

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #166
Monday, April 5, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 3:17 p.m.
Wood Center Ballroom

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
ANGER, Andy
BAKER, Carrie
BARTLETT, Christa
BOGOSYAN, Seta
BROCIOUS, Heidi (audio)
CAHILL, Cathy
CHRISTIE, Anne (Karen Jensen)
DAVIS, Mike
DEHN, Jonathan
GANGULI, Rajive (audio)
HANSEN, Roger
HAZIRBABA, Kenan
HOCK, Regine
HUETTMANN, Falk (audio)
KADEN, Ute
KONAR, Brenda
KOUKEL, Sonja (audio)
LARDON, Cecile
LAWLOR, Orion
LEONARD, Beth (audio)
McEACHERN, Diane (audio)
MCINTYRE, Julie
NEWBERRY, Rainer
REYNOLDS, Jennifer
ROBERTS, Larry
THOMAS, Amber

Members Present (cont'd):

WEBER, Jane
WILSON, Timothy

Members Absent:

DONG, Lily
FOWELL, Sarah
JIN, Meibing
JOLIE, July
KERR, Marianne
LIANG, Jingjing
PALTER, Morris
RALONDE, Ray

Non-voting Members Present:

Tim Stickel (audio)
Denis Wiesenburg
Pete Pinney
Martin Klein
Brian Rogers
Susan Henrichs

Others Present:

Guest: Mark Hamilton

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #165

The minutes were approved as distributed, with one correction to attendance.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with one amendment: Public Comments will be taken before Break during the first hour of the meeting.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Amend the Mandatory Placement Policy

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

Jon thanked all present for bearing with them during the difficult election process and for helping to resolve the concerns the minority had about the voting process to extend their terms. Both he and Cathy are honored that the supermajority has voted (twice) to extend their terms. He hopes to get an excellent president-elect candidate for the next election and will immediately start on that effort after today's meeting.

The System Academic Council has met regarding the distance education audit, and is working on plans to streamline distance education between the three campuses, aiming to make it more transparent to the students. Also, the Academic Master Plan is on the agenda for faculty suggestions and discussion.

Faculty Alliance is preparing for a change of leadership. They've also been working with SAC on the Academic Master Plan, and the Alliance wants to take the feedback from the three senates, synthesize it into a form supportive of the plan, which would then be shared with the Board of Regents.

Jon's also been working with the UAF Faculty and Student Technology Committee (FAST) that looks at the OIT organization with a view toward making recommendations for improvement.

Erin Trochim, guest speaker at the last meeting, had spoken about the Graduate Student Conference taking place in September. The graduate student abstract deadline is coming up at the end of this month for that conference. Jon encourages the faculty to help their students to participate in this effort, as well as to be involved with it themselves. Flyers are at the back table with details.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

Cathy also thanked the Senate for voting to extend their terms. She is definitely looking for individuals to step up for president-elect next year.

One of the primary things she's been working on the past few months with the executive leadership workshop and the Planning and Budget Committee, is the state of the budget and where we are going to be, given where we are in the legislative process at this time. The budget for the university is not looking good. We as faculty need to be prepared and willing to get our input into the process, helping identify what is good in our programs, what the deficiencies are, and how we can make them run more efficiently. Please share your ideas and suggestions for dealing with the budget difficulties with her, the Provost and the Chancellor. They're looking for ways to save money and still maintain the academic standards that we uphold as the faculty.

IV Guest Speaker

A. Mark Hamilton, UA President

[President Hamilton's remarks were recorded, along with the rest of the Faculty Senate meeting. Contact Jayne Harvie at x7964 for instructions to access the recording.]

Jon introduced President Mark Hamilton as today's guest speaker. The President talked about the conclusion of the UA presidential search, saying that he had met with his successor, Pat Gamble, who is anxious to take over this responsibility. Hamilton was not personally involved with the search, leaving that decision to the BOR since the position of president works for them. He remarked candidly about the security associated with the search, encouraging everyone that in this case, as well as the situation mentioned by Jon D. in his remarks, that good people survive bad process.

