

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #146
Monday, November 5, 2007
1:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jon Genetti

Faculty Senate President Jon Genetti called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Allen, Jane
Anahita, Sine
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar
Barboza, Perry
Barrick, Ken
Barry, Ron (William Simpson)
Bret-Harte, Marion
Cascio, Julie
Christie, Anne
Cooper, Christine
Daku, Michael
Dankekar, Abhijit
Dehn, Jonathan
Genetti, Jon
Hogan, Maureen
Huettmann, Falk
Illingworth, Marjorie (Debra Moses)
Iken, Katrin
Kingsley, Ilana
Konar, Brenda
Little, Joe
Lowder, Marla
Lurman, Julie
McEachern, Diane
Newberry, Rainer
Potter, Ben
Reynolds, Jennifer
Roberts, Larry
Sousa, Marsha
Thomas, Amber
Weber, Jane
Wiechen, Heinz
Zhang, Jing
Zhou, Thomas

Members Absent:

Leonard, Beth
Rosenberg, Jonathan

Others Present:

Clausen, Tom
Craven, John
David, Lorraine
Goering, Doug
Hapsmith, Linda
Hardy, Cindy
Harvie, Jayne
Henrichs, Susan
Ivey, Pat
Julius, Dan
Jones, Steve
Layral, Sheri
Lehman, John
Morrison, Joy
Nacke, Anne Marie
Olson, Link
Ryder, Danielle
Sunwood, Kayt
Thomas, Dana

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #145

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

- A. Motions Approved:
- B. Motions Pending: none

III Public Comments/Questions

Dana Thomas spoke about the Freshman Seminar Survey, asking for completion of the questionnaire about a first year seminar (copies were made available). Visits by two student success experts, Tinto and Kuh, spoke to first-year experiences of freshman and how to enhance those. Need to address high failure rates in some first year courses. Are faculty interested in a freshman seminar? If so, what kind? Encouraged to share ideas. A response greater than the 27 received to date would be more helpful.

IV A. President's Comments - Jon Genetti

Advisory Committee for Statewide Administrative Review: McTaggart report will come out soon (the product of an external review). An entire week of hearings took place with each functional unit of statewide administration giving presentations and answering questions. Brian Rogers helped McTaggart with this function. In the next week or so a draft report will be available and the advisory committee which includes Jon, Buck Sharpton and Ro Bailey for UAF (three members from each of the other MAUs as well) will meet again. President Hamilton will receive the recommendations from this committee.

National Survey of Student Engagement: Cindy Hardy and Jon will participate on the committee lead by Student Enrollment Services. Three faculty, three staff, three students, and some administrators will go through the report. Available on the SES web site:

http://www.uaf.edu/ses/NSSE_overview/index.htm

Joint Committee on Student Success: Marsha will lead the discussion on this.

OIT security review from the Bethel incident of last year: Jon felt they didn't address the methodologies for confidential data management to prevent the occurrence and potential reoccurrence. Consultant came and formulated a report that placed the university at Level 2 out of 5 levels – meaning "policies are in place". Level 1 is no plan or policies whatsoever, Level 3 is verification that policies in place are actually being followed. Levels 4 and 5 not defined, but Jon commented that no one gets to that level.

Faculty Alliance retreat with President Hamilton: Marsha will summarize. But with regard to the ORP, Jon commented that one of the unions summarized it eloquently by saying action choices for increasing the employer contribution rate are to: 1.) lobby statewide, or 2.) lobby the legislature, or 3.) sue. Statewide administrators are reluctant to lobby legislators when employer contributions are currently at 19%.

Chancellor's remarks were moved after the break because of his schedule constraints. He's been asked to give an organizational structure overview, and give an update of the FY09 budget outlook -- which may get tighter because of matching fund requirements among other things.

Bunnell House advisory committee member volunteer needed. Jane Weber stated that Committee on the Status of Women will volunteer a person.

UA IDs: Regarding the students these IDs are part of FERPA-protected records, so class rosters are still sensitive material and still must be protected.

Reminder of the Chancellor's reception at 5:30 PM tonight.

Question from the floor from Sine Anahita: She's concerned about the national student engagement study, particularly the non-response bias that needs to be managed – just 18% of first-year students responded, yet the published summary on the web presents the data as though it's representative of all UAF students. As the committees work on recommendations, this needs to be addressed.

Heinz Wiechen asked for clarification about the actual number of computer security incidents at Bethel. Reference made to last year's incident, but there is certainly a possibility of more incidents in general.

B. President-elect's Comments - Marsha Sousa

Marsha commented on the national student engagement study, that it was done in two parts with a part done by the community college branch of UAF and that information is available as well. They had a better response rate. Interesting data.

Faculty Alliance Retreat with the President: Student success initiatives were the primary focus of the morning. President would like to see broad participation on the part of faculty, staff and students at all 3 MAUs. Looking for novel and big ideas, for example: Math boot camp for high schoolers that is summer long, not just a few days, to bring their skills up in preparation for college. Talked about managing outcomes. What can be done better? In the afternoon, compared the MAU efforts for student success initiatives. Marsha mentioned Dana's efforts toward supplemental instruction and looking for early intervention measures. She noted Dana's mention of getting high schools to align with colleges for a grading rubric from about the junior year on up through college so that high school students and teachers understand how they would be graded and what kinds of demonstrations of success were appropriate at the college level. Does not yet exist, and only a few states are beginning to address it. FS reps will meet with school superintendents to get this initiative started. High school teachers could be matched with college instructors to get the process started. Marsha mentioned math examples to illustrate the disconnect with high school to college courses. Action items at the end of the day included: mandatory survey of intent by students when they register; achieve alignment with high schools in grading; why students leave other than just "failing" reason.

