

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #160
Monday, September 14, 2009
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
BOR Conference Room – 109 Butrovich Building

I Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn

Faculty Senate President Jonathan Dehn called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call for 2009-10 Faculty Senate

Members Present:

ABRAMOWICZ, Ken
ALLEN, Jane (Bethel) via video
ANGER, Andy via audio
BAKER, Carrie
BARTLETT, Christa via audio
BROCIOUS, Heidi (Josef Glowa)
CAHILL, Cathy
CHRISTIE, Anne
DAVIS, Mike (Bristol Bay)
DEHN, Jonathan
FOWELL, Sarah
GANGULI, Rajive
HANSEN, Roger
HAZIRBABA, Kenan
HUETTMANN, Falk
KADEN, Ute
KERR, Marianne via audio
KONAR, Brenda
LARDON, Cecile (Melanie Arthur)
LAWLOR, Orion via audio
LEONARD, Beth via audio
MCINTYRE, Julie
MOSES, Debra
NEWBERRY, Rainer
PALTER, Morris
RALONDE, Ray via audio
REYNOLDS, Jennifer

Members Present - continued:

ROBERTS, Larry
THOMAS, Amber
WEBER, Jane
WILSON, Timothy

Members Absent:

BOGOSYAN, Seta
HOCK, Regine
JIN, Meibing
JOLIE, July
KOUKEL, Sonja
LIANG, Jingjing

Others Present:

Brian Rogers
Susan Henrichs
Dana Thomas
Latrice Laughlin
Adrian Triebel
Todd Vorisek
Martin Klein
Walker Wheeler
Gabrielle Russell
Joshua Luther
Karl Kowalski
Mike Earnest

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #159

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 Reaffirm the SNRAS/AFES Unit Criteria
2. Motion to Approve a Certificate in Environmental Sciences
3. Motion to Approve a Graduate Certificate in Construction Management
4. Motion to approve the list of 2008-2009 degree candidates

B. Motions Pending

1. Motion to Reaffirm the Department of Mathematics and Statistics Unit Criteria

The DMS Unit Criteria have just recently been approved by the Chancellor, in a rearranged form. The rearranged form has been provided to the Administrative Committee, and there may still be an issue with time constraints mentioned in the unit criteria. Brenda Konar, chair of Unit Criteria, said that committee is wondering if they even need to look at it again because of the fact that the Chancellor has signed off on it. Jon D. noted the Administrative Committee will discuss it further and report back.

III Public Comments

Walker Wheeler, IT manager at the Rasmuson Library and member of Staff Council (unit 13), asked that consideration to time windows for system upgrades and maintenance be given his department and IT across campus in general. The academic calendar's start and end dates, especially with regard to the new '-mesters" from Summer Sessions, have seriously impacted available time windows for doing system upgrades. Provost Susan Henrichs asked what amounts of time are optimal for the system upgrades. Three clear working days every six months was mentioned as a good minimum. Working days are necessary as the weekends may have to be included for extra time to complete work, depending upon the scope of a project or unforeseen delays. Susan mentioned that schedules are pretty well set for this academic year, but for future planning, consideration to IT needs will be given and she'll contact Karl Kowalski at OIT for additional follow-up.

IV A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

Jon welcomed everyone to the busy year ahead, and asked members to make it a priority to keep in touch with faculty, staff and students at their units. Items of interest that Faculty Senate can address may be brought to the attention of the Administrative Committee.

Jon announced Brian Rogers' appointment as the new chancellor; the academic master plan is slowly coming to fruition; accreditation is starting in full swing this semester; and a variety of other issues making it a busy year for the senate. President Hamilton announced his retirement recently, and the search committee meets Thursday (Jon is a member of the committee). Jon will be suggesting further faculty involvement in that search, preferably from all three campuses. At a minimum, he'll suggest forums where the faculty can interact with the board and have a say in what they want to see in a new president.

Following up on a suggestion from the vice provost, the bylaws and constitution of the senate will be reviewed. Committee roles will be examined and updated to meet relevant needs.

