

MINUTES  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #165  
Friday, March 5, 2010  
1:00 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.  
201 O'Neill 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 (vidio)  
ANGER, Andy  
BAKER, Carrie  
BARTLETT, Christa (audio)  
BOGOSYAN, Seta  
CAHILL, Cathy  
CHRISTIE, Anne (Todd Sherman)  
DAVIS, Mike (audio)  
DEHN, Jonathan  
GANGULI, Rajive (audio)  
HANSEN, Roger  
HOCK, Regine (Jeff Freymuller)  
HUETTMANN, Falk (audio)  
JIN, Meibing  
JOLIE, July (audio)  
KAYDEN, Ute  
KERR, Marianne (audio)  
KONAR, Brenda (Brian Himelbloom)  
KOUKEL, Sonja (audio)  
LAWLOR, Orion (Anupma Prakash)  
LEONARD, Beth  
LIANG, Jingjing  
McEACHERN, Diane (audio)  
NEWBERRY, Rainer  
PALTER, Morris  
RALONDE, Ray (Alex Oliveira)  
REYNOLDS, Jennifer

Members Present (cont'd):

ROBERTS, Larry (Josef Glowa)  
THOMAS, Amber (audio)  
WEBER, Jane (audio)  
WILSON, Timothy  
  
Members Absent:  
BROCIOUS, Heidi  
DONG, Lily  
FOWELL, Sarah  
HAZIRBABA, Kenan  
LARDON, Cecile  
MCINTYRE, Julie

Others Present:

Erin Trochim, Guest Speaker  
Joy Morrison  
Dana Thomas

Non-voting Members Present:

Tim Stickel (audio)  
Denis Wiesenburg  
Pete Pinney  
Brian Rogers  
Susan Henrichs  
Todd Vorisek (2nd hour)

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #164

The minutes were approved as distributed with a minor correction to Rainer's statement (on page 11).

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with two additions to announcement items (the Faculty Forum hosted by FDAI, and the Department Chair Training), and the order of discussion items was modified by moving the Academic Master Plan discussion topic to follow item A.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

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

III Public Comments

Dana Thomas announced two items:

1. Implementation of the writing sample requirement for English placement – a copy of the plan will be posted electronically by Jayne. Dana shared some comments about the spreadsheet content of the plan. New to the process are reading placement scores that are now required, rather than only recommended as in the past. It's important to read the statements included in the footnotes to the tables. They include critical details about how test scores are used for placement purposes. Dana invites feedback.
2. First year freshman seminars – a draft solicitation for faculty to propose first-year freshman seminars will be circulated. Supplemental pay is available to faculty in the amount of \$1,000 for class preparation, and \$2,000 for each time the course is offered (with at least 12 students enrolled). Faculty are encouraged to submit proposals. Dana is working on the possibility of having these seminars offered free to students, without tuition or fee costs for next fall. It's possible that these seminars will be required for students under the future Core requirements, so they want to try these out this next year and see what works.

IV A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

Jon mentioned that he completed mediation training that was offered to faculty and staff, and he gained very useful tools. He recommended this worthwhile training to everyone.

He mentioned the meetings that had taken place since the last senate meeting: the Board of Regents meeting, the Faculty Alliance meeting where they submitted a motion to the System-wide Academic Council, and the meeting of the BOR presidential search committee. He'll report on these later in today's meeting.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

Cathy mentioned the motions on today's agenda regarding the changes to the bylaws which affect reapportionment. She extended thanks to Jennifer Reynolds and Anne Christie for all their work in preparing them.

Cathy attended the Executive Leadership Workshop. They talked about where the university is headed, and about what type of branding for UAF needs to be done to further its reputation and image. They also talked about the budget situation. They would like to identify what processes aren't working well to help identify where they could save money. The aim is to continue with the core mission with as little disruption as possible by getting rid of wasteful, non-productive or inefficient processes. Those with ideas and suggestions can send messages to her with the word "zamboni" in the title to flag it.

Cathy invited anyone who wants to stand for president-elect to please declare it now before we vote today on the motion to extend the leadership's terms. There were no responses to the invitation. Cathy encouraged senate members to think about getting involved in future years, if not today, because this is a very important job.