V Discussion Item

A. Composition of Joint Committee on Student Success - Marsha Sousa and Jon Genetti

GCC is charged with putting together a committee to address guidelines for student success. Motion passed last year requires involvement of at least one FS member, one Staff Council member, one from ASUAF, one from Provost's Council and one from Chancellor's Cabinet. Marsha sees need for Faculty Senate to get a sense how this committee will function. At UAS, they have 2 committees, for traditional students and non-traditional students. For UAF how should we form representation? -- should there be one large committee formed or should FS just be the touch plate for a variety of smaller committees? Marsha opened the floor for ideas. Cindy Hardy responded: SADA committee will put one of their members forward for participation. Marsha asked how do we get more representation from others involved with student success? What about rural campuses? Is there something in place at rural campuses that can tie in to this effort? Mention from the audience was made that rural campus directors were asked to forward names. RSS is a logical place; Dept. of Dev. Ed. – Jane Weber and Cindy mentioned this could be the same person from SADA committee. Marsha reiterated need to engage faculty, not need for more student assistance per se. Jon rephrased request – can one or two faculty (to represent Faculty Senate) address this for all groups involved to speak for faculty? Please forward comments to Jon and Marsha.

VI Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

Performance based budgeting (PBB) presentation by Chancellor Jones took place at statewide about 10 days ago. He spoke about UAF's achievements including: national ranking of research productivity; student taking nationally standardized tests with high national rankings. Central theme that came out was that despite all our accomplishments, we're not rewarded by the PBB process and policy. We've lost \$2 million dollars due to this process because we're found lacking by SW and PBB policy that looks at 5 major metrics (metrics include student credit hours, research expenditures, university-generated revenue, retention, and high-demand-job degrees). Quantitative metrics are being used and whether or not you're increasing based on growth numbers is emphasized. Factors playing into this include national funding level of earmarks which are being curtailed. Major agency research budgets are not increasing as they have in past years, resulting in smaller and fewer awards. UAF still managed to keep its research expenditures almost even with previous year; however; but still found wanting by PBB process because growth hadn't kept pace with past years due to factors mentioned. So our great faculty efforts are not being monetarily recognized nor rewarded by PBB. Follow-up meeting on Nov. 7th set with SW for feedback on UAF report.

Provost has had meetings with the President and various groups over past weeks. He's optimistic for a reasonable appropriation from the legislature, not only in terms of fixed costs but potentially some additional funding for increasing existing academic programs (engineering, health-related programs, fisheries were mentioned). But it's an uphill battle due to conservative legislature and fiscally conservative governor. There will be many requests from University

Relations for contacting the legislature to support UAF funding. Participation needed from all university supporters.

Ken Barrick commented on PBB: How can we respond to that as a group of faculty and students, to revise the process so we're not automatically at a disadvantage? Susan: We did advocate that, and will have further discussion with statewide administrators on the 7th. We'll then be able to assess if our message was heard and accepted by statewide and if they're willing to adjust the process. McTaggart report may also address the PBB process. Other MAUs felt similarly as to the arbitrariness of process. (The process has worked for Anchorage, though.) Jon asked about reallocation of the pot to the 3 MAUs in a situation where all 3 are failing to increase. Susan said ground rules keep changing unpredictably and it has been a zero sum game in the past, with the 'best' campus getting the pot, and the others getting little to nothing. Rather than pitting campuses against each other, statewide said benchmarks are being used to gauge performance instead so we're competing with our own benchmarks. Each MAU has a proportion of the total general fund appropriation, so the pot is split along the lines of the historical appropriation.

VII Guest Speaker

A. Dan Julius, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dan introduced himself and gave some of his professional background prior to coming to UA. Similar issues arose at other institutions he worked with. Pull between campuses and administrative offices is healthy and normal. One size does not fit all and we must nourish and protect distinctive missions of the MAUs. Common definitions are needed in current discussions and processes. Sees his role as coordinating and facilitating academic and research seed money. Overall goal is to enhance academic voice within the system. Addressed need to incentivise creativity, and enhance the lives of faculty. How do we nurture creativity? He prefers to look at the world using the telescope metaphor -- we look through and see the universe expands, rather than the pie metaphor where a slice for you means less for someone else.

Questions were invited from the audience. Jane Weber asked Dan to explain what he means by academic voice. Dan commented about looking at things more expansively, an academic approach, rather than a formulistic approach. Example was provided of wanting to see decisions come forward through the statewide provosts' council. Must be attentive to lines of communication utilized at the campus level which assume a constituency for that voice at higher (administrative) levels. Part of his task is to translate the voices.

Ken Barrick asked about the seed money for research and academic programs that was mentioned. Dan responded, saying he has roughly 3/4 of a million dollars in his budget. He's setting up a protocol for how faculty will be able to submit a proposal for this money (based on certain criteria such as collaborative work, interdisciplinary work, elevates and rewards student success). Grants will be for up to \$25,000 for academic proposals. There's roughly \$300,000 on the academic side, and roughly \$300,000 for the research side. Use Faculty Senate's established structures for review to help determine who gets the monies.

Susan Heinrichs added a comment: RFP coming out of her office in a few days via the deans. Look for it.

Ken Barrick asked if individual faculty are welcomed in Dan's office to communicate ideas?
Dan: Yes. He misses that. He'd like to see an exchange between SW and faculty offices.

Linda Hapsmith (Academic Advising Center) asked about issues of staff under Academic Affairs' purview – are there plans or voice for them too?

Dan responded that they do important work and offered thanks. No plans specifically – recommendations must come up to him through the campus, rather than his office dispensing a plan. Saichi of Student Services reports to him along with various other programs including Workforce Development, Health Care Programs and some other distance programs.

