AGENDA
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #178
Monday, November 7, 2011
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1:00 I Call to Order – Catherine Cahill 4 Min.
   A. Roll Call
   B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #177
   C. Adoption of Agenda

1:04 II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions 1 Min.
   A. Motions Approved: None
   B. Motions Pending: None

1:05 III A. President's Remarks – Cathy Cahill 10 Min.
   B. President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds

1:15 IV A. Chancellor’s Remarks – Brian Rogers 10 Min.
   B. Provost’s Remarks – Susan Henrichs

1:25 V Discussion Items 35 Min.
   A. Strategic Direction, role of UAF Faculty Senate – Cathy C., Jennifer R.
      http://www.alaska.edu/shapingalaskasfuture/
   B. Stay on Track Program – Cathy C., Jennifer R.
      http://www.alaska.edu/stayontrack/
      Link for “Time is the Enemy” document:
      http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#178
   C. Master’s Degree Awards Ceremony – All
   D. UAF Mission Statement – Susan Henrichs
      http://www.uaf.edu/uaf/about/mission/

2:00 BREAK

2:10 VI Public Comments/Questions 5 Min.

2:15 VII Guest Speaker
   A. Fred Schlutt, Vice Provost for Outreach and Engagement 20 Min.
      Topic: Outreach and Engagement Plan

2:35 VIII Governance Reports 5 Min.
   A. Staff Council – Pips Veazey
   B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag, Robert Kinnard
C. UNAC – Jordan Titus
   UAFT – Jane Weber

2:40 IX  Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements 20 Min.
A. December 5 Faculty Senate Meeting #179 – Location to be 401 IARC
B. Accreditation Steering Committee – Senate Rep vacancy
C. Edith R. Bullock Prize for Excellence – Nominations open
   http://www.alaska.edu/files/foundation/Bullock_Nomination_Form.pdf
D. Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)
   Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 178/1)
   Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Chair (Attachment 178/2)
   Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair
   Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair
      (Attachment 178/3)
   Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair
   Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
   Faculty Appeals & Oversight
   Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair
      (Attachment 178/4)
   Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair
      (Attachment 178/5)
   Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
      (Attachment 178/6)
   Research Advisory Committee – Peter Webley, Orion Lawlor, Co-chairs
E. Other Comments

3:00 X  Adjournment
Minutes: Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting
9/28/2011, 3:30-4:30 pm Kayak Room

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry, Anthony Arendt, Carrie Baker, Jungho Baek, Dave Valentine, Debra Moses, Retchenda George-Bettisworth, Brian Himelbloom (audio), Todd Radenbaugh (audio).
Voting members absent: Diane McEachern

Non-voting members present: Doug Goering (audio), Dana Thomas, Lillian Anderson-Misel
Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

A. OLD Business

1. Approval of 14 Sept Minutes
   Minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Chairperson and minutes taker elections (or whatever) for the year
   Rainer formally accepted chairship of the committee.
   Jayne agreed to take meeting notes to serve as minutes of the meetings and to help her stay tuned to the committee’s ongoing business.

3. Request to approve R Newberry as chair of Curriculum Review Committee 2011-2012
   Rainer was approved to continue chairing the Curriculum Review Committee.

4. Recent GERC issues (chairperson, etc) — comments by Dave/Carrie
   David recapped the GERC meeting that took place on Sept. 26. The group discussed characteristics they would like a committee chair to have. Carrie Baker was asked if she would consider co-chairing this fall semester with David; however, the issue of needing a chair beyond this fall remains an important consideration. Neither David nor Carrie can continue the chairship through spring.

   Rainer liked the idea of considering emeriti for the position, but this idea met with tepid response at the GERC meeting. The group would prefer a faculty. However, the time commitment is significant, and so is the accompanying responsibility for what is to be accomplished. Ultimately, Curricular Affairs Committee must take responsibility for getting the work of GERC underway soon. Several emeriti faculty were mentioned (Paul Reichardt, Phyllis Morrow, Rudy Krejci, and Barbara Lando) as individuals to consider.

5. ‘Stacked’ courses -- comments by Tony or Rainer
   Tony (Anthony A.) is on the subcommittee that was formed between CAC and GAAC members to address issues about stacked courses. Both undergraduate and graduate surveys have been formulated and Tony gave some examples of questions from each. A list of faculty teaching stacked courses is needed, and approaching the Registrar for this was suggested. Dana Thomas mentioned that full-fledged access to SurveyMonkey is available from the Provost’s Office for CAC to use on this project.