V A. Chancellor's Comments – Brian Rogers

Chancellor's remarks normally scheduled at this time on the meeting agenda, were postponed until after the break due to his meeting schedule having already been set for Friday.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Susan shared briefly about the background and purpose for the Academic Master Plan (AMP). The System Academic Council (SAC) membership includes two reps from the Faculty Alliance, the provosts for the three MAUs, the vice president for academic affairs – Dan Julius, the vice provost for research from Anchorage and the vice chancellor for research from Fairbanks. The reason SAC is working on the AMP is because the Board of Regents were concerned that, while the UA system has, for example, a rolling six year capital plan to prioritize university capital projects, there isn't anything similar to that for academic programs (not that they're looking to prioritize programs in that fashion). A need, however, was recognized for a document that looked at academic planning in the system. Are we unnecessarily duplicating effort? Do we need to have every program replicated at each campus? How are we going to establish where certain programs go or don't go? Are we really interacting as institutions in the most efficient way possible, or, are we too unproductively competitive about students and other resources in some cases? Planning ahead could help address these issues.

Susan announced that at ScienceWatch.com, where they had done an analysis on publication concerning climate change research, the University of Alaska ranks eleventh out of more than 10,000 institutions for citations about climate change. (ScienceWatch.com gets their information from Thomson, the people who do the science notation index.) In number of publications, we rank twelfth. In number of citations by author, UAF's Terry Chapin ranks first. It's a great achievement, considering the competition includes institutions like Berkeley

and Stanford. The ranking also included whole institutions like the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), which ranks fifth in specializing on climate change.

## VI Governance Reports

### A. Staff Council – Martin Klein

A Staff Council report was not available. Jon mentioned the Leave Share Resolution, and that Martin had mentioned that Staff Council would support it, as well.

### B. ASUAF – Todd Vorisek for Adrian Triebel

Erin Trochim read a statement submitted by Todd Vorisek, endorsing Jon D. regarding extending his term as president.

To the UAF Faculty Senate,

I understand that the chair of Faculty Senate will be back up for election at the upcoming March 5th meeting. I am serving as the president of the student body for this semester, and was vice-president of the student body last semester, and as the President of the Associated Students of University of Alaska Fairbanks, I am proud to through my full support behind reelecting Jonathan Dehn as the chair of Faculty Senate. Jon has been an enthusiastic supporter of issues relevant to students for as long as I've known him, and has always given us a careful ear when asked. He has served as a voice for students when I or my peers were unavailable, and has been one of the most reliable persons for alerting us to issues of concern. In all of our recent lobbying efforts to the Board of Regents (Successful or otherwise) Jon has provided terrific guidance and a strong point of view to our delegates. I can think of no one else I or my predecessor, as well as our constituents, would be better able to serve with in this capacity.

Thank you for your time,  
ASUAF President Todd Vorisek

### C. UAFT/UNAC

Jane Weber said there was no news on UAFT. Jon D. briefly commented that he spoke with the UNAC rep earlier in the week, who said that the ORP litigation is ongoing. More will be reported about that when it develops.

## VII Guest Speaker: Erin Trochim

Topic: Organizing the graduate students, and plans for an orientation.

Erin introduced two other graduate students accompanying her, Mel Durrett (Biology and Wildlife) and John Mumm (Hydrology). The Graduate Student Committee is a subcommittee of ASUAF, and their purpose is to provide a voice for all of the current and

incoming graduate students. They recognized there was a graduate student council that's collapsed due to lack of interest, and they took that into account when they started their effort.

Last October, Erin organized a group of 14 UAF graduate students to attend the Northern Students Conference at Whitehorse. The top research students presented at the conference, and it was an overall good experience, especially getting to know others and learn about their work. There are 1,500 grad students here at UAF who do a large scope of research, and it would be interesting to get these students together for a similar type of function. Erin started here in 2006 and got her master's here. She's working on her Ph.D. From her experience, it took a long time to get oriented here as a new student, to meet the faculty and learn about the campus. If there were a graduate student conference at the start of the academic year, it would foster networking, collaboration and interdisciplinary research. It would ease the process of learning about campus and working with faculty and administrators. This past fall there were 250 new graduate students. By holding an annual conference, in three years' time over half the graduate students would never know it had been any different. It will become the norm.