Joy Morrison asked if Anne Sakumoto reports to him because she has some funding that could be used for faculty development, like bringing in special speakers to speak to all 3 campuses as an example. Dan responded that he thinks she reports to the HR office. He's spoken to Jim Johnson at HR about doing things differently. But he (Dan) meets with Fac Alliance regularly though they don't report to him. He's open to input and coordinating with others.

VIII Remarks by Chancellor Steve Jones

1. Budget outlook: Representative Mike Kelly says we're about to enter long period of serious budget deficits, at least a 10 years long. FY09 funding is a crapshoot. Fixed cost increases may be covered. But he's not real optimistic, especially beyond FY09. Pres. Hamilton is optimistic about FY09, however. Some permanent budget deficits are seriously looming that are not manageable and will be long-term. Included are the Land Grant units of CES and AFES which need monies from the state above and beyond fixed operating costs. University is trying to organize a grass-roots effort to talk to legislature, but the Legislature is occupied with the petroleum production tax and other oil matters. Serious financial situation needs input from faculty, staff and students. Monday, November 19 meeting mentioned which may include the university-wide budget and planning committee.

2. CES, AFES review: Team was in from USDA's Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) for a week-long federal review of CES and AFES. Presented a 3-page draft report calling for the integration of CES with academic mainstream across a number of schools and colleges; and calls for elevating outreach and engagement across the university to give it greater prominence as a land-grant university. Final report will be delivered next week. President Hamilton commissioned it, and it will go to the President as well as Chancellor. Before direct action there's now a public hearing process on the web site for CES. Open for comment through Nov. 14.

3. UAF Organizational chart: <http://www.uaf.edu/chancellor/administration/UAF.pdf>
Compare org chart at Chancellor's Cabinet level. Ro Bailey (Administrative Services) was an existing position when he came on; Buck Sharpton's title is VC for Research, and did not exist -- had been a vice provost position. He wanted to elevate this position for research to rank at Provost level; Susan Heinrich's position has one change – she is also executive vice chancellor for academic affairs. Tim Barnett's title was dean of student enrollment; Bernice Joseph was an executive dean; they're both now VC's. Added to Tim: enrollment mgt is now student and enrollment services. These two changes did not reflect changes in salary, only in title. Jake's position is now combining a lot of offices and is raising 45% more this year than last and 163% more in the first quarter of this year than last year. Great returns from this position.

Ken Barrick asked whether with all the title changes, what the costs have been. As we approach difficulties in budgets, how can we reconcile rising administrative costs? With dire predictions of future budget difficulties that have been mentioned, will administration be the first area to look for cuts? Chancellor responded with question -- what elements of the university should be held protected against fiscal change? It shouldn't be the administration. What is core to our mission? What isn't? Fundamental core elements of the university must be protected.

Ken Barrick asked if Faculty Senate does have or can have a role in evaluating the need for future administrative positions? Is there a role for participation in planning? Chancellor responded yes. Says it's been done in the recent past -- Jon's predecessor as FS president had input. Feels the FS role is getting better now than years before as the Chancellor has greater need to engage them and more experience working with the FS. Three years plus have taught him how to work more effectively with them.

IX Governance Reports

A. Staff Council - Kayt Sunwood

President-elect Juella Sparks and she are representing Staff Council on many of the same committees as FS. Staff Alliance is keeping them busy -- recently met with interior legislators and talked about university funding. Nominations due for even units of Staff Council; nominees need to be named especially for CSNM and ARSC (Unit 10) and CLA, too. They are also working on goals and agendas, mapping strategic plan with their goals. Issues they are addressing include: Staff training, tuition waivers, handbook for staff, internal recruitments, HR redesign is a big issue for staff committees; PBB is on their agenda, along with family friendly policies, Bunnell house, online elections, PACs, postcard to the governor. Staff council blog site has information about sending a postcard to the governor. Addressing common issues with the GCC and student success issues with ASUAF, also.

B. ASUAF - Vice President Danielle Ryder for Jake Hamburg

ASUAF Vice President Danielle Ryder spoke. 19 senators and all director positions are filled. Innovation Challenge fair is being organized. It's to be held Feb 22 and 23, 2008. Encourage students to participate. Information at <http://www.asuaf.org/innovation>
Book swap planned for day before Spring classes start. Recycling fair next semester. Juneau trip 2/3-5/08. Met with President Hamilton to discuss Juneau goals, including needs based scholarships. Website is up and running; working on an off-campus housing list. They wish to implement a card swipe system for entry into dorms; web site will host a club calendar, message board, Nov 29th and 30th elections for a senator and concert board position. Sheri Layral mentioned need for students on Curricular Affairs committee.

C. UNAC - Jordan Titus

Jane Weber mentioned the Affordable Health Care red buttons she handed out. Sine said Jordan Titus had to leave early due to illness. Question was asked of Jane whether there are areas of staff employment where health benefits are not adequate. Jane responded that the health care

plan adopted applies to all UA employees, not just staff. Feels a terrible health care plan will affect lowest paid staff most adversely.

X New Business

- A. Motion to amend the policy on Course Prerequisites to clarify the C grade, submitted by Curricular Affairs & Student Academic Development and Achievement

Ilana Kingsley introduced the motion and it was passed unanimously.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the policy on Course Prerequisites (p. 39, 2007-2008 UAF Catalog) to clarify that a grade of C means a 2.0 C and not a 1.7 C-.

CAPS = Additions

[[]] = Deletions

Registration

COURSE PREREQUISITES (UAF Catalog, p. 39)

Course prerequisites tell you what previous preparation you need to enroll in a course. An instructor has the right to drop any student from the course if he or she does not meet the prerequisite or has not received a grade of "C" (**2.0**) or better in all prerequisite courses. Under special circumstances, an instructor may allow a student who does not meet prerequisites to enter a class.

