

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #152
Monday, Sept. 15, 2008
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Marsha Sousa

Faculty Senate President Marsha Sousa called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Abramowicz, Ken
Allen, Jane (KUC - Video)
Baker, Carrie
Barboza, Perry (Falk Huettmann)
Barrick, Ken
Barry, Ron
Bogosyan, Seta
Bret-Harte, Marion
Christie, Anne
Davis, Mike (BBC - Video)
Dehn, Jonathan
Hazirbaba, Kenan
Heaton, John
Hogan, Maureen
Huettmann, Falk
Illingworth, Marjorie (Debbie Moses)
Jin, Meibing
Konar, Brenda
Koukel, Sonja (Leslie Shallcross)
Leonard, Beth (Audio)
Liang, Jingjing (Audio)
Little, Joe
Lowder, Marla (Kari van Deldan -NWC)
McEachern, Diane (KUC – Video)
Newberry, Rainer
Potter, Ben
Ralonde, Ray (Audio)
Reynolds, Jennifer
Sousa, Marsha
Thomas, Amber
Weber, Jane
Wiechen, Heinz
Zhang, Jing

Members Absent:

Cahill, Cathy

Others Present:

Jennifer Arseneau
Abel Bult-Ito
Doug Goering
Josef Glowa (Alternate)
Dana Greci
Cindy Hardy
Susan Henrichs
Roger Hansen (Alternate)
Linda Hapsmith
Karl Kowalski
Angela Linn
Eric Madsen
Melissa McGinty
Brandon Meston
Scott McCrea
Brian Rogers
Tim Stickel
Buck Sharpton (Guest Speaker)
Kayt Sunwood
Layne Smith (Alternate)
Juella Sparks
Dana Thomas
Diane Wagner

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #151

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 approve the Unit Criteria for Library Science.
2. Motion to approve the Unit Criteria for the Graduate Program in Marine Science and Limnology.
3. Motion to amend the approved alternatives to a Minor.

B. Motions Disapproved:

1. Motion to reject use of the Digital Measures software for electronic Faculty Annual Activities Reports at UAF.

III Public Comments/Questions

A. Angela Linn and Jennifer Arseneau (UA Museum of the North)

Angela is the collections manager for ethnology and history at the Museum and Jennifer is from the Museum's education department. They talked about the current special exhibit running through November 30, called "Hunting and Trapping in Alaska's Interior: Our Stories, Our Lives." Brochures are available at the back table (and extra are available at the Governance Office). It's multidisciplinary and all instructors may come to the Museum free of charge with their students (who also get in free with their Polar Express card). They encouraged use of the Museum as a part of lesson plans, especially those with an emphasis on anthropology and history. There are also bird and mammal specimens in the current exhibition as well. Collections at the Museum are available for inclusion in courses; the faculty curators and the collections managers welcome the opportunity for courses to come through and use the collections in formal class study as well as to pass along the information to students who may be interested to use the collections as part of their study. The Museum is now web streaming and recording all of their lectures, which off campus sites may also be interested to use. Evening classes also may use some of the Museum's hands-on materials in their own classrooms. Hand-outs at back table provide details. Your ideas are welcomed.

B. Karl Kowalski (OIT User Services Executive Director)

Karl spoke about the project begun 11 months ago to consolidate email services for UAF and the statewide offices. It began as a pilot project, but now they've come to some conclusions. The project was undertaken because of the proliferation of email services on campus, the increased costs of providing a more robust and full-featured email service, and to find efficiencies and cost savings to reduce the duplication of service.

They've met with deans and directors and governance bodies to talk about the project. An email FAQ was sent out. They looked at options that would cost money, both in-house and outsourcing – that were too expensive. They looked at free services and that left Microsoft and Google. Google offered more features, so they did a live project with over 175 participants. Feedback from the project was pretty unanimous that the product be used (80%). Chancellor's Cabinet has endorsed the move to Google, and it will begin with student accounts. Faculty will have the option to keep both their existing account and opt over to Google when they wish to over the next year.