The BOR meeting last June brought only limited success with some new academic programs. A couple of the programs were not passed and they're looking at the reasons for that. There will be further discussion later in the meeting today.

Several meetings of the Statewide Academic Council occurred over the summer, and have been moving forward with the Academic Master Plan.

They met with the Vice President for University Advancement, to discuss a more coordinated and successful approach to the legislature by the governance bodies.

Last, Jon mentioned the MacTaggart Report for UAF. It's linked on the web sites for the Chancellor's office and UAF Governance. It focuses on involving students in research. He encourages everyone to read it.

Jane W. asked about the composition of the UA president search committee. Cathy C. noted that Jon is the only faculty on the committee presently, which has just been posted online. Dana T. also mentioned that a forum is taking place tomorrow morning.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

Cathy welcomed everyone and reminded them of the Chancellor's reception for the senate members this evening. Convocation will be tomorrow at 1 p.m. at Davis Concert Hall.

The Faculty Alliance retreat took place recently, with talk about what they can do as a unified group on issues such as the Academic Master Plan. Faculty from the three MAU's are fairly unified in their belief that they need to support each other.

The president search committee forums were again mentioned that take place in the morning (on campus) and the afternoon (Noel Wien Library). Email notification has gone out to everyone.

The (Group A) administrator reviews of Bernice Joseph and Buck Sharpton that are taking place this year were mentioned.

The survey for accreditation themes has been sent out to all from Vice Provost Dana Thomas; please respond to it and encourage others to complete it. (There's a link to it on the Faculty Senate home page, also.)

The difficulty of getting programs through at the last BOR meeting was mentioned. Cathy encouraged everyone to look at their programs in their units with a view toward updating courses and programs and eliminating those that are not active any longer. Let the Provost know. We want the BOR to know we're responsive to the needs of the state and staying current.

Jane A. commented about the reception at the Chancellor's this evening, asking if future dates could happen when a face-to-face meeting occurs. Chancellor Rogers responded that the timing of the reception would be corrected for future years.

V A. Chancellor's Comments – Brian Rogers

Terry MacTaggart was hired last spring to make recommendations about UAF's executive administration. His report is out and posted on the Chancellor's web site (as well as the Governance web site). One item that became apparent to him as he was holding meetings was the role of research at UAF, and the opportunity of connecting research with undergraduate education. Brian asked for faculty input on how to recognize faculty for the extra effort it takes to be involved in undergraduate research. And, he'll be looking at ways of funding costs of undergrad research. MacTaggart has suggested a reallocation of funding to support efforts, and Brian invites ideas on that, along with responses about the report in general.

The BOR meeting is in Juneau this month. UAF has two undergraduate certificate programs on the agenda: Environmental Studies and Ethnobotany; as well as the Graduate Certificate in Construction Management.

The BOR will review the President's recommendations on the FY11 capital and operating budget at the meeting. Brian anticipates the operating budget will be more of the same, looking a lot like last year's for UAF. Last year's UA system capital budget was a 541-million-dollar request and UAF received three million dollars, making it clear the laundry list approach is not the right way for UAF to get what is wanted. It'll be a smaller request going in next year, with an initial request for deferred maintenance. The President is recommending one new facility – the UAF Life Sciences facility. And the request includes planning and design for new engineering space for Anchorage and Fairbanks, and feasibility work on several rural campus facilities.

A reminder was given for the Chancellor's Convocation tomorrow at 1:00 PM. It will be available to the rural campuses via audio.

Regarding the UA Presidency -- Brian is not seeking that position and intends to stay on as chancellor here at UAF 'for as long as you'll have me'.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

At the BOR meeting last June, some programs did not get considered because of the large number of them put forward for consideration (16), and because of questions they had

concerning some of the programs (from both UAF and UAA). They'll be considered this fall, though some will need further explanation and adjustment.