   Pros and cons of course stacking were discussed. Dana mentioned he would for any NWCCU accreditation rules that may apply. Doug G. mentioned that the issue has not come up with ABET accreditation of CEM because only the undergraduate programs are accredited.
6. NON-UAF courses taught AT high schools FOR high school students with UAF 100-level
designators—Rainer Suggestion: students taking such must have passed the SOA HS Exit Exams
Discussion on this topic was postponed for the next meeting.

B. NEW Business

1. Proposed motion #1
   
   UAF Faculty Senate re-affirms its policy of I→F after a year and requests Faculty Senate president
to pursue making this OK with the BOR.
   
   The consensus reached after much discussion online is to have existing policy reaffirmed by the
senate. Brian H. will follow up on some of the specific problems that have been raised.
Additional data has been shared from the Registrar, and this will be included in the Faculty
Senate agenda for Monday, October 3.

2. Proposed motion #2:
   
   The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered wholly or in part by distance delivery, and all
existing courses adapted or converted to distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the
Faculty Senate. Furthermore, if the mode of distance delivery changes, then the course must be re-reviewed by the
appropriate committee.

   Modes of distance delivery are those defined by the UA Office of Academic Affairs & Research: Independent
Learning/Correspondence; Audio Conferencing; Video Conferencing; Web Meeting; Live Television/UATV; and
Online/Web Delivered.

   Effective: Spring 2012

   Rationale: The Faculty Senate has primary authority to initiate, develop, review and approve
academic criteria, regulation and policy (Faculty Senate Constitution, Article 1, Section 1). This includes
curriculum review.

   Distance delivery methods are fundamentally different methods of communication than face-to-face
instruction. Effective instruction by distance delivery requires adapting or designing content for new
formats and modes of communication. It cannot be assumed that a course approved for face-to-face
delivery automatically passes review for a different mode of delivery. The structure and content of
courses intended wholly or in part for distance delivery must be separately reviewed.

   This motion applies to all distance delivery courses within UAF, whether listed by an academic
department, a rural campus, or the Center for Distance Education (CDE).

   The committee discussed concerns about the lack of review of courses being converted for
distance delivery. Doug G. noted concerns relating to faculty workloads, and the fact that the
deans are not necessarily aware of what courses are also being offered by distance delivery.

   Dana noted that conversion of entire programs for distance delivery is under discussion. The
senate needs to take note of this while considering courses. He noted the issue of academic drift
where over time courses offered by distance lose their focus and faculty become out of touch
with the courses and their students. There are also issues to be addressed with delivery of core
courses by distance.

   Carrie suggested inviting the CDE director to talk with the committee and provide input on their
procedures and approach to converting courses for distance delivery. It was also noted that
distance courses are being offered by the colleges or schools themselves, outside of CDE
offerings.
Debra mentioned that because of student failure rates, they pulled their developmental courses out of distance delivery. Doug and Dana both mentioned the fact that deans and department chairs may be totally unaware that courses in their units are being offered by distance, and the fact is that faculty can make extra money doing it. They can also earn extra money grading coursework for CDE.

Debra asked if these issues are brought up under the Program Review process, and Dana responded that they’re not, but should be. Pass/fail rates need to be discussed.

Dana reiterated that consideration of converting programs to distance delivery needs to be included in the proposed motion. Doug noted that the motion is broad and there’s the issue to consider of who is administering distance courses and programs – the schools and colleges or CDE. Faculty workload is another significant issue that needs to be looked at.

David noted this motion addresses only new offerings, not existing ones. There was general agreement that synchronous course offerings (e.g., video conference courses) were more positive overall than asynchronous offerings. There are also hybrid issues such as eLive to be considered. It was also generally agreed that departments need to be aware of what courses are being distance delivered. Ongoing communication with every department chair is needed on a regular basis and student outcomes and completion rates need to be examined because of how they’re being affected by distance delivery. Dana encouraged the group to ask Alex Hwu to visit from CDE.
Faculty Affairs Committee  
October 19, 2011 Meeting Minutes

Attendees: 
Bella Gerlich, Ex-officio member  
Ken Abramowicz  
Cecile Lardon  
Chris Fallen  
Karen Gustafson  
Mike Davis, call-in  
Margaret Short  
Andrew Metzger

