

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #190
Monday, April 1, 2013 – 1:00-3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds

A. Roll Call

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Faculty Senate Members Present: | Present – continued: |
| ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (13) - audio | SHORT, Margaret (13) |
| ALBERTSON, Leif (14) - audio | VALENTINE, Dave |
| BANDOPADHYAY, Sukumar (13) | WEBER, Jane (14) |
| BRET-HARTE, Donie (13) | WEBLEY, Peter (14) |
| BROWN, Stephen (13) - audio | WINFREE, Cathy (13) |
| CEE, Vincent (14) | |
| CHAMBERS, Izetta (14) - audio | Members Absent: |
| COOK, Christine (14) | ALEXEEV, Vladimir (13) |
| DAVIS, Mike (14) - audio | CHEN, Cheng-fu (14) |
| FALLEN, Chris (13) | MCEACHERN, Diane (13) |
| FOCHESATTO, Javier (14) | WINSOR, Peter (14) |
| GEORGE-BETTISWORTH, Retchenda (13) | YARIE, John (14) |
| GUSTAFSON, Karen (13) | ZHANG, Xiong (14) |
| HARDY, Cindy (13) | |
| HARDY, Sarah (13) | Others Present: |
| HEALY, Joanne (13) | Chancellor Brian Rogers |
| HEATON, John (14) | Provost Susan Henrichs |
| HENRY, David (13) | Paul Layer, Dean, CNSM |
| JENSEN, Karen (14) | Dani Sheppard |
| JOHNSTON, DUFF (13) | Debu Misra |
| JOLY, Julie (13) | Eric Madsen |
| LARDON, Cecile (13) | Libby Eddy |
| LAWLOR, Orion (13) | Jon Dehn, Past President |
| MARR, Wayne (14) | Joy Morrison |
| MEYER, Franz (13) | Roy Roehl |
| NADIN, Elisabeth (13) | Gary Jacobsen |
| NEWBERRY, Rainer (14) | Carol Gering |
| NG, Chung-Sang (13) | Abel Bult-Ito |
| RADENBAUGH, Todd (13) - audio | |
| REYNOLDS, Jennifer | |

B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #188 and #189

Minutes #188 and #189 were both approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to approve the Library Science Unit Criteria
2. Motion to amend the grading policy for C- (1.7) as minimum acceptable grade for major / minor degree requirements and prerequisites
3. Motion to revise the grade appeals policy to clarify the time period within which grade appeals will be reviewed (Section III: Procedures, Article B, Subsection 5)
4. Motion to change UAF Catalog descriptions of letter grades

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Comments – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer announced the set-up of the ad hoc committee on joint appointments. The committee will work on policies and regulations for hiring and evaluation of faculty who hold joint appointments. This is related to the Faculty Senate's work on updating the *Policies and Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty* (commonly called the Blue Book). There are eight members, including: Perry Barboza, Bill Bristow, Doug Christianson, Roxie Dinstel, Javier Fochesatto, Pat Holloway, Gordon Kruse and Patrick Marlow. They will hold an initial meeting this spring, but will continue their work in the fall. Recommendations for changes and new regulations will be made to Faculty Senate and the Provost.

Debu M. asked if this work was at the beginning stage and wanted to know who will see the results. Jennifer responded that they are just starting, and Faculty Senate as well as the Provost will see what they recommend for changed and new regulations. The committee members are being asked to do this because of their direct experience with having joint appointments. Debu asked if others may have input, also. Jennifer said they may and noted that Bill Bristow from CEM is on the committee.

There is now a web page for the committee showing its charge and membership.

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/joint-appointments/>

B. President-Elect's Comments – David Valentine

David reminded the Senate that two months ago they had passed a motion supporting the formation of a Faculty Alliance subcommittee to address General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO). The other two MAUs passed similar motions. The committee is now formed of three faculty from each MAU. Representing UAF are Jonathan Rosenberg (currently chairing the General Education Revitalization Committee), Leah Berman and Cynthia Hardy. Cynthia will not be continuing on the Faculty Senate after this semester, so David will be taking her place starting this summer. A round of applause was initiated to thank those who volunteered to serve on the committee.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers brought two items to the attention of the Faculty Senate which will be on the Board of Regents' agenda. The first item is a report that will be included in the BOR agenda concerning the West Ridge revitalization project. The project will address combined deferred maintenance issues at the Elvey, O'Neill, Irving, and Arctic Health buildings. There are major logistical and financial challenges facing this 15-year-long project, especially in terms of how to sequence the renovations without disrupting ongoing research. He encouraged those working on West Ridge to look at the report to get a sense of the scope of the issues.

The second item is a proposal from the School of Management to charge a tuition surcharge of about 25% for all of their upper division and graduate level courses. Tuition surcharges have been approved in the past by the BOR for the start-up of new programs, but not for existing programs. The School is hoping to address how they will maintain their program quality and accreditation in light of their budgetary situation by means of this surcharge. A significant number of public universities have done this, so it would be tried as an experiment. Five of the six students groups in SOM are supporting it. Their view is, if it allows the School to offer more courses in a sequence which would allow them to graduate six months to a year earlier, they would still get into the workforce sooner and enter higher paying jobs in those fields, making the cost worthwhile. He expects some reluctance for the idea at the Board of Regents' meeting.

The Chancellor gave an update on the FY14 budget. The House proposes a \$2.4 million reduction below the Governor's budget; and, the Senate proposes a \$1.8 million increase above the Governor's budget. They'll appoint a conference committee to start working this week on the differences between them. Anything not in the operating budget at this time will not go in. But, for items that made it into the budget, it's worth sending letters of support. Senate added money back into the budget that the House had deleted. Money was included for fixed cost items like eLearning, UA Press and a couple of smaller items affecting UAF. The situation with the capital budget is not known yet. Given the small tuition increase, flat enrollment numbers, and reduced federal receipts, no matter which budget is adopted, they are still faced with the fact that only half of pay raises are covered and most of our fixed costs are not fully funded. He is looking at a series of steps to help address a deficit in the range of \$6 to \$7 million or higher. One measure is a mandatory 90-day vacancy for non-faculty positions before they can be filled. They are also considering vertical cuts in each of the programmatic areas, and are continuing to focus on what they can do to reduce off-campus leasing of space, as well as energy costs.

There is now a first draft of the list of what the units of measure will be for research program review. They are also working on that for the student services and administrative reviews, as well.

Administration will be adopting a new policy for minors on campus today which will go into effect in May. It will affect any program involving under-aged minors both on campus and off campus. The policy attempts to implement best practices throughout such programs. There are always some challenges with implementation, but it's the best thing to do to protect minors as well as the university.

Elisabeth N. wanted to know what sorts of issues are involved in the new policy about minors. Chancellor Rogers responded that we have minors on campus on a regular basis, and the primary issues involved include background checks of individuals who will have contact with the minors, inventorying locations where minors will be, and addressing situations where a higher standard may need to be implemented; i.e., music lessons where it's usually one individual with the minor. One of the biggest challenges with the new policy is doing background checks of volunteers who work with camps and other sorts of activities on campus. The issues generally do not have to do with minors attending college courses.

Debu M. asked about \$6 to \$7 million deficit that the Chancellor had mentioned earlier. The Chancellor clarified that it was a deficit amount for UAF, and only an estimate. It's highly dependent upon the volume of federal funds and the indirect cost recovery associated with that. It depends upon what happens at the federal level, making it very hard to estimate. Debu asked for more explanation about the planned vertical cuts. The Chancellor responded that they are not yet identified. Identification won't be started until the final budget comes out of the legislature.

Wayne M. asked the Chancellor to explain what a vertical cut is. The Chancellor responded that, rather than taking cuts to budgets across the board, vertical cuts would target support functions in non-degree programs as opposed to degree programs. Debu then asked if cuts in travel were being looked at before such cuts. Chancellor Rogers responded that UAF travel amounted to about \$12 million last year, with \$7.5 million of that being spent from restricted funds with grants and contracts, and the remainder from state general funds. Athletic team travel was a big portion of that being paid for with state general funds. He does not want to target travel because of the importance of faculty and staff development in maintaining a qualified workforce. On the administrative side, they would look at replacing travel with more video and audio conference options, but he would not anticipate big savings in that area because it has already been under scrutiny for several years.

Karen G. asked about funding for background checks in light of the new policy concerning minors on campus. The Chancellor said the cost will be borne by either by a department or college-wide in a particular unit. If it's a significant burden for a unit, the matter would be examined at the Cabinet level to address funding issues. Portions of the new policy have slowly been implemented in order to help identify these issues, and a couple of activities could not go forward already because of not allowing time for background checks to be accomplished.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

The Provost announced that the Planning and Budget Committee would get started with its activities this week. She noted the uncertainty with next year's budget; nonetheless, the committee will move forward with new increment requests and the FY15 budget request process. They will also discuss some of the process and criteria they will use for making decisions over the next several years as they adjust to their financial circumstances.

The Provost also mentioned that the Year Three Accreditation Report will be getting underway. It's largely factual in nature and deals with resources and capacity, but it is time consuming. Vice Provost Alex Fitts will direct the process. They are looking for volunteer writers, and might be able to provide an overload or summer contract for that work.

Last, the Provost mentioned they are working on data uploads to the Faculty 180 program. There have been some glitches which they're hoping to get ironed out this week so that faculty can try it out before the end of the academic year.

Debu M. asked which faculty are on the Planning and Budget Committee. Provost Henrichs named Jennifer Reynolds, David Valentine, and noted there are two more – one from SOM and one from CEM.

V Old Business

- A. Motion to confirm the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award, submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee (Attachment 190/1)

David V. announced that the selection committee has chosen Cindy Hardy as their candidate to move forward for the Outstanding Senator of the Year award. The Faculty Senate voted on the motion to confirm her nomination, and it carried unanimously with a round of applause. Provost Henrichs and Chancellor Rogers have arranged a \$1500 travel award for Cindy to use.

- B. Motion to affirm the election of the Faculty Senate President-Elect for 2013-14, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 190/2)

Jennifer R. brought forward the motion to affirm Cecile Lardon as the next President-elect, noting that with one nomination, a secret ballot vote was unnecessary. Ayes carried the motion unanimously. A round of applause for Cecile followed the voting.

- C. Faculty Senate Election Results (Attachment 190/3)

Jennifer commented that there was still one vacancy at CNSM to be filled, noting that as long as vacancies were filled before the new Faculty Senate was seated in May, it was fine. All the other units have reported in. Jennifer thanked them and invited comments. Javier F. asked for the reason for bold font in the results. Jennifer responded that newly filled seats are bolded, and that the parentheses show the term of appointment. Terms are staggered among the units to provide continuity from year to year.

VI New Business

- A. Motion to approve a new B.A. degree in Secondary Education with Content Area, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 190/4)

The full proposal and related document containing 4 – 5 year timelines are posted at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/curriculum-review-committ/12-13-curric-review/>

Rainer N. described the new program as a repackaging of an existing program. The costs are mainly administrative for the new program. It aims to improve the quality of secondary education teachers coming out of UAF and working in Alaska, especially rural Alaska. The program integrates secondary education classes with a student's major, instead of adding on secondary ed courses after the student completes the major. The program faculty envision this will better train and motivate future teachers and place them more successfully in Alaska. There is not a huge cost to implement this and Rainer urged support. Jennifer added this new program does not replace the post baccalaureate degree, but adds a new option for obtaining the goal of teaching in secondary education.

A vote was taken, and the motion to establish the new B.A. degree in Secondary Education with Content Area carried unanimously.

The Faculty Senate moved forward with the following new business since it was too early for the scheduled break.

VI New Business Continued

- B. Resolution to recommend ending automatic university-wide review in post-tenure faculty evaluation, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 190/5)

Jennifer explained that the Administrative Committee has come forward with this resolution, being motivated by the difficulty experienced for many years in assembling enough faculty to serve on the three university-wide promotion and tenure review committees (4th year review; promotion and tenure review; and post-tenure review). One of the challenges of staffing the post-tenure review university-

wide committee in particular, is that it must be staffed with full professors. The proposed new procedure will make the system of staffing the university-wide committees more efficient in three different ways (also included in the rationale of the resolution). First, it preserves the benefits of post-tenure review, but removes the step of university-wide review for most post-tenure reviews because that step has not contributed significantly to the process. The post-tenure review faculty were headed for a satisfactory review already in most cases. The proposed changes to procedure catch any potentially unsatisfactory reviews and send only those to the university-wide post-tenure review committee. It will reduce the workload for the university-wide committee significantly, from having to review around 35 files a year down to between zero and three or four files instead, without compromising the purpose of this review. This change will allow more full professors to be available for staffing committees for the 4th year review and promotion and tenure review. Unit peer review and dean review still take place for the post-tenure reviews and are the more important for faculty development purposes for post-tenure faculty. If the resolution passes here at Faculty Senate, they will take it to Labor Relations and ask for an MOA with United Academics until the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) is renegotiated in the future. They would also ask that these changes be considered for the next CBA. This would not affect UAFT faculty.