Questions were invited regarding Attachment #1 – the summary report of the previous academic year's promotion and tenure review cycle. Most people were successful. Susan's focus is on giving good guidance at the fourth year reviews, so faculty know if they're keeping the pace needed to be successful in future reviews for tenure. So, there is now more selectivity in the fourth year review process than in past years, to help those who need it to be more successful candidates for tenure. Overall, the results are on par with past years.

Amber T. asked about how unit criteria play into the statement that there is more selectivity at the fourth year review. Susan responded that the unit criteria have not changed for the most part; and they do not usually offer specific guidance or hard and fast numbers for the process, so the fact is that there's always substantive academic judgment in these matters. Susan wants to communicate clearly to candidates whether or not they're on track in the process. A satisfactory fourth year review does not guarantee tenure, either. There can be changes over the years. A steady record of progress through the fourth year is a good indicator of success, though.

Anne C. asked Susan to comment about workloads and teaching levels. Susan responded that not every unit or individual reports their teaching, research and service loads in the same way. For example, last year a lot of IAB and CNSM people reported, in terms of their summary workloads, their actual appointment split which is 50/50; but some had research buyouts of teaching which meant their teaching workload was less than what was indicated on the forms. Another across-the-board issue is that some people have paid summer assignments which are normally wholly research; other people do not. That information is not clearly shown on the summary forms either. So, for the UNAC people, they're asking that the workload unit-total-per-year in a particular area be reported rather than percentages. Workload units are a clearer indicator than percentages.

Rajive G. asked about reflecting summer research assignments in the workload. Susan gave some examples: someone with a summer research assignment might report for an annual summary workload, 20 units of research, 15 teaching units and 5 service units; and a person with a 30-workload-unit assignment might report 10 research units, 15 teaching units and 5 service units. So, on that basis, it would be a little easier to compare those two people. We want to be clear in what the differences in paid work are between different faculty and then let people evaluate that. This is an effort to make the comparisons more equivalent.

The question was asked about what other additional avenues are being looked at in terms of teaching effectiveness beyond the IAS scores and classroom observation? Two things Susan mentioned that she wants to work on this year include having a group of faculty look into alternatives to the IAS (volunteers accepted); and have them look into other means of assessing teaching fairly and more thoroughly, beyond the current classroom observations. There are no changes though, in this current year of review, to the process of assessing teaching effectiveness.

Rajive G. noted that UNAC contracts cover nine months, so would there be a problem with covering twelve months in the reporting? Susan noted that all work is covered in faculty

CV's and there should be consistency with reporting all work done in the activity report, including what occurs during summer.

Roger H. asked about the lack of evaluations for research faculty noted in the report. Susan didn't have percentages to cite, but she's noted over both years she's done it, that research faculty are lacking in regular evaluations as untenured faculty. She's communicating directly with the deans and research directors about improving that.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Martin Klein

Martin briefly recapped the success of Staff Appreciation Day last spring, thanking those faculty and the chancellor for their help.

Key issues for Staff Council include changes to compensation. A proposed grid is going before the BOR in September and would take effect next fiscal year. It's a flat 1% grid for staff, replacing COLA and step increases. For FY11 it amounts to a 3% combined increase; and staff are somewhat nervous about the change to this combination "Cola roll". Past step increases and COLA amounted to around 4.5%.

Staff Council rewrote their bylaws and Constitution last spring. That included setting up a position of president emeritus for the purpose of maintaining continuity in leadership. It was pointed out that the "emeritus" title is defined in the BOR policy, so that title is being changed to "past-president".

Senator Joe Paskvan visited their meeting, and he passed some advice that Martin wants to share with the faculty. With the Senate Finance Committee coming to UAF during October, what is the best way to be effective and supportive on behalf of UAF? The Senator advised them to meet with the senators in person while they're here in town and tell them directly how UAF is different.

B. ASUAF – Adrian Triebel

Todd Vorisek spoke for Adrian who had to leave early. He's been working on board assignments, including the Technology Advisory Board (TAB), student senate, concert board, master planning, Student Recreation Center (SRC) board.

