

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #149
Monday, March 3, 2008
1:00 p.m. – 2:43 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
Barrick, Ken
Barry, Ron
Bret-Harte, Marion (Link Olson)
Cascio, Julie
Christie, Anne
Daku, Michael
Dandekar, Abhijit (and Silke Schiewer)
Dehn, Jonathan
Genetti, Jon
Hogan, Maureen
Huettmann, Falk
Iken, Katrin
Illingworth, Marjorie
Kingsley, Ilana
Konar, Brenda
Leonard, Beth
Little, Joe (and Yijiang Zhao)
Lowder, Marla (Sonja Koukel)
Lurman, Julie
McEachern, Diane
Newberry, Rainer
Reynolds, Jennifer
Rosenberg, Jonathan
Sousa, Marsha
Weber, Jane
Wiechen, Heinz
Zhou, Thomas

Members Absent:

Barboza, Perry
Cooper, Christine
Potter, Ben
Roberts, Larry
Thomas, Amber
Zhang, Jing

Others Present:

Dieringer, Deanna
Duffy, Larry
Goering, Douglas
Hamburg, Jake
Hardy, Cindy
Hapsmith, Linda
Henrichs, Susan
Lewis, Sarah
Madsen, Eric
McCarthy, Paul
McCrea, Scott (guest speaker)
Morrison, Joy
Nacke, Anne Marie
Sfraga, Mike
Sparrow, Steve
Sunwood, Kayt
Thomas, Dana
Titus, Jordan
Wartes, Denise

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #148

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:

1. Motion to amend the Mandatory Placement criteria for English and Mathematics.
2. Motion to revise the Fresh Start policy for returning students.
3. Motion to approve a Ph.D. in Natural Resources and Sustainability

B. Motions Pending: none

III Public Comments/Questions

Ann Marie Nacke from the Academic Advising Center announced a couple of events: The Feist/Schamel Outstanding Undergraduate Faculty Advisor Award nominations are due March 7. Major Mania happens on March 21. Fliers left on table and also available on the Advising Center web site, or give them a call.

IV A. President's Comments - Jon Genetti

1. April 7 Faculty Senate Meeting will not be held at the Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom. The Hess Rec Center (at the Moore-Barlett-Skarland residence hall complex) is reserved; however, another location with video conferencing is being looked into.
2. Nominations are now open for next-term's Senate President-Elect. President-Elect statements from nominees are due by March 27 to be included in the next agenda. Send to Jayne.
3. Nominations for the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award are due by March 18; and may be sent to Jayne at fysenat@uaf.edu, or call x7964. If you would like to be on the OSYA Selection Committee, see Jayne.

B. President-elect's Comments - Marsha Sousa

A memo has gone out clarifying FERPA issues with regard to confidentiality; particularly students who have put a confidential hold on their records. No phone consultation or online advising with these students is permitted – advising must be done in person after they've presented a form of university or government ID. Because this can be a problem with advising remote/rural students, SAC is looking into it further. They're also looking at ways to help students understand the implications of putting a confidential hold on their records.

Jon R. asked about seeing this hold online in student records. Marsha confirmed that instructors can see this hold online when they look up their students. Jon Genetti commented that any graded work of the student becomes part of the confidential record, and is technically under the confidential hold. So if a student (with a confidential hold) wanted their grade over the phone, it can not even be confirmed over the phone that they're a student. Because of that hold, they must present valid UAF or government ID in person. The recent FERPA memo references computer accounts and business office functions – but hasn't addressed faculty or advising issues. Jon has two students with holds in his class, and he's verified their identities and made verbal agreements to allow communication via email, but it must come from their UAF user accounts. It's estimated that 11% of students have this hold. Instructors should talk to their students with confidential holds and make arrangements for communication within those constraints.

V A. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

The Chancellor is in Finland and so Susan will talk about the UA budget. The university's budget has been considered and moved out of the House, but lots of other steps, including the Senate and Conference, are still ahead so nothing is a done deal about the budget yet. With the House version there was an initial version that cut out an aggregate total of about five million dollars from the fixed cost increment request. This cut the step increases for staff, and cut out an allocation for increased fuel costs. There was an emergency meeting of BOR that changed the compensation policies of the university so that step increases were reduced relative to COLA increases, so that most of the increases for employees would come as cost of living increases as opposed to step increases. With that change they were able to restore fixed cost money for employee increases, but the fuel cost reduction was still left out. There is an assurance that later on there will be an adjustment for fuel costs for all state agencies and state-funded organizations. In terms of programmatic increments, much of the Allied Health and Construction and Engineering increments are there, but all else is gone from the House version. Still removed from the budget is an unallocated cut of about three-quarters of a million dollars to the SW systems budget, which was in response to press in Anchorage about concerns for UAA's budget in light of statewide's budget having grown more rapidly than any of the three MAUs delivering programs. So the legislature has decided to address this by taking this unallocated reduction to the statewide MAU, saying they needed to cut spending. But as all funding funnels through statewide to the campuses, a cut to them impacts us below at least as much as it might affect things at statewide. Just on general principles we don't want the legislature to micromanage the university's funding. We don't want to return the era where the legislature could control how much Anchorage or Fairbanks gets in funding – it should remain the purview of the BOR. Collectively all of the MAUs, including statewide, feel that the legislature directing where cuts should be taken is not the direction for the university to go. We should continue to manage our resources, with the BOR, statewide system and campus MAUs all working together to deliver programs with the funding we have available. There will be last minute wrangling of what is in the budget up to the end of the process, as usual. Somewhat pessimistic about funding for BIOS making it into the capital budget. Hoping to have the increment for R and R funded, though.