You should not register for a course for which you have not completed the appropriate prerequisite courses and received a grade of "C" (**2.0**) or higher unless you have received the instructor's explicit permission. You are expected to check all the prerequisites for the classes for which you intend to register. Prerequisites must be met in order to enroll in some math and developmental courses. Check for prerequisites in the current class schedule, the courses section of the catalog or at <http://uaonline.alaska.edu>.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: This clarifies that a C grade means a 2.0 C and not a 1.7 C-.

- B. Motion to amend the policy on Probation to increase the number of credits, submitted by Curricular Affairs & Student Academic Development and Achievement

Ilana Kingsley introduced the motion and it was passed unanimously.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the policy on probation (p. 78, 2007-2008 UAF Catalog) to increase the number of credits a student can enroll in each semester.

CAPS = Additions

[[]] = Deletions

Academic Standards

PROBATION (UAF Catalog, p. 78)

Undergraduate students-- Students whose cumulative and/or semester GPA falls below 2.0 will be put on academic probation. Students on probation may not enroll in more than [[12]] **13** credits a semester, unless the appropriate dean grants an exception. Probation may include additional conditions, as determined by the dean of the college or school in which the student's major is located. Students on probation will be referred for developmental advising/education and/or to an advising or support counseling center. The student will work with an academic advisor to prepare an academic plan for achieving a higher GPA; the advisor is responsible for forwarding this plan to the appropriate dean. A student on probation will not be allowed to register unless the academic plan is on file. Removal from probation requires the student's cumulative and semester GPAs to be at least 2.0."

EFFECTIVE: Spring 2008

RATIONALE: Changing the credit limit from 12 to 13 allows students to take a regular course load that may contain a lab or math course. The intent is so that a traditional full-time student who is on probationary status can take up to four courses.

- C. Motion to amend the English Proficiency Requirements for international student admissions, submitted by Curricular Affairs & Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

John Lehman addressed the issue, explaining that there are difficulties with demand for TOEFL slots, keeping students out because they're waiting a year or more for a TOEFL slot. IELTS exam is more widely available to foreign students. 6.5 score is adequate for IELTS score. Jennifer Reynolds asked about media reports regarding security measures regarding the TOEFL. John said some of these had to do with the online version of the test, however, there are no similar security

problems for IELTS. As the U.S. has tightened admission of foreign students, the Asian programs have compensated, requiring TOEFL and increasing the demand for it. John clarified that IELTS is British English. The motion was passed unanimously.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senates moves to amend the English Proficiency Requirements for international student admissions to allow the IELTS (the standard European test for English language proficiency) to be substituted for the TOEFL (2007-2008 UAF Catalog, page 32).

The Senate further recommends that we adapt an IELTS score of 6.5 as equivalent to our current TOEFL requirement.

CAPS - Addition

[[]] - Deletion

Applying for Admission: International Students (UAF Catalog, p. 32)

English Proficiency Requirements

1. Students who require an F-1 student visa must pass the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) with a minimum score of 213 (computer exam), 550 (paper exam) or 80 (Internet-based exam) **OR THE IELTS WITH A MINIMUM SCORE OF 6.5**. The TOEFL/IELTS requirement may be waived for applicants whose native language is English.
2. All applicants, including permanent residents on an immigrant visa, must demonstrate English proficiency by:
 - a. Passing the TOEFL with a minimum score of 213 (computer exam), 550 (paper exam) or 80 (Internet-based exam) **OR THE IELTS WITH A MINIMUM SCORE OF 6.5; OR**
 - b. Graduation from high school or equivalent in a country where English is an official language or the language of instruction in higher education; **OR**
 - c. Successful completion of at least one year of full-time study in a degree program at a college or university in a country where English is an official language or the language of instruction in higher education; or
 - d. Other substantiation acceptable to the Office of Admissions

Other tests may be required to satisfy application requirements for specific undergraduate or graduate degree programs. Additional information for international students is available at www.uaf.edu/admissions/international/ and www.uaf.edu/oip/, by e-mail at fyisa@uaf.edu or by calling (907) 474-7677 or (907) 474-5327.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Increased demand and problems with test administration have made the TOEFL increasingly difficult for many students to take; in many parts of the world

the number of test slots is significantly below the demand, resulting in long delays for potential students. A large number of US universities now accept the IELTS as a substitute for the TOEFL. Common minimum IELTS scores range from 5.5 to 7.0, corresponding to TOEFL scores of 500-600 (paper version). It is recommended that we adapt an IELTS score of 6.5 based on the average for mid- and top-tier research universities. Examples of peer universities that use this level are the University of Texas at Austin, the University of Minnesota and the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

D. Resolution on Honors status for graduate students, submitted by Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

Katrin Iken introduced the resolution and it was unanimously approved.

RESOLUTION:

=====

WHEREAS, Graduate students are expected to maintain excellent scholarship in all their studies, and

WHEREAS, Graduate students are currently not recognized for graduating with honors, and

WHEREAS, Graduate thesis, project or dissertation is a major part of the program of most students, and

WHEREAS, because uniform thesis, project and dissertation grading standards would be difficult to implement (even within individual departments), now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee recommends that graduate students will not be recognized as having graduated with honors, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, the Faculty Senate recommends that graduate students will not be recognized for graduation with honors.

E. Resolution on Open Meeting for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review, submitted by Faculty Affairs

John Dehn introduced the resolution and gave some background on its development. Jennifer Reynolds commented to clarify the issue: it's the committee's decision about whether or not a meeting is open, not the candidate's decision; therefore, the resolution is to encourage committees to keep meetings open. This had been the policy in place until several years ago. Discussion ensued with pros and cons being voiced, including the issues of trying to schedule for open meetings when the timeframe is tight for committees along with a heavy workload of files to go through. Leeway with scheduling was encouraged to support an open process since entire careers

are on the line. It was also clarified that in an open meeting the candidate only observes and listens. Anyone technically could attend. The resolution passed with 24 votes in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstentions.