Student Initiative for Renewable Energy Now – SIREN – is being supported by the student body who voted to pay \$20 per semester to support campus efforts working toward renewable energy and sustainable resources. The new fee will be collected in spring, with the Chancellor agreeing to match whatever amount is brought in to go toward the effort.

They've been preparing for the BOR meeting at this month, with four student senators going to the meeting. They will ask for increased student wages, as it's been ten years since any increases have happened. They're asking for a \$1.00 increases across the board to student job categories A, B and C.

They've been getting complaints at ASUAF, particularly from freshman, about problems with the bookstore. There's confusion among them about how to get their books. Jane W. noted complaints about problems getting books from her students, also. It's been especially painful as Jane teaches math. Latrice L. agreed with her as she's also seeing problems in her math class with students not having books. They have three books in their math lab to share among 40 students.

Jon D. asked about students being able to get PDFs while waiting for their books to arrive. Latrice noted that students can go to Printing Services and get the first chapter printed out, but it doesn't help with the number of students that drop/swap between math courses. Jane W. noted that they're also using computer programs along with their books, so if they don't have the book the student doesn't have the access code needed for the computer program that comes with the book itself. To go four weeks in a math class getting behind is too much.

Ken A. said that he talked with a regional bookstore representative personally, who told him bluntly that UAF is a guinea pig for Follett, only having an online bookstore with no brick-and-mortar bookstore on campus. Every other campus they're doing business with has the actual bookstore in addition to the online store. He'd like to see some type of formal process adopted for faculty and staff to get ideas, suggestions and problems reported to the bookstore to improve the whole process.

Foreign Language faculty are seeing a problem with students not having books as well. Jon D. mentioned that Anchorage said they'd like to go the online route at Faculty Alliance, and they were vehemently advised not to do that by the Fairbanks delegation. A faculty teaching both local and distance ed courses noted that the Center for Distance Ed bookstore has been helping out with the local book problem quite a bit.

Gabrielle R. from Rural Student Services mentioned that she is seeing students who can't get their books very far in advance because of their financial aid situation. She asked about having books available at the library, checking them out and then paying for them later if they decide to keep them. Jon D. noted that a forum for this ongoing discussion is needed (time being a factor at the meeting today) and that the subject will be discussed at the next meeting of the Administrative Committee.

Jane A. at Kuskokwim Campus mentioned, on behalf of both Kuskokwim and Chukchi Campuses, they get their books through CRCD and as of last Thursday, about 700 student book orders were displaced through some glitch. They're very behind in getting their books. It's been quite a dilemma for their campuses.

C. UAFT/UNAC – No representatives present to speak.

Jane W. noted that the Faculty Affairs Committee minutes mention they're still waiting for the union to do something regarding the ORP issue. Jon D. commented that union representatives need to attend the senate meetings to help keep the faculty updated.

VII Guest Speaker: Dana Thomas, Vice Provost & Accreditation Liaison Officer
Topic: Core Revitalization & Assessment Committee's Recommendation
to Adopt the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes

Handouts and PowerPoint slides (as PDFs) available online at:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#160

Dana recapped the work of the Core Revitalization & Assessment Committee over the past year. Their full report is posted online, as mentioned below (and again at the link shown above with the handouts and PowerPoint slides in PDF format).

It's time to revise the core now.

- • The current Core was implemented fall semester 1991 and it has not been reviewed in depth since.
- • UAF will be reviewed for reaffirmation of institutional accreditation in fall 2011
- • There have been many changes since 1990, e.g., the internet and electronic communications were far less pervasive and globalization of the economy has changed dramatically.