Being an alumna herself, Erin will care what graduate students are doing here even five years from now. Another advantage of a yearly conference would be the opportunity for the alumni to connect with the graduate students. Alumni and grad students can mentor each other.

Her advisor shared how he learned a third of what he knew by what he figured out, a third from what his faculty told him and a third from other graduate students. An annual conference would bring all three areas together. Others she has met with are very supportive. They're taking the full proposal to Provost's Council next week. The next task is to get organized and work with faculty. Erin shared four things that all faculty could do to support this effort: 1.) encourage their graduate students to submit abstracts and support their new grad students in attending; 2.) help them set their academic program -- all departments are invited participate and can help with editing abstracts; 3.) register for the conference; and 4.) provide feedback after the conference so they can grow and improve. A schedule is on the back of the handout.

Flyer is now posted on the Meeting web page for Faculty Senate at:  
[http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10\\_senate\\_meetings/165/Grad-Student-Conference-Flyer.pdf](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/165/Grad-Student-Conference-Flyer.pdf)

After a short question and answer time, Erin encouraged faculty in all departments to encourage their graduate students to be involved. The Graduate Student Committee posts information and meeting minutes at:  
<http://www.gsc-asuaf.com>

[The break was postponed until after announcements.]

## VIII Announcements

### A. Outstanding Senator of the Year Award (OSYA) –

Guidelines are at back table, and online at:

[http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10\\_senate\\_meetings/index.html#165](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#165)

Nominations are open. Two volunteers were asked for to serve on the selection committee. Jane Weber volunteered.

### B. Feedback from Faculty Senate being sought by NWCCU on proposed revisions to NWCCU eligibility requirements. Handout at back table, and online at:

[http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10\\_senate\\_meetings/index.html#165](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#165)

### C. Promotion & Tenure Workshop on April 23, 2010 – Handout

Morris P. asked if there was some mechanism for those who can't attend that date. Susan H. mentioned it is done yearly. Also, the provost's web site contains the policies and regs and basic guidelines. Faculty can look over the materials and then contact either Sarah Lewis or Susan H. if there are questions. The workshop is audio-conferenced and webstreamed on April 23. It's hosted by the Faculty Senate Committee on the Status Women.

### D. Faculty Forum sponsored by FDAI on March 26

Josef G. talked about the Forum planned by FDAI. It's 12-1 pm on March 26 at the Honors House. The forum will be on Academic Duty and Academic Freedom. A book by Don Kennedy (*Academic Duty*) will be discussed, and he encouraged people to peruse it to prepare for discussion. Provost Emeritus Paul Reichardt will be there. Joy M. has five copies available. James Huessmann will also make more copies available at the Rasmuson Library.

### E. Department Chair Training – Joy Morrison

A five-part series of webinars on department chair training is being initiated by Anne Sakumoto at statewide HR, working with Beth Behner and United Academics. It's paid for with dues of United Academics. The series starts next Friday from 9-11 AM in 340 Rasmuson Library. Topics will be listed on the Faculty Development web site:

[http://www.uaf.edu/provost/faculty\\_development/fallworkshops/](http://www.uaf.edu/provost/faculty_development/fallworkshops/)

After each of the last four sessions, she hopes to have some panel discussions with the Provost and a couple of the deans. It will be webstreamed at the Library Media Classroom. More information may also be found at:

[http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/cafe/events/chair-webinar.cfm#CP\\_JUMP\\_547506](http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/cafe/events/chair-webinar.cfm#CP_JUMP_547506)

### F. Chancellor's Diversity Action Committee (CDAC) Award

Jane W. announced that forms and instructions on nominations for the award are at the back table. Please nominate folks. Deadline for nominations is March 31.

<http://www.uaf.edu/cdac/chancellors-diversity-awa/>

BREAK was held at 2:05-2:15 PM.