Sukumar B., having served on the university-wide committee for many years, expressed support for this motion. He questioned a detail concerning the rank of reviewers serving on the post-tenure review committee, stating that associate professors have served on that committee. Provost Henrichs responded to his question stating that he is correct, though there is a clause in the UNAC CBA stating that only full professors may review the files of other full professors. There is a minority of associate professors on the post-tenure review committee, and they review only the files of other associate professors.

Debu M. commented that he felt that UNAC should have been involved first before this was brought before the Senate. David V. responded that this was merely a resolution to get a sense of what the Faculty Senate wants, and then it would be brought to UNAC for consideration. It is not a binding decision. Jennifer R. confirmed that Senate has no power to make this change, but before bringing the idea to the union, the resolution is needed to see if this is in fact what the Faculty Senate wants to have stated to UNAC.

Debu then responded that he doesn't believe it's a good idea because it's discriminatory action against the professors who receive unsatisfactory ratings.

Provost Henrichs commented she examined the past five years' worth of post-tenure reviews. It has never occurred that anyone getting a satisfactory rating at the unit peer and dean/director levels of review got an unsatisfactory rating at the university-wide level. The probability of this happening in the future is extremely low.

Debu asked about the other two MAUs, wanting to know if Faculty Alliance discussed this resolution at all. Jennifer noted that Faculty Alliance did discuss it at the last meeting. She forwarded copies to the Faculty Senate presidents at the other two MAUs and noted to them that any change to the CBA would affect the other MAUs. UAA's faculty senate president is taking the resolution to his executive committee today. Jennifer noted this is an early stage for this resolution. If Faculty Senate does not approve it, it goes no further, anyway.

Abel Bult-Ito commented that the union does not step into curricular affairs at the campus level. Likewise, he stated that the Faculty Senate leaders should not delve into union affairs without first coming to UNAC. He stated that he was very disappointed that this type of issue has come before the Faculty Senate which has no rights nor responsibilities regarding the CBA – its members can only follow it. He stated the resolution is in direct conflict with the current CBA, so he urged the Faculty

Senate / union members to vote against it. He stated that such changes have to be discussed among union members first and it's meaningless for it to come from the Faculty Senate. He stated he was baffled how this issue could come forward without being discussed with union leadership first, and that it is not just a resolution; it is a resolution in direct conflict with the CBA. He urged that the resolution be voted down.

Jennifer asked Abel to clarify if he was opposed on the merits or opposed on the principle of the resolution. Abel responded that it's a negotiated item and he is not going to make a public statement about an item in the collective bargaining agreement that he, as president of Faculty Senate, signed off on, and as the university representative signed off on and it is his responsibility to uphold the CBA and Faculty Senate is proposing a change to the way people are evaluated at this university that is in conflict with the CBA, so he objects vehemently against this because of a procedural issue. It's a UNAC issue and it should have been discussed with them first before bringing it before the Faculty Senate.

Rainer N. stated his opinion that Abel was having a temper tantrum. He also stated that he is a member of the union because it's required, but that the union does not represent him and he doesn't care what the union thinks. This is a good idea and we should ask people to consider it.

Julie J. made a statement that this issue has come to the fore because Unit Criteria Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee are cleaning up the Blue Book. Since many members of the faculty and the administration have recognized the process needs to be improved, it makes sense for the faculty to get together and recommend that their union consider this. It is not inappropriate to move forward in this way.

Cecile L. commented that she's a proud member of United Academics and finds unions to be incredibly important. She does not have a problem with the Faculty Senate making this suggestion to the Union. Having a resolution is the way that Faculty Senate as a body can make an official suggestion to other units on campus. It doesn't say "thou shalt do this" or that something has to be done a certain way, it asks for the topic to please be considered. She does not see a problem with that.

Steve Brown from Palmer commented that he thinks this is a good idea and supports the recommendation.

Debu M. responded to Julie's comment, saying that he understands where the process started. But the matter is one of the CBA and their door is open. Members could come to them directly and they've held forums where individuals could speak up and be heard.

Julie J. responded that Faculty Senate allows faculty to discuss these issues amongst themselves and respond with a louder voice than that of a few members. They are only asking the union to consider this issue.

Mike D. from Dillingham spoke in support of the concept presented here, but as a procedural issue, he supports getting the union's input. Cast a wide net and make sure everyone is included in the conversation.

Cindy H. asked about tabling the resolution to take time and get the union input before bringing it back for a vote. She commented that when the Senate passes a resolution they are making a clear public statement, and having been a loyal union member of both unions over time, she'd like to see that the unions are on board with this kind of a statement. She remembers when the topic of post-tenure review was a hot issue with administration and the union years ago. This would allow the union a time to

discuss the merits and move forward along with Senate in pushing for a change in the next bargaining round. It would make the resolution stronger.

Elisabeth N. said doing what Cindy proposed was pushing things forward in a way that was not proposed. Right now this is the forum in which we discuss and maybe the next step is going forward to the union. We haven't actually discussed the matter yet.

Jennifer noted as a point of order that the motion could be tabled until the next meeting, or it could be voted upon today. We just need to find out what the sense of the Faculty Senate is.

Cindy made the motion to table the resolution for further discussion with the union, and Mike seconded. Rainer commented that it was like a gag order saying we can't talk about it amongst ourselves without getting the union's permission first.

David V. pointed out that a motion to table was made and seconded, so it must be voted upon without discussion.

A verbal vote seemed equal between the ayes and nays, so a roll call vote was taken. The break occurred while the votes were counted. Following break it was announced that there were 17 ayes, and 15 nays and 1 abstention, so the resolution was tabled until the May meeting in order to seek input from the union.

- C. Motion to approve establishment of a central online collection of expanded course descriptions for all UAF courses, and template, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 190/6)

Jennifer read the following from the text of the motion:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve establishment of a central online collection of expanded course descriptions for all UAF courses, using the template provided below. Any changes to the template must be approved by the UAF Faculty Senate. Access to the online collection of expanded course descriptions shall be restricted to the University of Alaska community through a UA login.

This motion supersedes the Faculty Senate motion of October 12, 2009 (Meeting #161) to establish a single website containing sample syllabi for UAF courses.

She noted that the web site referenced in the old 2009 motion was never created. Mention of it here helps clear the table for this new online system, should the Faculty Senate approve it.

Also included with the motion are lists of what items are taken from the syllabus and what items are entered from drop-down menus to create the course descriptions. Three examples are also included, taken from sample syllabi found on the Faculty Senate web site.

Margaret S. asked if these course descriptions were binding or if the course syllabus overrides them. Jennifer explained they're not binding and confirmed the syllabus would override them. The expanded descriptions are not in the Catalog, which is another reason they're not binding in any way. These are intended as information for students and advisors when making academic plans. They don't include activities and textbooks and course schedule, which stay in the syllabus. The parts included in the expanded course description are from the more stable parts of the syllabus and should not have to change as often as the syllabus. They are basically "cut and paste" and should be simple to create, requiring only minimal upkeep.

Abel Bult-Ito read from a portion of the CBA, section 14.3.A.2 to make a point that everything a faculty produces is their intellectual property. He said the motion lacks the consent of the individual faculty member. He suggests modifying the motion to include instructor permission to take parts of the syllabus for the online repository.

Orion L. commented that the last paragraph from where Abel was reading from the CBA states that the university reserves the right to use all supportive works on a royalty free basis. This gives the university the right to take parts of a syllabus and publish them, for example. He asked about including more detailed information in the description such as how a course is graded. Jennifer responded that this had been discussed and the consensus was to leave it out to discourage instructor and course shopping. They want to promote classes based upon academic content instead.

Julie J. asked who is going to do the uploading task. Jennifer noted that the work is not assigned, but they tried to design something simple and fast that perhaps department support staff could upload and keep updated.

Dean Layer commented about the many different sections of some courses, such as MATH F107, wanting to confirm that the expanded course descriptions were general enough for each course that they would not have to differentiate between course sections. The purpose of the expanded course descriptions does not extend to the level of granularity among different sections.

Jennifer invited input from the rural campuses. Todd R. (Dillingham) noted staffing is low at rural sites. He wouldn't wish to have more work on him or his staff.

Franz Meyer reiterated that the goal is not to post the syllabus. The goals are to provide enough general course information to give students an idea of what they're signing up for and advisors the information needed to guide their students into appropriate courses. With that in mind, it would be more helpful to at least know if the courses are letter-graded vs. pass / fail.

Todd R. commented that in many cases they are teaching courses at the rural sites for other departments, so if the burden of posting expanded course descriptions is on the home department rather than the faculty who might be teaching them at a rural campus, this would be more workable. If this required more work for already short-staffed rural sites, that would be a problem.

Donie B. spoke in support of the motion. The Biology Department discussed this and agreed there is often not enough information in the Catalog description to adequately advise students. The content of the expanded course descriptions would be very useful. She agreed that there are issues of intellectual property with posting full syllabi, and noted that syllabi can be misinterpreted or misused in ways that were unintended. But with the restricted access, it's protected and a good solution for the needs of advisors and students.

Peter W. also supported the internal access required to access expanded course descriptions. It's a positive feature that will benefit students across the entire campus.

Debu M. asked if there is a guarantee that this system wouldn't be misused. There was a general response that no one could guarantee misuse, but that reasonable measures would be in place to prevent misuse.

Dean Layer asked if changes to expanded course descriptions will need Faculty Senate review and approval if they are subsequently changed. Jennifer responded that they won't. The purpose is for

providing up-to-date information for advisors and students, and there is no intent to police course content. David commented that if the Catalog description and online expanded description began to significantly contradict each other, there would need to be some mechanism for addressing it. Jennifer responded that they would request an update to the Catalog description at that point.

Ken A. suggested a scenario where providing course information would be part of a workload directive from the department, such as filling out a sheet for each course an instructor teaches for the purpose of providing content for the expanded description. This would get around issues of intellectual property. An instructor could take information from the syllabus if they wished, but wouldn't have to. Jennifer responded that the suggestion was not what was intended here with the motion before them.

Debu M. commented that even with the scenario suggested by Ken, the work product would still be considered intellectual property.

Cecile L. noted that all of this is covered by the same portion of the CBA that addresses syllabi.

The motion was voted upon, and passed by the majority. There were four nays and one abstention.

Jennifer noted that the details will need to be worked out, and invited everyone's comments and questions, encouraging members to get input from their units.

VII Discussion Items

A. Invitation for feedback to FDAI on "Assessment of Electronic Course Evaluation Options for UAF" – Franz Meyer (Attachment 190/7)

Franz described the project undertaken by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee and Eric Madsen from the School of Education. They have examined the literature about electronic course evaluation systems and explored what technology is currently available. They have come up with an assessment of the available technology and the potential effects of adopting and implementing such a system at UAF. The implications of making such a change would affect everyone, changing how course evaluations are made and what information is collected. Faculty need to have a say in this. Over the past four and a half months they have looked at wide range of software vendors and tried to assess how they fit needs at UAF. The attached report (Attachment 190/7) provides a summary, without the committee's conclusions, of what the final report will contain. Please look it over and see if you have any feedback about items you think the committee should consider or may have overlooked. Let Eric Madsen or Franz know by email over the next week and a half. They will meet in two weeks where they will finalize the main report layout, so they would like feedback before that step.

Jennifer encouraged senators to review the attachment and give Franz feedback.

VIII Public Comments/Questions

Abel Bult-Ito addressed the Senate again, saying everyone here is a union member, so when you talk about the union you talk about yourself. If you give things away here at Faculty Senate, it makes it very hard to get them back at the union negotiation table. He was involved in the rewrite of Article 14, so to say that the university can use this royalty free is in a very specific context and may not apply directly to the control that you have over your intellectual property. Don't blame the union because when you do, you are blaming yourself. It's your active involvement that makes a difference, whether you're a member of UNAC, UAFT or the adjuncts union – we are the union as active members and he just represents you as the elected president.

He also commented on electronic course evaluations, noting they do not work at UAS and UAA because the participation rate is too low. The response rate will go from 80-90% down to 5-10%. Instructors will be evaluated on a return rate that's dismal and doesn't mean anything.