Proposed revision to faculty activities report (attached) - Presented by Dana Thomas (Vice Provost) and Barbara Taylor (Director of undergraduate research and Scholarly Activity; URSA).
   Proposed changes in response to undergraduate research as a priority and a recognition of the need to track undergraduate research activities – motivation for proposed changes  
   Undergraduate research is an accreditation metric  
   FAC Committee generally supports the idea  
   Wording of Sections 4 and 5 needs to be revised – redundancy in listing undergraduate research  
   Additional discussion items; possible further additions to activity report:  
      Service-based learning activities  
      Distance education learning activities

Appeals and Oversight Committee  
   May, or may not, be beneficial to dissolve this committee  
   Inquiries (informal) about dissolving this committee (Abramowicz); dissolving committee may not be desirable  
   May be possible to improve/ modify committee to have greater impact  
   Further inquiry into committee’s role and products/ activities in rent years – Action Item for next meeting

Promotion for Term Faculty  
   Determine what action(s) if any occurred after last time this was discussed at FAC meeting  
   Engage CRCD to determine their current position and understanding on the issue  
   Contact Jane Weber

Teaching by Non-regular Faculty  
   Metzger taking lead  
   Working with Jennifer Reynolds to secure data from last academic year  
   On-going effort
ANNUAL ACTIVITIES REPORT

Covers the period July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011

Instructions: Respond to each section of this Annual Activities Report as completely as possible. If you have any questions, please consult with your dean or director, or contact the Office of the Provost at 474-5178. This report is to cover the period July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011. Submit the completed report to your dean or director, together with a current CV, no later than October 2.

1. Personal Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Academic Title</th>
<th>Department/Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Workload Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teaching (%)</th>
<th>Research (%)</th>
<th>*Service (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Include management under service.

3. Teaching

Table 3.1: Instructional Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course Name, Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Contact Hours (Lecture &amp; lab, i.e. 3&amp;0)</th>
<th>Students # of</th>
<th>Type†</th>
<th>Shared‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Classroom, studio, laboratory, distance delivery, undergraduate/graduate seminars, new course preparation, independent studies, non-credit educational activities, extension instructional activities, major revision of an older course, and other activities related to curriculum development.

‡ Name(s) of instructors if course is team-taught.

Table 3.2: Student Advising – Graduate and/or Undergraduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type†</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Member of graduate committee, individual advising of graduate students, assigned undergraduate advisees, unassigned undergraduate advisees.

4. Research, Scholarly and other Creative Activities

Table 4.1: Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Published</th>
<th>Citation †</th>
<th>Type‡</th>
<th>Review §</th>
<th>Student Coauthor¶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Clearly reference entry on CV or give proper citation if publication is not listed on CV.

‡ a) Published (i) articles and (ii) technical papers.
   b) Published books, monographs, case, book chapter, book review, conference proceeding.
   c) Completed reports, technical manuals, guides, pamphlets, etc., (e.g., specify if in-house or distributed by some agency other than UAF).
   d) Published abstracts, including publisher, title, and author(s).

   b) On-line, internet, website, etc.

¶ Scholarly, creative, or other.
Table 4.2: Publications IN PRESS
List those publications for which all editorial work is complete; awaiting scheduled publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Student Coauthor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Clearly reference entry on CV or give proper citation if publication is not listed on CV.
2. a) Published (i) articles and (ii) technical papers.
   b) Published books, monographs, case, book chapter, book review, conference proceeding.
   c) Completed reports, technical manuals, guides, pamphlets, etc., (e.g., specify if in-house or distributed by some agency other than UAF).
   d) Published abstracts, including publisher, title, and author(s).
   e) Published reviews, with the complete reference.
   f) Other scholarly publications such as magazine or newspaper articles.
3. e.g. Peer-reviewed, reviewed by editor or board of editors, reviewed by conference committee, reviewed by conference session chair, or other (specify).

* Name and standing of student coauthor

Table 4.3: Professional, Creative Activities
List activities such as performance, exhibits, presentations, audio/video recordings, computer programs, musical compositions, poems, concert performances, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Nature of Activity/Title</th>
<th>Participating Individual(s)</th>
<th>Level of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. If participating individual is a student, indicate undergraduate or graduate student standing
2. International, national, regional, or local

Table 4.4: Sponsored Projects/Commissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Granted &amp; Duration</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>PI/Co-PI?</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Grant Sponsor</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Include names of all the investigators.