The Core Revitalization and Assessment Committee's report is posted at the link provided above. In short, it recommends:

- UAF should adopt the AACU Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) Essential Learning Outcomes as the new major learning outcomes from a new hybrid Core curriculum (specific additional UAF outcome recommendations are noted parenthetically)
- See the link at:

http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/08-09_senate_meetings/159/CoreRecommendations.pdf

Accreditation requirements for general education programs now include:

The general education component of undergraduate programs demonstrates the following:

- • an integrated course of study that helps students develop the breadth and depth of intellect to become more effective learners and to prepare them for a productive life of work, citizenship, and personal fulfillment.
- • represents an integration of basic knowledge and methodology of the humanities and fine arts, mathematics and natural sciences, and social sciences.
- Applied degree and certificate programs of thirty (30) semester credits or forty-five (45) quarter credits in length contain a recognizable core of related instruction with identified outcomes in the areas of communication, computation, and human relations that support the program's goals or intended outcomes.

Derek Bok's book, *Our Underachieving Colleges* (Princeton University Press, 2006) reports from a recent survey that while a majority of Arts and Sciences faculty do not see preparing for a good job as an important goal for undergraduates, it's the most important reason for going to college for almost three-fourths of entering freshman (not to mention their parents). The student perspective needs to be considered in this process of review of the core curriculum.

Dana recommended four steps to help insure that a thorough job is accomplished of revising the core and related policies:

1. Identify the intended learning outcomes – which is the purpose of the motion being considered at today’s meeting;
2. Identify courses and experiences to achieve the intended learning outcomes;
 - Identify small working groups from across UAF, e.g., math faculty alone should not set the quantitative requirements; report committee members are willing to serve!
 - Focus on intended outcomes, not courses, emphasize shared responsibility for achieving outcomes
 - Add greater flexibility for transfer students
 - Attempt to achieve similar SCH production among units to reduce the fear of losing faculty members
 - Connecting Essential Learning Outcomes with High-Impact Practices (See appendix 2 in committee report.) See additional sub-points on slide number 12 of the PowerPoint presentation.
3. Identify a process to holistically assess the intended learning outcomes of the Core
 - Move away from individual course based assessment to reduce the burden on faculty
 - Implement assessments required by the Voluntary System of Accountability, which were developed through a partnership between the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the Association of Public And Land-Grant Universities
 - See <http://www.voluntarysystem.org/index.cfm>
4. Periodic Review Processes to be established
 - Establish a process for periodic review of components of the Core and the Core as a whole.
 - Establish a process for periodic review of Core Assessment
 - Align these processes with the seven year accreditation process

Rajive G. commented regarding the #2 bullet-point about attempting to achieve similar credit hour production among units, and the fact that CEM does not offer any core classes-- nor would they according to this recommendation. He disagrees with this because engineering and engineering technology and its products are a big part of everyone’s life. He and some of his colleagues in CEM believe that they should contribute to the core. Dana responded that the proposed motion actually supports Rajive’s point, as does the Core Revitalization and Assessment Committee’s executive summary (technology was added as a parenthetical point).

The Break was cancelled due to time constraints.

VIII New Business

A. Motion to Adopt the AACU – LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes (Attachment 160/2)

The motion was tabled (with one nay vote), and referred to committee for further discussion.

B. New Research Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate – Jon Dehn

The purpose of this new ad hoc committee is to provide a faculty voice into research policy. With the statewide Research Advisory Council having been combined with the Statewide Academic Council, it's unclear at the campus level what the faculty input is regarding research policy. The new ARC - Advisory Research Committee - will provide a forum for faculty to express concerns and give input on research policy decisions, and it will provide a faculty perspective on the process of streamlining grant processes. It will provide administrators with a sounding board to faculty on new and major program initiatives. The ad hoc committee would create its own bylaws. At the end of this year or by next year the Faculty Senate could vote to decide whether or not it becomes a permanent committee. The Vice Chancellor for Research would be an ex officio member.

Issues are coming up that affect research on campus. The current VC for Research, Buck Sharpton, is stepping down from his position – is this research role one to be filled with a vice chancellor or would a vice provost be more appropriate, given the link between the academic and research enterprise which was emphasized in the new MacTaggart report. With tightened funding opportunities, questions are coming up about going back to classified research on campus and these need faculty input. There is the issue of overhead sharing policies, with different units on campus having different agreements rather than a standard one, which has caused problems with submitting proposals. Another issue is the separation of the Office of Sponsored Programs from the Grants and Contracts office. There are issues about getting undergraduate students involved in research without overlooking the commitment to graduate students who are the backbone of research effort. There are issues about technology transfer and the university possibly making money from that; as well as internal use of university research to get better return on the dollar.