He told Pat Gamble that it will be the greatest learning curve he'll encounter, given the statewide scope of 16 campuses, and the scope of the University mission, not to mention the geographical scope being dealt with.

The President remarked on the Academic Master Plan, thanking Provost Susan Henrichs for her work on it. Related to this effort on the plan, he believes that it's absolutely necessary that we look ahead at what our expectations are of each of the major academic units. The system can not continue if it's guided only by plans based on aspirations, as opposed to disciplined plans which are needed to remain an excellent institution within the bounds of its charge. He commended the Board of Regents for going after only one new facility rather than the laundry list approach. What was evident from the laundry list approach was that the priority of the BOR would be overlooked in favor of regional support. Thus, roughly 80% of new construction accomplished in his tenure has been at Anchorage, due to the political realities – not because of the BOR's priority or budget.

He's somewhat fearful that if the Regents' recommendation does get passed, that it will go on to a general order bond. If that happens, it will be a remarkable challenge, given the

political atmosphere we're facing. With concerns at the national level that we're going so far into debt, the probability that a new general order bond that says we take on six hundred million dollars of debt is very likely to crash and burn.

Speaking about the future, President Hamilton believes the pipeline is a pipe dream. He wishes that he would be proven wrong on this, because his children and grandchildren are here and he plans to stay here. But, it's a simple matter of supply and demand, and he provided figures and statistics to support it. 2035-2040 is when he believes it will be more realistic that supply and demand will support bringing North Slope oil to the market.

In the meantime, he doesn't think we'll deal with a fiscal crisis. We may deal with some decisions based on fear, causing their own crisis. As there is more demand for oil down the road, oil will likely be \$85 to \$100 dollars a barrel in the future. What it means for us here at the university is that we plenty of time to adjust to this without panic. But, we need to start asking ourselves the difficult questions. He hopes the faculty is very involved in this, and it will take honesty and a tremendous depth of introspection. Does the university need three education schools, or three business schools? Should biology be out of one campus as the nursing program is?

He then shared about an interesting thesis he's had for many years. Being convinced there something to the thesis, he even presented it to the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. military. The thesis is that the most likely organization of institutions follows, by one generation, the most popular children's toy. He provided examples of building blocks, Lego's, and transformers, relating them to the development of new and more complex organizational models of the day. The latest, transformers, use all (and only) the pieces available to become something new. He told the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from this example that we have to make one unit that can transform into the necessary instrument of utility, rather than building a new army for every war. About three years later he read the first business book on transformational organizations. In the future, there will be the spontaneous formation of teams that take on tasks without ever seeing or knowing one another except via the internet. We're still informed by the transformation analogy. We need to use all and only the pieces of the university to design the instrument of service and continuity for the future. He says 'all' because he thinks the perfect solution is not to have to worry about getting rid of individuals in administration or faculty. We'll use only and all the instruments that we have available to us – it's a worthy challenge. We have the remarkable luxury of time. There may be panic and knee jerk reactions, but let's not be the source of those reactions. There's time to be thoughtful and contemplative about this and do things that are only different and not evil as we move forward.

Folks, including the faculty, have been very kind dealing with him. He's not an academic and has none of the contempt born of familiarity. He thinks the faculty is absolutely magnificent. He has gone to nearly 100 commencement exercises and he knows what faculty do -- they transform lives. Watching people go across the stage accomplishing something they didn't think they could do is all he has needed every year to be reenergized. He admires terrifically what the faculty do and how they do it.