A new, untenured (but tenure-track) faculty member spoke about getting a letter of non-retention due to lack of budget from their dean and shared a copy of that letter. The process was described as very cold and unsympathetic. They were not told the nature of the meeting beforehand, and the actual meeting only lasted a minute. They were given the letter and had no recourse. Other faculty in the unit indicated they were not consulted, nor were any ideas discussed about other means of addressing budget matters. They went to the union and were told to count their blessings as they had twelve months to find other employment. They were advised not to appeal the decision or it would hurt their career, and they felt threatened into silence. They share this with Faculty Senate today because this same thing could happen to other untenured members who are most vulnerable to these types of circumstances.

A long-time faculty member of 25 years from the same unit spoke about being exceedingly disturbed by the turn of events just described. There was no discussion amongst the faculty in the unit about the decision to terminate a new tenure-track faculty member or to address budget concerns or to look for other ways to handle the matter. He asked how faculty are going to be recruited under these types of conditions. He also urged Faculty Senate to address this turn of events and not forget this. He predicted that a staff person will start to teach the courses, and the trend may become the hiring of retired professionals to teach rather than recruiting tenure-track faculty. He hopes the Faculty Senate and union are listening, because these types of things should not be happening at a major research institution.

Debu commented that this is the first time he had seen the letter.

Mike D. commented that he would like further discussion at the next Faculty Senate meeting about issues of budget and related budget constraints and their effect on programs in the future. He would like to come with a recommendation for the next Senate meeting to address more faculty representation on the budget committee the Provost had described in her comments. He would like to talk with Faculty Senate leadership more on that topic, and Jennifer indicated they could have that discussion after the meeting.

IX Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Juella Sparks

No report was available from Staff Council.

B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag

No report was available from ASUAF.

C. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

Dani reported about some of the initiatives going on in Athletics. She has started conducting exit interviews to collect solid data from student athletes who've exhausted their eligibility. She is also working on ramping up the scholarships available to student athletes and getting more students nominated for those; particularly the post-graduate scholarships that are offered at a national level. They had three students nominated this year who are going forward for regional consideration.

Dr. Gray, director of Athletics, is turning things around at the department and providing impressive leadership. Some of the issues he's looking at include revising eligibility and financial aid issues, drug-

testing policies, facilities planning – both short- and long-term, and embarking upon a five-year strategic planning process and redoing the budgeting process.

Concerning the GPA awards from fall semester that she had mentioned at the last meeting, the faculty athletic reps from within their conference have initiated a faculty athletic rep award that requires a cumulative GPA of 3.85 or higher. They were able to award 17 of those this year, which constitutes about 15% of their student athletes. Six of their seven winter sport teams went to post-season play. They turned out a national champion swimmer for the first time.

One of the structures that Dr. Gray has put in place at the department is a leadership team to help with making major departmental decisions. Dani is on that team, so there is a faculty voice in the department now.

D. UNAC – Debu Misra

Debu mentioned the general membership meeting they had with Vice Chancellor Pat Pitney and Associate Vice Chancellor Raaj Kurapati as guests. The slides Raaj presented are now available on the Faculty Senate web site. There is a question about how the numbers were used in the presentation, and Debu will get clarification and share that via email with everyone.

He announced a special speaker for Thursday. Bill Lyne from Western Washington University will talk about eLearning at Schaible Auditorium from 1:00 – 2:00 PM. He is considered an expert in the field.

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane commented about Joint Health Care Committee. Due to lack of quorum, the March meeting was cancelled. April 19 is the next meeting. She reminded everyone that open enrollment for health care is coming up this month. Information should be mailed soon.

X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

Franz Meyer commented that the report from FDAI about electronic course evaluation will address response rates by students. He urged everyone to read the report and make up their own minds. Response rates are an issue and they are definitely being taken into consideration.

B. Committee Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 190/8)

Faculty Affairs – Cecile Lardon, Chair

Unit Criteria – Karen Jensen, Chair

Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 190/9)

Core Review Committee – Jean Richey, Chair

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
(Attachment 190/10)

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair
(Attachment 190/11)

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair
(Attachment 190/12)

Research Advisory Committee – Jon Dehn, Chair (Attachment 190/13)

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:01 PM.

ATTACHMENT 190/1

UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013

Submitted by the Outstanding Senator of the Year Selection Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the nomination of Cynthia Hardy for the 2012-2013 Outstanding Senator of the Year Award.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The selection committee has carefully reviewed the nominations according to the award criteria, and forwards the nomination of Cynthia Hardy as Outstanding Senator of the Year for confirmation by the Faculty Senate. Procedure stipulates that a simple majority vote of the Senate shall confirm the nomination, and a formal resolution shall be prepared for presentation to the recipient at the May meeting.

ATTACHMENT 190/2
UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to affirm the election of Cecile Lardon as the Faculty Senate President-Elect for 2013-2014.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: A single nomination has been received for the President-Elect position; therefore, a secret ballot election need not be held. A simple majority vote will suffice.

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF THE NOMINEE:

Cécile Lardon, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Psychology

I came to Fairbanks and to UAF in 1999 after earning an M.A. and Ph.D. in community and organizational psychology at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). I was a member of the Psychology Department for the first 13 years at UAF but joined the Sociology Department this year where I currently serve as the interim department chair. I have long been interested in organizational and community change and in leadership. While at UIC I worked at the Institute of Government and Public Affairs where I participated in organization development and strategic planning with government and not-for-profit agencies. My dissertation was on organizational cultures in state psychiatric hospitals. In Alaska I have worked with Alaska Native communities on health issues. A multi-year NIH funded project aimed to develop a community development approach to health promotion by designing a culturally based planning and evaluation process and then developing local expertise, infrastructure and processes to support that project plan.

I have served on the Faculty Senate for a total of 5 years: My first term in 2005/06 ended prematurely when I needed to take on the role of department chair in the Psychology Department. More recently I have served two full terms. My Faculty Senate committee work has included the Committee on the Status of Women (1 year) and the Faculty Affairs Committee (4 years) which I have chaired this year. Participating in governance has always been a priority for me. I grew up in Germany in the 60s and 70s as part of the second post-WWII generation. Being an active and critical member of one's society was a strong societal value that has shaped my life since. I strongly believe in the importance of shared governance in the academy. And to make that work faculty need to be active, informed, and critical participants. Although there are many ways for faculty to participate in the affairs of the university, the Faculty Senate is the main venue for faculty to shape policies and help set priorities that affect our work. To be an effective body the Senate needs to draw on the perspectives and talents of all its members. It also needs to take an active role in developing its future leaders. Serving as Faculty Senate President during a time of high levels of general disengagement and cynicism among the faculty can certainly be a challenge but I also see it as an opportunity to bring new interest in and attention to the issues the Senate deals with. I feel honored to have the opportunity to participate in the Senate's crucial role as a credible and forward thinking partner in university governance.

FS Election Results as of 3/22/2013:

College of Liberal Arts

| Representatives | Alternates |
|---|--|
| Arts & Communication – Vince Cee (14) | Arts & Communication – Karl Knapp (15) |
| English & Humanities – Chris Coffman (15) | English & Humanities – Michael Edson (14) |
| Language & Culture – Anna Berge (15) | Language & Culture – Alla Grikurova (14) |
| Social Sciences – Amy Lovecraft (15) | Social Sciences – Chanda Meek (15) |
| Applied & Distance Program – J. Rob Duke (15) | Applied & Distance Programs – Vacancy |
| At large – Duff Johnston (14) | At large – Wendy Croskrey (15) |
| At large – Karen Gustafson (14) | |

Libraries – New Representation

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Leslie McCartney (15) | Elizabeth Humrickhouse (15) |
| Dennis Moser (14) | |

College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics

| Representatives | Alternates |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Mark Conde (15) | Falk Huettmann (14) |
| Donie Bret-Harte (15) | Ataur Chowdhury (15) |
| Javier Fochesatto (14) | Brian Rasley (15) |
| Knut Kielland (14) | Vacancy |
| Franz Meyer (15) | |
| Rainer Newberry (14) | |
| Margaret Short (15) | |

College of Rural & Community Development

| Representatives | Alternates |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Bill Barnes (15) – UAF CTC | Jennie Carroll (14) – IAC |
| Mike Davis (14) – BBC | Diane McEachern (15) - KUC |
| Galen Johnson (15) – UAF CTC | Patty Meritt (14) – CTC |
| Todd Radenbaugh (15) - BBC | |
| Jane Weber (14) – CRCDD | |
| Cathy Winfree (15) – UAF CTC | |

Cooperative Extension Service

| Representatives | Alternate(s) |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Leslie Shallcross (15) | Julie Cascio (14) |
| Leif Albertson (14) | |

College of Engineering & Mines

| Representatives | Alternates |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Cheng-fu Chen (14) | Orion Lawlor (14) |
| Debu Misra (15) | Rorik Peterson (15) |
| Xiong Zhang (14) | |

School of Natural Resources & Agriculture

| Representatives | Alternate(s) |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| Julie L. Joly (15) | Glenn Juday (14) |
| John Yarie (14) | |

School of Education

| Representatives | Alternate(s) |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Christine Cook (14) | Phil Patterson (15) |
| Joanne Healy (15) | |

School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences

| Representatives | Alternates |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Izetta Chambers (14) | Tori Baker (14) |
| Sarah Hardy (15) | Andrew McDonnell (15) |
| Lara Horstmann (15) | |
| Peter Winsor (14) | |

School of Management

| Representatives | Alternates |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Xiaoqi Chelsea Han (15) | Jungho Baek (14) |
| Wayne Marr (14) | Charlie Sparks (15) |

Geophysical Institute

| Representatives | Alternate(s) |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Jonathan Dehn (15) | Gerhard Kramm (15) |
| Peter Webley (14) | |

Int'l Arctic Research Center

| Representatives | Alternate(s) |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Chris Fallen (15) | <i>Pending</i> |
| Georgina Gibson (14) | |

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the new Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education with Content Area.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014, with Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: Alaska has a chronic need for teachers. This proposed new major provides a structured path, within a baccalaureate degree, for a student to gain the complete education necessary to become a secondary education teacher in the State of Alaska. The program is structured to improve access to interested students and to increase availability of qualified and successful secondary school teachers in Alaska, particularly in rural Alaska. The additional cost of this program is essentially administrative, with no new courses or faculty required, but the likely benefits are considerable.

Currently a student intending to become a secondary educator earns a baccalaureate degree in a subject area and then undergoes 1-2 years of post-baccalaureate teacher training. There are numerous disadvantages to this approach, including extremely limited financial aid for the post-baccalaureate training and a disconnect between studying the major subject and learning to teach that subject. The new approach addresses these problems by enrolling the student in a unified, integrated double major in Secondary Education combined with a major in an approved Secondary Education field (English, Mathematics, Art, Biology, etc.).

Other advantages of the proposed program stem directly from identification of interested students early in their career at UAF. These students interact with (and provide moral support to) each other and establish long-term working relationships with the secondary education faculty. Further, through integration of their education coursework and their major they receive consistent encouragement in their intended career path. Finally, through their continuous interaction with the secondary education faculty they receive encouragement to pursue careers in secondary education in rural Alaska.

This program addresses UA's Strategic Direction Initiatives, specifically SDI Theme 2: *Productive Partnerships With Alaska's Schools*, Topic 2.c *Teachers for Alaska Schools*. In particular, the program will address SDI through (1) improving teacher education, (2) providing greater incentives for Alaskan students to teach in rural communities, and (3) providing greater opportunities for incoming Alaskan minority educators. The program is also likely to result in the desired SDI effects of (1) high-quality UA-educated teachers, (2) a greater proportion of UA-educated Alaskan new teacher hires, and (3)-better retention of students interested in a career in secondary education.

The full program proposal, #31-UNP (revised) from the Fall 2012 review cycle, is available at <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/curriculum-review-committ/12-13-curric-review/>

**STATEMENT OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM, ITS OBJECTIVES
AND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES**
New Degree Request

The University of Alaska Secondary Education Department prepares teachers for 7-12 grade classrooms. The program's aim is to develop teachers who can demonstrate through standards-based, performance assessment that they will be effective teachers for all students. The primary mission is to provide teachers for the unique environments of Alaska's urban and rural communities. This will be a truly unique degree program as it is the only BA degree that requires a double major. In order for students to be certified by the State of Alaska, they need to complete a teacher education program as well as a content major for which they will be endorsed on their certificate. This double major results in more than 120 credits, which is the minimum number of credits for a degree in a content area. However, a student cannot be certified unless they have an accompanying content major along with the secondary education major.

The Alaska Content/Performance and Cultural Standards for school students are the foundations of education for children in Alaska. The Standards for Alaska Teachers adopted by the Department of Education and Early Development are recognized as indicators of successful teachers. The goal of the Secondary Education Department is to develop teachers who successfully incorporate Content/Performance and Cultural standards into their instruction and who successfully meet all Standards for Alaska Teachers.

