, and got back 44 responses. 52% of instructors reported differentiating between 400 and 600 level courses on a weekly basis; but over 90% differentiated between them at least once per month. Over 91% had differences in projects between levels, and 64% had differences in readings. Most stacked courses were stacked due to low enrollment in separate courses, and to expand the variety of electives offered. We still need to survey graduate students. GAAC members: what policy recommendations does this data suggest?

The graduate school has proposed a new Responsible Conduct in Research (RCR) requirement:
"All Graduate Students who are currently or have received NSF or NIH funding while at UAF are required to take a Responsible Conduct in Research course (LAS601) or an approved alternative."
Start Date: Students whose first enrollment is after 10/25/2012.
Rationale: RCR training is required by 42 CFR Parts 50 and 93 for NIH grants, and Section 7009 of the America COMPETES Act for NSF grants.
Background: LAS601 (approved by GAAC fall 2009) is a two-credit course, and will be run every semester. Not a lecture course, this uses a case study review and discussion approach. Example issues: authorship disputes, ethical issues in mentoring, treatment of cell lines. Typically each meeting starts with a 15 minute introductory lecture, followed by a lively discussion between students. Students can either sign up for the course officially; or attend 10 total meetings, sign the attendance sheet, and participate in the discussion. Biology already requires a research design course, and scientific writing course, which may have some overlap with these topics, and could eventually be approved by the graduate college as an alternative.

Next meeting: Friday, February 24, 9am in the Kayak Room (Rasmuson 408).

ATTACHMENT 181/12
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012
Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 2, 2012

Attending:
Sarah Stanley, Dana Greci, David Maxwell, Cindy Hardy, Amy Barnsley, Sandra Wildfeur, Curt Szuberla, Gabrielle Russell, Nancy Ayagarak

Not attending: Diane Erickson, Deseree Salvador, Erin from Nome, Elizabeth Izaki, David Veazy, John Creed, Alan Morotti

Approval of December minutes:
Approved by acclaim.

Motion on Committee Definition
We discussed how to encourage rural faculty to participate in this committee. We decided to list all those who don't attend meetings along with those attending. Cindy will contact specific people to see if they are continuing to represent their campus on the committee.

The motion to revise and update the committee definition was approved.

Learning Commons update
Library is setting up tables with dividers, white boards. They will do that in March.

Ideas on support for student success
This is an ongoing item on our agenda. We discussed the Very Early Warning and Freshman Progress Reports. Let's encourage our departments to participate.

Sandra suggested a rural student award as means of encouraging student success. This may already be done through CRCD.

Gabrielle mentioned that there have been changes to the withdrawal process, such as the elimination of the drop/swap. She asked whether these policy changes are getting out to faculty and advisors.

SADA data requests
We continued our discussion of gathering data on student outcomes in entry-level courses. Dana G reports that Developmental Education's NADE data request will be in by Feb 15 from institutional research. David will find out if any data requests have been made for math. Sarah S reported that a request was made for placement data for English. Dana Thomas may have some data reports as well. At the next meeting, we will look at the data that exists and see what further questions we want to address. We would like to have two or three standing requests for yearly data from PAIR so that we can track the success of initiatives such as mandatory placement or advising.

Prep Courses

We looked over a list of "Prep" courses at Mike Earnest's request, and, in general, all of the courses listed are preparatory or developmental. We discussed how some courses with different designators (ABUS, ECE, TTCH) relate to other content courses such as DEVM or DEVE courses. We raised the question of how "Prep" is defined on this list. We noted that some of the courses listed are required math courses for specific certificate and associates degrees, not "preparatory" for those degrees. We discussed how this request links with discussions of pass rates. Dana G suggested that this fits with our discussion of how to study D/F/Ws. We could limit it to two variables: those not doing well because of trouble learning the material and those not doing well because of external factors.

UAA Questions

We discussed a list of questions UAA faculty sent to UAF DEVE faculty in preparation for meeting to discuss aligning assessment in our programs.

David noted that, in the past, Math and DEVM faculty enforced prerequisites by manually checking student prerequisites in UAonline. Mandatory placement has not improved their pass rates, but has eliminated this process and students' need to change classes early in the semester.

Curt said he teaches upper level Physics classes, so placement isn't really an issue. He does teach some 200 level classes, but he can talk with individual students to help with placement issues. He does not want to block a student who wants to try a class, though it may take three times before they successfully complete the class.

In response to the notion of state-wide standardized placement, Sarah recommends a more rounded look at each student in deciding placement through advising. We discussed the benefits of a locally designed placement test and of student self-directed placement.

We noted the advantages of Accuplacer, as well: no need to argue over placement, better reflection of current knowledge than HS transcripts (which may be out of date or mean varying things).

To further address placement issues, we will invite Linda Hapsmith to the next meeting. We will also invite Dana Thomas to the April meeting, once we have looked the data on hand and can formulate further questions.

Next meetings: Those in attendance agreed to 3:30 to 5:00, the first Thursday of the month. Semester meeting dates will be March 1, April 5, and May 3.

Research Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes - January 25th 2011

Attending : Orion Lawlor (co-chair), Peter Webley (chair), Joanne Healy and John Heaton

Unable to attend: Kris Hundertmark, Sarah Hardy and Roger Hansen

Visitor: Flora Grabowska (GI Librarian)

Location : IARC 417

Started at 10:02 am

1. Open Access policy at UAF

Flora came to present to the committee on the Open Access for journals. Flora had presented to the Faculty Senate in the public comments at the October 2011 Faculty Senate meeting and it was felt that Flora should come to talk to the Research Advisory Committee.

Flora provided a detailed overview of what Open Access is and that every year there is Open Access week in October. Flora pointed out that if a paper is open access then there will be more citations than if it was kept in a 'Toll Access' journal.

The questions is how do we allot those in UAF to have open access papers? John Heaton made the point that researchers should get to determine their journal of choice and what is this is always open access. Peter Webley spoke about that he submits to journals that offer open access but only at a cost of up to $2000 per journal.

Flora pointed out that she was only advocating that UAF faculty, staff, students whom do submit to journals to be encouraged to make them open access papers. this will not only help the citation index of the paper but will help promote UAF research

Peter Webley stated that it might be institute, department, college level advisement to researchers to aim to include papers for open access rather than a faculty senate statement or policy decision. Might those with grants to write aim to include additional 'publication fees' only with those for printing color pages to manuscripts associated to that grant directly to also cover open access fees so that the paper can then be open?

Flora pointed out to all on the committee that the GI now is able to assist researchers in getting their manuscripts as open access.

2. Discussion on Policy and Regulations request from Admin Services Committee

Discussion on the requested sections of the UAF Regents Policy and Regulations documents from the UAF faculty Senate Administrative services committee. Orion Lawlor showed his edits and queries to several of the items and these were discussed by committee members attending. Orion will send his

version to all members and they will send edits to Peter Webley, Chair, by Friday am so that the edits can get the Administrative services committee.

3. Timing of monthly meeting

Request to have monthly meeting at similar time of the month. February meeting aimed to be 15th. Flora has offered GI Library conference room. Peter Webley, chair, will get response from full committee to get a time on February 15th.

The aim is for following meetings is 2nd to 3rd Wednesday of each month, Location: GI Library conference room

Ended at 11:17 am