

MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #178

Monday, November 7, 2011

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

Bandopadhyay, Sukumar

Barboza, Perry

Bret-Harte, Donie

Brown, Stephen

Cahill, Cathy

Davis, Mike (audio)

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

Metzger, Andrew

Meyer, Franz – Gerhard Kramm

Moses, Debra

Nadin, Elisabeth

Newberry, Rainer

Ng, Chung-Sang – Hui Zhang

Members Present (cont'd):

Radenbaugh, Todd (audio)

Reyes, Sue

Reynolds, Jennifer

Short, Margaret

Valentine, David

Weber, Jane

Winfrey, Cathy

Members Absent:

Zhang, Xiong

Others Present:

Maggie Griscavage

Joy Morrison

Committee Reps:

Josef Glowa (FDAI)

Cindy Hardy (SADAC)

Peter Webley (RAC)

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Brian Rogers

Susan Henrichs

Jon Dehn, Past President

Mike Earnest

Jordan Titus

Paul Layer

Anita Hartmann

Mari Freitag

Guest Speaker:

Fred Schlutt

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #177

The minutes for meeting #177 were approved.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved: None

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – Cathy Cahill

President Gamble has asked that UA policy and regulations be reviewed, assigning the task to both system and governance groups. UAA and UAS are also involved in the review. Faculty Senate committees will be asked to review various assigned portions. Cathy and Jennifer are seeking feedback from the faculty perspective and have asked that reviewers look for red flags (top priorities that need to be addressed soon; e.g., a regulation that conflicts with federal regulations), redundancies, outdated content; and land mines (controversial, difficult to fix). Suggestions are also sought for tweaking the language. The assignments have been distributed to members of the Administrative Committee to take to their committees.

Dave V. asked about the process for weaving together all the information coming out of the committees, and whether the senate will vote on this. Cathy responded that she and Jennifer will synthesize the feedback from the committees and then share and compare with the results from the other MAUs. They are seeking a unified faculty response across the three MAUs via Faculty Alliance.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer had two brief topics to mention. The first was the online discussion groups which are proving very useful to help guide the committees. Be aware that the groups are not meant to be private and that other involved parties have been allowed access.

The second topic concerned the health care issue about the tobacco surcharge – a recent news item in the Statewide Voice. There had been concern that statewide would apply the tobacco surcharge to anyone who smokes in the household where an employee lives, but this has now been removed. It will only apply to the insured employee and their dependents on the program.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

The Chancellor reported that the Accreditation: report has been received from the reviewers so they can review it and fix any errors of fact. He noted it's a spectacular report. The review team recognized the level of effort that was put into it by everyone, especially for a brand new process. They'll know if the full Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities accepts the finalized report in January – in time for February senate meeting.

The review of the core is very important for this next cycle in the accreditation process. He anticipates external pressure on this topic and he hopes faculty will come up with a more flexible way to accomplish the revitalized core (essentially in fewer credits).

The Board of Regents met last week and approved the budget request from President Gamble. Now it goes forward to the governor. Now is the time for anyone with issues concerning the operating or capital budgets to coordinate with Ann Ringstad and communicate concerns to the governor's office. We're in a good position with the governor with regard to money for pay, utilities, and operations and maintenance; but, for things such as indigenous studies or the new veterinary program, it may come down to how well the university advocates for those items with the governor and the legislature.

Deferred maintenance is the only priority in the capital budget right now. There's a long list of UAF facilities that need rehabilitation. The governor has promised \$37 million to the UA system for deferred maintenance and they're trying to get him to do even more than that.

Cecile L. commented on the need to replace Gruening Building and Chancellor Rogers agreed. However, the next new building will be for engineering. It will have two large classrooms; one accommodating 60 students and the other for 120. It will connect Bunnell and Duckering Buildings, taking some pressure off of Schaible Hall for large classes.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

The Provost noted that UAF is now beginning the next seven-year cycle of accreditation. Next fall a year-one report is due which will contain any revisions to the UAF institutional mission and core themes (and related objectives and indicators). Volunteer faculty are needed for this effort and anyone interested should contact Vice Provost Dana Thomas. While it would be nice to have someone commit to the entire cycle, it is not required in order to participate.

Work has commenced on the UAF mission statement at Chancellor's Cabinet. There are several subcommittee groups already focusing on academics, research, and community campuses, among other topics. The Faculty Senate Administrative Committee is responsible for looking at draft mission statements and will be invited to make suggestions about core theme objectives and indicators. Ultimately, the Faculty Senate will be asked to approve the changes when they're finalized.

Big changes in the statement are not anticipated. Communicating among ourselves about who we are and where we want to go is a valuable part of the process. Examples of redundancy in the current statement were given, and the fact mentioned that it doesn't currently show that there is a community campus mission. The research mission statement is currently very generic. Keeping the revised statement concise and fairly brief is also an important consideration.

The Provost also provided a recap of the discussion concerning the core themes and some compromises being suggested regarding the Discover theme as it relates to research. The university's commitment to the community as expressed in the core themes of Connect and Engage is also under discussion, along with whether or not they should be kept separate or brought together.

An idea that's been suggested is to express the core themes in an Alaska Native language – or translate it into all dialects as one way to express connection across Alaskan communities in the state.

She encouraged senators to get involved in discussions and to share their ideas and feedback.