To assist in meeting state mandated standards, the effective preparation of teachers requires participation of university faculty and master practitioners actively involved in the teaching profession. Currently, the secondary program involves collaborative partnerships among districts, schools and the university. It draws upon the expertise of public school teachers who serve as mentors throughout the academic year. The program seeks to build a collaborative learning community between the university and secondary faculties from schools throughout the state.

Students in the secondary teacher preparation program are assessed relative to state and national standards, including National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards, the Alaska Teacher Standards, Alaska Content Standards, Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools and standards relative to academic specialty organizations (i.e. National Council of Teachers of English, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Council of Social Studies, National Science Teachers Association, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages).

Specific Objectives of the new baccalaureate degree are:

1. To provide a teacher certification program that can be completed concurrent with an undergraduate degree.
2. To provide undergraduate teacher certification course work leading to a baccalaureate degree that includes both academic and classroom internship requirements necessary to meet NCATE Standards, standards of academic specialist areas, Alaska Teacher Standards, and Alaska Standards for Culturally Responsive Schools through close and on-going collaboration with districts and schools in urban and rural Alaska.

3. To provide an undergraduate teacher certification degree that responds to the State of Alaska's critical need for more teachers who are prepared to successfully teach in linguistically and culturally diverse schools.

The central components of the new baccalaureate degree include:

1. Identified undergraduate majors in content areas suitable for public school teaching that can be completed concurrently with education courses leading to teaching certification.
2. Early, appropriate and consistent advising of students who seek to enter the teaching profession in an identified content area.
3. An integrated set of education courses and fieldwork experiences in school and community contexts throughout the degree offering to provide the foundation for a successful internship.
4. A year-long school internship with a mentor teacher with concurrent enrollment in professional coursework that focuses on the integration and application of theory, research and practice in both urban and rural school environments.

Career Opportunities

There are unlimited career opportunities for secondary teachers in the State of Alaska, as well as nearly every other state in the United States. This program is designed to help fill the hundreds of positions in the State of Alaska open every year to qualified teachers that are currently filled by candidates from outside the State. Existing and predicted shortages of teachers are well documented in the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, in the Alaska Teacher Placement Office and in the U.S. Office of Education.

Description of the Program

1. Program title B.A., Secondary Education; Content Area (e.g. English, history, biology, mathematics)

2. Credential level of the program, if appropriate Secondary (7-12) Teacher Licensure

3. Admission Requirements

- Complete the [general university requirements](#).
- Complete the [B.A. degree requirements](#).
- Enrollment in a major in a content area usually taught in public schools AND enrollment in a major in secondary education.

Admission to professional year

- a) Senior standing
- b) 2.75 Minimum grade point average
- c) Three current letters of reference that address potential as a teacher
- d) *A personal statement of 500-800 words addressing motivation to enter the teaching profession, self-assessed qualifications to teach, experiences which have prepared candidate for teaching.
- e) Alaska passing scores from the Praxis I exam in reading, writing and mathematics
- f) Academic Content Testing

Content Area Exams: Candidates must submit a score report from the relevant content knowledge Praxis II Subject test for each content area the applicant expects to teach. The scores must meet the score set by the State of Alaska

(www.eed.state.ak.us/TeacherCertification/pdf/Content_Area_Exams_2008.pdf)

World Language Exams: Applicants applying to teach a World Language are required to submit Praxis II scores in the target language AND are required to submit scores for the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) and Writing Proficiency Test (WPT). Applicants must meet the Advanced Low rating for both tests (www.languageTesting.com).

- g) An extemporaneous writing sample
- h) Interview with secondary faculty.

Each candidate is evaluated based on the above requirements. Each candidate must receive acceptable rating on each of the criteria and be interviewed by three faculty members prior to being accepted into the professional year. The entire faculty meets and either approves the candidate or rejects the candidate. In rare cases the candidate may be provisionally admitted with areas needing strengthening.

4. Course descriptions of required and recommended elective courses.

These required education courses are currently available through face-to-face delivery on the Fairbanks campus and through a variety of distance delivery modes (synchronous/asynchronous or a combination). Courses have been developed as part of an overall program that connects theory and practice and sufficiently grounds prospective teachers in pedagogical theory and classroom practice.

Content course selections are designed to both meet the requirements for specialty organizations and NCATE and to fulfill requirements for content area majors.

Proposed General Catalog Layout Copy of Program

Bachelor of Arts Secondary Education; Content Area (e.g. English, history, biology, mathematics)

The requirements for a secondary school teaching certificate include completion of both a teaching major in an academic subject area appropriate to the secondary school and the professional education sequence. The degree is awarded as a B.A. with a double major.

Upon declaration of a major in secondary education, students are assigned an advisor in the Education Department to plan the completion of the teaching major and the education sequence of courses.

Teaching Majors

The teaching major must be in an academic subject area approved for a State of Alaska secondary school teaching certificate and available as a B.A. degree: art, biology, chemistry, earth science, economics, English, French, German, history, mathematics, political science, or Spanish.

Course work provides students on the Fairbanks campus and in distance sites with the experience necessary to be eligible for a secondary teacher license. The integrated of content major degree requirements and secondary education degree requirements are designed to prepare students to meet standards that recognize, respect and build upon Alaska's cultural, linguistic and geographic factors.

- Complete the following secondary course work:
 - EDSC F110—Becoming a Middle School/High School Teacher (1)
 - EDSC F407--Reading Strategies for Secondary Teachers (3)
 - EDSC F414--Learning, Development and Special Needs Instruction (3)
 - or EDSE 422 – Curriculum and Strategies II: High Incidence (3)

or EDSE F482 Inclusive Classrooms for All Children (3)
EDSC F205--Introduction to Secondary Education (3)
or EDSC F415--Foundations of Modern Educational Practices (3)
EDSC F458--Classroom Organization and Management (3)

Must be admitted to the Professional year

EDSC F402--Methods of Teaching in the Secondary School (3)
EDSC F442 --Technology Applications in Education I (1)
EDSC F443--Technology Applications in Education II (2)
EDSC F457--Multicultural Education and School-Community Relations (4)
EDSC F471--Secondary Teaching: School Internship I and Seminar (3)
EDSC F472--Secondary Teaching: School Internship II and Seminar (3-9)

One of the following

EDSC F432--English/Language Arts Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3)*
or EDSC F433--Mathematics Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3)*
or EDSC F434--Science Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3)*
or EDSC F435--Social Studies Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3)*
or EDSC F436--Art Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3) *
or EDSC F437—World Language Secondary Instruction and Assessment (3) *

**Candidates must take the section or course that corresponds with their major teaching content areas*

Complete requirements for a major in content area: art, biology, chemistry, earth science, economics, English, French, German, history, mathematics, political science, or Spanish.

**RESOURCE COMMITMENT TO THE
PROPOSED DEGREE PROGRAM**

| Resources | Existing | New | | Total |
|---|--|----------------|------------------|--|
| | College/School | College/School | Others (Specify) | |
| Regular Faculty (FTE's & dollars) | \$392,970 budgeted salary, \$142,961 benefits 5.875 FTE | No Change | No Change | \$392,970 budgeted salary, \$142,961 benefits 5.875 FTE |
| Adjunct Faculty (FTE's & dollars) | \$106,969 budgeted salary, \$10,697 benefits 1.75 FTE | \$3,000 | No Change | \$109,969 budgeted salary, \$10,697 benefits 1.75 FTE |
| Teaching Assistants (Headcount) | 1 | No Change | No Change | 1 |
| Instructional Facilities (in dollars and/or sq. footage) | 160 Old U Park 820 sq. ft | No Change | No Change | 160 Old U Park 820 sq. ft. |
| Office Space (Sq. footage) | 701A, 714C, 714B, 709A, 719, 721, 723, 707C, 701A Gruening 973 sq. ft. | No Change | No Change | 701A, 714C, 714B, 709A, 719, 721, 723, 707C, 701A Gruening 973 sq. ft. |
| Lab Space (Sq. Footage) | 162 Old U Park 820 sq. ft. | No Change | No Change | 162 Old U Park 820 sq. ft. |
| Computer & Networking (in dollars) | \$37,285 for all SOE | No Change | No Change | \$37,285 for all SOE |
| Research/ Instructional/ office Equipment (in dollars) | \$7,000 for SOE | No Change | No Change | \$7,000 for SOE |
| Support Staff (FTE's & dollars) | \$94,866 budgeted salary, \$45,214 benefits 1.5 FTE | \$5,000 | No Change | \$99,866 budgeted salary, \$45,214 benefits 1.5 FTE |
| Supplies (in dollars) | Avg \$1,000 / FY | No Change | No Change | Avg \$1,000 / FY |
| Travel (in dollars) | Avg \$10,000 / FY | No Change | No Change | Avg \$10,000 / FY |



Board of Regents Program Action Request
University of Alaska
 Proposal to Add, Change, or Delete a Program of Study

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| 1a. Major Academic Unit (choose one) UAF | 1b. School or College EDUCATION | 1c. Department SECONDARY | |
| 2. Complete Program Title SECONDARY EDUCATION; CONTENT AREA (e.g. English, History, Biology, Mathematics) | | | |
| 3. Type of Program <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AAS x <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Baccalaureate <input type="checkbox"/> Post-Baccalaureate Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Master's <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate | | | |
| 4. Type of Action x <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add <input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> Delete | | 5. Implementation date (semester, year) Fall, 2013 | |
| 6. Projected Revenue and Expenditure Summary. Not Required if the requested action is deletion. (Provide information for the 5 th year after program or program change approval if a baccalaureate or doctoral degree program; for the 3 rd year after program approval if a master's or associate degree program; and for the 2 nd year after program approval if a graduate or undergraduate certificate. If information is provided for another year, specify (1st) and explain in the program summary attached). Note that Revenues and Expenditures are not always entirely new; some may be current (see 7d.) | | | |
| Projected Annual Revenues in FY 2013-14 | | Projected Annual Expenditures in FY 2014 for all of Secondary not just this degree | |
| Unrestricted | | Salaries & benefits (faculty and staff) | \$793,677 |
| General Fund | \$-0- | Other (commodities, services, etc.) | \$45,285 |
| Student Tuition & Fees | \$121,900-145,900 | TOTAL EXPENDITURES | \$838,962 |
| Indirect Cost Recovery | \$-0- | One-time Expenditures to Initiate Program (if >\$250,000) | |
| TVEP or Other (specify): | \$-0- | (These are costs in addition to the annual costs, above.) | |
| Restricted | | Year 1 | \$-0- |
| Federal Receipts | \$-0- | Year 2 | \$-0- |
| TVEP or Other (specify): | \$-0- | Year 3 | \$-0- |
| TOTAL REVENUES | \$-0- | Year 4 | \$-0- |
| Page # of attached summary where the budget is discussed, including initial phase-in: 30 | | | |
| 7. Budget Status. Items a., b., and c. indicate the source(s) of the General Fund revenue specified in item 6. If any grants or contracts will supply revenue needed by the program, indicate amount anticipated and expiration date, if applicable. | | | |
| Revenue source | | Continuing | One-time |
| a. In current legislative budget request | | \$-0- | \$-0- |
| b. Additional appropriation required | | \$-0- | \$-0- |
| c. Funded through new internal MAU redistribution | | \$-0- | \$-0- |
| d. Funds already committed to the program by the MAU ¹ | | \$-0- | \$-0- |
| e. Funded all or in part by external funds, expiration date | | \$-0- | \$-0- |
| f. Other funding source Specify Type: | | \$-0- | \$-0- |
| 8. Facilities: New or substantially (>\$25,000 cost) renovated facilities will be required. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes x <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, discuss the extent, probable cost, and anticipated funding source(s), in addition to those listed in sections 6 and 7 above. | | | |

¹Sometimes the courses required by a new degree or certificate program are already being taught by an MAU, e.g., as a minor requirement. Similarly, other program needs like equipment may already be owned. 100% of the value is indicated even though the course or other resource may be shared.

9. Projected enrollments (headcount of majors). If this is a program deletion request, project the teach out enrollments.

| | | | |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Year 1: 15 | Year 2: 15 | Year 3: 20 | Year 4: 20 |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|

Page number of attached summary where demand for this program is discussed: **17**

10. Number* of new TA or faculty hires anticipated (or number of positions eliminated if a program deletion):

| | |
|--------------|------|
| Graduate TA | None |
| Adjunct | None |
| Term | None |
| Tenure track | None |

11. Number* of TAs or faculty to be reassigned:

| | |
|--------------|------|
| Graduate TA | None |
| Adjunct | None |
| Term | None |
| Tenure track | None |

Former assignment of any reassigned faculty:
For more information see page _____ of the attached summary.