## IX Chancellor's Remarks

The Chancellor arrived from the Rural Human Services Program commencement ceremony, commenting what a highlight of the year it is to attend these ceremonies. He mentioned his pleasure at the new graduate student organization and plans for the conference that Erin Trochim spoke about. And, he mentioned thanks for moving our senate meeting date for the UA presidential finalist forum.

Speaking about the budget, the House Finance Committee wasn't as friendly this year as they would have hoped. It looks as if we're headed toward not having the full funding for university's fixed costs. He expects that we'll be short-funded in the coming year. He'll be prepared to discuss this in more depth at the April and May meetings of the Faculty Senate. We're entering an era of belt-tightening, with costs rising more rapidly than funding. We're doing better than 45 other states, though, which are worse off. The situation will require some extended discussion. Looking ahead a couple of years, there's a growing budget gap in the revenue sources that have supported us; and he foresees flat federal funding and tempered state funding, and tuition can only be raised so much. Support services will be looked at first, before academic and research functions, for belt-tightening measures.

Jeff F. mentioned he saw in the newspaper that the new climate center for UAF will be in Anchorage, and he wanted to know why. The USGS and Secretary of the Interior are supporting nine new national climate change and wildlife centers. While eight new centers are being competitively awarded, one has been non-competitively awarded to Fairbanks (UAF). The physical location of Anchorage was chosen for proximity to the USGS main office and other Department of the Interior agencies. The actual research projects will be carried out at many locations in Alaska.

Jennifer R. asked if this only relates to the interior – what about NOAA and others. The Chancellor responded that it's similar to the fact that we have multiple institutes at UAF dealing with climate change and there are interdisciplinary issues here, at the federal level it is an inter-agency issue. The focus of the Secretary of the Interior's decision to do the nine centers is to get the climate info needed to support their missions. Not all the activities can be coordinated, but it allows for multiple approaches to the climate issues.

Falk H. commented about the long history of the USGS and Anchorage competing and ignoring UAF. He is a wildlife modeler who looks specifically at climate, and this announcement really surprised him and he thinks it puts UAF at a tremendous disadvantage with Anchorage. Chancellor responded that it's important to recognize that the award is to UAF, not UAA, and Fairbanks needs a presence in Anchorage. We're not Fairbanks-bound. We serve the entire state and do research for the entire state. An enhanced presence in Anchorage may help us in other ways.

X New Business

A. Motion to Extend Terms of Faculty Senate President and President-Elect (Attachment 165/1)

Jon spoke first about his willingness to serve another term (and Cathy's willingness, also) and mentioned his statement that's included in the agenda. The issue of the Academic Master Plan and changes in the university system leadership weighed heavily into Jon's decision to go forward with this motion. He would like to see the Senate remain stable through these times, instead of being the entity changing each year. He doesn't, however, want this motion to take up the meeting time to discuss the other important issues of the Academic Master Plan and the bylaws motions.

Jennifer R. commented that while some folks have gotten heartburn over this motion, they should look at what the alternatives are. There aren't any other candidates who've stepped forward. Alternatively, Jon could stand for election for president-elect and he could be in for two more years on the basis of a majority vote. This motion requires a two-thirds majority vote. Cathy C. had already brought up early on the question to everyone – who wants to run for president-elect? Jennifer endorses extending his term. He's been doing an excellent job.

Jon responded to Jennifer's remarks that he doubts he'd run for president elect. It's not an easy job and it takes much of his time. It's a worthwhile job that he's willing to give three years to, but probably not four years.

Mike Davis wanted to hear from Cathy about why she doesn't assume the presidency right now. And, Mike asked about the electronic voting timeline. Cathy expressed her willingness to stay on another year as president-elect. She's been working closely with Jon on the issues they've been dealing with and working with Faculty Alliance, and, she, too, wants stability for the campus at this time of leadership change for the system. This is an opportunity for the faculty to show they are the stable force in this university and not to be underestimated. They can show the new leadership coming on board that the faculty are unified. One of the things she's learned this past year is that faculty, no matter what MAU they are at, are all dealing with similar issues. We want to educate new leadership coming in. Having the continuity right now in the Faculty Senate keeps things stable. She is willing to delay becoming president to ensure the stability – she feels it will benefit the faculty.