As a campus we're moving forward on electronic faculty activity reporting, but the plan is for a more gradual movement with feedback along the way, not all at once. Wants a useful system but not an onerous one for faculty. Hoping for an even trade of effort on both sides. A phased implementation is planned with people in several units signing up for the system this spring. If they wish they can enter info between now and the fall when reports are due. Then, we'll see how it goes with that subgroup. Based on feedback, the intent is to move on to everyone participating in the Fall of 2009. SFOS piloted the program and identified glitches with that

version which was not in full form yet. Now working on being able to incorporate uploading citation info in Endnote to the program, among other ways, to make it less difficult to use. Although somewhat time consuming, for most people it's not an incredible time investment. SFOS folks spent 2-3 hours getting info into the electronic format. If you have a lot of publications and abstracts it could be more time consuming, and you might need to have some staff assistance to do that. Direct benefits to faculty come on down the road with personal reporting for activities and preparing promotion and tenure files. Ultimately you should easily be able to generate documents for P&T files. This makes it easier for a unit to do reporting each year, for example, the mission and measure reports for the statewide system, and PBB reports, generating proposal lists, publication lists and the like. There will be less work in the long run, but in the learning and implementation phase there will be more work initially.

Will administration be able to look at individual faculty and use the information against them? She says it won't happen at her level at her office as long as she's here. This doesn't really change the fact that info about what faculty are doing and their workload are already out there and being used by administrators. Statewide already points to and expresses concern about faculty info already out there. Statewide's Annual report (UA in Review) shows credit hours that are tabulated per faculty member and student credit hours per faculty member...comparing each campus to the other and to national figures. If Susan has more info to work with, for example, what kind of hours – graduate hours or lab intensive credits, she can then explain the numbers to them. More information is good, not bad.

Final thing the Provost mentioned is the revising and updating of the Blue Book (evaluation, promotion and tenure procedures). There will be a small group that Sarah Lewis will put together (staff, faculty, administrators) who will go through and make editorial changes and clarifications and improvements to wording. Some substantive changes will be proposed, as policy changes have superseded some of the older regulations. It will go to Faculty Affairs for review and then to the Senate for overall approval. Timeline: small committee now, passes it to Faculty Affairs in a month, and approved by end of academic year. This may be too ambitious of a time schedule. May end up being next fall for overall approval. Jordan Titus asked if unions will participate in the committee review. Susan said they'll work with the CBA in front of them; trying hard to align it to the CBA. The Blue Book is not a union document. They will involve Kris Racina who is familiar with the CBA's, but it's a faculty and university document and many union members will review the document. This Blue Book is more static, while the CBAs are fluid documents. The union will see it and can comment on it.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council - Kayt Sunwood

Staff Alliance returned last week from Juneau lobbying. Saw firsthand about the goings on regarding staff compensation. It was exciting to see it all happen. Finally ratified their Staff Council elections and had their orientation of new members. There will be a retreat in March for SC, and will set what they'll be working on for rest of year and next. Bunnell House is one issue they'll be working on in Staff Affairs. Will work with other governance groups on this.

Staff Council is helping out on the merit and needs-based scholarships that Jake Hamburg will talk about.

B. ASUAF - Jake Hamburg

The Innovation Challenge has been extended to March 30 and 31, with ideas to improve campus and community sustainability and development.

An off-campus housing list is now up on their site, for benefit of new students.

Progress is being made on a small business project, to show that students can start small businesses with what they're learning in their undergraduate programs and that they can contribute to the state economy, even if the program is not one of the workforce development-types of programs.