12. Other programs affected by the proposed action, including those at other MAUs (please list):

| Program Affected | Anticipated Effect | Program Affected | Anticipated Effect |
|--|---|--|---|
| Teacher education programs at other MAU's. | Some students may be attracted to the Fairbanks campus because of the offering, however the impact to other campuses is likely to be minimal. It is anticipated that the highest number of recruitments will be from rural areas currently served by UAF. | Departments at UAF that offer content majors suitable for teaching (math, English, sciences, history) | Departments may see an increase in enrollment if students choose UAF becau of the baccalaureate degree leading to a degree and teacher license. |
| | | | |

Page number of attached summary where effects on other programs are discussed: 20, 22

13. Specialized accreditation or other external program certification needed or anticipated. List all that apply or 'none':
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).
(As of January 1, 2013, NCATE will be called Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)).

14. Aligns with University or campus mission, goals, core themes, and objectives (list):
Educate undergraduate students.
Prepare: Alaska's Career, Technical and Professional Workforce
Connect: Alaska Native, Rural, and Urban Communities through Contemporary and Traditional Knowledge
Engage: Alaskans via Lifelong Learning, Outreach, and Community and Economic Development

Page in attached summary where alignment is discussed: 1, 2, 14, 15, 25, 26

15. State needs met by this program (list):

The Institute for Social and Economic Research 2011 report "Alaska's University for Alaska's Schools," indicates that 28% of all teachers statewide are prepared in the UA system. Research shows that teachers trained in Alaska stay longer, which means better continuity, especially in the rural areas. More continuity means higher achievement. The need for secondary teachers is significantly more pronounced than that for elementary teachers.

Page in the attached summary where the state needs to be met are discussed: **page 18, 19, 25**

16. Program is initially planned to be: (check all that apply)

☐ Available to students attending classes at campus(es).

☐ Available to students via e-learning. **All EDSC courses available by e-learning.**

☒ Partially available students via e-learning. **Not all content degree courses are available by e-learning.**

Page # in attached summary where e-learning is discussed: **25**

Submitted by the University of Alaska Fairbanks with the concurrence of its Faculty Senate.

*Net FTE (full-time equivalents). For example, if a faculty member will be reassigned from another program, but his/her original program will hire a replacement, there is one net new faculty member. Use fractions if appropriate. Graduate TAs are normally 0.5 FTE. The numbers should be consistent with the revenue/expenditure information provided.

☐ Summary of Degree or Certificate Program Proposal☐ Other (optional)

RESOLUTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends that the process of post-tenure performance review of UNAC-represented faculty be modified to eliminate levels of review above that of the dean in cases where both the unit peer committee and the dean have judged the performance to be satisfactory. Review by a university-wide committee and by the Provost should be required if either the unit peer committee or the dean rates performance as unsatisfactory in two of the three areas (teaching, research, service), or if either rates performance as unsatisfactory in one area if that area is the main part of the faculty member's workload.

RATIONALE: According to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University of Alaska and United Academics, in effect between January 01, 2011 - December 31, 2013: "The post-tenure review process is generally intended to be a formative rather than a summative process of faculty evaluation, focused on faculty development. It is not intended to be the equivalent of the probationary evaluation of tenure track faculty. At the same time the process should review and encourage progress toward promotion where applicable, ongoing development, scholarship and productivity." The post-tenure reviews also serve to identify faculty whose performance is unsatisfactory. The CBA states that "Unit members who receive an unsatisfactory comprehensive post-tenure review shall be ineligible for market and merit salary adjustments until they receive a satisfactory outcome in a subsequent post-tenure review."

The current system of full university-wide review of post-tenure files by a committee of full professors is costly in terms of effort, yet for several reasons these university-wide reviews are useful in only a small number of cases. First, approximately 35 post-tenure reviews are conducted each year at UAF and typically just 0-3 are rated unsatisfactory overall. This low number is expected in light of the fact that tenured faculty have already undergone rigorous review for tenure and promotion, and nearly all continue a high level of performance after tenure. Second, for the stated purpose of faculty development, the portions of the post-tenure reviews that are most useful to the faculty are the reviews at unit peer and dean levels. Third, the need for a university-wide review committee composed of full professors draws experienced faculty away from the university-wide committees on 4th Year Reviews and Promotion & Tenure, where their advice would be more effective.

To fulfill the purpose of post-tenure review, in most cases review by a unit peer committee and the dean will be sufficient. Review by a university-wide committee and the Provost can be reserved for cases in which the results at those levels indicate a possible unsatisfactory rating overall, without compromising the goal of post-tenure review. Results at the unit peer and dean rankings can be used to identify these files. The recommended trigger of an unsatisfactory rating in two of three areas (teaching, research, service) or an unsatisfactory rating in the main area of the faculty member's workload, by either the unit peer committee or the dean, is based on UAF experience. Focusing on these files would be a more productive use of university resources and would not compromise the purpose of post-tenure review.

Modification of the post-tenure review process will require a change in the CBA because the current CBA requires that comprehensive post-tenure review must include review by MAU Peer Review Committees (at UAF, the university-wide review committees).

The Faculty Senate resolution will be forwarded to the UAF administration and to United Academics. We will request that Labor Relations negotiate an MOA to permit this change under the current CBA, and also request that the change be incorporated into the next CBA.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve establishment of a central online collection of expanded course descriptions for all UAF courses, using the template provided below. Any changes to the template must be approved by the UAF Faculty Senate. Access to the online collection of expanded course descriptions shall be restricted to the University of Alaska community through a UA login.

This motion supersedes the Faculty Senate motion of October 12, 2009 (Meeting #161) to establish a single website containing sample syllabi for UAF courses.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately.

RATIONALE: Course descriptions in the official UAF catalog are limited to 50 words or less, and there are legal and logistical impediments to longer catalog entries. A centralized online collection of expanded course descriptions will assist students and advisors with course selection based on academic considerations by providing easy access to more detailed information. Discussions in the Faculty Senate and a faculty-wide survey in February 2013 have indicated strong support for this. The survey also indicated a clear preference for posting expanded course descriptions rather than syllabi, and for a restricted-access site.

The template makes use of required elements in a UAF course syllabus, so that most of it can be filled in by simple cut-and-paste from a syllabus. Several additional entries require interpretation of the syllabus or reference to the catalog, but are simple enough that including them should not pose a problem. It should be quick and straightforward to create and update expanded course descriptions using a current syllabus. Some courses are taught by several instructors, but only one expanded course description would be needed because the elements in it should be consistent among instructors.

Template elements directly from the syllabus: Course Title, Course Number, Credits, Prerequisites, Course Description, Course Goals, Student Learning Outcomes.

Additional elements, all entered using dropdown menus: Designator, Course Format, Lab, Grading.

The following three examples of expanded course descriptions are based on sample syllabi posted on the Faculty Senate web site.

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course-degree-procedures-/uaf-syllabus-requirements/syllabus-examples/>

TEMPLATE for Expanded Course Descriptions

Course Title: *from syllabus*

Course Number: *from syllabus (cross-listed and stacked courses have several numbers)*

Designator: *dropdown menus (none, O, W)*

Credits: *from syllabus*

Course Format: *several dropdown menus to allow for classes with multiple formats (face-to-face, videoconference, audioconference, online)*

Lab: *dropdown menu (yes, no)*

Prerequisites: *from syllabus*

Course Description: *from syllabus*

Course Goals: *from syllabus*

Student Learning Outcomes: *from syllabus*

Grading: *dropdown menu (pass/fail, letter grade)*

Date of Entry: *(can be automatically entered by the computer system)*

EXAMPLE #1

Course Title: Omlet Design and Fabrication

Course Number: EGG F637

Designator: none

Credits: 3

Course Format: face-to-face

Lab: no

Prerequisites: EGG 601 (Molecular Gastronomy) and CHEM 451 (Biochemistry--Metabolism)

Course Description:

This is a graduate level course in the design, analysis, and synthesis of the beaten-egg cooked foodstuff known variously as an omelet or omelette. This is a required core course in the Master of Egg degree program, but can be taken as an elective by interested graduate students in related fields. In addition to basic cooking knowledge, a detailed understanding of molecular gastronomy (EGG 601) and metabolic foodstuff processing (CHEM 451) is required to understand the relationships between chemical transformations and crispiness.

Course Goals:

Generally, we will cover the detailed molecular transformations obtained in beating and frying eggs, primarily the effect of anhydrous heat on eggs and yolk, and the determination of the optimal trade-off in cooking times, from blackened Cajun style through tepid and runny.

Student Learning Outcomes:

After completing this course, students will be able to:

- Explain how heat denatures protein chains in egg yolk and whites.
- Explain the effect of glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase on ingested lipids.
- Use this knowledge to cook a truly spectacular omelet.

Grading: letter grade

Date of Entry: February 26, 2013

EXAMPLE #2

Course Title: History of Earth and Life

Course Number: GEOS F112

Designator: none

Credits: 4

Course Format: face-to-face

Lab: yes

Prerequisites: GEOS 101 or GE 261

Course Description:

Historical geology is about evolution. This course will explore the evolution of planet Earth and the degree to which geological and biological processes have influenced each other throughout the history of our planet. This is a subject that is deeply concerned with time - large amounts of time. Geological events are typically measured in millions or billions of years. This time scale, *geologic time*, vastly transcends human experience. Events that are exceedingly rare during a human lifetime may be frequent and inevitable at geological time scales. If you take this course seriously, it will change your frame of reference to incorporate a sense of geologic time, a concept that will transform your understanding of the landscape, the biota, and your place in history.

Course Goals:

The primary mission of this course is to provide you with the tools and skills necessary to reconstruct physical and biological events that occurred deep in Earth's past. To meet this goal, there are three primary course objectives: 1) Explore the ways in which plate tectonics, erosion, and climate change modify the size and topography of continents, using North America as the prime example. 2) Examine the sequence of organic evolution, from the triumphant trilobite to the mighty mammoth. 3) Understand the interrelationships between physical and biological processes and events

Student Learning Outcomes:

Ultimately, you will learn to think like a historical scientist. Labs will allow you to practice interpreting geological data (rocks and fossils) and using basic tools (maps and microscopes), while class discussions and homework assignments will encourage you to think critically. Upon completing this course, you will be able to:

- Use sedimentary rocks to reconstruct past climates and environments
- Identify fossil organisms and use them to reconstruct past habitats
- Reconstruct the tectonic and climatic history of a region based on a geologic map
- Explain the origin of the major physiographic features of North America
- Outline major "breakthroughs" in the history of life on Earth
- Evaluate historical data in terms of quality, reliability, and interpretation
- Investigate a geological topic and display your findings on a poster

Grading: letter grade

Date of Entry: February 26, 2013

EXAMPLE #3

Course Title: Fundamentals of Media Design and Web Tools 2.0
Course Number: ED F432
Designators: none
Credits: 3
Course Format: online
Lab: no
Prerequisites: GEOS F101 or GE F261

Course Description:

Create and publish materials with proper media design for use in teaching and learning. Topics include photo and graphics formatting, video production, video podcast production, SMART technologies, static screen capture, motion screen capture, and analyze for educational content. These productions will be included on the students' MITI eportfolios. This course is a prerequisite for subsequent MITI courses and should be taken after or concurrently with ED 431 Web 2.0 Fundamentals: Participate, Produce, Publish. It is expected that this course will take 135+ hours to complete.

Course Goals:

This course supports the UAF School of Education's mission by providing students with the skills necessary to design thoughtful individualized instructional environments utilizing technologies and strategies appropriate to all learners. Students will acquire skills in the management and implementation of technology that will enhance their professional qualifications based on ISTE and Alaska teacher standards for technology and instructional design.

Student Learning Outcomes:

Students in the course will:

- Capture and manipulate photos in proper format for print, computer display and web publication.
- Create and publish video productions with multiple elements and in correct format.
- Create, publish and video podcasts for educational content.
- Create and publish SMART presentations and incorporate available presentations
- Create, publish, and print tutorials using static screen captures and analyze for educational content.
- Create, publish, and analyze video tutorials using motion screen captures.