V Discussion Items

- A. Strategic Direction, role of UAF Faculty Senate – Cathy C., Jennifer R.
<http://www.alaska.edu/shapingalaskasfuture/>

Cathy introduced the topic which originates from President Gamble's office. He is gathering input from communities throughout the state at this time via listening sessions, and there are plans to gather input from within the university community next spring. Currently, listening sessions are taking place at the UA branch campuses. Cathy asked faculty at those locations to go and listen to the community input. Faculty Alliance would like to gather faculty feedback from these sessions to help guide the future listening sessions. Session information and a link to an online survey are posted online at: <http://www.alaska.edu/shapingalaskasfuture/listening-sessions/>

Lara H. asked what sessions have occurred thus far and how well they were attended. Cathy reported that sessions had occurred at Eagle River and Bristol Bay. The word didn't get out well for the Eagle River session and attendance was low. Mike Davis reported for Bristol Bay. Fuller Cowell was at their campus, in conjunction with their campus council. So, there was a pretty good discussion and participation. Todd R. noted they also had a Bristol Bay Campus visioning project going on and those folks got involved, too. They were able to communicate about their rural issues effectively.

Lara asked about publicity for these sessions as she hadn't heard about them before. She also wondered if the MAP agents know about this. Jennifer noted that President Gamble and Paula Donson have been advised that MAP agents could be useful contacts, but she doesn't know if MAP agents have been involved or not. The publicity focus is at the communities, not the campuses. Cathy and Jennifer are contacting specific faculty at each location (Mike D. at Bristol Bay, for example) to help gather feedback.

Lara asked about audio capability and Cathy responded that Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Paula Donson, is addressing that need and it's also the reason for the online survey. Faculty Alliance has been pushing on this issue.

Chancellor Rogers urged faculty to let external supporters of their programs know about the sessions and encourage them to speak on our behalf. Their feedback will carry more weight at these sessions. MAP and CES agents would be effective in making contacts with constituents and he's made a note to follow up with that.

B. Stay on Track Program – Cathy C., Jennifer R.
<http://www.alaska.edu/stayontrack/>

Link for "Time is the Enemy" document:
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#178>

Cathy described the new program which is aimed at first-time, full-time freshman who want to obtain their degree in four years. It is created and run by Statewide. The problem some faculty have noted is that the majority of students don't fit into this category, and may be influenced by the program to think that they're second-class citizens if they're not fitting into this group. Students need to know the faculty are there for them and that their goals are valid no matter what their educational goals are. The program is being pushed right now, but of course, the faculty want students to have the college experience that suits what they need.

Mike E. commented that enrolling in 12 credits is considered full-time for financial aid purposes, and students have come to accept this definition. But, they cannot finish a degree in less than five years at 12 credits a semester. This is one reason behind the program's development.

Lara H. asked how bottleneck courses like Chemistry are being dealt with. Cathy said they're working on ways to get more students through those particular courses. They looked into whether students can

take certain courses off-sequence, but their accrediting body said no. It is acknowledged that there are bottlenecks, but they are being discussed and everyone is examining courses and frequency of offering that would allow students to finish in four years.

Elisabeth N. commented about the signs she's seen around campus to advertise the program. Was there input from students for these? Chancellor Rogers noted that the campaign came out of the system office with little campus input. Mike E. said there was some input by student volunteers working jointly with statewide Student Enrollment Services and Public Affairs. Elisabeth also commented on recent work at the Geology and Geophysics Department to create a flowchart of courses to allow students to finish in four years. Doing so helped them iron out some wrinkles with course sequencing and she encouraged other departments to do the same thing. Cathy noted that posting it on the department web page for easy reference is a big help to students.

Dave V. recalled that at the last senate meeting, President Gamble put a heavy emphasis on getting all students through in four years. Cathy responded that they may be rebelling against that idea. Chancellor Rogers commented on the need for a set of messages that go to the majority of students whose goals may not be to graduate in four years due to family and jobs and other interests. The university must address their issues, too (financial, advising, etc.), and serve all of the students, both part- and full-time.

Jennifer R. noted the President's remarks are often context dependent, so his views might seem to vary from one focus of conversation to another. But, while his thinking may be somewhat fluid on some topics, this allows faculty to take the opportunity to influence which point of view becomes the dominant one. Communicating clearly to him about what the priorities should be is necessary.

Stephan G. commented on the fact that students are regularly told by the media that debt is bad and to work through college to come out debt-free in ten years instead of finishing in four with debt. This can be erroneous thinking. Getting the financial facts and information out there in a less dry and "accounty" way would be helpful to students. Jennifer mentioned the "mortgage calculator" type of tool they've been suggesting at Faculty Alliance in order to allow students to try out different financial scenarios.

Ken A. talked about the emphasis on quantitative numbers of students, credit hours and graduates. He asks his students if they are preparing for a career as well as getting a degree. It's important to ask if their degrees will prepare them for their careers. We need to promote more than efficiency and metrics to get numbers up. Faculty don't want to do what could be compared to a student going for the grade in a class rather than the work of learning.

C. Master's Degree Awards Ceremony – All

Cathy summarized the consensus thus far in the online discussion, which is that adding a separate ceremony is not preferred. Instead, the preference seems to be to add to the existing ceremony. For example, master's recipients would be recognized apart from baccalaureate recipients and would be hooded (but not have their thesis titles read since not all necessarily have thesis titles).

Lara H. reported that all her students had responded to a survey in favor of an extra ceremony to recognize them. Laura Bender reported their Graduate School listserve poll results which were overwhelmingly in favor of a separate ceremony.

Cathy asked for discussion on advantages and disadvantages of both approaches. Dave V. mentioned the possibility of a low faculty turn-out at the smaller, extra ceremony. Mike E. expressed a concern that there might be a correspondingly lower turn-out by faculty at the regular commencement because they

already attended the smaller ceremony. He also asked about master's students who wished to attend the larger ceremony for recognition rather than the separate one.

Cecile L. noted that the larger ceremony is already so long that more people start to leave as their person has been recognized. There is a balance needed between creating a sense of community and providing individual subgroups the recognition deserved.

Orion L. reported about GAAC's discussion. The viewpoint of GAAC's graduate student was that it seems strange to pull out just master's students from Commencement. Why not also pull out the Ph.D. students for a smaller, special ceremony? Jennifer R. noted the focus on the master's students was because there was a feeling they were being shortchanged. Orion suggested a reception as a means to incentivize attendance at the smaller ceremony.