Jon asked for volunteers to raise their hands, and Orion Lawlor and Roger Hansen responded. They'll choose a chair, who'll attend the Administrative Committee meetings. Anne C. asked whether people outside the senate could serve on the committee, and Jon felt that in order to get good representation for research interests, that should be the case. He asked everyone to communicate to their constituents about this committee.

C. Academic Master Plan Update – Jonathan Dehn

Jon said some progress has been made. Faculty Alliance and the President's Cabinet have seen a copy of the report to date, shared by Statewide Academic Council. Jon gave assurance that the Faculty Senates will have input and will not be asked to rubberstamp the plan. The primary issues that he sees concern the division of resources among the three main campuses, and defining what's been called each university's "lane". How do they move forward in defining the mission without cramping or crippling any of the campuses? He hopes the plan

will be given to the Senate before Christmas. Susan commented that currently they're waiting on feedback from President's Cabinet and then expect to receive word that the plan can be distributed to the respective Faculty Senates.

IX Discussion Items

A. Recap of Summer Actions by the Administrative Committee – Jonathan Dehn

The Administrative Committee met in May in response to President Hamilton's request for input regarding appointing Brian Rogers as permanent chancellor. The committee voted in favor of appointing Brian Rogers the permanent chancellor of UAF.

A second Administrative Committee meeting took place in early August, and a one-time exception was granted to Summer Sessions to shorten Summer Session I to five weeks from six weeks. The lengthening of the spring semester and inclusion of Maymester has contributed to a problem, however, for future academic years. The matter is under discussion at Curricular Affairs Committee, and is a discussion item today.

B. Length of Summer Sessions Semesters: 2010 Action and Future Years – Curricular Affairs

Rainer Newberry spoke to the current situation and why an exception was needed for Summer Session I in summer 2010. Unless a course compression is approved for offering a course in a timeframe format less than six weeks long, it's a violation of curriculum policy. Six weeks is the minimum required length for a class. Without this exception, there would have to be an extensive evaluation of each and every one of the SS I courses and the schedule couldn't be firmed up in a timely manner, or this summer session would have to be cancelled. To alleviate this problem, this exception for summer 2010 was approved for just this one time. It is not to set precedent on the issue.

Anne C. asked about cancelling Maymester. Rainer acknowledged that some faculty have a queasy feeling about Maymester anyway, but it's been marketed and advertised to the extent that no one liked the option of cancelling it.

Falk H. said the issue needs a really thorough discussion, as there are not just two or three issues hanging on it, Maymester just being one of at least ten complex issues needing to be discussed.

Registrar Tim Stickel mentioned some research he's done about the length of summer sessions I in the last seven years. Mostly it's turned out to be about 5-and-a-half weeks long; and only three times in the last seven years has it been a full six weeks long.

Chancellor Brian Rogers reiterated that he approved a one-time exception only, and encourages all sides of the issues to be explored and considered carefully by the Curricular Affairs Committee.

Michelle Bartlett, director of Summer Sessions, spoke to the importance of Maymester, in response to Anne C.'s earlier comment. Two-thirds of the students who took Maymester last year also took courses in Summer Sessions I. The aim is to improve the time it takes to earn a degree, which currently averages six years. It allows for courses to be offered at times when classrooms are available and time is available between semesters.

Amber T. commented that it's hurting students who are taking courses during regular semesters. The last two spring semesters have been really short, not allowing her to meet enough times with her seminar students that are scheduled for once a week meetings. She's often creating additional class meeting times because of this. She doesn't think a two-week course should take precedence over a semester long course. And it worries her to hear about Augustmester, how it might affect fall semester.