He described himself as an absolute freak for statistics and analysis, and loves the idea of informational-based decision making and so he wanted to leave them with the following

facts. The university was founded in 1917, with its first graduate in 1921. But, half of all people getting degrees from the University of Alaska (he admitted it's actually 47%) got their degrees under his watch. We're still very new to our service for Alaska, and our influence on the state. He admires those who were here in the desert – the 10 years with no funding increases at all – who held the institution together. We have built a different university, its depth in this state and its level of service in this state are so increased and there will not be another time in the desert. We've gone from 40% of Alaska's college bound students coming to this university to this fall, when close to 67% of Alaska students will come here. It's going to be a wonderful time for faculty to continue their careers here. The university is here to stay and faculty have made the difference.

Cecile L. asked how he sees UAF and UAA continuing into the future, given the element of competition. President Hamilton stated that his opinion is that competition absolutely has to end, and he will make the same statement to the UAA faculty next week. Let's be fabulous at what we are. If there are to be professional doctorates offered, let's make sure we're not just picking any one we can to gain the prestige. Let's pick one that is of sufficient service to the state, and that we're willing to pay for to achieve quality delivery. Faculty can agree to jointly offer Ph.D. programs, and a professional Ph.D. might be the way to start. He would like it to be the result of a continuum that says, for example, we have an excellent baccalaureate program in education and an excellent master's in education, and so it's only appropriate that we move forward to offer an Ed.D. It should not be transparent aspiration for the purpose of prestige. He's been disturbed by the very fact that the top facility building project at UAA is a sports arena. What about their engineering building or refurbishing their science building? Isn't the next program down there an Allied Health one? He can't believe that a sports arena is their top priority. It's aspiration that goes beyond the pale. It costs a lot of money to offer Ph.D.'s, and there is no possibility that the state can financially support two universities to do it. The infrastructure is here at UAF – it does not need duplication down there. How it will work out politically he doesn't know, but that's his long-held opinion.

He again expressed his sincere admiration for the faculty and wished everyone the greatest fortune in their own lives and professionally as they continued their service to the state. He departed to a standing ovation by those present.

V A. Chancellor's Comments – Brian Rogers

The BOR meets next week in Dillingham. One item they're reviewing is the Academic Master Plan. There's also an issue coming to the BOR he wants the Senate to consider, which is guns on campus. A presentation will be given by a 2nd amendment group to the BOR. He wants faculty to address the issue and let the BOR know their views. We're fairly tolerant at UAF, having a rifle team and providing secure lock-up of student-owned firearms. But concealed carry of firearms is the specific issue being discussed. There's an interesting clash of priorities on this issue, and faculty should weigh in on it as it concerns their classrooms. The BOR may consider changes in policy.

As the legislature is moving into its last days on the budget, they're more hopeful about certificates of participation regarding the Life Sciences facility in the budget process.

Movement away from a bond issue will help the project become a reality this summer, and get it fully funded. The operating budget looks fairly challenging. Clearly, there will need to be some reallocation in the coming year and choices made on where to focus new investment and where to cut back. He's been preparing some briefing papers for the new president on UAF-related issues. If there are any issues they want the president to be aware of, please email the Chancellor's Office.

Lastly, he commented on how President Hamilton used the term MAU, as "major academic unit" rather than the more common "major administration unit" – Brien said we may see more use of the term the way the President used it.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Susan looks forward to senate input on the Academic Master Plan. The plan represents many compromises made by the System Academic Council (SAC) that has put it together. There were extensive and usually constructive discussions during its formation. In giving her input, Susan asked the senate members to be specific and constructive – to please give alternatives and suggestions, not just flat statements about something that isn't liked.

As they go into an operating review to present detailed budget plans, they'll also give a detailed performance review. Related to performance, our graduation rates are not great. The six-year rate for graduation, including first-time freshman and associate and certificate degree seekers, is only 25% completion. It's not within about 50% of some of our peer institutions, which is not great. Mitigating that is we're almost an open admission university. We only just recently tightened up the admissions standards.