Sue R. reminded everyone of the fact that some graduate faculty teach on Thursday night before graduation, and some departments already host their own small gatherings.

Ken A. suggested considering what Virginia Tech does at commencement. Their entire department faculty got up and congratulated students as they received their diplomas. There was time to talk to the individual students and interact with families. He also suggested that advisors hood their students and then the students are congratulated by all the department faculty in line. It's the personal experiences that encourage people to come, and to stay.

Elisabeth N. suggested having everyone together for brief formal ceremony (involving the special speaker and regents, etc.) and then break into colleges where there is more personal attention given -- such as to hooding graduates.

Cathy asked everyone to get on Google groups and throw out ideas. Senators were urged to send in their votes on having a separate ceremony, particularly now that they've heard the students seem to be in favor of it. Jennifer suggested listing all the options that have been proposed and members responding to them.

Laura Bender noted that Friday evening has been proposed for 2012. Thursday might be too early for those traveling. Laura will summarize the information she has in writing.

- D. UAF Mission Statement – Susan Henrichs
<http://www.uaf.edu/uaf/about/mission/>

In the interest of time, Susan referred to her earlier remarks (see item B, above).

BREAK

VI Public Comments/Questions

No public comments were made.

VII Guest Speaker

- A. Fred Schlutt, Vice Provost for Outreach and Engagement
Topic: Outreach and Engagement Plan

Fred provided a brief overview of what's been happening under his direction in the last year and a half at Cooperative Extension Service, where programs have been realigned and become more issue-based.

He described his work as vice provost for outreach. He has identified about 225 outreach programs throughout campus and the state. In most cases, these programs are centered on K-12 programs and the Fairbanks North Star Borough, reflecting the fact that this focus is required because of their NSF and NIH funding. The goal of the process he's started is to help move the science we do out to the state and to engage communities in addressing their needs and issues (energy and climate change were mentioned as examples).

He has involved all the deans and leaders of outreach to help identify how programs can be delivered statewide, as well as identifying what faculty need to do so. They are developing a center or clearing house for faculty where outreach plans can be developed and coordinated when grants are awarded.

They also wish to involve students in the effort of outreach. He mentioned Laura Conner who is working on student service learning.

There is a need for developing a culture at UAF of engagement by faculty with communities throughout the state. He is working on helping to frame this for the UAF academy. They continue to meet in subgroups. One assignment in a chancellor's cabinet subgroup is to identify how many campus groups currently target Fairbanks K-12 students in the FNSB. Their goal is to create a resource that faculty can use.

Stephan G. asked if the outreach Fred described is more focused toward those with grants. Fred responded that the outreach is more general in nature, with the broader goal of taking the information generated on campus out to communities where it can be used. It's also a two-way process, where communities can come to the university with needs as well – engage with us.

Steve B. asked if he were on campus and wanted to find out who had expertise in a particular area, if he would be able to find that out through Cooperative Extension. Fred confirmed that outreach role of agents as part of Extension's land-grant mission. Steve noted that Extension agents know their communities well, and faculty can come to them to find out more about communities they may want to go into. Fred commented on the active role of their stakeholders in the current Strategic Direction effort underway.

Fred confirmed a similar role for Marine Advisory Program agents at SFOS, following a comment by Jennifer Reynolds. He noted that the efforts he's described have focused on local areas, but the goal is to be inclusive of all areas and faculty throughout the state. Jennifer also commented on the fact that there are many individual faculty who've worked extensively to create partnerships within many communities. Fred responded he's still finding out about many of these partnerships and doesn't want to overlook anyone.

Lara H. spoke about communities potentially being overwhelmed with the outreach efforts of a large number of diverse scientists. Fred reiterated that the goal is to create working partnerships, but noted the reality of what Lara described. He gave the example of Barrow and the hundreds of grants being worked on there and corresponding numbers of researchers who come in, do their research and then leave without sharing the results with the community. Communities don't wish to be used in such a fashion and get no useful information in return.

Lara commented on the need to educate the faculty about how to get involved and give back to the communities where they've conducted research. Fred responded about the benefits of having CES agents in communities who are doing that, but noted there are no MAP or CES agents in Barrow. He wants an Extension and MAP presence there. Lara mentioned the need not to go in uninvited, along

with the existing role of the Ilisagvik College in Barrow. Jennifer emphasized that doing so would be in response to the village's request and not a unilateral move. Fred mentioned dialog with the Barrow community last April.

Cindy H. shared about the arts outreach of the campus and her work with high school students on arts projects and summer camps. She urged Fred to include the arts in the efforts he's described which have primarily mentioned research and Extension. Fred acknowledged the need for the deans or outreach managers at CLA and SOED to become more involved in the current process. A more inclusive and focused effort would result. He gave the example of four different staff approaching the high schools to ask for lists of science teachers.

Deb J. suggested contacting Sherry George at CES as a good contact for help with data and outreach. Fred noted she used to be at the Center for Distance Ed and is well-connected and informed.

VIII Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Pips Veazey

No report was available from Staff Council.

B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag, Robert Kinnard

Mari F. reported that ASUAF is working on a voter registration day. They're also planning to have a legislative luncheon to meet with the interior delegation. They wish to include all governance groups in that event.

Last month Mari had been asked to name three issues important to students. She wished to identify them as including 1.) Plus/minus grading; 2.) Consistent advising across departments; 3.) Campus parking; and 4.) Food.

Dave V. asked why the plus/minus grading was an issue: Mari said students don't understand it clearly and have the perception that it lowers GPAs, making it harder to achieve a 4.0. Ken A. asked if this view is widely held and Mari responded that it is a general view of the student body.