The services by Google will be under a signed contract, which is different than the free mail service offered by Google. Also, the "@alaska.edu" domain will be used for the email accounts. Students will keep the same account across the campuses. People can use signature files to identify which campus they are with. Handouts provided include their report to Chancellor's Cabinet, some graphs and some cost savings. Savings include not having to refresh hardware at \$160,000 per upgrade cycle for just keeping the status quo. Software cost savings will be \$89,000 per year. No positions are being lost. There is no lack of work to fill the time being saved in hardware maintenance. The positions maintaining accounts will still be doing that function.

Jennifer R. asked about privacy and security issues. Karl says the Google contract ensures that accounts will not be sold, bartered, traded or moved. Email encryption is supported by Google. All these documents and reports will be online when available, including the contract with Google. Karl's business card is also at the back table and he's willing to meet with anyone to discuss concerns.

Ron Barry asked about the timing of changing students' accounts during the semester. Karl responded that the switch will be done with parallel service during the entire switchover process over the next year. Email will be routed through the existing accounts and maintained in both places for the coming year.

Jane Weber asked about desktop email clients. Email clients will remain the same; just configure the connection. Workshops and handouts will be available to help folks with the switch.

Ken Abramowicz asked about what makes it financially viable for Google. Answer: marketing data. Google does keyword indexing of everyone's email; and potentially will target users after they leave their university accounts (no advertising on the free service for university).

IV A. President's Comments – Marsha Sousa

Marsha and Jon co-chaired the Chancellor's transition team for faculty issues – report is available online with those of the other teams. She looks forward to the summary of team findings tomorrow at the Chancellor's Convocation.

She, Jon Genetti and Jon Dehn met in August with Faculty Alliance (which is made up of the faculty governance leadership from UAF, UAA and UAS). The Alliance looks at issues that are of concern broadly at each MAU. In the past, student success initiatives were a major push from Faculty Alliance, and now you're seeing initiatives coming forth from the budget process as a result of those efforts. Faculty Alliance is responsible for the questionnaire on student

enrollment which asks students what their educational intent is and what their educational background is – these two questions are now online as part of the required enrollment process. This will help us learn who our students are and help determine if they are truly meeting their goals in our terms of what student success might be.

This year the new initiative through Faculty Alliance is sustainability. Chancellor Rogers had a sustainability transition team. UAA is currently advertising for a director of sustainability position. UAS also pursuing sustainability initiatives, though without the financial commitment of their chancellor at this time. Genuine interest in sustainable practices is high with regard to facilities, programs and academic issues on campus.

Two actions came from Faculty Alliance: Vice President Dan Julius formed a charge to develop a statewide academic master plan which Faculty Alliance chose not to endorse in its first original form, and this is on the agenda for later today. Also, Alliance formed a motion to reject the Digital Measures' electronic faculty activities reporting. Both of these motions are available on the Faculty Alliance web site. The draft charge for the statewide academic plan is available at the back table as a hand-out.

Goals for this academic year are multiple, but can be honed down to looking forward with energy and excitement to what our new chancellor is going to bring forward, and to move together as a unit to do all that we can to benefit UAF, and that we begin a serious, earnest review of the core curriculum, and that sustainability become one of our major focal points as we move forward.

B. President-elect's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

Jon echoes the push for enthusiasm and making sure this is the most productive senate we know how to make it be. He would like the Senate to look at the number of senators representing units, as well as research, and make sure our numbers accurately reflect the university. They will be doing a recount of faculty, and this may allow a few more senators to come to the table as faculty have been growing slowly but steadily.

A research advisory committee is being considered, which would help advise, guide and bounce off ideas from our vice chancellor for research – though the name of the committee would be different as a research advisory council already exists with the same acronym.