Grading: letter grade

Date of Entry: February 26, 2013

Assessment of Electronic Course Evaluation Options for UAF

A Short Summary by the Core Evaluation Team

Authors: Franz J Meyer (CNSM), Eric Madsen (SoEd), Chris Beks (OIT), Andrea Ferrante (CNSM), Kelly Houlton (CRCD/Dev Ed), Brenda Konar (SFOS), Michael Koskey (DANRD), Sally Skrip (Provost's Office), Nathan Zierfuss (OIT)

Task and main research activities

In October 2012, the Faculty Senate was approached by Provost Susan Henrichs to evaluate a potential implementation of an electronic course evaluation system at UAF. As a consequence, the Faculty Development, Assessment, and Improvement (FDAI) committee together with Dr. Eric Madsen, School of Education, were entrusted with studying the following two main questions associated with electronic course evaluations:

- 1. Is it advisable for UAF to move to an electronic course evaluation model?**
- 2. If so, what would be the necessary steps towards adopting an electronic course evaluation system?**

In addition to these main goals, the activities performed are also aimed at reviving the discussion about electronic course evaluations (ECEs) by surveying their current state of the art and by gauging the sentiment towards ECEs on campus. To respond to the task at hand, a work program was developed by Dr. Eric Madsen and members of the FDAI that has been carried out since November 2012. This work program includes the following tasks:

- Develop a comprehensive set of evaluation criteria to be used in the evaluation of existing electronic course evaluation systems and for assessing their fit to UAF's needs
- Compile a list of electronic course evaluation systems through an extensive internet research
- Downselect this list to a set of vendors that showed sufficient focus on higher education
- Schedule weekly one-hour demos with the selected vendors to assess the main capabilities and limitations of their systems
- Write a report summarizing the main findings from this exercise and formulating the next steps in the evaluation process

The report at hand is intended to provide the Faculty Senate with a short summary of the conducted activities as a basis for discussion. Senators are specifically asked to read through and assess the list of evaluation criteria that were used by the evaluation team. A full report will be submitted and attached to the documentation of the Faculty Senate meeting in May 2013.

Composition of team

Announcements for the weekly demos were distributed over every campus listserv and all faculty, staff, and students were invited to participate in the evaluation process. Widely spread announcements were important to provide a representative evaluation of analyzed electronic course evaluation systems. During the evaluation period, a core evaluation team emerged that includes faculty from both Fairbanks and rural campuses, as well as representation from the Provost's office and representation from the Office of Information Technology. This core evaluation group included the following members:

- Chris Beks, OIT
- Andrea Ferrante, CNSM
- Kelly Houlton, CRCO / Dev Ed
- Brenda Konar, SFOS
- Michael Koskey, DANRD
- Eric Madsen, SoEd
- Franz Meyer, CNSM
- Sally Skrip, Provost's Office
- Nathan Zierfuss, OIT

Main evaluation criteria

While working towards answering the two main questions of this study, a set of technical evaluation criteria developed that were used in assessing electronic course evaluation options. These technical evaluation criteria are listed in the following, structured by their relationship to the two core questions of this study. The left column of the following table contains general requirements that an ECE must fulfill to be relevant to UAF. These general requirements are translated into corresponding technical evaluation criteria that are listed on the right side of the table. Please provide feedback to the evaluation team (fjmeyer@alaska.edu or ecmadsen@alaska.edu) to propose additions and/or changes to this list.

| Evaluation Criteria Related to Goal 1: Advisability of ECEs for UAF | |
|---|---|
| General Requirements | Related Technical Evaluation Criteria |
| Do ECEs provide sufficient student response rates? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are actual response rates at other universities using a specific ECE system? • Does the system include strategies for improving / sustaining response rates? |
| Will the faculty accept and promote move to ECE? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of use (user friendliness) of the system for faculty and students • How early after the semester ends can reports be released? • Usefulness of output to students, faculty, UAF |
| Will students accept move to ECE? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is student anonymity guaranteed? • Can results be easily shared with students? • Does ECE Interface with Banner/Blackboard? • Does the company provide implementation on smart devices? |
| Is moving to ECE financially efficient? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the ECE system's cost structure? • What are the immediate and short term costs related with adoption, conversion, implementation? • What are potential ongoing costs associated with hardware, software, system operation, and system management? |
| Can continuity with legacy system be achieved (in case we want this to be an option)? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What latitude does UAF have to determine or modify "standard" (cross-campus) questions? • Can legacy data be easily imported into the ECE? • Can review reports be fully customized? |

| | |
|--|---|
| Is data security guaranteed? Who owns the data and who has access to original survey information? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where do the data reside (inside/outside UAF)? • Is privacy for instructors guaranteed? • How is anonymity of students provided? • What is the privacy policy of the service provider? • How will UAF be able to retrieve/retain data if we decided to change the provider? |
| Do ECEs meet the unique needs of the UAF system (dispersed campuses; field classes; rural campuses with limited internet access; ...)? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the system flexible to merge online and paper-and-pencil reviews if necessary? • Can different schools / faculty add customized questions? |
| What are the training and maintenance efforts? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of support and training • Are support hours user-friendly for Alaska? |
| Evaluation Criteria Related to Goal 2: Necessary Steps Towards Adopting an ECE | |
| Abstract Evaluation Criteria | Related Technical Evaluation Criteria |
| Which ECE is the best fit for UAF's needs? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the ECE providing a service (data hosted and processed by vendor) or a product (hosted and executed at UAF)? • Experience of vendor and popularity of system • Does the ECE provide online and offline access? • Does the ECE interface with other management software at UAF and is it flexible enough to respond to changes in software preference? |
| How can ECE be phased in at UAF? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does ECE offer free or low cost pilot studies? |
| How will survey formats, data access permissions, and report content be defined? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who manages assessment deployment, data collection/analysis, distribution of results to faculty? • Can detailed and layered access structures be implemented? |
| How can questionnaires and review results be made more useful to both faculty and students? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are data analysis tools provided within the system? If so, what are they like? • If not, what is the export process (to what packages, who handles...)? • Can questions be customized to better fit UAFs specific needs? • Is an archive of typical (unbiased) questions available as a guideline and as an archive to pick from? |
| How can student responses be improved both in quantity and quality | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What recommendations do the ECEs have for improving the student evaluation process on campus? • Are the ECE providers actively assisting their customers in improving quality and quantity of student feedback? |

In addition to these technical criteria, there are further questions that need to be addressed when discussing the advisability and procedure of moving towards an electronic course evaluation option. These include (1) "What is the purpose of course evaluation at UAF?" (our answer to this question has bearings on both the advisability and the implementation of change) and (2) "What are valid uses of the produced data?". These and other related questions will be discussed in the full report that will be submitted to the Faculty Senate in May 2013.

Content of the full report to be submitted to the Faculty Senate in May 2013

In May 2013 findings of this initial study will be published in form of a final report. This report will contain the following information:

1. A more extensive description of the task at hand.
2. An explanation of the concept that was applied to assess advisability, implications, and procedures related to a change in course evaluation methodology.
3. A list of studied ECE systems together with an assessment of their capabilities and their fit to UAF's needs.
4. The result of a down-selection procedure to identify a limited group of ECE finalists for further research.
5. A list of recommendations and future steps.
6. A summary of general findings and "lessons learned".

Curricular Affairs Committee

11 Febr 2013 MINUTES 9-10 am Reichardt 301

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry, Chair; Ken Abramowicz; Retchenda George-Bettisworth (phone); Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy (phone); Sarah Hardy (phone); David Henry; Todd Radenbaugh (phone). Absent: Diane McEachern

Non-voting members: Donald Crocker (phone); Libby Eddy; Lillian Misel; Carol Gering (phone); Alex Fitts, Jayne Harvie.

Absent: Doug Goering.

1. **APPROVE MINUTES OF 28 Jan**
2. **Report on GERC from Cindy Hardy**

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. C-/C business

Motion: The minimum acceptable grade that baccalaureate students may receive in courses in the major, the minor, core, and courses used as prerequisites shall be a C-.

Justification: consistency

1. With the past. Before \pm grades a 'C-' was acceptable because a 'C-' was simply a version of C
2. With faculty who do not use +/- grades. A student who receives a 'C-' from a faculty member who does not use \pm is ok because that grade gets recorded as a 'C'. Same course, different teacher, this one does use \pm and the grade is not acceptable.
3. With BOR policies. BOR defines a C as an acceptable grade. Clearly a 'C-', which is a version of C, also should be acceptable.
4. With transfer policies: a course with a grade of C- transfers. However, currently it only transfers as 'credit' for a course in one's major or minor. In order to satisfy the requirement for the major or minor the course would need to be re-taken and a grade of C or higher received.
5. A grade of C- is the minimum acceptable for a 'core' course. This is confusing for students, who recognize that sometimes a C- is good enough, and sometimes not.
6. Many faculty have privately told or emailed me that that they give grades of D+, D, D-, A+, A-, A, B+....but never C- because it means the student will need to re-take the course. They would award the grade that the student actually deserved (C-) if such a grade didn't require re-taking the course. Why not be honest???? Given this phenomena, allowing C- to 'count' would result in grade deflation.

Note that the proposed change wouldn't change the fact that a student's overall gpa and gpa in the major must be a minimum of 2.0.

After considerable and heated discussion, this motion passed

B. Grading System and Grade Point Average Computation --current

"All course grades are letter grades unless otherwise specified in the class schedule. The method of grading (letter or pass/fail) is an integral part of the course structure and is included in the course description. Instructors are expected to state their grading policies in writing at the beginning of each course. Grades appearing on academic records are:

A An honor grade, indicates originality and independent work, a thorough mastery of the subject and the satisfactory completion of more work than is regularly required.

B Indicates outstanding ability above the average level of performance.

C Indicates a satisfactory or average level of performance.

D The lowest passing grade, indicates work of below-average quality and performance.

F Indicates failure. All F grades, including those earned in pass/fail courses, are included in the GPA calculations."

CHANGE TO?:

B Indicates an ability well above the minimum level of accomplishment

C Indicates a satisfactory level of accomplishment

D The lowest passing grade, indicates minimum level of accomplishment

AFTER HEATED DISCUSSION WE AGREED TO SEND THIS ON TO SADA FOR THEIR COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

4. New Business

As part of the grades and grading controversy, we took up the question of whether acceptable grades for 'core' classes should be re-lowered from the current C- to the 'anything goes'. More heated discussion. SPLIT VOTE. Cindy agreed to take this to SADA and Rainer agreed to take it to Fac Senate Adcomm.

Curricular Affairs Committee

25 Febr 2013 Minutes 9-10 am Reichardt 301

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry, Chair; Ken Abramowicz; Retchenda George-Bettisworth (phone); Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy; David Henry; Todd Radenbaugh (phone). Diane McEachern (phone)

Non-voting members: Brendon (for Linda); Libby Eddy; Lillian Misel; Carol Gering (phone); Alex Fitts; Doug Goering (phone); Jayne Harvie (MVP)

1. We approved the amended MINUTES OF 14 Febr & agreed to meet again Monday > spring brk

2. Report on GERC from J Rosenberg: report will be coming soon!!!

3. NEW BUSINESS #1 – PROPOSED NEW BA IN Secondary Education

We came up with the following questions:

(a) how precisely is this better than the current bacc degree + 5th year license? [We came up with possibilities like 'allows student to integrate knowledge in one's major with education courses; likely better retention by grouping students interested in 2ndary ED as a cohort for mutual support...'] Would like to see the document beefed up with such statements (assuming that they're true) + any others that would be useful in making the pitch.

(b) It's an extremely heavy course load--well in excess of typical here--to get through in 4 years.

1. Suggest putting an '*' next to courses that could conceivably be taken in a 'mester' or summer class to reduce the credits during a regular academic semester

2. Suggest creating a '5-year plan' as well with more 'normal' course loads

(c) basically to get through in 4 years one needs to start fall semester of one's freshman year knowing 'I want to be a high school physics (or whatever) teacher'. Which seems highly unrealistic. Would it be better in such a case to go for the existing 'bacc degree + 1' program?

We agreed that we'd have Gary Jacobsen, SOE, at our next meeting for discussion

4. OLD BUSINESS

We agreed to the following revised grade definitions and agreed to make further changes as needed through emails over the next couple of days

"A" (including A+ and A-) indicates a thorough mastery of course content and outstanding performance in completion of all course requirements.

"B" (including B+ and B-) indicates a high level of acquired knowledge and performance in completion of course requirements.

“C” (including C+ and C-) indicates a satisfactory level of acquired knowledge and performance in completion of course requirements.

“D” (including D+ and D-) indicates a minimal level of acquired knowledge and minimal performance in completion of course requirements. This grade is acceptable for elective courses, but does not satisfy requirements for courses in the major, minor, core, or graduate programs.

“F” indicates failure to meet a minimal level of understanding of course content and (or) performance in completion of course requirements. All F grades, including those earned in pass/fail courses, are included in the GPA calculations

The meeting ended at 10:15 am. Rainer expressed gratitude to all.