Jennifer R. noted the Stay on Track program is geared to full-time freshman students. She asked Mari if she could give them an idea about how much the priorities she just mentioned are reflective of ASUAF membership as a predominantly full-time freshman group, or whether they're representative of the broader non-traditional student group. Mari acknowledged that ASUAF is comprised of mostly freshmen, and the majority of students on their senate are full-time. But she emphasized that the Coalition of Students had broader representation among the non-traditional students. While the issues she mentioned are those probably more important to full-time students, Mari felt the advising issue was a concern of shared by all students.

Stephen G. asked Mari to elaborate about her statement that more consistent advising across departments is of concern to students. She noted that the Coalition of Student Leaders has looked at this issue from the perspective of better coordination between student services offices such as financial aid and the business office. From the student perspective, the push is more about the level of advising which differs between departments. Some departments take planning with and advising of students further than others. She noted that she has personally experienced the different levels of advising available to students, having moved between three departments.

C. UNAC – Jordan Titus

Stephan G. reported on Jordan's behalf. An agreement has been reached about the ORP case as a result of mediation meetings held at the request of the state and university in early October. A joint statement about the agreement is supposed to have been made, but is overdue at this time. The agreement still needs to be signed.

Information regarding upcoming general membership and executive meetings was provided.

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane reported on the Joint Health Care Committee: All four unions (UNAC, UAFT, Crafts and Trades, and the Firefighters) have agreed to vote as a block whenever possible. They plan to meet before JHCC meetings to coordinate their votes.

IX Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. December 5 Faculty Senate Meeting #179 – Location to be 401 IARC

Cathy explained how to find the location and the reason for the change.

B. Accreditation Steering Committee – Senate Rep vacancy

A one-year term is open for a volunteer from senate.

C. Edith R. Bullock Prize for Excellence – Nominations open

http://www.alaska.edu/files/foundation/Bullock_Nomination_Form.pdf

D. Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 178/1)

Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Chair (Attachment 178/2)

Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair

Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 178/3)

Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

Faculty Appeals & Oversight

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowka, Chair
(Attachment 178/4)

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair
(Attachment 178/5)

Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee – Cindy Hardy, Chair
(Attachment 178/6)

Research Advisory Committee – Peter Webley, Chair; Orion Lawlor, Co-chair

Rainer N. reported for the Curricular Affairs Committee. He mentioned the issue of the Incomplete grading policy. The committee is discussing a proposed change to the length time allowed to complete an "I", changing it from one year to one semester beyond when the "I" is given. Further extensions beyond that semester would have to be arranged. Faculty are encouraged to participate in the discussion.

Andrew M. reported for the Faculty Affairs Committee. He explained the draft Annual Activities Report sample that was attached to the agenda, noting there has since been another revision which will

be included for the next meeting. Ken A. asked that the newer revision be shared with senators so they can provide feedback about it. Jennifer noted the senate will wait on a resolution from Faculty Affairs.

Orion Lawlor reported for the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee. A revised policy for F-1 students who complete their graduate degrees has been approved by the university. The revision allows more time in the country than just ten days (which it was previously) for a student who has defended their thesis.

E. Other Comments

No additional comments were given.

X Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:53 PM.

ATTACHMENT 178/1

UAF Faculty Senate #178, November 7, 2011

Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

**Minutes: Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting
9/28/2011, 3:30-4:30 pm Kayak Room**

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

Voting members absent: Diane McEachern

Non-voting members present: Doug Goering (audio), Dana Thomas, Lillian Anderson-Misel

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

A. OLD Business

1. Approval of 14 Sept Minutes

Minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Chairperson and minutes taker elections (or whatever) for the year

Rainer formally accepted chairship of the committee.

Jayne agreed to take meeting notes to serve as minutes of the meetings and to help her stay tuned to the committee's ongoing business.

3. Request to approve R Newberry as chair of Curriculum Review Committee 2011-2012

Rainer was approved to continue chairing the Curriculum Review Committee.

4. Recent GERC issues (chairperson, etc) —comments by Dave/Carrie

David recapped the GERC meeting that took place on Sept. 26. The group discussed characteristics they would like a committee chair to have. Carrie Baker was asked if she would consider co-chairing this fall semester with David; however, the issue of needing a chair beyond this fall remains an important consideration. Neither David nor Carrie can continue the chairship through spring.

Rainer liked the idea of considering emeriti for the position, but this idea met with tepid response at the GERC meeting. The group would prefer a faculty. However, the time commitment is significant, and so is the accompanying responsibility for what is to be accomplished.

Ultimately, Curricular Affairs Committee must take responsibility for getting the work of GERC underway soon. Several emeriti faculty were mentioned (Paul Reichardt, Phyllis Morrow, Rudy Krejci, and Barbara Lando) as individuals to consider.

5. 'Stacked' courses -- comments by Tony or Rainer

Tony (Anthony A.) is on the subcommittee that was formed between CAC and GAAC members to address issues about stacked courses. Both undergraduate and graduate surveys have been formulated and Tony gave some examples of questions from each. A list of faculty teaching stacked courses is needed, and approaching the Registrar for this was suggested. Dana Thomas mentioned that full-fledged access to SurveyMonkey is available from the Provost's Office for CAC to use on this project.

Pros and cons of course stacking were discussed. Dana mentioned he would for any NWCCU accreditation rules that may apply. Doug G. mentioned that the issue has not come up with ABET accreditation of CEM because only the undergraduate programs are accredited.

6. NON-UAF courses taught AT high schools FOR high school students with UAF 100-level designators—Rainer Suggestion: students *taking such must have passed the SOA HS Exit Exams*
Discussion on this topic was postponed for the next meeting.

B. NEW Business

1. Proposed motion #1

...UAF Faculty Senate re-affirms its policy of I→F after a year and requests Faculty Senate president to pursue making this OK with the BOR.