If we look at our retention, in the course of the first year and toward the end of the first year, we lose 37% of our incoming students if you count the associates degrees and certificates. Our freshmen retention isn't bad if you look at our peer institutions, but it's still not great. But we've retained 63% of our first-time, full-time freshman. Another 13 % of these students are lost the next year. Years after that, (about 12 years out) we only lose 6 %. But, they're graduating very, very slowly.

What she would like to see us do as a university is to redouble our efforts to retain incoming students, and help those who are taking a long time to attain graduation.

Cecile L. noted that in psychology which is a large major, students move in and out of universities more than they used to. They have had to redesign their curriculum and rearrange their program plans. She asked to what extent these numbers reflect students who attend through the military and who otherwise move around a lot. How realistic is it to have those students who start here, finish here? Susan responded that while we do see a lot of that, the numbers she's speaking about are a cohort model; the group of students looked at were those who started and stayed here, over a 12-year time frame). At the end of that 12-year period, we still had either graduated or still taking classes, over 45 % of those incoming freshman students. There's a lot of hanging on and getting through the system very gradually.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Martin Klein

Martin reminded all that Staff Appreciation Day is coming up on May 19.

He mentioned the ongoing union organization efforts of non-represented staff by two different unions. Statewide Labor Relations has good info on their web site about both of them.

Staff Council members were in Juneau in March and they spoke with several legislators. They were successful in conveying the message that we are one university not three.

A leave share resolution was also passed by SC (identical to the one passed by the senate); and they will bring it up at Staff Alliance shortly.

The Chancellor asked Jon D. and him to appoint folks to serve on the New Facility Naming Committee, and Martin will chair (in his Facilities Services role). He mentioned names of folks on the committee (Cathy Cahill, Maria Russell, Emily Drygus and Deb Horner).

B. ASUAF – Todd Vorisek

No report was available.

C. UAFT/UNAC

No report available.

Public Comment (as an item introduced to the agenda at the beginning of the meeting):

Vice Provost Dana Thomas mentioned the Mandatory Placement policy that the senate had passed and that was approved, and that this will be a transitional year of implementing that new policy. They'll work very hard not to impact students who've already taken placement tests this fall with the newer requirements.

UAF has signed up for the voluntary system of accountability – an agreement and process that was reached via the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (which is the new name for NASULGC – the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges). Under the Bush administration, Secretary Spelling (Education) pressed hard for an act like “No Child Left Behind” for universities. A lot of faculty and administrations across the country thought it would ease up after Bush left office, but this is not the case. The motivation for the continuing efforts on this national legislation is that the cost of higher education is growing faster than Health Care even, and so people want accountability. In response to this, a voluntary system of accountability was formed. He urges faculty to look at their site:

<http://www.voluntarysystem.org/>

The site is paired with College Portrait, and taking part requires having a student survey. UAF is using the NSSE survey and has data posted at College Portrait. The other piece of this effort is that in two years they must implement an exam for incoming freshman and exiting seniors – a sample of the whole (200 incoming freshmen, 100 exiting seniors).

Three exams have been approved for this purpose. One is the CLA, the Collegiate Learning Assessment. The other two are written by ETS and ACT (MAPP and CAAP are their names). <http://www.voluntarysystem.org/docs/cp/LearningOutcomesInfo.pdf>

At the next senate meeting, he wants to make a recommendation that we use one next year. Please look at these three tests and come prepared to share opinions and ask questions.

Jane W. asked him where the sample numbers of 200 and 100 come from. Dana answered that it came from the people developing these tests. He got this from the workshop he attended recently. They're trying to reduce the margin of error so they can assess learning gained.

BREAK occurred at 2:10 PM.

NOTE: All referenced attachments are contained in the Agenda #166.

VII New Business

A. Motions to Amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws, submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachments 166/1-166/4; 166/5-All Changes)

Motion 161/1 was brought to the floor by Faculty Affairs Chair Jennifer Reynolds. Its purpose is to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection B.4 (page 13). This amendment changes the way split appointments are handled in reapportionment calculations for representation on the Faculty Senate.