Jon said that voting electronically is open through the end of the meeting. The deadline put up earlier is extended and not meant to restrict anyone's chance to vote or take part in discussion.

Jane W. asked about the last paragraph in Jon's statement about the position having a steep learning curve and very short time to implement meaningful change and she sympathizes with that. Maybe we should be thinking about changing the terms of the president and president-elect positions for these reasons. Jane also mentioned because she's been traveling she doesn't have email access. Can she vote by phone by leaving a voicemail message at the Faculty Senate office? Falk mentioned he would like to be able to vote in that manner, as well. It was arranged to vote after the meeting is over because they can't call in their votes

right now as it's their means of being on this audio conference. Jon said that voting by phone after the end of the meeting was fine.

Jon talked about the differing roles of the two leadership positions and the learning curve involved. They are different roles, and while fulfilling the president-elect's roles, one is not necessarily prepared for filling the president's roles.

Pete Pinney of CRCD made some comments as a past president and faculty alliance chair. It's never been easy to get president-elect nominees. It's similar to the example of their past CRCD academic chair who filled the role again and again because no one would step up to do it. This didn't give new faculty a chance to serve. Pete also said he suspected his influence wouldn't have been that great during the second year. Changing the timing of the leadership rotation may not serve CRCD that well. He asked for senate leadership to visit the rural campuses and hold one of the senate meetings at another campus.

Jon D. clarified that this term extension can only be done once, not over and over again. With regard to meeting on other campuses, he has an announcement that will come later on the meeting related to that idea.

Brian H. asked about whether or not an off campus faculty could serve as president, and he was informed that one could. Jane mentioned the efforts made to get someone to serve from off-campus, but without success. The effort has been made, though. Brian H. then questioned the legality of a 24-hour announcement of such an important vote.

Diane M. commented from the Bethel campus. She did not see a notice calling for people to run for president-elect; and, she felt pushed to get her vote in without much advance notice. She feels this issue has been ramped up without much reason or notice and she feels rushed into it. She felt the issue is an important one and should not be trivialized.

Cathy C. responded that the discussion about this motion was in the meeting minutes from the February meeting. The call was first made for president-elect nominees and Jon's proposal was expressed and discussion took place at the February 1<sup>st</sup> senate meeting. Cathy reiterated that Jon, after learning today about the 10 AM deadline, immediately extended it. If someone has changed their mind after this discussion, they can re-submit their vote. Jon's comment about not wanting to bog down the meeting time with this motion was not meant to imply it wasn't an important discussion, but this meeting is not the first time the discussion has been held nor the first time senators were asked to nominate others for president-elect.

Brian H. then moved to table the motion and Mike D. seconded that. Jane asked what this means if we table it. Jon D. commented about what the impacts of delaying the vote on the motion would be, to answer Jane's question, saying that we endanger our ability to have a functioning governance committee because no one has stepped forward for president-elect. Mike D. interrupted to say there could be no debate on the new motion as a point of order. Jon reiterated that he was answering Jane's question about what the impacts could be, and not debating the motion. Jon noted that the reason they were discussing this motion at this meeting is because they usually hold president-elect elections at the next meeting, but no one has stepped up. Jon called for a vote on the motion to table the motion on term extensions of the senate leadership. The vote was taken by role call for those online. There were six "yes"

votes in favor of tabling the motion. There were eighteen “no” votes against tabling the motion.

The secret ballot vote on the motion to extend the leadership’s terms proceeded. Because of votes also taking place online and by telephone, the results were not available at the meeting.

B. Motions to amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws, submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachments 165/2-165/9, Bylaws Handout)

Jon asked the Faculty Senate to formally thank the Faculty Affairs for all their hard work on these motions and the reapportionment issues. A round of applause followed.

The first motion (for subsection A), 165/2, was brought to the floor. The motion updates a reference to one of the faculty unions in the Bylaws at Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection A. Motion 165/2 was passed unanimously.