The consensus reached after much discussion online is to have existing policy reaffirmed by the senate. Brian H. will follow up on some of the specific problems that have been raised.

Additional data has been shared from the Registrar, and this will be included in the Faculty Senate agenda for Monday, October 3.

2. Proposed motion #2:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered wholly or in part by distance delivery, and all existing courses adapted or converted to distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the Faculty Senate. Furthermore, if the mode of distance delivery changes, then the course must be re-reviewed by the appropriate committee.

Modes of distance delivery are those defined by the UA Office of Academic Affairs & Research: Independent Learning/Correspondence; Audio Conferencing; Video Conferencing; Web Meeting; Live Television/UATV; and Online/Web Delivered.

Effective: Spring 2012

Rationale: The Faculty Senate has primary authority to initiate, develop, review and approve academic criteria, regulation and policy (Faculty Senate Constitution, Article 1, Section 1). This includes curriculum review.

Distance delivery methods are fundamentally different methods of communication than face-to-face instruction. Effective instruction by distance delivery requires adapting or designing content for new formats and modes of communication. It cannot be assumed that a course approved for face-to-face delivery automatically passes review for a different mode of delivery. The structure and content of courses intended wholly or in part for distance delivery must be separately reviewed.

This motion applies to all distance delivery courses within UAF, whether listed by an academic department, a rural campus, or the Center for Distance Education (CDE).

The committee discussed concerns about the lack of review of courses being converted for distance delivery. Doug G. noted concerns relating to faculty workloads, and the fact that the deans are not necessarily aware of what courses are also being offered by distance delivery.

Dana noted that conversion of entire programs for distance delivery is under discussion. The senate needs to take note of this while considering courses. He noted the issue of academic drift where over time courses offered by distance lose their focus and faculty become out of touch with the courses and their students. There are also issues to be addressed with delivery of core courses by distance.

Carrie suggested inviting the CDE director to talk with the committee and provide input on their procedures and approach to converting courses for distance delivery. It was also noted that distance courses are being offered by the colleges or schools themselves, outside of CDE offerings.

Debra mentioned that because of student failure rates, they pulled their developmental courses out of distance delivery. Doug and Dana both mentioned the fact that deans and department chairs may be totally unaware that courses in their units are being offered by distance, and the fact is that faculty can make extra money doing it. They can also earn extra money grading coursework for CDE.

Debra asked if these issues are brought up under the Program Review process, and Dana responded that they're not, but should be. Pass/fail rates need to be discussed.

Dana reiterated that consideration of converting programs to distance delivery needs to be included in the proposed motion. Doug noted that the motion is broad and there's the issue to consider of who is administering distance courses and programs – the schools and colleges or CDE. Faculty workload is another significant issue that needs to be looked at.

David noted this motion addresses only new offerings, not existing ones. There was general agreement that synchronous course offerings (e.g., video conference courses) were more positive overall than asynchronous offerings. There are also hybrid issues such as eLive to be considered. It was also generally agreed that departments need to be aware of what courses are being distance delivered. Ongoing communication with every department chair is needed on a regular basis and student outcomes and completion rates need to be examined because of how they're being affected by distance delivery. Dana encouraged the group to ask Alex Hwu to visit from CDE.

ATTACHMENT 178/2
UAF Faculty Senate #178, November 7, 2011
Submitted by Faculty Affairs Committee

**Faculty Affairs Committee
October 19, 2011 Meeting Minutes**

Attendees:

Bella Gerlich, Ex-officio member
Ken Abramowicz
Cecile Lardon
Chris Fallen
Karen Gustafson
Mike Davis, call-in
Margaret Short
Andrew Metzger

Proposed revision to faculty activities report (**attached**) - Presented by Dana Thomas (Vice Provost) and Barbara Taylor (Director of undergraduate research and Scholarly Activity; URSA).

Proposed changes in response to undergraduate research as a priority and a recognition of the need to track undergraduate research activities – motivation for proposed changes

Undergraduate research is an accreditation metric

FAC Committee generally supports the idea

Wording of Sections 4 and 5 needs to be revised – redundancy in listing undergraduate research

Additional discussion items; possible further additions to activity report:

Service-based learning activities

Distance education learning activities

Appeals and Oversight Committee

May, or may not, be beneficial to dissolve this committee

Inquiries (informal) about dissolving this committee (Abramowicz); dissolving committee may not be desirable

May be possible to improve/ modify committee to have greater impact

Further inquiry into committee's role and products/ activities in next years – **Action Item** for next meeting

Promotion for Term Faculty

Determine what action(s) if any occurred after last time this was discussed at FAC meeting

Engage CRCD to determine their current position and understanding on the issue

Contact Jane Weber

Teaching by Non-regular Faculty

Metzger taking lead

Working with Jennifer Reynolds to secure data from last academic year

On-going effort

ANNUAL ACTIVITIES REPORT

Covers the period July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011

Instructions: Respond to each section of this Annual Activities Report as completely as possible. If you have any questions, please consult with your dean or director, or contact the Office of the Provost at 474-5178. This report is to cover the period July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011. Submit the completed report to your dean or director, together with a current CV, no later than **October 2**.

1. Personal Information

Name	Academic Title	Department/Division

2. Workload Summary

Year	Teaching (%)	Research (%)	*Service (%)

* Include management under service.

3. Teaching

Table 3.1: Instructional Activities

Semester	Course Name, Number & Title	Credits	Contact Hours (Lecture & lab, i.e. 3&0)	Students # of	Type ¹	Shared ²

¹ Classroom, studio, laboratory, distance delivery, undergraduate/graduate seminars, new course preparation, independent studies, non-credit educational activities, extension instructional activities, major revision of an older course, and other activities related to curriculum development.

² Name(s) of instructors if course is team-taught.