RESOLUTION

=====

WHEREAS the members of Faculty Committees are called upon under the concept of shared governance to provide professional review of other faculty candidates undergoing Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Review (Pre and Post-tenure),

WHEREAS the faculty portion of the review process must be fair and reasonable in order to maintain the reputation of the University, and the integrity of the academic process,

WHEREAS open and transparent Committee deliberations facilitate fair and reasonable review,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly requests that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an “open” meeting, and that “mandatory closed” meetings be avoided, including during the 2007-08 review cycle.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty Committee meetings are “open” at the request of a candidate and are consistent with all other relevant UAF rules and procedures.
2. Open meetings provide strong incentives for fair and reasonable review, including the oversight of the candidate.
3. The Committee can query a candidate for clarification of the file, which will greatly reduce the number of false assumptions and errors during deliberation.
4. Open meetings are educational—candidates who opt to attend their review have the opportunity to learn about academic traditions and practices.
5. Attendance can reduce candidates' anxiety, and make them feel like a part of the process.

XI Committee Reports

.

A. Curricular Affairs - Ilana Kingsley

The following two reports were attached to the agenda:

**Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes Sept. 24, 2007**

Present: Mae Delcastillo (for Melissa McGinty), Deanna Dieringer, Linda Hapsmith, Ilana Kingsley, Beth Leonard, Rainer Newberry, Jane Allen, Carol Lewis, Amber Thomas, Dana Thomas, Libby Eddy

Absent: Falk Huettmann, Diane McEachern

Motion on grades for course prerequisites (a C means 2.0):

- UAF Faculty Senate (Meeting #129) has already passed a motion in regard to prerequisite courses and grades. “Students should not register for a course if they haven’t met the prerequisite courses or has not received a grade of “C” or better in all prerequisite courses.”
- Need to consider prerequisite courses, as well as credit/no-credit grades and transfer grades. This applies to any course, not just core courses.
- Committee decided to bring motion to FS to change the wording in the catalog that a C is a 2.0. Beth (and Ilana) will draft a motion.

Motion on 12 credit/13 credit rule for probationary students:

- Committee decided to bring a motion to FS to change the wording in the catalog from 12 credits to 13 credits. This will allow students to take lab classes or other variations of classes that total 13 credits.

Issues of Readmittance after Academic Disqualification:

- Who makes the final decision for readmittance. It’s not specified in the catalog. Right now, the Dean of the school has to sign off. Should it be the Assistant Provost? Carol Lewis will bring this issue up at Dean’s council.
- Do requirements for baccalaureate degree seeking students also work for certificate seeking students?
- Dana suggested the catalog reads “...To be eligible for reinstatement in an academic program, the student must earn at least 9 credits as a non degree student and achieve both a current and cumulative GPA of at least 2.0” – so the question asked as should the GPA be cumulative?

Unfinished Business:

- CLEP
 - FreshStart
-

**Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes Oct. 08, 2007**

Present: Jane Allen, Mae Delcastillo, Deanna Dieringer, Linda Hapsmith, Falk Huettmann, Ilana Kingsley, Beth Leonard, Diane McEachern, Rainer Newberry, Ramona McAfee

Absent: Carol Lewis, Amber Thomas

1. Approved minutes from last meeting
2. Discussed motion on grades for course prerequisites

- a. Students are allowed to sign up in Banner; Banner doesn't prohibit students from signing up.
 - b. Need to remind FS that:
 - o Banner does not automatically prevent people from signing up and that the Dept. admin has the ability to check if students have the appropriate prerequisites.
 - o Faculty can withdraw students who don't have the appropriate prerequisites.
3. Discussed issue of readmittance
- a. Linda will find out what % students going for an associates degree get disqualified & what proportion of students who are on probation get disqualified.
 - b. Ilana will follow up with Carol regarding Deans' Council
4. Ramona McAfee presented the group with a proposal to change the required # of residency credits, for active service military members who are seeking an associates degree, from 6 to 3.
- a. UAA residency is set at 3 credits for a 2 year degree
 - b. UAF is the administrative MAU for military programs in Interior AK
 - c. The degrees offered are in goarmyed – the military portal; for UAF they include:
 - o Associate of Arts (AA)
 - o Associate of Applied Sciences in Accounting (AAS-A)
 - o Associate of Applied Sciences in Culinary Arts (AAS-CA)
 - o Associate of Applied Sciences in Maintenance Technology - Airframe and Powerplant (AAS-M)
 - d. A motion was made to bring this to FS.
 Post-Meeting Info: The issue of military credits has been indefinitely tabled per Ramona McAfee.

Unfinished Business:

- CLEP
- FreshStart

B. Faculty Affairs - Jon Dehn

A report was attached to the agenda. The minutes should reflect that Donie Bret-Harte was in attendance and updated minutes are included below. Committee has been working on adjusting the bylaws to properly include their role as a conduit of communication between the unions and the senate. They are trying to find accurate budget information and to that end Jon is now on the Chancellor's budget committee. They're also looking at the new online travel system, and waiting on a report by a faculty who investigated this. There have been positive comments from staff so far. The online system for Annual Activity reports caused lively discussion in the committee meeting. Jon provided the senate with a description of the system and some of the background associated with it. Jennifer Reynolds commented on proposed design changes and issues of usage of the system by administrators.

**Faculty Affairs Committee
 19 October, 2007, WRRB 101**

Attending: Ken Barrick, Donie Bret-Harte, Anne Christie, Jon Dehn, Marla Lowder, Jennifer Reynolds, Jonathan Rosenberg

Discussion of the bylaws description of the faculty affairs committee. A slight modification is in the works, where all are tasked with suggestions for language to include the role of faculty affairs as a conduit for Unions / Senate communication / coordination. The rationale is to update the language to encourage participation of the Unions as well as the Senate in Union efforts.