Jennifer gave a comprehensive background of the bylaws changes which carried over from the March meeting. She talked at length describing how faculty numbers were apportioned between academic and research assignments for those with split appointments. It's been a very heavy workload to read every appointment letter to correctly account for split appointments. The Provost's Office did the laborious task last year and provided the data to Faculty Affairs.

Currently, research units (GI, IARC, and IAB) are represented as a conglomerate unit. With the newer reapportionment figures, however, both the Geophysical Institute and the International Arctic Research Center are now large enough in numbers of faculty to each have two representatives on the Faculty Senate. This will go into effect next year.

All of the IAB faculty also have teaching appointments at CNSM. If their faculty are all counted as research, then they qualify for their own representation, but CNSM would drop two seats. In addition to that effect, a new group of blended research faculty are created, which includes the museum, INE and other small units.

Faculty Affairs supports split appointments being dropped for reapportionment purposes. They would be counted in their unit of their primary appointment. This would be the tenure-granting unit, where their rank is determined. There aren't any faculty with split appointments who don't have part of their appointments in a unit that doesn't also grant tenure.

Rainer N. asked about how they go about saying we want to do this as outlined in Motion 161/1 for subsection B.4 of the Faculty Senate bylaws. A motion was made to consider these apportionment changes in 161/1, and then a vote was taken. It was unanimously approved by the ayes (no nays and no abstentions). The two versions outlined in the motion were then discussed. Next, a vote was taken on Motion 161/1, version 1 of B.4, which received no ayes. A vote followed on Motion 161/1, version 2 of B.4 to count faculty by means of their tenure-granting unit for apportionment purposes. The ayes passed version 2 of Motion 161/1 unanimously.

Motion 166/2 for bylaws subsection B.8 was then considered. This amendment addresses the frequency of reapportionment for the purpose of Faculty Senate representation. Currently, the bylaws state that it's done every two years or upon a two-thirds vote of the senate. In practice, though, this is not happening. This motion recommends that reapportionment coincide with the accreditation review year, every seven years, when the Provost's Office is already gathering the necessary data in the accreditation process. The motion was called to question and seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously passed, with no nays and no abstentions.

Motion 166/3 on bylaws subsection C.1 was considered next, having to do with elections of senators in the research units. Currently, the bylaws state all of the elections in the research units are coordinated out of the Faculty Senate office. This procedure worked when the units were very small in numbers and were treated as a conglomerate unit; but, now they've grown and this is no longer practical. This motion transfers the conducting of elections back to the larger research units that will have their own representation on the senate. The motion was called to question and seconded. A vote was taken, and the ayes passed it unanimously, with no nays and no abstentions.

Motion 166/4 on bylaws subsection C.4 was then considered. In reference to election of representatives to the Faculty Senate, this amendment addresses the voting procedure for faculty with split appointments (in multiple units). This motion presented two versions for discussion, and the version selected must be in alignment with the versions of Motion 161/1 which addressed reapportionment. Version 1 received no votes. Version 2 was adopted so that faculty will vote either in their tenure-granting unit (if tenure-track), or in the unit of their primary appointment (faculty with research appointments). The motion (version 2) was called to question and the vote taken. The ayes passed it unanimously.

B. Motion to Reaffirm ANLC/ANLP Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 166/6)

Brenda K. brought this to the floor. The committee thought these criteria looked good and only minor changes were requested. Larry R. called it to question and it was seconded. The vote was taken, and the ayes passed the motion unanimously.

C. Motion to Approve an AAS degree in Drafting Technology, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 166/7)

Ken A. brought the motion to floor. Some modifications were made; after much discussion in committee, particularly regarding the math requirement and resource requirements. Rainer N. called it to question and Jane W. seconded. The motion passed by majority; with one abstention; and no nays.