Table 3.2: Student Advising – Graduate and/or Undergraduate

Year	Type ¹	Number of Students

¹ Member of graduate committee, individual advising of graduate students, assigned undergraduate advisees, unassigned undergraduate advisees.

4. Research, Scholarly and other Creative Activities

Table 4.1: Publications

List only those publications that appeared in print during the time covered in this review.

Year Published	Citation ¹	Type ²	Review ³	Student Coauthor ⁴

¹ Clearly reference entry on CV or give proper citation if publication is not listed on CV.

² a) Published (i) articles and (ii) technical papers.

b) Published books, monographs, case, book chapter, book review, conference proceeding.

c) Completed reports, technical manuals, guides, pamphlets, etc., (e.g., specify if in-house or distributed by some agency other than UAF).

d) Published abstracts, including publisher, title, and author(s).

- e) Published reviews, with the complete reference.
 - f) Other scholarly publications such as magazine or newspaper articles.
- ³ e.g. Peer-reviewed, reviewed by editor or board of editors, reviewed by conference committee, reviewed by conference session chair, or other (specify).
- ⁴ Name and standing of student coauthor

Table 4.2: Publications IN PRESS			
List those publications for which all editorial work is complete; awaiting scheduled publication.			
Citation ¹	Type ²	Review ³	Student Coauthor ⁴

- ¹ Clearly reference entry on CV or give proper citation if publication is not listed on CV..
- ²
- a) Published (i) articles and (ii) technical papers.
 - b) Published books, monographs, case, book chapter, book review, conference proceeding.
 - c) Completed reports, technical manuals, guides, pamphlets, etc., (e.g., specify if in-house or distributed by some agency other than UAF).
 - d) Published abstracts, including publisher, title, and author(s).
 - e) Published reviews, with the complete reference.
 - f) Other scholarly publications such as magazine or newspaper articles.
- ³ e.g. Peer-reviewed, reviewed by editor or board of editors, reviewed by conference committee, reviewed by conference session chair, or other (specify).
- ⁴ Name and standing of student coauthor

Table 4.3: Professional, Creative Activities			
List activities such as performance, exhibits, presentations, audio/video recordings, computer programs, musical compositions, poems, concert performances, etc.			
Date	Nature of Activity/Title	Participating Individual(s) ¹	Level of Activity ²

- ¹ If participating individual is a student, indicate undergraduate or graduate student standing
- ² International, national, regional, or local.

Table 4.4: Sponsored Projects/Commissions					
Date Granted & Duration	Names ¹	PI/Co-PI?	Project Title	Grant Sponsor	Grant Amount

- ¹ Include names of all the investigators.

Table 4.5: Other Scholarly Work		
Either in tabular or narrative form, describe scholarly work in progress. This will include, but is not limited to: proposals pending, proposals in preparation, proposals submitted and denied during review period, manuscripts at all stages up to IN PRESS, unfunded projects/activity.		

Table 4.6: Conference/Meeting Participation				
Date	Conference Name	Type of Presentation/Activity ¹	Title of Presentation	Student Co-presenter ²

- ¹ Poster session, round-table, etc.
- ² Name and standing of student co-presenter

5. Integration of Teaching and Research

Table 5.1: Graduate Committee Chair:

A) Supervision of Thesis, Research/Creative Projects; B) Students with No Thesis or Project

Student Name	Duration ¹	Degree Sought	Student Status ²

¹ Indicate mentoring effort; duration and frequency of student contact, preparation, supervised and unsupervised student effort.

² Active, inactive or graduated (if graduated, indicate date year degree was awarded) and contribution to publication or presentation referenced in part 4, Research, Scholarly and other Creative Activities.

Table 5.2: Graduate Committee Member:

A) Supervision of Thesis, Research/Creative Projects; B) Students with No Thesis or Project

Student Name	Duration ¹	Degree Sought	Student Status ²

¹ Indicate mentoring effort; duration and frequency of student contact, preparation, supervised and unsupervised student effort.

² Active, inactive or graduated (if graduated, indicate date year degree was awarded) and contribution to publication or presentation referenced in part 4, Research, Scholarly and other Creative Activities.

Table 5.3: Undergraduate Research Mentoring

Year	Type ¹	Duration ²	Student Status ³

¹ Primary mentor, Co-Mentor, Supporting Mentor or Committee Member.

² Indicate mentoring effort; duration and frequency of student contact, preparation, supervised and unsupervised student effort.

³ Active, inactive or graduated (if graduated, indicate date year degree was awarded) and contribution to publication or presentation referenced in part 4, Research, Scholarly and other Creative Activities.

6. Public, University, and Professional Service

Table 6.1: Public Service¹

Activity	Duration	Your Role

¹ Public service: in organized, non-remunerative, educational and consultative activities which devolve from a unit member's professional expertise and further the interests or prestige of the University.

Table 6.2: University Service¹

Activity	Duration	Your role

¹ University service: as department head, program director, or governance officer; service on administrative and governance committees; service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office; and other tasks as deemed necessary by the University.

Table 6.3: Professional Service¹

Activity	Duration	Your Role

¹ Professional service: on grant, journal, or accreditation review boards, or as an ad hoc reviewer, in the unit member's area of expertise; as an officer in a professional society; organizing and/or chairing conferences, symposia, seminars, etc.; teaching short courses, seminars, etc. that are not regular academic courses; editing journals, books, special volumes of papers, etc.

7. Professional Development.

Describe/list activities that contributed to your professional development e.g. continued formal education, workshops, conferences, and fellowships - and indicate how they contributed to your development.

8. Honors and Awards.

List any honors and awards received, including the year in which you received them.

9. Narrative Self-Evaluation.

In each of the following categories which constituted part of your workload in the period covered by the report, briefly assess your own efforts. Focus on your comments on 1) how your effort “made a difference” and 2) frustrations/shortcomings and how you intend to address them.