Table 4.5: Other Scholarly Work
Either in tabular or narrative form, describe scholarly work in progress. This will include, but is not limited to: proposals pending, proposals in preparation, proposals submitted and denied during review period, manuscripts at all stages up to IN PRESS, unfunded projects/activity.

Table 4.6: Conference/Meeting Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Conference Name</th>
<th>Type of Presentation/Activity</th>
<th>Title of Presentation</th>
<th>Student Co-presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Poster session, round-table, etc.
2. Name and standing of student co-presenter
5. Integration of Teaching and Research

Table 5.1: Graduate Committee Chair: A) Supervision of Thesis, Research/Creative Projects; B) Students with No Thesis or Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Duration¹</th>
<th>Degree Sought</th>
<th>Student Status²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹ Indicate mentoring effort; duration and frequency of student contact, preparation, supervised and unsupervised student effort.
² Active, inactive or graduated (if graduated, indicate date year degree was awarded) and contribution to publication or presentation referenced in part 4, Research, Scholarly and other Creative Activities.

Table 5.2: Graduate Committee Member: A) Supervision of Thesis, Research/Creative Projects; B) Students with No Thesis or Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Duration¹</th>
<th>Degree Sought</th>
<th>Student Status²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹ Indicate mentoring effort; duration and frequency of student contact, preparation, supervised and unsupervised student effort.
² Active, inactive or graduated (if graduated, indicate date year degree was awarded) and contribution to publication or presentation referenced in part 4, Research, Scholarly and other Creative Activities.

Table 5.3: Undergraduate Research Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type¹</th>
<th>Duration²</th>
<th>Student Status³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹ Primary mentor, Co-Mentor, Supporting Mentor or Committee Member.
² Indicate mentoring effort; duration and frequency of student contact, preparation, supervised and unsupervised student effort.
³ Active, inactive or graduated (if graduated, indicate date year degree was awarded) and contribution to publication or presentation referenced in part 4, Research, Scholarly and other Creative Activities.

6. Public, University, and Professional Service

Table 6.1: Public Service¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Your Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹ Public service: in organized, non-remunerative, educational and consultative activities which devolve from a unit member’s professional expertise and further the interests or prestige of the University.

Table 6.2: University Service¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Your role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹ University service: as department head, program director, or governance officer; service on administrative and governance committees; service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office; and other tasks as deemed necessary by the University.

Table 6.3: Professional Service¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Your Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

¹ Professional service: on grant, journal, or accreditation review boards, or as an ad hoc reviewer, in the unit member’s area of expertise; as an officer in a professional society; organizing and/or chairing conferences, symposia, seminars, etc.; teaching short courses, seminars, etc. that are not regular academic courses; editing journals, books, special volumes of papers, etc.
7. **Professional Development.**
   Describe/list activities that contributed to your professional development e.g. continued formal education, workshops, conferences, and fellowships - and indicate how they contributed to your development.

8. **Honors and Awards.**
   List any honors and awards received, including the year in which you received them.

9. **Narrative Self-Evaluation.**
   In each of the following categories which constituted part of your workload in the period covered by the report, briefly assess your own efforts. Focus on your comments on 1) how your effort “made a difference” and 2) frustrations/shortcomings and how you intend to address them.
   - A. Teaching
   - B. Research, Scholarly and Creative Work
   - C. Service

10. **Curriculum Vitae.**
    Please attach a current copy of your curriculum vitae.
Committee on the Status of Women
Minutes Tue, Oct 11, 2011; 2-3 pm, Gruening 718

Members absent: Derek Sikes, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen
Guest present: Sine Anahita

1. Luncheon Report. Oct 4th Tuesday, 12.30-2.30pm, Carol Brown Ballroom, Jane Weber reported: There were 95 attendees at the faculty luncheon – in person and online. From the past years’ experience 90-100 attendees were expected. Kayt mentioned a video recording will be available on the Women's Center blog. Ellen suggested that after the speech, each table should be asked to discuss some problem or issue and collect data. E.g. a question could be discussed, or conduct a short survey, brainstorming on some topic, something that is publishable by CSW. To be discussed in future meetings.