The big issue for students right now is affordability. Costs have increased all around with tuition, housing, transportation, books, etc. There's been a 56% increase in the cost of tuition in the last four years. This is preventing access to the university. UAS surveyed students that were dropping out, and the #2 reason was they can't afford it, which they know is tied to the #1 reason for dropping out which is family issues. Students drafted their own legislation for needs based and merit based scholarships. They consulted with a number of experts around the country and with the Alaska Council on Postsecondary Education. They looked at Iowa and other state programs, emulating what works in their programs. They created the Alaska Achievers Incentive Program – which is a merit-based and needs-based hybrid program. “Merit aid” is the popular term in the country. Funding for this program now sits in a committee at the legislature. Letters of support are coming in from SW and the community, from students and principals of K-12 school district, and they do not see a need for a task force – the need is obvious. For every \$160 dollars of increased tuition costs to students, we lose .5% of neediest student enrollment, and 2.3% of community college students who are needy. But just \$1000 difference in cost to students boosts enrollment by 9%. Alaska is 51st in the country (DC included) for affordability. Jake invites your letters of support. Blog available.

Ken Barrick asked Jake where the funding sources for this program are coming from. Jake answered that they're from the General Fund in the form of a \$100 million endowment. There are two separate bills – the main one is HB 397 which is the scholarship program itself, and HB 403 is the appropriation from the General Fund to an endowment program which would be directed by ACPE. That endowment would generate about 5% per year, or about \$5 million/year would become available, which would be state controlled money. So, it's a sustainable way of providing scholarship funds.

Susan H. commented on the students' good work and that they have university support. Administration has kept in the background purposely, as they believe the students have a better shot at this being in the forefront with their efforts and the legislature. This money goes directly to students, through the ACPE, as is done in most states supplying needs-based funding to students. About 95% of grant aid from ACPE would probably come to the UA institutions via the students receiving aid.

C. UNAC/ACCFT

Jane Weber (ACCFT) mentioned that the contract has been ratified and is at BOR. Just waiting for their checks.

Jordan Titus (UNAC) shared that there is a tentative agreement after haggling over straggling articles. Bullet points went out just recently, and there should be access to the entire document today. They're hoping to do electronic ballots. Pub Night is back – this Wednesday at 4 pm, come with questions and concerns over the agreement.

VII Guest Speaker

A. Scott McCrea – University Marketing & Communications

Scott is the Director of Marketing and Communications – which was formerly Marketing and Publications.” It was also formerly known as University Relations. There's been a span of 2 years on these changes and there has been some confusion. Hope this structure will be clear and set now. Communications handout was distributed, outlining the roles and responsibilities.

Media Relations: Carla Browning's and Marmian Grimes' roles with the media; i.e., the News-Miner. Encourages contacting them for any advice for media training and what to expect when reporters call.

UAF Photography: Todd Paris. Classroom projects and field research photos are welcomed. Todd also “has camera, will travel.”

Publications: These range from the recruitment pieces (to prospective students), the useful (UAF Catalog), to the controversial (the telephone directory). They work with student enrollment services on the catalog and class schedules, both print and electronic.

Web Development: They are the front door for the UAF web site. They also work with the web pages for the Chancellor, Admissions, and Financial Aid, among others. Will be moving to Roxen content management in the next month or so. Easy user interface allowing individuals to update sections more easily.

Publication Standards: “Logo police.” They work with units like KUAC, TVC and GI with their own identities, but try to balance with the university standards.

Crisis Communications: This gets lots of attention nationally. They work with Ro Bailey (Administrative Services) on how word would get out and people informed.

Internal Communications: “Cornerstone” is only electronic now. They're going to do a communications audit to see what's out there for faculty and staff.

Chancellor's Communications – they're responsible for that office's communication forms which include *Ad Summum*, Musings, and others as well.

Jane Weber asked Scott about the Cornerstone; she's heard folks say they liked the paper version. Scott says they hear both views. They'll survey the campus via this communication audit. Linda Hapsmith asked about the web calendar off of the UAF page. Scott said that Ann Ringstad's office handles the web calendar and community engagement (which is University Relations). Will the Cornerstone pick up the web calendar events automatically (like it did in the past)? Scott will have to check on that.

VIII New Business

- A. Motion to approve a Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography, submitted by the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee.

Paul McCarthy, Chair of GAAC, spoke about the program, which had been returned to the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee at the last Senate meeting. GAAC met again and invited Ken Barrick, John Fox, Steve Sparrow and Mike Sfraga to discuss their concerns. Met for an hour, but the bottom line is that the procedures have been followed to the satisfaction of the Committee; all parties were informed, all signatures were obtained and a 7-1 vote brought it back to the Senate today.