- A. Teaching
- B. Research, Scholarly and Creative Work
- C. Service

10. Curriculum Vitae.

Please attach a current copy of your curriculum vitae.

ATTACHMENT 178/3

UAF Faculty Senate #178, November 7, 2011

Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women

Minutes Tue, Oct 11, 2011; 2-3 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Nilima Hullavarad, Melanie Arthur, Ellen Lopez, Jenny Liu, Shawn Russell, Johnny Payne

Members absent: Derek Sikes, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen

Guest present: Sine Anahita

1. Luncheon Report. Oct 4th Tuesday, 12.30- 2.30pm, Carol Brown Ballroom, Jane Weber reported: There were 95 attendees at the faculty luncheon – in person and online. From the past years' experience 90-100 attendees were expected. Kayt mentioned a video recording will be available on the Women's Center blog. Ellen suggested that after the speech, each table should be asked to discuss some problem or issue and collect data. E.g. a question could be discussed, or conduct a short survey, brainstorming on some topic, something that is publishable by CSW. To be discussed in future meetings.

2. Brown Bag Lunch subcommittee. Kayt Sunwood, Ellen Lopez, Nilima Hullavarad, Shawn Russell, and Melanie Arthur.

The first Brown bag lunch was held today, Oct 11, 2011 at 1 pm in Gruening 306 on the UAF campus by the Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Women, the Women's and Gender Studies Program, the UAF Women's Center and the Office of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity. The discussion was led by Sine Anahita and Sean Parsons.

3. UAF Statistics on Salary Equity Studies. Jane Weber invited Sine Anahita to discuss the data & statistics prepared by Ian Olson on the salary equity (time in rank, non-retention, etc) studies. Kayt and Sine have started a new website "Towards Equity", where all this data is available. Data was discussed in details. Melanie has agreed to double check on the data. Dean Johnny Payne suggested that we could focus the data collection on a single college and suggested the following questions for data analysis; What Happened? Why did it happen? How will it happen?' Kayt suggested that the data from 2005 can be analyzed in the same way as mean, median, mode format. Melanie's concern was: What can we do as a committee? Since we don't have direct access to any data? And, do we have a role in changing any policy? Jane reported that the 2005 data was presented to the Deans and Directors and everywhere we could. Large audience was bombarded with the data.

4. Important CSW Meeting Dates:

November meeting date. Tuesday, Nov 15th 2.00-3.00pm.

December meeting date. Tuesday, Dec 13th 2.00-3.00pm

November Brown Bag Lunch date. Friday, Nov 4th 2.00-3.00pm.

November Brown Bag Meeting date. Monday, Nov 7th 10.30-11.30am.

Meeting was adjourned at 3.00pm;

Respectfully Submitted, Nilima Hullavarad

These minutes are archived on the CSW website: <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/>

ATTACHMENT 178/4

UAF Faculty Senate #178, November 7, 2011

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes September 6, 2011**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm.

II. Roll call:

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

Absent: Stephen Brown (?)

III. Report from Joy:

After we welcomed our new members, Joy shared that she had a great New Faculty Orientation, with about 20 out of 36 new faculty participating. Joy did three syllabus workshops prior to classes starting and only a total of 10 faculty attended these. The other two workshops since then also had low attendance (Foley and Kenaston). Joy expressed frustration regarding low faculty attendance at development opportunities, so the committee discussed ideas and decided to address the issue this year. One suggestion was to have Provost Henrichs encourage faculty to attend a minimum of 8 faculty development sessions each year (except for tenured, full professors). Another idea was to develop a survey for UAF faculty to gauge their interest levels in upcoming session topics. Once our committee gets the survey ready, Joy will email it out to faculty.

Joy discovered some nice materials during her sabbatical and will give one presentation in November: one on Great Britain's Teaching Certificate program for university faculty.

IV. New Business:

1. Report on faculty development workshops:

Kelly was able to attend the first morning of the New Faculty Orientation, and while she enjoyed herself, she did not have any suggestions on how it might be improved.

2. UAF Principle Investigator:

It was decided that our committee would discuss the Research Advisory Committee's draft of Frequently Asked Questions via email and then Josef will draft a response to Peter Webley.

3. Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills:

It was decided that our committee would discuss the possible implementation of this via email as well.

4. Other:

Josef noted that Dana Thomas wants information on Smart Evaluations (electronic evaluations) made available to departments and/or have the FDAI committee look into it. Jayne Harvey had passed this on to Josef but there was some confusion as to exactly what Dana was asking for.

V. Next meeting: Tuesday, October 11, 2011, 4:00 – 5:00 pm, Bunnell 222

VI. Adjourned at 5:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 11, 2011**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 4:04 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Channon Price

Excused: Stephen Brown, Mike Castellini, Julie Joly, Alexandra Oliveira

Discussion: Diane Erickson is still listed as an official member, and since she is still interested in serving on the committee we will ask her to add our next meeting to her calendar. Kelly will talk to her and ask her to join us.

III. Report from Joy:

Joy had an interesting audio conference with United Academics, Statewide Labor Relations, and the Offices of Faculty Development in Anchorage and Juneau. While UAF employs 57 percent of the UNAC faculty and therefore should receive the bulk of faculty development funds, the union has decided to have each campus submit proposals for funding requests for faculty development. Joy did get approval to bring Bob Lucas to UAF in April to present workshops on grant writing. She has also submitted other requests, including funding for new faculty to attend a teaching conference during spring break, and \$25,000 for travel. Anchorage has requested funding to bring up a presenter to address the pitfalls of e-learning. UNAC has expressed an interest in bringing up a presenter to address bullying and incivility amongst the faculty, but Joy does not feel that this falls within the parameters of faculty development.