D. Motion to Approve a Minor in Mining Engineering, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 166/8)

Ken brought the motion to the floor and described it. It had unanimous approval in the committee. Rainer mentioned there is no cost involved, and called it to question which was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

E. Motion to amend the UAF "Policies and Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty" (Attachment 166/9)

Jennifer R. described the background of this motion and the situations creating a need for a promotion procedure for faculty who are not represented. These faculty are usually supervising other faculty and filling an administrative role, but still have 49% academic duties. Faculty Affairs held three meetings of extensive discussion on this topic. They recommend a similar promotion procedure as that for represented faculty. These non-represented faculty should still have 49% faculty duties in their workload in addition to their administrative role.

They talked about issues of unit peer committee representation. A special peer committee will be appointed for these faculty, and a dean or director outside their academic unit will select the faculty. Otherwise, the procedure is just like that for a regular faculty. The criteria for evaluation will be the same as for those with 51% academic duties. Who is on the unit peer committee and how that committee is appointed was addressed to avoid conflicts of interest.

The motion was called to question and seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was passed unanimously.

- F. Motion of Confirmation for Outstanding Senator of the Year Award, submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee (Attachment 166/10)

Cathy spoke to the motion as chair of the selection committee. Both Jennifer Reynolds and Anne Christie were nominated. The committee felt that both were deserving of recognition for taking on the herculean task of addressing reapportionment issues. Resounding ayes confirmed the motion. (One abstention from Jennifer.)

VIII Announcements

- A. Chancellor's Advisory Committee for the Naming of Campus Facilities

Cathy C. will fill this role on behalf of the senate. and this may be a traditional role for the president-elect in the future.

- B. Promotion & Tenure Workshop on April 23, 2010 (Handout)

Jon announced the workshop. Cathy encouraged everyone to remind others in their units, also.

IX Discussion Items

- A. Academic Master Plan – Susan Henrichs, Jon Dehn (Handout)

Available online at:

http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#166

Rainer suggested that in light of President Hamilton's estimate of the viability of a gas pipeline, that rewording might be in order for page 16, the second paragraph. Rainer said as a potential alternative, some discussion of apparent or real competition or dichotomy between nonrenewable and renewable resource extraction; referring, of course, to the Pebble controversy.

Jon raised some of the comments he's heard. The vision statement, while good, is lean. More background and support is needed for what sorts of needs we have in the state. Statements such as meeting students' needs and the needs of the state need statistics and figures to back them up. How many students stay in state and with what programs?

Under new and augmented programs; the wording makes it appear that different means will be used for evaluating various programs. For example, education programs will not be approved without statewide planning groups being involved; whereas for engineering programs it only mentions that program deans agree. It looked like the criteria were different when they're actually not.

Ken A. noted that on page number 8, at the fourth bold dot down, it states, "For instructional programs, student demand for the program exists proportionate to the resources needed to offer it." He was concerned that it could be used to throw new resources to Anchorage because of the population base of Anchorage. The School of Management could have a hard

time competing for new programs in this case. If you put UAF against UAA in light of student demand numbers, Anchorage would win. This could really impact distance campuses when justifying instructional programs. Programs are needed to train people for jobs in high demand in an area, but may not necessarily be economical to offer at an area. Susan responded that the idea was that the demand would be proportionate to the resources, so that if you were serving fewer students, say 50, you wouldn't need all the resources that you would need if you were serving 100 students. It's problematic for a program such as Dental Hygiene, which is quite expensive and can only have six students admitted per year compared to the expenses of offering it; vs. a low program startup cost for something like History. She'll look carefully at how it's been presented. The intent is that student demand would be just one criteria among others to be looked at, it's one part of the puzzle. You must also consider state needs and a variety of other factors before making a decision one way or the other.

Jon D. emphasized that it's important to look over the master plan – it's the foundation upon which other plans will be built. He spoke to some of the things affecting development of new programs that are contained in the plan. One must go to the BOR to pre-approve developing a new Ph.D. program, for example. If this requirement is approved, it will substantially affect how new programs are developed. It's not meant to inhibit program development, but rather to keep programs from investing time and efforts on something that will not have much chance of success. It needs to be carefully and clearly worded, however.