Discussion of the perceived increase in early tenure applications, clarification was asked for since there was no increase noted in the data from past senate minutes, or from Doris Nichols at the Provost's office.

We went over the org chart briefly, note that there are now 13 persons with the title "Chancellor" at UAF.

Also, we were unable to find accurate budget information about UAF online at the website.

The new online travel system was not discussed until it could be seen demonstrated. The GI is taking special interest in this a demo was scheduled in IARC.

The new automated annual activities reporting was demonstrated as being tested by SFOS. Not only is it cumbersome, time consuming, ill-conceived and buggy, it undermines the primary function of the activities report. What was once a tool to help the faculty member chart their career with the aid of their director or dean has now become a data mining project for statewide. Further, much of the data required to be entered here is potentially sensitive, including students grade distributions and particularly the information in the self narrative. The committee feels this will eliminate the usefulness of the activities reports on at least two levels.

First, the faculty will be disinclined to fill out every single manuscript, since it is an impenetrable process requiring more detail than any journal citation. As Jeff Freymueller noted last year when this was proposed, he would be inclined to enter the minimum required and then move on to more important matters. This would skew the data-mining efforts of statewide and under represent UAF's total contribution.

Second, faculty will be disinclined to enter candid information which should be documented and discussed with their director/dean to ensure a healthy academic environment. That makes the reports less useful to faculty and directors/deans to manage their careers and institutes/schools respectively. This speaks to core areas of academic freedom which could be threatened by this sort of activity. There are certainly more points can be made here.

There are no obvious positive aspects of the current online system. A perfect world would include past reports, automatically gauge and prepare a tenure/promotion packet, have areas blocked from data-mining or scrutiny from statewide, and a doi database search to ease reference entry. This should be an aid to faculty, not the burden it currently represents.

Finally the issue of open meetings in faculty tenure/promotion reviews came up, and led to the motion before the senate. Though we cannot change the current rules in CBA, this motion was requested by Dan Walsh to give the Union leverage to change the language in the CBA such that the review process remains fair and open. Open meetings tend to give the entire process transparency and weight. Attached is the edited motion. [Not included here.]

C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar

The following report was submitted as a handout.

Unit Criteria Meeting

Oct 29 2007

In attendance: Lisa Lehman (Library Science visitor); Brenda Konar, Lee Cooper, Gerri Brightwell, Thomas Zhou, Julie Casico, Jing Zhang

NOTE: Please reserve Dec 3 at noon for our next Unit Criteria meeting. You will be notified with details as it gets closer.

Meeting commenced at noon with the review of the Library Science Unit Criteria. These were reviewed previously (last year) and have been submitted with revisions. Lisa Lehman was in attendance to answer any questions.

Discussion on Criteria:

General Criteria:

-Is the first sentence in the added ALL CAPS area needed?

Lisa: Not needed, will delete

-The time-based part of the description in second paragraph needs to be deleted. Criteria should not be time-based.

-Second paragraph starts out with Tenure. The rest of the paragraph is not about tenure alone. This paragraph needs to be consistent.

-The second paragraph specifies that ratings should be at least "good". Discussion around ratings ensued. Consensus was to leave the rating in as it gives guidance to the faculty.

Teaching:

-First paragraph of page 4 needs to say "workload" and not just "load" so that it is apparent that it is 1-2 units per year. This section should mention that teaching is a small portion of the library science workload.

-1.f. added material: doesn't read as the rest of the other points. The wording needs to be re-written as a criterion.

-Wording on the top of page 5 fourth paragraph... "major contribution" and "major improvements" may be a problem. Much of the first 4 paragraphs are vague. Much of this may fit better in section 1 (effectiveness). Perhaps the details for assistant, associate, and full don't fit for library science. Consensus is to delete the 4 paragraphs on the top of page 5.

Research:

-Part of the added section in l. might fit better elsewhere. Example, case studies and translations should be under publication. Others also may fit better elsewhere in this section.

-End of page 6, the paragraphs say "as evidenced by any"... this implies that perhaps they only need to have one of the examples. Also, much of this is repetitious of the points above (a-l). A better explanation of what is expected out of the assistant, associate and full is needed.. i.e. how do they differ. As example, are broader publications expected of full?

-The top of page 7 needs to say "workload" and not just "load".

Service:

- The service portion of the unit criteria tries to explain what library science does, however the added part at the end of the evaluation is not a way to evaluate the faculty. Perhaps break the various items under either public or university service.
- Under evaluation, there is nothing to use to evaluate assistant, associate, and fulls. There needs to be something to guide faculty as far as what they need to be doing. Perhaps fulls must be acting at the national level.
- There needs to be something in the Service section that states that the bulk of the workload is service.
- Top of page nine needs to be re-worded so that only a self-evaluation is not the only item needed.
- Descriptions of what library science does are great but it would be nice to see specific examples and how to evaluate these. You should particularly mention items that are unique to library science.

Meeting ended at 1310.

D. Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber

The following report was attached to the agenda:

Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Women October 16, 2007

Members present: Diane Wagoner, Kayt Sunwood (ex-officio), David Koester, Jane Weber, Cindy Hardy, Carol Gold, Sine Anahita, Renate Wackerbauer, Brenda Norris

Members missing: Uma Bhatt (Uma was not the on email list, and thus did not receive notice of the meeting; this has been rectified)

Guest: Christiana Wright, student journalist from the *Sun-Star*

Minutes by Sine Anahita

Next meeting moved to 11/13/07

Family friendly policies

- letter from new faculty member was circulated; she just had a baby and was unable to obtain faculty housing; was living in student housing that was unacceptable and unhealthy; wished us to write a letter in support of her obtaining adequate and safe housing
- we discussed other issues related to family-friendly policies that the university could adopt that would improve the quality of work life for women faculty: automatically stopping the tenure clock upon the birth or adoption of a child instead of faculty having to request it; instituting payroll deduction for Bunnell child care center; adequate faculty housing; increasing access to childcare
- health and safety issues, Americans with Disability Act issues are also involved
- Carol made a motion to form a subcommittee; members volunteered to write a resolution for presentation to Faculty Senate that urges the University to examine its policies and to increase its family-friendliness
- subcommittee: Alex, Sine, Jane, and Diane

- timeline: resolution ready by December Faculty Senate meeting
- Kayt will work with Staff Council and ASUAF to encourage these two bodies to present parallel resolutions; in particular, Staff Council has been also discussing family friendly policies and the need for them to be developed at UAF

Tenure and promotion inequalities

- Carol had noted in an earlier email that had been circulated among the committee that, judging by the ad in the *Fairbanks News-Miner* that celebrated the faculty who had been awarded tenure and/or promotion, there were continuing gender inequalities
- among faculty who were tenured and/or promoted, 18% were women (eight women out of 44 faculty)
- among faculty promoted to full professor, 5% were women (one woman out of 22 faculty)
- among the faculty who were tenured, 32% were women (seven women out of 22 faculty)
- discussion about the women faculty who left early career, and of the female full professors who left—concern that we are losing women at every stage
- Sine and Jane did exit interviews with some of the female full professors who left this past year; lack of adequate resources, lack of research support and lab space, the presence of the glass ceiling emerged as common themes
- we have data from the previous study about when women and men go up for tenure and/or promotion; we lack data about why faculty go up for tenure and/or promotion when they do
- Kayt talked about the 2010 Vision Task Force and how T&P was an issue brought up
- Kayt and Sine volunteered to conduct a quantitative study to explore the tenure and/or promotion decision-making process among faculty
- some Qs: timely evaluations as a resource for deciding to pursue T&P; what campus are you on; effect of Faculty Development Office; at what level do you think you were safe to go up; choose three of the most important elements that helped you decide to go up, e.g. mentoring, travel funding, encouragement from chair, etc.; one open-ended qualitative Q, e.g. tell your story, with hopes of collecting these for a later qualitative study; also ask if R may be willing to participate in a qualitative study at a later date
- Sine and Jane will ask the Provost for \$\$ to support a qualitative and quantitative study on this topic—SurveyMonkey first (\$199/annually for the full package); \$5K for later qualitative study; David Koester is interested, may be graduate student help with the work; Kayt suggested Women’s Center students may be able to help
- timeline: have online quantitative study up for faculty when we return from winter break

Adjunct exploitation

- Cindy noted the continuing and increasing exploitation of adjunct faculty at UAF, most of whom are women
- Jane said that unions on a national basis are conducting campaigns to increase visibility and awareness of the exploitation and to increase the movement of adjuncts to tenure-track status
- Sine suggested we refer this issue to Faculty Affairs, as it affects all faculty
- Cindy volunteered to present the issue to Faculty Affairs
-

E. Core Review - Michael Harris

The following report was attached to the agenda:

Core Review Committee

Minutes for the Meeting of 10:30-11:30am. Wednesday Oct. 10

Present: Latrice Bowman, Christine Coffman, Steve Cysewski, Mike Harris (members), Linda Hapsmith, Sue McHenry (ex-officio)

Report for the Senate Minutes. The committee reviewed five petitions (two were approved, two are waiting for more information, and one was sent back to graduation as we felt it was not a core issue). In addition to petitions we finalized the revisions to the petition form and we discussed the assessment issues that we need to deal with. This will be completed in the next meeting. The next committee meeting is on Wednesday Oct 31.

F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry

No report was available. Rainer mentioned the 120-plus courses currently under review by the committee.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Tom Clausen

No report was available. Mention was made of the 3 Class A administrators under review and the 5 Class B administrators being reviewed.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - Larry Roberts

A draft report was attached to the agenda. Below is a finalized report:

University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate Faculty Development, Assessment, and Improvement Committee Meeting Minutes – October 9, 2007

Meeting was called to order at 8:00am

Attending: Christie Cooper, Michael Daku, Marjorie Illingworth, Link Olson, Channon Price, Larry Roberts, Dana Greci, Eric Madsen, Joy Morrison, Julie Lurman,

Agenda items:

1. Roll-call.
2. Fill recorder position.
3. Consideration of minutes from last meeting.
4. Joy's report.
5. Meet with Provost.
6. Old business.
7. New business.
8. Additional items for discussion
9. Adjournment.

1. The meeting opened with a roll-call.

2. Dana Greci was elected to replace Christie Cooper as Recorder.
3. September 11th meeting minutes were approved with a few changes. Christie agreed to update them.
4. Joy's Report:

The new faculty orientation has been expanded from last year to include a week of orientation. This included a two-day NSF grant writing workshop and a lot of assistance to new faculty in the area of setting up their relationship with the Human Resources department.

Faculty trainings are being held on Friday mornings and attendance has been good. The list of trainings can be seen at the Fac Dev website.

Joy went to a conference on assessment of critical thinking. It wasn't very good, but Joy remains keen to push this notion of critical thinking with faculty. She wants to assess how critical thinking is taught here at UAF. Dana offered to draft a rubric to share with the committee.

Joy is going to work with trainers in the Community Health Aides Program on classroom assessment techniques. She will be working with Palmer faculty on 10/16, taking part in the Chap Convocation, doing a half-day workshop for Anchorage Community Health Aides on 10/17, and visiting the UAF faculty in Anchorage.

Joy sent a rubric for Peer Assessment of Teaching to deans to distribute to all faculty.

5. Meeting with the Provost:

The Provost could not attend because she was attending another meeting. We rescheduled our next meeting so it doesn't conflict with that other meeting, next time, in hopes that she'll be able to come.