Rainer N. commented to Amber that the length of Maymester is totally independent of the length of spring semester; that it's the date set for graduation that is causing the problem of shortened spring semesters, combined with the start date set for the spring semester.

Amber T. responded that it was a necessary part of the discussion that took place in Curricular Affairs last year. She felt that the issue of the graduation date and timing with Mother's Day was a smaller issue than the one of length of time between fall and spring semesters (accommodating Wintermester) and the overall issue of these shorter programs in the larger picture of education priorities.

Uta K. commented that it's important to have flexibility in education. It's important to consider the needs of different student groups; e.g., the rural students who have different needs. She supports offering many options for students to accommodate their needs.

Michelle B. commented that they're observing the 800-minutes-per-credit rule, though many other institutions have it set at 750 minutes. The first Wintermester last year had 190 students enrolled. It's filling a student need during available times for classrooms, etc.

Ken A. talked about what's being done in the School of Management, where they are breaking up semesters into 'half-semester'. Some faculty like it and others don't. But it's helping them increase enrollment and get students through their programs. Their student surveys show the differing views of students – some like getting through the material more quickly without having to cover extraneous subject matter; while at the same time they're questioning whether they're really learning the material in a shorter timeframe. Everyone likes the idea of getting students through more quickly, but the quality aspect needs to be examined closely. Sometimes for the sake of student credit hours the quality aspect is being sacrificed. Is the program rigor being maintained? That's the responsibility of the faculty to address. The tail should not wag the dog.

Dana T., who serves as the accreditation liaison officer for NWCCU for UAF, shared that one of accreditation requirements is that learning outcomes for courses and programs have to be the same no matter where or when they're offered. Evaluators from the Commission will expect us to prove, whether courses are taught by distance ed or are compressed to two weeks, that the learning outcomes achieved are equivalent. That's the standard to insure that we're achieving.

Rajive G. commented about the six-year graduation rate. Through his work with the Advising Center he's aware that many students don't have a clue about what they wish to major in for several years when they start college. It's not that there aren't enough sections offered of lower-level courses. The courses that do have scheduling constraints are the higher-level courses for seniors, which are never going to be offered during Summer Sessions or a two-week-long compression. He doesn't see that having lower-level courses offered between fall and spring semesters will necessarily improve the length of time it takes for students to reach graduation.

C. Role of Senate in Approval of Accreditation Core Themes for UAF – Provost Susan Henrichs (Attachment 160/3)

A slide used for this is posted online as a PDF titled **Proposed Accreditation Core Themes** at the Senate meeting web page (in addition to the agenda attachment):
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#160

UAF needs to work on accreditation and complete it in two years, although the new standards are still in their draft form from NWCCU. The preliminary discussion began last spring, and the slide and attachment show where they're at now after discussions and revision over the summer up to now.

The core themes are a very important fundamental part of setting UAF on the path toward reaccreditation because they're the basis and organizing thread for all of the accreditation reporting. They are supposed to be essential elements of the institution's mission and encompass everything that is important about the mission. The Commission only wants between 3-7 themes, thus they are broad, overarching statements.

Each theme will have a number of objectives listed beneath it to further explain the theme and serve as the basis to illustrate to the Commission how UAF is meeting its mission.

The Senate should review the themes and make suggestions for improvement. Ultimately, they want them to be endorsed by the Senate. They need to provide the Commission with the core themes and objectives by December or January.

Wider university input is being sought on the themes, and a survey link has been sent out to everyone. (Responses received thus far are posted online.)

Susan mentioned the attachment to the agenda which covers the chronological development of the themes through the present. There is still much input being considered, especially regarding the wording of 'place-based education', as well as 'creative activity and scholarship'. It's important to keep in mind that whatever is contained in the themes will need to be demonstrated to the Commission with evidence.

Amber T. asked about where the mission of CLA fits in these proposed themes beyond the obvious one of education. The phrase "with an emphasis on high latitudes" causes some concern about excluding elements of CLA's mission. Susan noted that interim dean Eric Heyne has been involved with the theme development, and she agrees it needs further thought and suggestions to be kept inclusive.