Comments: Ken Barrick moves to strike all references to Geography from this proposal. He thinks this compromise is best for all parties. It's an NRM proposal and degree. In terms of Geography, they hope to be back and have their own Geography degree staffed with their Ph.D.'s to have their own Masters. This revision would allow Geography to maintain high academic quality. Undergraduates will suffer if they're staffing a graduate program right now. He feels geography, the students and the state are better served if they wait until they have four or five full-time geographers to better staff the program and maintain academic quality. Jon asked for a second of the motion and it was seconded.

Julie Lurman commented on this being a school-wide degree made up of four departments. She wanted to know how the head of Geography feels about this. Mike Sfraga commented that an historical perspective plays here, as for the last two decades Ken Barrick and Cary de Wit kept the program in existence. He sees this blended degree as helping to make a future geography degree possible later on when they are better staffed and ready. He and Ken have different approaches, but the same passion is shared with Ken for having a geography master's degree program of its own someday. Mike recognizes Ken's expertise.

As a member of GAAC, Heinz W. stated that he voted in favor of this motion; formally all is OK as Paul M. stated. But he has the feeling that there are things going on affecting this 'in the background.' He doesn't know if there's an opportunity to have a consensus within the department, though he would prefer that to be the case.

Jon G. called for a vote on Ken's motion to strike all references to Geography from the degree program. There were three votes in favor; 14 votes against; and 7 abstentions. Motion failed.

Returning back to the original motion, Jon opened the floor for discussion or questions. There were no further comments or questions and so the motion went to vote.

The motion for the Masters of NRM and Geography passed with 20 votes in favor; three votes opposed; and two abstentions.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008 and/or
Upon Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: See the full program proposal #29 from the Fall 2007 review cycle
on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography Program Goals:

The goals of the MNRMG degree are to provide coursework and training for (1) students who are currently working in or wish to work in the NRM/Geography (NRM/G) fields in a professional capacity, but who lack specific training or an appropriate undergraduate degree; (2) students seeking additional skills or advanced training in NRM/G in order to enhance their professional effectiveness and/or advance in their professional careers; and (3) students who wish to pursue the NRM/Peace Corp Masters program and focus on applying existing NRM/G technologies and knowledge in the context of the developing world and in conjunction with their Peace Corps assignment.

Because of the diversity and broad scope of the Natural Resources Management and Geography fields, the objectives of this degree will be tailored to each individual student in a manner similar to our current MS degree. The graduate committee will be the main body that assesses the student's background, individual deficiencies, and specific coursework needs. There will, however, be a minimal number of common courses that all will take, plus a requirement for an individual academic project addressing some existing NRM/G problem or issue. While not requiring scientific experimentation or sampling or the gathering of primary data, the work is expected to involve critical reflection, empirical inquiry, and intellectual honesty. A written product (opus) and an oral presentation demonstrating sound scholarship will be required. Final acceptance of the opus will be by the student's committee and the Associate Dean of SNRAS. It will not require review by the graduate school.

Note: Please refer to the Agenda for this meeting for additional attachments to this motion. The full packet is available for review at the UAF Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

B. Motion to approve an Associate of Science degree program.

Rainer Newberry brought the motion to the floor. Basically the only cost associated with this new program is that an outcomes assessment needs to be done and must get done. Described it as a psychological ploy designed around a two-year degree program for students wishing to become junior scientists. It's not known if it will meet this goal, but it's unlikely to cause any harm and it might create some benefit. No new faculty or courses are associated with this program. Like any advertising campaign, it's built around the psychology of the individual rather than anything particularly new.

The motion was passed unanimously.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve an Associate of Science degree program.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008 and/or
 Upon Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: See the full program proposal #100 from the Fall 2007 review
 cycle on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

Brief Statement of the Proposed Program

Overview: An increasing number of students are seeking degrees in the sciences. Many of these students, however, have limited high school experience with and preparation for the rigor and investigation required by science courses. In addition, many of the potential students have been out of school for several years and their learning skills may be dormant. Finally, many students are interested in acquiring specific vocationally related science skills that they can immediately use while enroute to a baccalaureate degree. According to an October 2005 report entitled "A Profile of the American High School Senior in 2004: A First Look" released by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) a third of the students who planned to get a four-year degree had not mastered "simple problem solving, requiring the understanding of low-level mathematics concepts." And almost one-half of those who anticipate getting a graduate or professional degree had only "an understanding of intermediate-level mathematical concepts" or "the ability to formulate multistep solutions to word problems." (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2006348>) This proposed AS degree provides the preparation needed to enter into a science-related baccalaureate while gaining the basic academic preparation and sought after vocationally related skills.

The Associate of Science degree will be offered through the Interior-Aleutians Campus of the College of Rural and Community Development (CRCDD) and is designed to allow students to select a concentration area in a science related field.

Objectives:

- To prepare students for Baccalaureate of Science coursework.
- To provide an articulated pathway for science-related certificate students to progress to the Baccalaureate of Science.
- To prepare students for employment in science-related fields.