The electronic activity reporting topic has been discussed from last spring (Faculty Affairs committee) and over the summer and continues to be a lively topic of discussion. The recent memo from the Provost mentions some difficulties with the Digital Measures software, but we're hoping to use Digital Measures as guidance for what the faculty would really like out of an electronic annual activities report.

V A. Remarks by Interim Chancellor Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers extended an invitation to all to join him at the convocation in person or by web stream. He previewed a couple of the issues that he'll address tomorrow. A number of new initiatives have come out of the Transition Teams that met over the summer months. For Faculty Senate, there were not a whole lot of academic issues from his office because that isn't

something the chancellor addresses on his own without faculty involvement and input. There are a couple of issues he wants to highlight though.

First, he wants to start a discussion about the community engagement portion of the public service mission of the university. The promotion and tenure process does not adequately recognize public service, with the exception of that done by the Cooperative Extension Service. He wants a discussion about how to better recognize those who are doing an outstanding job of public service, and what it means to do public service on the community engagement side.

Second, over the course of the next year or so, as there are more technologies being employed in how we work with students and being used in the classroom, we need to think about how we recognize faculty who have high levels of proficiency with those technologies and use them in the classroom to meet students' needs. He hears from students who appreciate faculty who are meeting their needs with the use of current technologies in the classroom, and there needs to be a way to recognize them.

The budget request preparation was the other major activity over the summer. The UAF budget request was one of two processes used by President Hamilton to develop his proposal which is going to the Board of Regents this week. It was a campus-up process and involved six planning teams which included members from all three MAU's. The request that is going to the BOR (outside of covering fixed costs) focuses on the K-12 bridging programs and teacher education as the highest priority; and second is energy, engineering and climate change (both instruction and research); third is in health and biomedical research; fourth are workforce development programs; and fifth are campus-specific programs. In our case, that's new money for the indigenous studies doctoral program, and new money to beef up the honors program and undergraduate research. Tomorrow he'll talk in-depth about the operating and capital budget. Overall it's a pretty good budget for UAF going forward to the governor and legislature.

B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

Regarding the outcomes of the promotion and tenure processes and faculty review processes from last year (Attachment 152/1), most candidates for promotion and tenure were successful, and most of the post-tenure reviews were satisfactory. She feels this reflects the overall quality and productivity of UAF's faculty. She does have concerns about the process which have to do with administration at the deans' level and how certain issues are being handled. One example that came up a number of times had to do with annual workloads and the fact that across campus there's not enough consistency in percentage of workloads; for example, with teaching workloads there were great variations in what percentage was being reported as full-time, ranging from just one up to five courses per year. She'll be working with the deans to correct issues like this, and to standardize workload percentages across campus.

Also, there were some issues with unit criteria, but mainly that some units that need to have specialized criteria do not. She encouraged units to develop their own unit criteria, especially if the unit is specialized. This is helpful to those on the review committees at the campus level when they're looking at files from a unit that they may not be well-acquainted with.

There were also issues relative to research faculty, particularly those expected to find external funding sources for their work. They may not actually have paid time to do public service, so there was the issue of whether university service should be expected of them. In terms of the

university-wide review committee understanding what research faculty do, the sources of their funding and the constraints they're operating under, it would be good for research faculty to develop unit criteria.

Finally, she would also like to see more frank and explicit reviews at all levels leading up to tenure, especially if a person isn't performing satisfactorily. There were several cases where fourth-year reviews and annual reviews were basically satisfactory, maybe containing some critical information (usually about research), but they didn't come out and frankly say the review wasn't satisfactory and it wasn't going to lead to tenure. Later, when it got to the point where the dean, director or peer review committee would recommend against tenure, it was unexpected. She wants better communication with those who are doing poorly in a review process; they need a clear indication of problems earlier in the process, not an equivocal one.

Kenan H. asked about how the 07-08 report results compared to previous years. Susan responded that it is quite similar to results of past years. More of the applicants to professor were successful than is usually the case; there was only one denial in this cycle.