Cecile L. asked whether there's sense of competition among the faculty about developing Ph.D. programs, or if that is occurring at the administrative level. Jon responded that the majority of faculty realize developing a Ph.D. program is no trivial undertaking. While some at UAA may want to deliver Ph.D. programs, they're not accredited to do so. The matter was an administrative point of contention, not a faculty one.

B. Peer Observation Form – Josef Glowa (Attachment 166/11)

Forms are posted online at:

http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#166

Jon shared about some of the discussion that took place in Administrative Committee. It's not a form that's required in any way, nor one that would likely be included in one's promotion and tenure file. It was developed for use among peers, and it can also be used as a self-observation form. It's useful to read over during the semester, especially when offering a new class. He really likes it and it's a useful form in many ways.

C. Update on Follett Bookstore – Ken Abramowicz, Jane Weber

Ken A. shared about the proposal by Follett to bring books back to the campus. The UAF Bookstore also has one. Ken and Jane W. are on the bookstore committee and evaluated the proposals. Follett's was more a proposal to make a contract, and he and Jane advised against it, unless Follett extended the UAF Bookstore with its current employees. But the decision is at the Chancellor's Cabinet level. There are lots of ideas under discussion, and they're still hoping for a full-fledged bookstore on campus.

Rainer asked if anything will happen in the next couple of months. To Ken's knowledge, no decision has been made yet by Chancellor's Cabinet. Rainer noted that potentially decisions could be made during the summer when faculty aren't around. Jon mentioned he's been very vocal to the Chancellor and Provost about the need for a physical bookstore at this university. He promises the Administrative Committee will watch it closely over the summer.

Ken commented that it came up loud and clear during their committee meetings that the administration doesn't think there's any problem. As time goes by, people resolve problems in other ways and the faculty and students do the best they can. He doesn't want the administration to think the problem has gone away and encourages faculty and students to be vocal about any problems with books to the administration.

Robert Holden reiterated that there has been no resolution to the issues which have been brought up. They are working towards bringing books back to campus, no matter what. Jon asked for any numbers on how it went this semester. Robert agreed that it was quiet this semester. He, too, asked for people to make problems known. Only a limited number of people took advantage of the books brought on campus, but, the effort helped students taking core classes and those testing into classes. Robert said that Loly Tilly Commons would be an ideal space as a bookstore.

D. Update on the Core/LEAP discussions

Ken said there will be a meeting next Monday and they'll go line by line on the Core objectives. They will then invite faculty comments. Next year they'll plan to discuss how to implement the core objectives into courses. Ken's hope is that they complete objectives so they can get into discussion on courses next year.

X Committee Reports

Jon recommended reviewing minutes, and reminded folks about the annual reports due at the next meeting. NOTE: All referenced attachments are contained in the Agenda #166.

- A. Curricular Affairs – Falk Huettmann, Ken Abramowicz
(Attachment 166/12)
- B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 166/13)
- C. Unit Criteria – Brenda Konar (Attachment 166/14)
- D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Alex Fitts
(Attachment 166/15)
- E. Core Review – Latrice Laughlin
- F. Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks
- H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa
(Attachment 166/16)
- I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Rajive Ganguli
- J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy
- K. Ad Hoc Committee: Advisory Research Committee – Roger Hansen

XI Members' Comments/Questions

Tim Stickel mentioned Fairbanks registration opened today; and the new Banner implementation impacted servers for registration. OIT worked on it and so far things are again working great.

Commencement is on May 16; and currently there are 889 graduation applications and they've completed 603 degree audits to date, with more to be done by mid-April.

Jon mentioned they went to yellow on Mt. Redoubt this morning, so be aware of that if traveling.

XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 PM.