6. Old Business:

Larry asked for 2-3 people on the committee to develop a list of topics for Provost forums and present it to the Faculty Senate to see if the Senate wants to sponsor these forums. He said he would participate. Michael and Marji volunteered.

The group discussed the upcoming March 2008 Arctic Institute of Innovations of Excellence in Teaching. The Far North Lilly Institute has been suggested as a new name for the institute in the future. Sixteen new faculty will be going to Lilly West in CA March 20-22. Larry will keep us advised on the institute as things develop.

7. New Business:

Joy requested that all FDAI committee members work on projects. She will be taking this idea to the Advisory Board too. The group discussed working on the following projects:

1. Development of faculty peer assessment,
2. Provision of input to the Strategic Visioning Task Force,
3. Development of Provost faculty forums, and
4. Development of the adult learning institute.

8. Additional Item for Discussion:

Link suggested a fifth project: improvement of methods of generating activity reports, and Eric brought up possibly including workload agreements too. Link agreed to be the point person for this project. Julie Lurman agreed to look at a draft of his suggestions. Channon said he would provide a power point for the committee to review.

Larry volunteered to send around a list of the 5 projects, including who has volunteered to work on each one and asking for additional volunteers.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 a.m.

Next Meeting: Tuesday November 6, 2007 @ 8:15 a.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Dana Greci, Recorder.

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee - Paul McCarthy

No written report available, but Katrin Iken gave a brief verbal update.

J. Student Academic Development and Achievement - Cindy Hardy

Cindy highlighted the discussion of unintended consequences of mandatory placement in the meeting notes, as well as more collaboration with Curricular Affairs. The following report was attached to the agenda:

**Meeting of the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee (SADAC)
October 19, 2007**

Attending: Mark Box, John Creed, Jill Faudree, Dana Greci, Marji Illingworth, Ron Illingworth, Cindy Hardy, Joe Hickman, Carol Murphrey (Some members calling in were cut off or put on hold by the system.)

The committee met and acted on the following:

Election of Chairs: Cindy Hardy and Joe Mason were re-elected as co-chairs.

Motions from Curricular Affairs: The committee read and discussed two motions from the Curricular Affairs committee. We agreed to co-sponsor the motions on the 12-credit rule for probationary students and on clarification of a C grade. We also agreed to maintain communication between the two committees so that issues best addressed in SADAC can be forwarded to us and vice versa. We hope to be able to have more motion co-sponsorships in the future. This should be facilitated by the overlap in membership of our two committees.

We also discussed issues surrounding the implementation of mandatory placement.

Ron raised two issues: Prerequisites for classes apply to degree-seeking and transfer students and any student taking core English and Math classes, but do not apply to non-degree seeking (i.e.: community member taking an art class). We discussed the best way to clarify this. We will forward this concern to Dana Thomas.

Ron also raised a concern specific to the way vocational certificate students are placed in their communication and computation classes. Many of these programs have designed classes which have communication and computation embedded and taught in applications specific to the trade. Placement testing for these students that directs them to DEVM 050, for instance, may cause them to unnecessarily take an extra math class—a significant impact on a student’s progress in a one-year program. We agreed that this can be dealt with through advising to place the student in the appropriate vocational math or English class. We also raised the question of whether there were separate placement tests that could direct a student towards the appropriate vocational, rather than academic, placement for students in those programs and whether more developmental level preparatory vocational courses could be developed. These concerns will be referred back to the Department of Developmental Education.

Mark raised the issue of the impact Mandatory Placement will have on the affected core teaching departments, particularly English and math. We discussed the potential impact on FTE, class size, and TA class availability during the initial transition period. Both English and Math faculty on the committee felt that their departments had not yet addressed these issues. Dana Greci also raised the question of reading placement and how this will impact other core classes.

We need to find data on the following questions:

What impact will mandatory placement have on core enrollments in Math and English (such as English 111 and Math 107 or 103)?

What courses will be impacted by placement based on reading level?

How can we best measure reading level—ACT and SAT may not be the best measures. Is COMPASS an accurate measure?

Next meeting: November 16, 2-3:30 pm.

XII Resolution of Appreciation for Sheri Layral’s Service to Faculty Senate – Jon Genetti

***RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION
FOR
SHERI LAYRAL***

Whereas, Sheri Layral has served the UAF Faculty Senate for 17 years in a manner deserving of the UAF Faculty Senate's greatest admiration and respect; and

Whereas, Sheri Layral has provided the institutional memory that has allowed UAF shared governance to reach new levels; and

Whereas, Sheri Layral has mentored many young faculty into the leadership roles necessary to support the UAF Faculty Senate; and

Whereas, Sheri Layral was instrumental in ensuring that deadlines were met by the UAF Faculty Senate committees; and

Whereas, Sheri Layral was successful in ensuring that the UAF Faculty Senate meetings ran smoothly; and

Whereas, Sheri Layral enthusiastically agreed to continue serving after retirement to ensure a smooth transition to a new office manager; and

Whereas, Sheri Layral's thorough knowledge of UAF system policies and regulations, academic programs and course catalog was invaluable; and

Whereas, Sheri Layral has made the impossible job of UAF Faculty Senate President possible; and

Whereas, The past and current UAF Faculty Senate Presidents and current President-elect wish to acknowledge the outstanding service rendered the faculty and the University by the work of Sheri Layral; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the past and current UAF Faculty Senate Presidents and current President-elect acknowledge the many contributions of Sheri Layral and express their appreciation for her exemplary service.

XIII Members' Comments/Questions - none

XIV Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:27 PM. Refreshments followed, in honor of Sheri.

Tapes of this Faculty Senate meeting are in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall if anyone wishes to listen to the complete tapes.

Submitted by Jayne Harvie, Faculty Senate Secretary.