Note: Please refer to the Agenda for this meeting for additional attachments to this motion. The full packet is available for review at the UAF Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

Workshop Announcement:

Provost reminded about workshop tomorrow (March 4) in Room E-F of Wood Center, from 1-4 pm. Barbara Willis is presenting on systematic peer evaluations of teaching. Thanks extended to Denis Wiesenburg who is providing webstreaming of this workshop. There are many handouts though, so contact Joy Morrison to get those.

Jon G. announced the panel discussion by the Northern Leadership Center, from 7-8:30 pm tonight on building social capital and making our community better; at Wood Center, Room C-D. Contact NLC if questions.

- IX Discussion Item: 10 Min.
A. The MacTaggart Report - The report was posted online at the Faculty Senate web site (URL below). The link to the report was included with Meeting #149 info on the web page.

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/fsfy08meetings/fsfy08meet.html>

(Please note that as of 3-10-08 the link to the report was removed by request of Statewide.)

Jon reported that Statewide is now working on addressing the specific recommendations made by the report. President Hamilton reviewed the report with his senior leadership team. They've doled out the report recommendations to the appropriate VPs, and they're working in teams to put together changes and proposals based on report recommendations. Dan Julius, via Faculty Alliance, has asked for input about concerns faculty want addressed (especially those that may have not made it into the report). So at the Faculty Alliance meeting last week, it was decided that the faculty senate groups of all three MAUs would to get their ideas and concerns together for consideration in this process. Comment now or email Jon, Marsha, or Shirish Patil.

- X Committee Reports
A. Curricular Affairs - Ilana Kingsley/Rainer Newberry

The following reports were submitted with the agenda:

**Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes Jan. 28, 2007**

Present: Deanna Dieringer, Linda Hapsmith, Beth Leonard, Rainer Newberry, Ilana Kingsley, Lael Croteau, Libby Eddy, Anne Marie Nacke, Amber Thomas, Jane Allen, Dana Thomas
Guests: Michael Schuldiner

1. Approved Fresh Start motion. Discussion:
 - a. Need to advertise Fresh Start so students know about it.

- b. Issue of part-time vs. full-time.
- 2. Approved Mandatory Placement Amendment motion. Discussion:
 - a. Writing samples: UAF doesn't require applicants to include an essay with their application—so placement into Eng. 111 couldn't be based on such an essay. The idea of Mandatory Placement was that students would be placed in an appropriate class and they would not have to deal with testing and placement on the first day of classes.
 - b. Standardized testing for English:
 - o Standardized tests scores for English aren't really a good placement indicator. Tests are timed, and thus a student who may have done well with a longer time span, as well as writing/rewriting drafts (e.g., the writing process), don't have an opportunity to perform well on time tests.
 - o Standardized tests are not good indicators for ESL students (due to the fact that they are timed tests).
 - o COMPASS is not a timed test. Accuplacer, which is not a timed test, is not used by UAF. ASSET, a timed test, is listed in the advisors manual and an equivalent test.
 - o Students who are placed in a developmental class may take the COMPASS test up until the first day of classes. If they do well on the COMPASS test, they can forgo the developmental class.
 - c. If standardized test score numbers are changed, does this have to go through Curr. Review and Faculty Senate? Probably not, but it would be nice to include pertinent faculty and Dana.
 - d. English 111 placement impacts placement into core science and perspectives on the human condition classes.
- 3. Discussed / Tabled (until next meeting) Associate of Science Degree. Discussion:
 - a. Scientists are generally not in favor of this degree, where as non-scientists are.
 - b. This motion has come up in the past, but was rejected by previous Provost.
 - c. Many other universities have such a degree.
 - d. This degree would be a stepping stone for a BS, whereas the AA isn't.
 - e. Courses offered are not available for rural students.
 - f. Need to change Math requirements to 200 or 272 (or higher) (remove 201).
- 4. Discussed BA in General Studies
 - a. This degree would be available for students who have most/all required credits, but can't graduate because they can't get through a required class in their major.
 - b. Right now the students are using the Interdisciplinary Studies degree to get by.