Joy informed us of a 6-part series on Alaska Native Issues and Pedagogy that has already started with only two people participating in the first session. The next session is on October 27. She requested that our committee be more proactive in promoting the presentations offered by the Office of Faculty Development.

Barbara Taylor from the Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Activity (URSA) office did a great presentation today on undergraduate research, but only four faculty attended. In order to discover how faculty would like to have faculty development monies spent, Duff Johnston has volunteered to speak with Cyndee West with UNAC about developing a survey that could be distributed by UNAC to their respective faculty. The survey would also need to be distributed to faculty represented by the University of Alaska Federation of Teachers in order to get feedback from them about faculty development. Items

to include on the survey would be mentoring, travel to conferences that have a specific benefit to faculty, grant writing, proposal writing, publishing, and support for faculty or teaching assistants not educated in the American university system as to what to expect in the American classroom. Duff has experience with this last issue and will discuss it with Cyndee West.

IV. Old Business:

1. Josef Glowa was elected to serve as committee chair.
2. Josef shared our committee's suggestion at the Administrative Committee meeting that the Provost encourage faculty to attend a minimum of eight faculty development presentations. Some faculty stated that eight was too many.
3. The distribution of the UAF Principle Investigator document should be sent out on the list-serve with a link to the document.
4. Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills – this was tabled for our next meeting.

V. New Business

1. Development of the survey will be on-going. Duff will contact Cyndee West with UNAC to determine their support of implementing a survey to their faculty.

VI. Next meeting: Tuesday, November 15, 2011, 4:00 - 5:00 pm, Bunnell 222

December meeting: Tuesday, December 13, 2011, 10:00 – 11:00 am, Bunnell 222

VII. Adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 178/5

UAF Faculty Senate #178, November 7, 2011

Submitted by the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee

GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate

2011-09-20 Meeting Minutes

Present:

Voting: Orion Lawlor, Vincent Cee, Elisabeth Nadin, Chung-Sang Ng, Donie Bret-Harte, Lara Horstmann-Dehn

Ex officio: Timothy Bartholomaeus, Anita Hughes, Laura Bender, Larry Duffy

Visitors: Carol Gering (ED 653 instructor)

Excused: Sue Renes

Absent: Xiong Zhang

Regarding carry over course 115-GNC/CHEM 671, Donie will continue to follow up with the instructor.

Regarding the M. Ed. in Instructional Technology Innovation ([GAAC 100-108](#)), a GAAC subcommittee consisting of Vincent, Tim, Orion, and Sue reviewed the updated syllabi for these courses. One brief comment is that “office hours” are implicitly in Alaska standard time: for world-wide students, the time zone should probably be listed explicitly. GAAC welcomes the addition of three synchronous meeting times during the semester for these distance delivered courses, and appreciates the effort the Education department has put into addressing GAAC's concerns. Based on these revisions, GAAC approved GNC 104-108: ED 653, 654, 655, 676, and 677. GAAC also approved the new concentration for M.Ed. in Instructional Technology Innovation.

Regarding [GAAC 61-92](#), the dozens of one credit courses and new certificate in construction management that Bob Perkins is putting together, a subcommittee consisting of Elisabeth, Chung-Sang, and Xiong reviewed the courses. Elisabeth talked with some of the instructors about GAAC's spring 2011 suggestion to renumber the courses. It appears renumbering to the 500 level is not appropriate, because BOR regulations stipulate that such courses cannot be applied to a graduate certificate. However, GAAC still has serious concerns that the courses as described are missing the rigorous journal-level reading and writing of a more typical graduate course. GAAC would also like to see an actual syllabus, including the actual assigned readings and a more detailed schedule. It was also unclear how the repetition for credit would be implemented to be useful for students. Discussions are ongoing, and will continue next meeting.

Regarding example syllabus for "EGG 637", after a few corrections GAAC approved this example syllabus to be posted to the faculty senate website. Lara agreed to prepare a Format 1 for this course by November.

GAAC, acting as the graduate school's curriculum council, approved the proposed LAS 693 special topics course “Data Analysis: Mixed Methods Approach”.

Discussions will continue electronically, but GAAC's next meeting will be Tuesday, October 25, at 3pm.

ATTACHMENT 178/6

UAF Faculty Senate #178, November 7, 2011

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 20, 2011**

Attending:

David Maxwell, Curt Szuberla, Alan Morotti, Dana Greci, Cindy Hardy, Amy Barnsley, Sandra Wildfeuer, Sarah Stanley, Diane Erickson, Gabrielle Russell

The committee met and addressed the following:

Meeting times: All of those attending can meet Tuesdays 12:30-2, for at least part of the meeting. Cindy will get together with Jayne to set dates for the semester's meetings.

Agenda for the year: We brainstormed a list of topics and actions for the year, including continuing work on the learning commons (a subcommittee will meet with library faculty), looking at ways to strengthen advising, looking at the effectiveness of freshman seminars, developing cross curricular support (such as writing across the curriculum), and continued conversation on Sarah's proposal to record reasons for students receiving Ds or Fs.

Sarah will write up some other ideas she'd like us to address.

We also carried over some discussion from last year:

Re-examining DEVS placement policy to determine when a student would be placed in a study skills class (i.e.: with two DEV placements? As a freshman seminar? As part of orientation?)

Reviewing student success policies that are already in place

Finding ways to support the faculty that teach 100-level classes

Course approval: Diane Erickson presented the course proposal for DEVS 114, Reading in the Humanities and Social Sciences. This course came to us last spring, but Diane asked that we address it in the first meeting of fall, so she could attend the meeting. Right now the course is offered as a special topics course. The committee approved the course unanimously.

Other notes or discussion:

Sandra shared that IAC now has a student success coordinator, Robin Brooks.

Dianne Erickson asked how we relate to the new Alaska Performance Scholarship.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Oct 10, 12:30-2pm