Dana T. urged that as these themes are being looked at and discussed, to look back at UAF's existing mission statement. Connect wording in the mission to the themes.

The new seven-year cycle will be completed by UAF in Fall 2011, and it immediately will start over again in 2012. The themes need to reflect what has been done in the last five years, and what we're able to implement and assess before 2011. The online survey is very short – only four questions long. Please respond to it. Some things that are not listed in the themes, like diversity, access and quality, are actually values - not themes. A brief discussion about this is included in the preamble to the survey. Things that contribute to achieving the mission (facilities, and student advising, for example) are not a part of the themes. Keep these things in mind during their discussions.

Falk H. mentioned, being in Alaska, we should consider including some environmental issues, sustainable development, climate change and globalization, for example. Right now the themes make it appear that we're a production, job creation institution. Dana mentioned his concern about the many uses of the word "sustainability" by institutions. For each core theme, the Commission will send an evaluator. Falk said we should also see it as our vision and opportunity, and that we have a lot to offer in the area of environmental sustainability; Alaska is more than high latitude. Susan mentioned that the themes can be expanded upon through the objectives.

Rajive G. mentioned his concerns with the "high latitude" wording as it relates to Alaska research issues.

Dana asked that the Senate consider a resolution of what the themes should be for the next meeting. The survey closes on October 9 and he'll send them out.

D. Proposed Freshman Year Seminars – Dana Thomas

Dana has submitted a proposal for doing freshman year seminars to Curriculum Review. He wants to have them approved centrally rather than in each school or college. The proposals will be approved on a competitive basis to ensure that retention elements are included. Curriculum Review is looking at the proposal.

Jane W. asked if they're mandatory; Dana said no, not at this time; however, the Core Revitalization and Assessment Committee and the transition team on advising improvement both recommended they be made mandatory.

Jon D. noted the idea of an introductory seminar on UAF for graduate students might also be a good idea to consider.

E. Implementation of Required English Writing Sample – Dana Thomas

Dana is working with an implementation group, and they've collected about 200 writing samples out of AccuPlacer's WritePlacer component with which to compare hand scoring results. These are being matched up with the WritePlacer scores, so the experiment is almost complete, and he'll be looking at the results soon.

F. Status of Committee/Board Assignments

1. Technology Advisory Board – Representative is Orion Lawlor.
2. Chancellor’s Diversity Action Committee – No vacancies.
Current seats: Jane Weber, 2009; Christa Bartlett, 2011
3. Provost’s Planning & Budget Committee –
Jon Dehn serves for the Senate
4. Administrative Representatives for Faculty Senate Committees –
Recently named from Provost’s Council and sent to the Administrative
Committee.

X Committee Reports

Due to the meeting being overly long, Jon D. asked for chairs just to share any burning issues for the moment.

A. Curricular Affairs – Ken Abramowicz / Falk Huettmann

Falk mentioned the Summer Sessions issue still under discussion, as well as another issue about the statement that was asked to be added in the syllabus (by the emergency preparedness committee) regarding risks and liabilities.

B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds

The committee is conducting data gathering about use of non-regular faculty in all departments on campus. Data doesn’t seem to exist in any useable form, so they’re going directly to the source.

C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar

No burning issues to mention.

D. Committee on the Status of Women – Alex Fitts / Jane Weber (Attachment 160/4)

Jane gave a reminder about the 5th Annual Women Faculty Luncheon on Tuesday, October 13, from 12:30-2:30 PM at the WC Ballroom.

E. Core Review - Latrice Laughlin

Latrice mentioned that the “O” and “W” intensive core courses review is underway.

F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry

No burning issues to mention.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight (to be convened)

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Alex Oliveira

They've met and had a brainstorming session. No current burning issues yet.

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Rajive Ganguli

Rajive let everyone know he has been elected to chair the committee.

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy

XI Members' Comments/Questions
None.

XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:20 PM.