Outstanding Issues:

- CLEP (Dana)
- School of Management's Sports Management Minor in Business (Deana)

**Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes Feb. 11, 2007**

Present: Deanna Dieringer, Linda Hapsmith, Beth Leonard, Rainer Newberry, Ilana Kingsley, Libby Eddy, Amber Thomas, Jane Allen, Dana Thomas, Carol Lewis, Falk Huettmann

- Discussed possible BA in General Studies: Dana said that instead of creating a new BA, UAF is considering revising the current BA.
- Discussed proposed Associate of Science degree:
 - It's not an essential degree; the goal behind it is to lead more students into the sciences, especially in the rural areas.
 - Will not cost additional faculty; there may be some admin costs associated with the degree. The major cost is having someone be responsible for administering the program.
 - Math requirements need to be reviewed by Math dept. Perhaps add a footnote that says, "If you plan to go on to a B.S., a calculus course is recommended, since such a course is a B.S. requirement." Dana will talk to Ron Illingworth regarding the math requirement.
 - **Motion to approve the proposed degree** and send it on to FS, noting a slight modification to Math if necessary.
- Discussed proposed BA & Minor in Fisheries degrees:
 - There is seed money to set up the BA degree in fisheries; in the long run it could cost UAF money.
 - Would require hiring faculty.
 - There are more courses from School of Management than Fisheries; isn't this really a BA in Fisheries Management?
 - Fall of 2007 there were 16 admitted into the Fisheries program; 11 enrolled.
 - Ilana will contact Trent Sutton and Mike Castellini to attend the next Curr. Affairs committee meeting.
- Discussed Individual Study problems:
 - a. Faculty don't include Individ. Study in their workloads. They aren't getting credit for it.
 - b. In some instances "Special Topics" be used instead of "Individual Study."
 - Is this a FS issue? A union issue?
 - Carol will bring the issue of workload to Dean's Council.

Next meeting is Feb. 25th, 9am, Rasmuson Library Joint Conference Room.

B. Faculty Affairs - Jon Dehn

Jon Dehn talked about concerns with the automated reporting system for activity reports. Their primary concerns are two-fold. First, the automated system seems to serve a separate role from that of the annual activity report -- the automated system provides accurate metrics for UA; while the activity report is designed to help faculty guide and develop their careers, and they feel these two roles are not compatible. Second, there are security concerns about data-mining and confidentiality.

Potential adjunct faculty exploitation is being looked at by a sub-committee lead by Ken Barrick. They're looking for facts about adjuncts to add to the anecdotal information gathered so far.

The committee is looking at potential changes in the bylaws to clarify their role in communicating with the unions. They're also looking at the bylaws with regard to their role

with the legislature. Perhaps they can be a clearinghouse to help people formulate ideas and learn what's going on so there aren't competing proposals or people working at cross-purposes talking to the legislature.

A new matter came up where it appears a research faculty can't put forward an emeritus nomination, although an emeritus can be awarded to research faculty. This should be easily rectified though. [Sarah Lewis (from the Provost's Office) who was present at the Senate meeting offered to talk with Jon following the meeting to clear this up as it seems to be a miscommunication.]

Regarding Abel Bult-Ito's concerns about the Chancellor's Diversity committee nomination that he mentioned at last December's meeting, the committee decided that to avoid this happening again, if the chancellor doesn't accept a nominee, then he or she should give cause as to why to the Senate. The role is so that the Senate can better serve the needs, and they want to ensure Senate representation on the Diversity committee.

The following report was submitted with the agenda:

**Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
15 Feb 2008 14:00-15:30 WRRB 101**

Present: Barrick, Bret-Harte, Christie, Dehn, Fowell, Hogan, Reynolds, Rosenberg, Wiesenburg

Update from committee chair, comments on statements given in the last administrative committee meeting and Senate.

Pending Items:

- Annual Activities Reports
 - Vigorous discussion on all points
 - Target to have reports and motions by end of Senate term
 - Current comments from test group focus on ease of use. Faculty Affairs Committee sees a need for examination of larger issues.
 - The report is a measure of faculty performance, hence sensitive, and raises concerns about confidentiality and academic freedom.
 - The need for metrics on faculty performance and the purpose of Annual Activities Reports are two separate things.
 - The system appears *ad hoc*, with full ramifications not considered.
 - Data-mining is a serious issue of concern.
 - Approach from this committee
 - Prepare a report outlining the issues and comparing the current system and the proposed system.
 - Four options discussed
 - Accept the current system with changes to remove sensitive and irrelevant fields, ensure confidentiality and security.
 - Recommend killing the initiative from the committee, and voting on this in the Senate.
 - Bring the initiative to the Unions to be negotiated as part of the CBA given the concerns over workload, confidentiality and academic freedom.