The topics of Core Curriculum Review and eFAR are on the agenda for later, and she'll comment on those at that time.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Juella Sparks

Juella mentioned working with Staff Alliance on transition teams over the summer, reviewing their constitution and bylaws, developing a supervisory training program with the Chancellor, and working with the statewide staff compensation taskforce. This year Staff Council will look at compensation, child care, their constitution and bylaws, online elections, staff handbook, a mediation program and a political action committee (to name a few).

B. ASUAF – Brandon Meston

He worked in the transition team process this summer. He also worked with the Student Recreation Center (SRC) board, organizing and building partnerships. He can be contacted for student volunteers for committees. He mentioned there is a faculty seat open for the SRC Board, and the next meeting is October 11 at 11 AM at the Patty Center in the Nanook Lounge.

C. UNAC/UAF

Abel Bult-Ito spoke as the acting organizational vice president for UNAC, and he's the grievance chair for UAF as well. UNAC faculty should have noticed that their new contracts show market salary increases which the union bargained for on their behalf. For those faculty going through review, he's available as grievance chair to give feedback and help to faculty if they're having issues.

No one was present to speak on behalf of UAFT.

The Break was taken at this point in the meeting.

VII Guest Speaker

A. Buck Sharpton, Vice Chancellor for Research

He sees this as an opportunity to open up a dialog about what his office and research administration are involved with. Research administration essentially pervades the whole system, much like any form of administration does, and receives input from units and deans and directors. The academic and research units each have their own business offices, their own proposal coordinators, and grant techs that ensure the post-award activities are met in accordance with the funding agencies' requirements. His position integrates all these activities to the campus level. It encompasses management and leadership skills, and he oversees the Offices of Sponsored Programs; Intellectual Property and Licensing; Research Integrity; and the Center for Research Services. He supervises four research institutes and four large research programs: GI, IAB, ARSC, and IARC, as well as EPSCoR, INBRE, the Geographic Information Network of Alaska (GINA) and the Office of Electronic Miniaturization.

He listed nine main administrative responsibilities: 1.) advocates for research funding at both the state and federal level; 2.) ensures that the resources that are directed toward this campus are wisely invested; 3.) plans and prioritizes for future research growth; 4.) chairs the Research Working Group which is a forum for discussing research issues across the campus; 5.) communicates research capabilities and successes to the outside world; 6.) represents the university at various state and federal organizations; 7.) attempts to expand opportunities for undergraduate involvement in research; 8.) compiles research performance metrics such as the publications database; and 9.) interacts and assists the chancellor and the president at their discretion.

Jennifer R. asked at what point individual researchers should interact with his office rather than their units or schools? Buck answered that if there's an issue that can not be resolved at the unit level, his door is always open. If there's something that doesn't seem to be receiving an appropriate level of attention or treatment within your unit from your dean or director, you can talk to him. While he doesn't promote going above chain of command, he will help find a solution and get things addressed.

Anne C. asked him to describe how his publications database might interface with the electronic annual activities reporting. Buck answered that they're moving to Endnote software which has translators that can move fairly seamlessly from one software package to another. The eFAR reporting will also use Endnote as well, to his understanding.

Josef G. observed that the discussion has primarily focused on engineering and the natural sciences. What is the role of the humanities in research, particularly with regard to undergraduate research projects? Buck said he has always ignored any distinction in terms of priority or importance or relevance between stem related research and social sciences. If you look at how social sciences have grown at the campus because of infrastructure building programs such as EPSCoR, you can see there's an effort on the part of administration to ensure that research and science are used in the broadest possible definitions of the terms. We're investing heavily in social sciences.

Susan H. noted that the budget request the Honors program has in for this next fiscal year is partly directed toward enhancing undergraduate research opportunities particularly in the areas that don't see a lot of external funding. There will be some money for things like travel for

students who wish to engage in humanities-related research or creative activity in the social science areas.