The second motion (for subsections B1 and B7), 165/3, was described in more detail by Jennifer R. It addresses Section 1, Article III: Membership, existing subsections B.1 and B.7. The amendment addresses inconsistencies in the treatment of research institutes for the purpose of Faculty Senate representation. The purpose is to update the bylaws to bring the treatment of the research institutes in line with that of the academic units. At the time the bylaws were written the research institutes were much smaller and they were treated as a conglomerate in terms of representation. However, as the research institutes grow, changing the bylaws will allow them to be treated in the same manner as academic units for representation on the Faculty Senate.

The motion was called to question and seconded. There was one nay vote, but the ayes carried the motion.

The third motion (for subsections B.2-B.5 and C3), 165/4, amends the Bylaws at Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsections B.2 through B.5. The amendment removes the use of Full Time Faculty Equivalents (FTFE) in reapportionment calculations for Faculty Senate representation.

Jennifer described the background of this motion. Faculty Affairs first tried to follow the bylaws in the use of the FTFE count and the specified formula, which meant a long and laborious process at the Provost’s Office, which had to go through each and every faculty contract letter to look at faculty appointment percentages. The result was that this labor-intensive adjustment used for faculty with less than 75% appointments made no difference in the apportionment of Senate representation among the units when both ways of counting faculty were compared (the other way being to count each faculty as one, rather than by split appointment). This amendment proposes that the FTFE adjustment will be dropped from the reapportionment calculation and faculty will qualify for representation simply by holding academic rank or special academic rank.

The motion was called to question, seconded, and a vote taken. The ayes passed the motion unanimously.

The fourth motion (for subsection B.4), 165/5, was brought to the floor and Jon described how it has two parts (version 1 and version 2) to be examined. The vote on which version is adopted in this motion will also affect another following motion, 165/8 (on subsection C2 which has to do with voting). Motion 165/5 addresses Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection B.4, and changes the way split appointments are handled in reapportionment calculations for representation on the Faculty Senate.

Jennifer described how adopting version 1 or 2 in this motion affects reapportionment, and how it relates to motion 165/8 which affects elections. If version 1 is chosen for this motion, then it must align with choosing version 1 in the other motion, and the same goes for version 2 which must align in both motions (depending upon which version is chosen). The aim is to address how split appointments are considered for representation on Faculty Senate.

In the current bylaws, it's recognized that many faculty have split appointments between academic and research units. The motion proposes to modify how these split appointments are represented on the Senate, and simplify the process to do so. Appointments change on a yearly basis which makes it even more impractical to go through the labor-intensive process of going through every appointment letter to update reapportionment. There are also some faculty who, for example, have a 25% appointment in a tenure-granting unit and a 75% appointment in a research unit; which raises the question of how they should be looked at for reapportionment purposes. (It affects at least 27 faculty, which Jennifer clarified after Jane asked about it.) Faculty Affairs did not want to make this determination for them, and thus proposes the two versions for the Faculty Senate's consideration and examination.

At this point, there was some confusion as some people had the earlier version of the agenda which had reversed sections in the rationales for version 1 and version 2; and others had the corrected agenda, making discussion difficult and confusing. With the meeting already in overtime, it was decided to postpone voting until the April meeting, which was proposed as a motion by Ken A. on the floor. The motion to postpone was passed.

C. Leave Share Resolution, submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women (Attachment 165/10)

Jane W. brought the resolution to the floor and discussed its reasoning. Jennifer R. had a question about including the wording in the rationale for the resolution that mentioned employees who qualify for Family Medical Leave. Jane W. unfortunately was disconnected from the audio at this point during discussion. It was decided that this language did not directly affect the recommendation being made in the resolution, and a vote was then taken. The resolution was passed unanimously.

D. Motion to amend the Mandatory Placement Policy, submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee (Attachment 165/11)

Cindy Hardy brought the motion to the floor, explaining that it had been returned to committee at the February meeting because of a question about the timing of placement exams. A sub-committee of Math folks re-examined the question and reached agreement on it, so it's brought before the faculty today. Cindy answered some questions about the catalog

language of the motion. Jon raised concerns about falling below quorum and a quick roll was taken. Cindy mentioned the need for timely consideration of the motion due to the printed catalog deadlines. After determining that the meeting had fallen below quorum, it was decided to hold an electronic vote as soon as possible on this motion.