- Separate the two functions of Annual Activities Reports and Faculty metrics, help the administration design a less onerous reporting system that meets the guidelines laid out to the Faculty Alliance almost 5 years ago. Leave the current Annual Activities Report as is for now, perhaps use the software support funds for a data entry person instead to create a useful database of faculty performance based on the fields that fall in the public domain.
- Adjunct Professor “exploitation”
 - Limited to a few schools/departments
 - Create report for Senate by end of term
 - Need for data gathering, subcommittee to be led by Barrick
 - Determine scope of problem, is there data in Banner we can request
 - Suggest standards for adjunct faculty to assure students/university of instructor’s qualifications (no authority to do more than this at this level)
 - Suggest standards for departments (provide office, phone, means to complete the course)
 - Current system lacks accountability
 - Currently no advocate due to the diversity of the adjunct professor group (4 types noted previously)
 - Many do not need or want health care
 - Some are truly overworked and underpaid, etc.
- Bylaws change for Faculty Affairs Committee to represent new role with Unions
 - Suggested text passed out for review
 - Some edits made on the fly, will have a draft for a motion next committee meeting
- Role of Faculty Affairs Committee with legislature
 - Discussion on the wording in the current bylaws, “legislative and fiscal issues that may impact faculty concerns at the university.”
 - There is a lot happening at this level, outside of the knowledge of the committee.
 - Suggestion that it be policy for the committee to be informed, so that those looking to approach the legislature could check here to make sure they are not re-inventing the wheel or working at cross-purposes to another group.
 - Suggested that Ann Ringstad would be a good contact person for advice here.
 - Idea of bringing legislators here to UAF, however the local legislators are already good advocates, and bringing in legislators from other districts is problematic.
 - Perhaps a better outreach to constituents in other districts the best approach.

New Items:

- Research Faculty not permitted to recommend Emeriti
 - A letter nominating a retired academic faculty member for emeritus status from a research faculty member was declined by the Provost’s office on the basis of the research faculty member’s status.
 - More research here to discover whether research faculty are truly restricted in this fashion and whether they may become emeriti themselves.

- Note that the rules for Emeriti nomination do pass through this committee, and we have the ability to amend them.
- Bult-Ito request to investigate appointment to Chancellor's Committee on Diversity
 - Letter entered into Senate minutes and email exchanges were discussed.
 - Bult-Ito brings up three points in the letter, he feels:
 - Senate misled into changing the appointee
 - Bult-Ito denied appointment on the basis of race and gender
 - Bult-Ito academic freedom curtailed
 - Committee finds insufficient grounds to censure the Chancellor at this time.
 - Nomination does not necessarily equal appointment
 - Serving on such a committee is not a right
 - Where was the nomination changed, did it in fact reach the Chancellor? It appears not based on the email traffic.
 - It is unclear whether the three year appointment to this committee can be renewed with a new appointment. There does not appear to be language prohibiting this, so there may in fact be a difference in the interpretation of the rules. Regardless, the denial appears based on interpretation of this rule rather than gender and race, which was first broached by Bult-Ito.
 - Bult-Ito's academic freedom remains intact, as evidenced by his ability to raise this inquiry.
 - More research is required into the chain of events.
 - The committee feels that a request for a statement on why the Chancellor's office requested the alternate nomination would be appropriate.
 - Alter the nature of the agreement for nominations in the future such that when the nomination is declined the Chancellor's office must give cause. The purpose here is to avoid such contention in the future, and to better understand the needs of the Chancellor's office for these committees.

C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar

Brenda mentioned the committee is reviewing the criteria for a couple of units and she noted the report available at the back table.

The following report was available as a hand-out at the meeting:

Unit Criteria

Feb 25 2008

Attending:

Brenda Konar, Julie Cascio, Gerri Brightwell, Mark Herrmann, Lee Taylor, Jing Zhang, Thomas Zhou

Meeting commenced at 2pm with an agenda to review two Unit Criteria.

Library Science:

General comment is that the criteria have improved much. There are only a few remaining points that we would like clarified:

Grammar and spelling errors need to be fixed.

C. 2. a. Case studies should be added to the list at the top of that section
Clarify assessment of library programs. Is this in-house? Should this go under service?

C. 2. d. Peer-reviewed exhibit curation does not fit well here. It should be a separate bullet.

C D. Last paragraphs in both is these sections: It should either 1) give expectations for associate level or 2) drop expectations for full.

D. 2. After g. It should start : "Along with University service, librarians also must have unit service. As such,..." then go on with "librarians must demonstrate competence..."

English and Philosophy and Humanities (Gerri Brightwell was present to answer specific questions)

General comment is that the criteria are good. There are only a few points that we would like clarified:

First paragraph: Do you want to say "for use in annual evaluation" or for more general guidance.

B A. f. Instead of "web pages" use IT or technology based advances

C. 2. a. Not all forms of writing is peer-reviewed. How can it be show that the work has merit? Perhaps pull non-peer reviewed items out and put under a separate bullet. Also, add "selected by editor or publisher" where applicable.

Specific criteria of associate and full professor will not be included as per dept.

D. Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber

Jane mentioned the fliers for the April 18 P&T workshop available at the back table, and asked for folks to post these widely and spread the word.