The “Frontiers” journal, resource guides, and some DVDs were made available. More copies are available from his office, if anyone wants them.

VIII New Business/Discussion Items

A. Research Management at UAF

Discussion that followed the presentation is included above.

B. UAF Accreditation

Marsha noted that UAF is coming up for re-accreditation in 2011, and that will be under new standards that are still being lined out by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). It is known that re-evaluation and reporting will be required of us on a more frequent basis. In preparation for our self-study, we would like to do a thorough Core Curriculum review. The Core was implemented in 1991 and hasn't been reviewed as a whole since then. Assistant Provost Dana Thomas and the Provost have created a charge to us for this task, and a committee will be convened to start the review.

Rather than a course by course type of review, this review will look at what we actually intend for our baccalaureate graduates to gain in terms of a broad liberal education and how we are meeting this goal. Times have changed; for example, computer technology has changed since 1991, and are we testing or teaching to the same standard that we should be at this time? Several people were able to attend the presentation last week provided by Inside Higher Ed that looked at a variety of ways of looking at liberal education.

The committee would be similar to the original committee that designed the Core. It would include all the chairs of the college/school curriculum councils (with additional representation from the Math and English departments if they are not represented among those chairs), a student representative, a staff academic advisor, and a Senate Core Review committee representative. They would also look at whether it's a Core that we need versus General Education requirements.

An endorsement of this project needs to come out of Faculty Senate. Rainer N. proposed an informal motion endorsing it, and Jane W. seconded it. The Senate voted unanimously to endorse the review as proposed by the Provost and Assistant Provost. The project will start in early October, and the time commitment is through the end of spring semester.

(Marsha Sousa has formalized the endorsement with a memorandum. A copy has been posted online with these minutes.)

C. Core Curriculum Review

Discussion of this topic was incorporated into the discussion of item B on the UAF accreditation (above).

D. Development of a Statewide Academic Master Plan

Vice President Dan Julius created a charge approved by the Statewide Academic Council (SAC) to develop a statewide academic master plan. The goals of the plan are to identify and clarify what each MAU is responsible for in a variety of different venues. Faculty Alliance received the original charge, but chose not to endorse it because it wasn't clear in the charge how faculty would participate in the process. Vice President Julius has assured them faculty will be included in that process. Faculty Alliance will meet with SAC and the Research Advisory Council in early October to clarify a process for moving forward on a statewide academic plan.

Jon D. commented that he's looking forward to having the Research Advisory Council meet, as it's been a long time. Buck Sharpton agreed with that comment, and mentioned that either RAC will meet in the next month-and-a-half, or RAC will be incorporated into SAC. If they do that, they'll need the Provost's approval, and that of SAC.

Marsha commented that the merger of RAC and SAC is a question that's come before Faculty Alliance. In whose best interests is this merger? This question is now before Faculty Alliance.

Abel asked if a strategic planning committee is still being set up. Marsha said yes; and clarified that it was the original charge to the committee that was felt to be too vague by Faculty Alliance. Abel reminded the Senate that the academic plan is the business of the faculty, not administration's business.

E. Technology Advisory Board faculty nominee

Solicitation was given at the meeting for a volunteer to serve on the board. Senate members were asked to forward names as no volunteers came forward.

F. Resolution on Graduate Student Tuition Rates, submitted by GAAC (Attachment 152/2)

Ron Barry brought the resolution to the floor, explaining that its purpose was to address the problem of foreign PhD students who can never qualify for in-state tuition – so it recommends that after two years in their PhD program, those graduate students would be able to pay in-state tuition rates. Rainer observed that the resolution doesn't actually specify it's the PhD. Ron concurred. Ron motioned for a change in the wording to insert appropriate wording, and it was seconded.