ATTACHMENT 190/9
UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women

Minutes Friday, February 22, 2013; 10:30-11:30 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Megan McPhee, Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Diana Di Stefano, Shawn Russell, Ellen Lopez, Jenny Liu, Nilima Hullavarad,

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Derek Sikes (on sabbatical)

1. April 26th 10:00 am - 12:00 pm. Strategically Planning Workshop

Confirmed panelists: Roxie Dinstel (CRCD), Sine Anahita (CLA) Paul Layer (Dean CSM), Joan Braddock (retired full professor, former Dean CSM), Ellen Lopez (in process of fourth year review, CLA). Mary will ask Todd Sherman Dean of CLA. List of women full professors attached for further consideration – other suggestions? Will be broadcast and recorded eLive. Jane will order the food. Room is still being discussed.

2. Conversation Cafes –

First one was held Friday, Feb 15. Mentoring was the topic. For next year: could we do a more formal discussion on mentoring? Send invitations? Provide informal lunch, or coffee/ tea/ cookies for mentoring discussion. Maybe 12-2pm Tues/Thursday time frame.

For next year: At the fall women's luncheon maybe each table could brainstorm topics for the conversation cafés. Promote conversation café's at the luncheon.

Next scheduled for Thursday, Feb 28th 3:45-4:45pm – flyer attached, please post
Additional Conversation Cafes scheduled for the following times March 21st 3:45-4:45pm;
March 29th 10:30-11:30am; April 12th 10:30-11:30am; April 18th 3:45-4:45pm
topic requests/ideas. Send ideas to Kayt.

New faculty orientation: a flyer in their packet might get lost in the overwhelming amount of information. Maybe we reach out to new faculty after they have been here a few months. Call / email to invite them to conversation cafés.

3. Women's Center Advisory Board

Meeting again: March 8, 10:30 to 12:00

4. Fall 2013 Luncheon

Speaker suggestions:

- a. Cheryl Frye, INBrE Director and Professor of Neuroscience. Her email is: cafrye@alaska.edu her phone 474-5492. Some background <http://www.uaf.edu/chem/faculty/cfrye/>
- b. Director of Women's Center in Maine.
- c. Someone who has done research in mentoring.
- d. Dr. Claudia Lampman from UAA. Psychology. Ellen will look into this.
- e. URSA : Barbara Taylor: working with undergraduates

f. Denise Thorsen: Electrical Engineer, Associate Professor, Ph.D., Electrical and Computer Engineering

What about several shorter presentations? Choosing local women has many benefits.

5. CSW elections are not needed this year. All expiring seats are interested in continuing.

6. Rational for a part-time faculty/ administrative position focusing on the issues of women faculty - Still on the table. We need to be very prepared. What is the evidence of inequity? Show these problems are affecting women faculty at UAF. We need data.

Upcoming CSW meeting: March 22/10:30-11:30/Gruening 718

Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

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

**Committee on the Status of Women,
Meeting Minutes Friday, March 22, 2012; 10:30-11:30 pm, Gruening 718**

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Diana Di Stefano, Jane Weber, Megan McPhee, Jenny Liu, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Nilima Hullavarad, Ellen Lopez

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Derek Sikes (on sabbatical), Shawn Russell

1. April 26th 10:00 am - 12:00 pm. Strategically Planning Workshop, BOR Conference Room

Panelists: Roxie Dinstel, Sine Anahita, Paul Layer, Ellen Lopez, Joan Braddock, Todd Sherman. Flyer is done. Jayne Harvie will send it out. Please post it. Jane ordered refreshments. Todd Sherman has also agreed. Kayt will moderate. We need help with Illuminate Live. We'll ask people to focus on their experience. Kayt will tell the panelists that the focus is on strategy.

2. Conversation Cafes –

Future Cafes: April 12 10:30-11:30. Topic: Leadership. Challenges and rewards of taking on leadership roles. Kayt may use some of the LeanIn organization. They provide information and guidance on creating/ promoting women in leadership roles.

3. Women's Center Advisory Board
Meeting again: Monday, March 22, 2013

4. Fall 2013 Luncheon

Can we do more? Paper invitations. Can we help Jayne more? Put that on our radar for end of September on a Tuesday. We need to choose a speaker or panel. Sheryl Frye? Claudia Lampman from UAA?

Upcoming CSW meeting: May 3, /10:30-11:30/Gruening 718

Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

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

ATTACHMENT 190/10

UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for Jan. 24, 2013**

Attending: Dana Greci, Cindy Hardy, Andrea Schmitt, Joe Mason, Sandra Wildfeuer, David Maxwell, Gabrielle Russell

November minutes: Approved

Updates:

Brown Bags—Andrea reported that nothing has been done for this semester as advisors have switched positions, so have not been able to address this.

She asked if we want the format to be a brown bag discussion or a luncheon. We agreed to use the less formal brown bag format. She noted that the advising center has ideas, but wants some guidance. We discussed some issues where student and faculty intersect and noted that what was exciting about the Veterans Brown Bag was that students, faculty, and staff talked to each other without distinguishing who is who. Cindy and Andréa will get together to talk more about ideas.

Learning Commons --Suzanne Hahn put up a note board in the library for students to put up suggestions on what they would like to see in the library. Dana noted that currently there are two floors worth of comfortable seating where students can study and talk and that the library is opening up more space, following a nationwide trend to bring more people to the library.

OIT is housed in the library but further coordination of services hasn't happened yet, though departments may take the initiative if they want to use the space. Right now there is no coordinator for these spaces, but there is a signup sheet. Dana will send out a letter to departments about the library space available and she will ask Suzan about outreach on the Learning Commons to the rural campuses.

Statewide Course Alignment—This is actively going on between English and DEVE on the statewide level. There is interest from Dana Thomas that placement scores in English and Math be consistent across MAU's. David Maxwell noted that the Math department is already doing Accuplacer data analysis to see where students are placed on the first day of class. They are not using this to move students out of classes, unless they also have not otherwise met prerequisites. He also noted that the Math Department thought mandatory placement would fix the problem of students signing up for wrong class, but it still happens. Students register for a higher math than they are placed in because their advisor overrides the placement, or students sign up before end of semester, and didn't earn a passing grade.

Cindy suggested that Math coordinate with DEVM faculty looking at DEVM data because MATH 107 and 103 are entry points from DEVM courses. Jane Weber and Greg Owens are doing DEVM data analysis now.

A Statewide English/DEVE group met in the fall, and is planning another audio meeting. As a result of this meeting, English is in the process of passing a higher Accuplacer placement score. If this passes, UAF's placement will go up by 10 points and UAA's will be lowered by 5 points, so both MAUs will have the same placement level on Accuplacer. UAF's DEVE 109 will slot into the score range opened

up between ENGL 111X placement and DEVE 070. This will be a Major change, so it will go through the steps of approval by Faculty Senate. DEVE is waiting for the change to English 111X to be approved, then will change the placement on DEVE 109. We discussed how the MAUs agreed to the changes (lowering or raising cut score) and noted that Compass was linked to SAT, and Accuplacer to ACT. DEVE and English faculty will be meeting at the Pacific Rim Conference to talk more about each MAU's progress on this

Another piece of this is renumbering the DEVE courses so that DEVE 060 becomes DEVE 100 and DEVE 070 becomes DEVE 104. These changes will need to be approved in the CRCAD Academic Council, then will end up in SADA for approval before being approved by the Senate.

Gabby asked if we can have DEVE and ENGL and DEVM and MATH listed together in UAOnline. Currently, they are listed separately by course designator. We noted that DEV ED has talked about changing the department name, but changing the designator is problematic. UAA offers Developmental math through their Math department, but their developmental English has a separate designator (PRPE).

GERC update--Cindy and Sandra reported on the statewide meeting of GERC and AACU to discuss LEAP themes and alignment across MAUS. UAF has been working on the core revision process for a year, but UAA and UAS are just beginning to work on theirs.

We discussed how the general education revision process began. Dana Thomas led the process, noting that some faculty was unhappy with the core; now he is the position to do something about it. One of the issues raised at the Anchorage meeting was that of students "MAU-shopping" or looking for online classes that meet the core at one MAU and not the other. The weekend also introduced some ideas of curriculum reform that AACU felt were effective, especially those using VALUE rubrics and "high-impact practices." Cindy agreed to send around a list of these from the AACU website.

Accuplacer motion— We had discussed writing a motion requesting non-renewal of Accuplacer; however, there is not a groundswell of support for this action. We will leave this alone for now although we did discuss some of the issues raised by placement. In the English department and Developmental English, there has been talk about using multiple measures for placement, including writing samples. We acknowledge that Accuplacer costs money; however, for Math ACT and Accuplacer scores are pretty well aligned, and Accuplacer seems to be doing a better job of placing students than the self-placement method used before. We also noted that Accuplacer was chosen, in part, because it's easier to set up proctor for rural sites.

Question about the C grade: The Curricular Affairs committee has been discussing whether to change the minimum grades for major and minor courses changed from a C to a C-. This would make the acceptable grade requirement for both major, minor, and core classes the same. After much discussion about the value of a C grade, the fact that students getting C- currently need to retake courses, the tendency to give only C or C+ grades to avoid a student retaking a class, and the impacts on financial aid, the committee agreed to recommend the following to CAC:

"A C- is passing for Core and major/minor requirements; however "good standing" remains at 2.0 and good standing for major courses remains at 2.0."

Cindy will relay this to Rainer.

Committee membership definition: We agreed that any changes to the committee definition are major changes and would have to go through Faculty Senate. We agreed to leave the definition as it stands for now, especially since those committee members who are elected have already indicated their willingness to serve again. We will revisit this and pass some definition changes before the end of the semester

Meeting times for spring: We agreed to stick with the third Thursdays of the month 3 – 4:30.

Adjourned at 4:20pm.

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013

Attending: Joe Mason, Sarah Stanley, Andrea Schmidt, Sandra Wildfeuer, Dana Greci, Cindy hardy, Alan Morotti, Gabrielle Russell, Curt Szuberla, David Maxwell

Minutes of the previous meeting were not available, but we reviewed table notes.

C/C- grades: Curricular Affairs asked for our input on three motions relating to this issue:

1. To make C- acceptable minimum grade for major, minor, and core classes. This maintains the 2.0 cumulative requirement for majors and for good standing.

The committee voted 8-1 in favor.

2. To revise the current catalog descriptions of letter grades to eliminate the words “average” and “performance.”

The committee voted unanimously against this motion, stating that we thought the grade definitions should be left alone, and expressing concerns that wordsmithing in this way would lead to a need for further definitions for the +/- grades and could represent an attempt to avoid grade inflation by redefinition.

(A second draft of this motion, using language from BOR policy, was subsequently circulated to the committee and met with 6-1 approval).

3. To strike out the minimum requirement of C- for core classes, reverting to a D- as acceptable for core classes.

The committee voted unanimously against this motion, stating that we thought that having a D- as an acceptable grade for the core set students up for failure.

GERC Update: Sandra reports that the GERC committee is nearly ready to move forward and show what they’ve developed to the departments. However, at a statewide meeting in the past few days, it became apparent that UAA and UAS are in very different places with this process.

Sandra noted that the committee has five working groups addressing different aspects of General Education requirements (drawn from the LEAP outcomes):

Civic Engagement
Quantitative Literacy
Diversity

Communication (included written and oral)

Alaska

She reported that the committees have looked at what a class would have to do to be in each category, and that it's the committee's general feeling that courses in different departments could fit into these categories. We discussed the history of the current core, in place since 1989, and the role this core revision process has in the move toward statewide GER alignment. Sarah S. noted that the LEAP outcomes were accepted by all three MAUs, but that different courses would work within that framework for each campus. We also noted that UAF is ahead of the other two MAUs in this process, and that there has been a push from Statewide for UAF to cut the number of credits required in the core to better match UAA and UAS. We noted that deans are now being told to keep degree requirements to 120 credits, though our faculty survey suggested that faculty want to keep the number of credits to degree the same.

We will continue to get updates on the progress of the GERC committee, since three SADA members now serve on the committee.

Student Learning Commons: Dana G. has drafted a letter to encourage faculty/departments to tutor in the library study rooms. Suzan Hahn has written to say that the library is not yet ready to call the space a learning commons, but is willing to invite people to use the space for tutoring and other similar activities. Dana noted that there needs to be a coordinator of the spaces for the area to function as a learning commons.

Statewide Alignment: This is still a work in progress. Some DEVE/ENGL faculty will meet with UAA/UAS colleagues in Anchorage at the Pacific Rim conference to update on this.