The following report was included with the agenda:

**Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes February 19, 2008**

Present: Kayt Sunwood, Alex Fitts, Jane Weber, Sine Anahita, Carol Gold.
Several members had emailed to say they would not be present because they had another important meeting. Due to this, we decided to table a couple of issues until the next meeting.

Minutes by Sine Anahita

Women Faculty Luncheon 2008

- Fran Ulmer tentatively accepted our invitation to be the keynote speaker
- she will know for sure in May, and will let Carol know
- thanks to Carol Gold for taking the lead on arranging with Fran Ulmer
- discussed how to fund her airfare; possible to share funding with student activities or other sources

Flyer for P&T Workshop 2008

- some suggested changes to shift to positive focus
- wording agreed upon: Strategically Planning for Promotion & Tenure?
- Kayt says rural faculty have already contacted her regarding web-streaming

Bunnell House update:

- Chancellor committed \$24K towards keeping Bunnell House open Summer 08
- shortfall may be covered through additional fees for users, other sources
- Advisory Board, Chancellor, and others are still working on the issue
- concern about continuing child care needs; we will discuss this in future meeting(s)
- thanks to Diane Wagner for taking the lead on this issue

Election process timeline

- nominations solicited from all faculty during the next couple of weeks
- university-wide elections will follow, ending about the 3rd week of March
- nominees will be asked to write brief statement explaining why they wish to serve on the CSW
- we will follow the same process as in years past, and will discuss possible procedural changes at a future meeting

T&P decision-making process study

- is still in process

Reminder of future meetings:

- 3-18; 4-15; May TBA
- 1:00-2:00 PM

E. Core Review - Michael Harris
No report available.

F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry
No report available.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Tom Clausen
No report available.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Michael Daku for Larry R.

Michael Daku mentioned two faculty forums coming up and gave out handouts. The dates are Wednesday, April 2, 12-2 pm at the TVCC Rm 442; and Friday, Apr. 4, 12-2 pm at Copper Lane House. Presenters will do short presentations in several sections, from 12-1 pm, and 1-2 pm and participants can attend one or all sections. Presenters include Charlie Dexter, Ron Illingworth, Dani Sheppard, Susan Herman and Beth Kersey; they'll talk about motivating, encouraging and retaining students. Lunch will be provided by the Provost's Office. Both sessions are available by audio conference.

Marji Illingworth mentioned the March conference at the Princess Hotel.

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee - Paul McCarthy
No report available.

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement - Cindy Hardy

Cindy Hardy mentioned that more meeting minutes are forthcoming. They've been talking with Linda Hapsmith about ACT scores and student success rates, related to reading levels needed by students to pass certain classes. Also mentioned the role of this committee is to address issues of student success -- and therefore invite others with classes in their departments dealing with student study skills, student success, orientation, etc. – please let the committee have input on them.

The following report was included in the agenda:

**SADA Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes February 2, 2008**

Attending: Linda Hapsmith, Bernice Joseph, Mark Box, Cindy Hardy, Joe Mason, Dana Greci, Brian Rasley

The main focus of our meeting was a discussion of a motion to amend mandatory placement brought to the Curricular Affairs Committee by Michael Schuldiner, English Department Chair. We discussed whether or not to support the motion.

Cindy reported that PAIR data in the new motion includes a small sample size (the cohort is only 51 students) and considers a grade of D to be a successful outcome. She also said this motion amends the catalogue, not the original motion and referred us to paragraphs 1 and 3 in the original motion for information about testing and placement.

Linda reported that Curricular Affairs supported using the motion to change policy because these changes affect more than just CLA. The hard part, she thought, will be checking all the high school GPAs as it's not possible to do it yet through BANNER.

We discussed who should be responsible for placing students into ENGL F111x and how accurate an indicator of English placement a GPA is. Our committee felt that graduate student teaching assistants should not be responsible for placement decisions. We discussed the in-class writing sample and suggested that students who don't meet the minimum requirements using placement tests could have the option of taking COMPASS or using a writing sample. We had forwarded a recommendation on placement to the English Department last semester, but the English Department's Composition Committee hasn't met yet this semester because the English Department has been busy interviewing candidates for the Composition Director position.

We discussed various options regarding the motion: table it, send it forward with our comments, hold it to make changes, amend the original motion. We decided to bring the motion to the Senate meeting on Monday with amended language. The new language will substitute "Composition Director or appropriate rural campus director," instead of "instructor," thus taking placement decisions out of the hands of graduate level Teaching Assistants. We will go back to the original motion at our next meeting to review the language that's written there about what assessment methods are used.

The next meeting will be February 15, 2:00-3:30pm.

XI Members' Comments/Questions
No comments.

XII Adjournment at 2:43 PM.

Submitted by Jayne Harvie, Faculty Senate Secretary