Abel spoke against the amendment, that Masters students should be included as well. Brian Rogers spoke to the issue – he's sympathetic, but as written there's a technical problem with the resolution. The use of waivers is limited at the campus level as to the total amount of waivers they may grant; it's 3% of the total tuition revenue of the campus. So, if the non-resident tuition is waived, this means that waivers elsewhere would have to be reduced. Change BOR policy to provide that after two years the non-resident surcharge would not apply, and that's a much better way of doing this so it doesn't end up being a zero sum gain. As a former regent, he fought the increase in non-resident tuition, but this will be a hard one to win. There wasn't much sympathy at the BOR level.

Ron asked about the wording change – drop the word “tuition waivers” and instead use wording to the effect, “...recommends that the BOR adopt a policy waiving non-resident surcharge on graduate tuition after two years.” Susan Henrichs suggested making a recommendation instead, such as “UAF administration should pursue all appropriate avenues in an effort to obtain relief” – which would allow for more than tuition waivers.

Susan recommends withdrawal of the resolution because the present wording will not work. Ron moved to table the motion and return it to the committee; which was seconded unanimously. GAAC will continue working on this with input from the Chancellor and Provost.

G. Resolution on Majority Vote of Graduate Student Committees,
submitted by GAAC (Attachment 152/3)

Ron noted that the purpose of the resolution is to clarify the fact that a pass for comprehensive exams or thesis defense is a majority vote of the student’s graduate committee.

Jennifer R. asked what criteria supersede if a unit has their own criteria. Susan H. spoke from her experience as the Graduate School dean, saying that it was always permitted for schools or colleges to have more stringent criteria than the Graduate School criteria for anything, but that they couldn’t be less stringent. Right now the vast majority of units do not have criteria for this, including the Graduate School. Jennifer R. commented on the need then, for a clear statement about this in the Graduate Student Handbook. A motion was made to bring the resolution to the floor, and seconded. The resolution passed unanimously.

IX Unfinished Business

A. eFAR and Faculty Concerns

Marsha talked about the Digital Measures motion that was disapproved by Chancellor Jones last spring. Faculty Alliance also brought forth a motion rejecting use of Digital Measures software for the electronic Faculty Activities Reporting tool, and recommending a search for another tool in the best interests of faculty and administration. That motion was unanimously passed at Faculty Alliance. In discussions with the provost since that time, she’s still in favor of it and making requested changes by faculty to the software. Digital Measures, however, has not made the requested changes in a timely manner. The latest memo to deans and directors from the Provost makes using Digital Measures optional. Faculty are still invited to try it out when its revised form is made available.

Marsha invited comments from the group and from the Provost. Susan responded that her favor of the DM software has been overstated. More accurately, it’s the only commercial tool she’s found out about that is customizable and which allows input from the Banner system. It may or may not work for us in the end, but she wants to test it in its modified form. All of faculty experience from last year was with a different version that had, for example, a lot of questions that were not considered necessary or relevant. Also, there was not enough communication with faculty and not enough chances to air their concerns or get responses to their questions before the motion was passed by Senate. So, the two parts that she has set in motion for this year are: 1.) opportunities for faculty to have questions addressed by experts who will be brought here to speak to issues about data security, ease of use and so on; 2.) and, asking faculty to test three modules of the software, which include the teaching part which imports from

Banner, the publications part which can interface with Endnote, and a direct import of grants and contracts information from Banner (which is well-known for its inaccuracies, so provides an opportunity for faculty to review this info). There will be opportunity for anonymous feedback from those who try this software and those who don't. This will be useful for determining what is needed in an electronic reporting tool for activity reports, even if Digital Measures isn't the tool chosen in the end.

Falk H. asked about getting a list of items that are needed in the next two years, and establishing a timeline now for deliverables needed down the road; for instance, reference numbers for papers – it would be good to know they're needed now so that it doesn't all hit at once. It would be good to get some infrastructure help to get to what needs to be delivered. Susan concurs and says they'll work on this.

Heinz W. commented about the request to continue testing the software which is still in beta or gamma testing by faculty. Susan reiterated that using the software is voluntary. Participating in the software test will help to inform us how to go forward in a way benefitting both faculty and administration.