David M reported that Dana Thomas and the Faculty Alliance are both pushing for alignment in Math and English. He is the chair of a placement committee in Math, which is considering moving to ALEKS as a placement test. They will share this information with UAA, if it looks like it will work out. He noted that ALEKS, unlike Accuplacer, can place students into classes up to Math 201. DEVM is also looking at placement, reviewing demographic data on which students succeed in DEVM and Math.

DEVM 094: Sandra reported on a class she has developed, "Math Literacy," which combines material from DEVM 050 and 060 into a 5-credit accelerated class. She is also developing an asynchronous online course and will have a full-time math tutor to support the class. We discussed the various math pathways students take to Math 107 or 103. David noted that the Math department is rethinking the prerequisites for Math 103, and Dana G reminded us that Marji Illingworth had developed a Reading in the Mathematical Sciences class that had some success.

Designator Alignment: Gabby asked if we could ask the registrar how to list DEVE/English and DEVM/Math in the Course Finder so that a student looking for Math, for example, would also find listings for DEVM.

Next meeting: April 18, 3-4:30pm

ATTACHMENT 190/11

UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee Meeting Minutes for February 26, 2013

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 11:03 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Stephen Brown, Mike Castellini, Cindy Fabbri, David Fazzino, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Eric Madsen, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison

Excused: Izetta Chambers, Amy Vinlove

III. Report from Joy

Joy called in from the Alaska Society for Technology in Education (ASTE) conference in Anchorage where their “K-21” focus is on all the newest uses for technology for teaching, in the classroom as well as for distance education. She reported that although the focus is primarily on K-12 teachers there are some UA faculty members and CDE staff present. UAF’s own CDE is presenting numerous sessions.

The faculty development for February (focus is on SFOS) is finishing up this Thursday with a presentation on best practices for online learning. Joy noted her appreciation for Mike’s active role in promoting and encouraging his faculty to attend OFD’s offered sessions. Mike noted that his estimate of SFOS faculty attendance is between 12 – 15% and asked how that compared to Joy’s statistics. Joy reported that compared to some other colleges, this was an impressive amount. She is collecting data on how this experiment of bringing faculty development straight to each college for a month is working. She will share her results with the committee so we can help determine if this approach is successful enough to continue next year. Franz asked how the email reminders were handled for SFOS this month. Joy explained that she and Mike shared the process since she must be sensitive regarding the number of emails the OFD sends out. Joy sends emails campus-wide whereas Mike was very active in sending out reminder to his faculty encouraging them to attend. Having support from college deans with regards to emailing faculty has been very helpful. Mike noted that SFOS is working on a survey to determine what would be a reasonable number of emails.

Planning for the group of faculty members traveling to the Lilly West conference is going well. The conference is March 14 – 17th in Pomona, CA. Joy also informed us that Linda Hapsmith of the Academic Advising Center has 50 one-way railroad tickets for faculty and advisors to travel to a big regional advising conference being held in Anchorage in early May. Linda will also be awarding \$750 travel grants for this conference to 25 faculty and/or advisors.

Joy pointed out that the department chair training session has been postponed to Thursday, April 11 from 3:00 – 6:00 pm due to medical issues for presenter Walt Gmelch. The session is intended for newer department chairs, or those considering becoming department chairs, and focuses on managing challenging personalities in a leadership position. The session is titled “Mending the Cracks in the Ivory Tower”.

IV. Progress on analysis of electronic student evaluation options for UAF

Franz noted that the demos are continuing with good attendance from our committee and OIT. Sally Scrip from the Provost's Office has also attended most of the demos, and we had one student attend a demo. The demos are pretty consistent but we have learned some interesting differences in the last week or so: some vendors offer a lot more statistical analysis and reporting capabilities, and some vendors offer a complete hybrid of electronic and paper-and-pencil evaluations simultaneously. The next demo is scheduled for this Friday, with the last demo slated for March 29.

The core committee members who have been attending each demo (Franz, Eric, Andrea, Kelly) are discussing how we will evaluate the process and write a recommendation/report for Faculty Senate. Eric has proposed that the core group work on the report rather than having the whole FDAI committee involved. We will share the report with the committee when it is finished. Eric reminded us that this is just the first step of a very long process, and that the Provost is hoping to gain insight into the campus climate regarding the feasibility of using electronic course evaluations at UAF.

Franz and Eric will be meeting with the Faculty Senate President and President-elect to discuss their expectations regarding the information in our report and what the timeline should be.

We once again discussed the issue of low response rates with electronic evaluations. The core group has learned about strategies that other institutions are using (usually from recommendations from their respective vendors) to increase response rates. These include making the evaluation process as visible as possible (i.e. getting university Presidents, Chancellors, Provosts, Deans, faculty, and advisors to talk about it with students at every opportunity), multiple email reminders for students who have not yet completed their evaluations, offering incentives (i.e. early access to grades, free iPads, coupons, etc.), explaining to your students why it is important (i.e. how you have made changes to the structure of your courses based on students' responses), and sharing results with students in an easy-to-find way. We agreed that some of the "side issues" we have been considering should definitely be part of our report to Faculty Senate.

V. Research speed dating event discussion: Shall we attempt it or not?

After a short discussion in which we determined the name should be changed so as not to include the "speed dating" descriptor, the committee agreed that this will be a good idea to pursue. While attendance might be lower for the first event, it has the potential to grow in the future. Trina mentioned that getting deans involved will be key in spreading the word to their research faculty to get them involved. Joy has set up the details with Gary Bender of OIT for May 2 at lunch time in Bunnell 319. The one-hour session will have computers set up with Skype to facilitate 5-minute connections between researchers to quickly explain their research and discover people they may collaborate with. Face-to-face meetings will also occur with researchers who are able to come in person. Joy has asked us to think about a new title that would better express the intent of the session.

VI. Other Business: Discussion on potential subscription to Faculty Development Resource "Magna Commons"

Joy explained that a one-year subscription allows all faculty access to Magna Commons' archive of seminars and presentations. There are about 150 available to choose from with each lasting 60 to 90 minutes. She pointed out that if we started the subscription now, faculty could take advantage of the offerings over this summer. She also notes that there is money available for the subscription now whereas it may disappear by fall. Mike suggested that it could be promoted during the remainder of the OFD's monthly faculty development presentations. Andrea asked if it was possible to try a free sample, and David noted that there is a 7-day trial offer on Magna Commons' website. Joy also stated that she

has bought some of Magna Pubs' DVDs that faculty are welcome to check out. (Magna Commons is the online access group.)

VII. Upcoming events:

Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, March 4, 2013 from 1:00 – 3:00 pm in Wood Center

VIII. Next FDAI Meeting: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 from 11:00 am to 12:00 pm.

IX. Adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 190/12
UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for 2/06/13.**

Attending: Franz Mueter (by phone), Karen Jensen (by phone), Donie Bret-Harte, John Yarie, Jayne Harvie, Cheng fu Chen, John Eichelberger, Lillian Misel, Laura Bender, Chung-san Ng, Mike Daku, Vince Cee, Lara Horstmann, Tim Bartholomaeus

GAAC discussed numerous courses and program changes, and passed the following:

3-Trial: [MSL F694 - Physical, Chemical, and Biological Interactions in the Oceans](#)

6-GPCh. Program Change: M.Ed. – concentration areas of language and literacy, cross cultural education, secondary education

10-GPCh. Program Change: B.S./M.S. Mechanical Engineering

17-GNC: New course: STO F601 – Communicating Science

22-GNC: New course: Phys F605 – Physics teaching seminar (pending correction of disabilities phone number)

27-GPCh.: Program Change: [M.S. and Ph.D. - Environmental Chemistry](#)

28-GPCh.: Program Change: [M.S. and Ph.D. - Geophysics](#)

Clarifications in a variety of other course proposals were requested. No other motions were considered.

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for 2/27/13**

Present: Lara Horstmann, Cheng-fu Chen, Tim Bartholomaeus, John Yarie, Donie Bret-Harte, Elisabeth Nadin, Chung-san Ng, John Eichelberger, Jayne Harvie, Laura Bender, Stacy Howdeshell

Minutes from our meeting on 2/06/13 were approved.

GAAC discussed the use of electronic copies of graduate applications. In some departments, it appears that there is a delay because paper copies have to be scanned to produce electronic copies before they are made available to faculty members for review, which introduces delays. Upon discussion with Laura Bender, it appears that this may be a problem originating at the Department level, as the graduate school makes available electronic copies of all graduate applications that it receives. The Registrar for Admissions can be contacted to provide instructions on how to access them.

GAAC passed numerous course proposals and program changes, as listed below:

4-Trial: [GEOS F694 - Snow and Snow Cover](#)

4-GPCh Program change: M.Ed. – Elementary Education

5-GPCh. Program Change: Post Baccalaureate Licensure Program – Elementary Education (pending clarification of impacts, Elisabeth will contact)

7-GCCh. Course change STACKED: ED F478/F678 – Math methods and curriculum development

8-GCCh. Course change STACKED: ED F479/F688 Science Methods and Curriculum Development

9-GCCh. Course change STACKED: EDSE F422/F622 Curriculum and Strategies II: High Incidence

18-GNC: New course: STO F602 – Mentoring in the Sciences

20-GNC: New course: STO F604 – Science Teaching and Outreach internship (passed pending correction of credit distribution – John will contact)

21-GNC: New course: STO F692 – Current topics in Scientific Teaching

24-GNC: New Course: [ATM F673 - Introduction to Micrometeorology](#)

36-GCCh.: Course change STACKED EDSC F442/F642 – Technology Applications in Education

38-GPCh.: Program Change: M.S. Physics

41-GPCh.: Program Change: **MS in Marine Biology**

42-GPCh.: Program Change: **PhD in Marine Biology**

43-GPCh.: Program Change: **MS in Oceanography**

44-GPCh.: Program Change: **PhD in Oceanography**

In addition, **26-GCCh.:** Course Change: [CHEM F674 - Neurochemistry](#) and Program change **29-GPCh** were passed via email after the meeting.

RAC Minutes 18 January 2013

Jon Dehn, Peter Webley, Orion Lawlor, Joanne Healy, Claudia Koch, Barbara Taylor, John Eichelberger

1.) Thanks (particularly to Lawlor and Koch) for getting the FAC for faculty research out and up on the VCR's website. This should be a useful guide to faculty wanting to do research, or a good refresher for those who need to brush up on policies and procedures.

2.) Discussion on coordination of graduate student and undergraduate research. A model was proposed where graduate students would serve as mentors to undergraduates, involving them in the thesis projects.

Each proposal would be overseen by a faculty member, but the graduate students would have latitude in how to manage and mentor the undergrads. This provides valuable experience to the grad and encourages undergrads to go on to higher degrees.

Funding for this effort could be from many sources. One idea is to have the governance fee for the graduate students be managed by a graduate student council with assistance of the Dean of the Graduate School to evaluate and support research efforts. URSA and Prof. Taylor could assist to pair eager undergraduates with grad student mentors.

This was the start of the conversation and it is hoped that the Graduate School and URSA will continue looking into this.

3.) Role of the RAC, the committee expressed interest to have a more active role in providing advice to the VCR and being a sounding board for large programmatic research enterprises. Talks with the VCR suggest this would be a good avenue. The faculty would really like to help out here.

4.) Program review of research at UAF requested by the Chancellor. In response to recent efforts to engage the Board of Regents in the role of research at UA, they have asked for a review of the research program at UAF. In turn the Chancellor has approached the RAC to do this. Given the experiences with the vision 2017 document, the Chancellor's transition teams, the Academic Master plan and the early stages of the Strategic Direction Initiative, this is not as daunting a task as it may seem. The Chancellor is willing to support two retreats, likely in the form of a weekend day of the committee together, one early on to establish a work plan, and one near the end of the process to finalize a draft document for review and publication.

The whole process should be done this semester with the first retreat in March and finish at the end of the summer, the final retreat to take place just before classes start in the Fall. The target is to have a document for the Regents in their Fall meeting.

Overall much of the data is already available through the VCR's office, past documents and PAIR. Some data collection will have to happen and be done by the RAC, hopefully with some help from the colleges and business offices around campus.

There are clearly some charged issues that should be avoided by focusing on the tight integration of the teaching and research missions at UAF. With that in mind a basic structure for the document is as follows:

Intro and executive summary of the 5 components

1. Students in research, grad and undergrad, numbers, their roles in the state, how colleges and research institutions work together to drive one of the most success research enterprises in the world
2. The research income to the UAF, its role in the State's economy, how colleges and research institutions work together to drive one of the most success research enterprises in the world
3. How our research gets out, where are we active, what is a quantitative measure of our publications and creative activity
4. Our role in the State, unique as we provide many services normally reserved for State agencies, and how we add to the state's cultural and intellectual capital
5. Our recommendations for the future, investment into research ventures, seed funding and commercialization