E. Motion to Reaffirm ANLC/ANLP Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 165/12)

This motion was put on hold until the April meeting because the meeting had fallen below quorum.

XI Discussion Items

A. UA Presidential Finalists – Jon Dehn

Jon stated that he will write a series of comments on this topic and the Academic Master Plan topic for electronic distribution because of the meeting falling below quorum. His remarks will be brief. He talked about the united presence that was communicated by the faculty and other governance groups to the presidential finalists at all three campuses, and he thanked faculty for attending the forums. Jon talked about the workings of the committee, which did not see the entire group of applicants considered – only the three finalists. Their role was to give input to the Board of Regents.

Feedback forms are still being accepted and it's an anonymous process. The forms will be destroyed after their use, and the feedback is separated from the personal information included on the forms.

The BOR had a meeting yesterday and Jon was present. It went into executive session, so he's limited in what he can say about the process. Personally, he expects no surprises. On March 15 the BOR will meet again and will make their final decision.

He did make a suggestion to some of the Regents privately that one good way to demonstrate unity among the three campuses would be to have all three faculty senates meet together face-to-face once a year to discuss broad issues affecting the entire system. His suggestion was met with positive reaction from those he talked to.

Item "B" under Discussion Items was moved down to accommodate item "F" next.

F. Update on the Academic Master Plan – Jon Dehn

Jon talked about the fact that it's been a difficult process developing the plan. The timeline and faculty input into the process haven't panned out the way they had hoped, though they've worked hard for that to happen. He encourages careful reading by everyone of this draft version 23 of the plan. It impacts everything we do for the upcoming future years. There are many points for discussion, and good feedback is needed from the faculty. Please read it and give feedback.

Discussion will happen at the April meeting, and in May he hopes that motions will be forwarded to SAC and BOR to make sure the voice of the faculty is documented. Thanks were extended to the Provost for her efforts on the plan.

Susan spoke to the challenge of writing this document. Each campus wants to do its own thing and set its own priorities, which must be balanced with avoiding nonproductive competition and unnecessary duplication of efforts between the campuses. There was the challenge of keeping the document meaningful without trampling campus autonomy and preserving the freedom to pursue research and creative activity that campuses wish to pursue. The plan aims to move the system forward to address what Alaska needs in a university system. Where should we put our resources and what should be the highest priorities? Faculty feedback is needed and welcomed. Jennifer asked how long they have to provide feedback. Susan said there will be initial feedback in May, and they'll do some more revisions in response to that, and then present the draft plan to the BOR in June. There will be some time in the fall to continue discussing the plan until October 22, 2010, which is the last time for feedback. If one wishes to remain anonymous, Jon said comments could be forwarded to him to forward to Susan.

The rest of the discussion items will be carried over to the April senate meeting:

- B. Peer Observation Form for Seminars – Josef Glowa (Attachment 165/13)  
[http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10\\_senate\\_meetings/index.html#165](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#165)
- C. Update on Follett Bookstore meetings – Ken Abramowicz, Jane Weber
- D. Update on the Core/LEAP discussions – Falk Huettmann
- E. Update on CIRTS Report – Jon Dehn  
<http://www.uaf.edu/chancellor/administration/advisory/cirts/>

## XII Committee Reports

Committee reports were postponed until the April senate meeting.

- A. Curricular Affairs – Ken Abramowicz / Falk Huettmann
- B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 165/14)
- C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar (Attachment 165/15)
- D. Committee on the Status of Women – Alex Fitts / Jane Weber  
(Attachment 165/16)
- E. Core Review - Latrice Laughlin
- F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks
- H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa  
(Attachment 165/17)
- I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Rajive Ganguli
- J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy
- K. Ad Hoc Committee: Advisory Research Committee – Roger Hansen

XIII Members' Comments/Questions

No comments or questions.

XIV Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.