Abel asked in what direct way the Senate is involved in changes to the software package. Marsha commented that it's not a direct involvement; they've made suggestions, and the Faculty Affairs Committee report addressed the parts of the software that were problems for users. Susan has taken that information and requested changes to the software. Susan notes some changes were made, though they've taken too long. She reiterated that she's not trying to collect more info than was collected in the past. The main administrative reason to have electronic reporting is to enable things like Buck's publications database, and to ensure its accuracy while not being too cumbersome. Abel believes that a small group of faculty within the Senate should look at the changes that are made before it's sent out to a larger test group. Susan responded she would be happy to have that review by the Senate, but would want that to happen fairly quickly so that there is time for the larger group of faculty to try it out. Marsha said she would be happy to take volunteer names to do so. She noted that Digital Measures is not finished with implementing the changes. Donie B. suggested referring this back to the Faculty Affairs Committee to look at the changed version. Marsha said she'll talk further to the chair of the committee.

X Committee Reports

A. Curricular Affairs – Amber Thomas / Falk Huettmann

The committee has not met yet.

B. Faculty Affairs – Cathy Cahill

The committee has not met yet.

C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar (Attachment 152/4)

No criteria under review yet. Minutes are attached.

D. Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber
(Attachment 152/5)

Minutes are attached. They had their first Brown Bag Lunch on Sept. 9, and more than 25 faculty attended. Another Brown Bag Lunch is being set up for October. Also, the 4th Annual Women Faculty Luncheon is coming up on Oct. 7; please encourage women faculty to attend. For rural faculty, Fran Ulmer's speech will be audio-conferenced.

E. Core Review - Michael Harris / Latrice Bowman

Linda Hapsmith reported that they have not yet met.

F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry

The committee has not met yet.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – James Bicigo

The committee has not met yet.

H Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Dana Greci /
Julie Lurman Joly (Attachment 152/6)

Dana spoke about their short first meeting. Joy Morrison of the Faculty Development office mentioned Professor Ken Bain's visit on Sept. 12 (advertised on the Faculty Development web site). More workshops are scheduled, and listed on the web site. More faculty forums will be organized this year by the committee. March 4-6, 2009 is the Lilly Adult Learning Conference. Several subcommittees are being formed; and one has to do with faculty peer assessment to make some tools available to faculty and departments for faculty self-evaluation, along with a mentoring form for new faculty.

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Ron Barry

Today's resolutions comprise their work so far.

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement - Cindy Hardy

Joe Mason and Cindy were elected co-chairs at their first meeting. There will be a December election to replace her when she goes on sabbatical in spring. The committee will be monitoring the intended and unintended consequences of mandatory placement, looking at reading placement into core and entry-level courses, and talking about other elements impacting student success, for example how students access courses through cross-regional schedules.

XI Members' Comments/Questions

Jane W. mentioned hearing that the bookstore orders for spring semester will be online. She's worried as she's in CRCD and they've had problems with this in the past. Brian Rogers says

there's a request for proposals out now to move to an online ordering system, because students are already moving in that direction in growing numbers. Bookstore finances are being affected already by this trend. He saw a presentation of what is needed and wanted by the bookstore, and though he went in as a skeptic, he was persuaded that this was a direction the Bookstore should pursue. Jane was told this was in effect now, for students for spring semester. Brian said that this is still in process – it wouldn't make sense for it to be required right now because students haven't registered yet for spring. Tim Stickel suggested getting in touch with Robert Holden, associate director of auxiliary services, who developed the RFP. Brian will push them to get better info out for faculty and students.

Brian noted that the next meeting (October 13) is face to face, and he and his wife, Sherry Modrow, are issuing an invitation to a reception at their residence after the Senate meeting from 5-7 PM.

XII Adjournment

The senate adjourned at 3:03 PM.