The first Brown bag lunch was held today, Oct 11, 2011 at 1 pm in Gruening 306 on the UAF campus by the Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Women, the Women's and Gender Studies Program, the UAF Women's Center and the Office of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity. The discussion was led by Sine Anahita and Sean Parsons.

3. UAF Statistics on Salary Equity Studies. Jane Weber invited Sine Anahita to discuss the data & statistics prepared by Ian Olson on the salary equity (time in rank, non-retention, etc) studies. Kayt and Sine have started a new website “Towards Equity”, where all this data is available. Data was discussed in details. Melanie has agreed to double check on the data. Dean Johnny Payne suggested that we could focus the data collection on a single college and suggested the following questions for data analysis; What Happened? Why did it happen? How will it happen?’ Kayt suggested that the data from 2005 can be analyzed in the same way as mean, median, mode format. Melanie’s concern was: What can we do as a committee? Since we don’t have direct access to any data? And, do we have a role in changing any policy? Jane reported that the 2005 data was presented to the Deans and Directors and everywhere we could. Large audience was bombarded with the data.

4. Important CSW Meeting Dates:
   November meeting date. Tuesday, Nov 15th 2.00-3.00pm.
   December meeting date. Tuesday, Dec 13th 2.00-3.00pm
   November Brown Bag Lunch date. Friday, Nov 4th 2.00-3.00pm.
   November Brown Bag Meeting date. Monday, Nov 7th 10.30-11.30am.

Meeting was adjourned at 3.00pm;
Respectfully Submitted, Nilima Hullavarad
These minutes are archived on the CSW website: http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/
I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Castellini, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Julie Joly, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Alexandra Oliveira, Channon Price
Absent: Stephen Brown (?)

III. Report from Joy:

After we welcomed our new members, Joy shared that she had a great New Faculty Orientation, with about 20 out of 36 new faculty participating. Joy did three syllabus workshops prior to classes starting and only a total of 10 faculty attended these. The other two workshops since then also had low attendance (Foley and Kenaston). Joy expressed frustration regarding low faculty attendance at development opportunities, so the committee discussed ideas and decided to address the issue this year. One suggestion was to have Provost Henrichs encourage faculty to attend a minimum of 8 faculty development sessions each year (except for tenured, full professors). Another idea was to develop a survey for UAF faculty to gauge their interest levels in upcoming session topics. Once our committee gets the survey ready, Joy will email it out to faculty.

Joy discovered some nice materials during her sabbatical and will give one presentation in November: one on Great Britain’s Teaching Certificate program for university faculty.

IV. New Business:

1. Report on faculty development workshops:

   Kelly was able to attend the first morning of the New Faculty Orientation, and while she enjoyed herself, she did not have any suggestions on how it might be improved.

2. UAF Principle Investigator:

   It was decided that our committee would discuss the Research Advisory Committee’s draft of Frequently Asked Questions via email and then Josef will draft a response to Peter Webley.

3. Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills:

   It was decided that our committee would discuss the possible implementation of this via email as well.

4. Other:
Josef noted that Dana Thomas wants information on Smart Evaluations (electronic evaluations) made available to departments and/or have the FDAI committee look into it. Jayne Harvey had passed this on to Josef but there was some confusion as to exactly what Dana was asking for.

V. Next meeting: Tuesday, October 11, 2011, 4:00 – 5:00 pm, Bunnell 222

VI. Adjourned at 5:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 11, 2011

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 4:04 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Channon Price
Excused: Stephen Brown, Mike Castellini, Julie Joly, Alexandra Oliveira

Discussion: Diane Erickson is still listed as an official member, and since she is still interested in serving on the committee we will ask her to add our next meeting to her calendar. Kelly will talk to her and ask her to join us.

III. Report from Joy:

Joy had an interesting audio conference with United Academics, Statewide Labor Relations, and the Offices of Faculty Development in Anchorage and Juneau. While UAF employs 57 percent of the UNAC faculty and therefore should receive the bulk of faculty development funds, the union has decided to have each campus submit proposals for funding requests for faculty development. Joy did get approval to bring Bob Lucas to UAF in April to present workshops on grant writing. She has also submitted other requests, including funding for new faculty to attend a teaching conference during spring break, and $25,000 for travel. Anchorage has requested funding to bring up a presenter to address the pitfalls of e-learning. UNAC has expressed an interest in bringing up a presenter to address bullying and incivility amongst the faculty, but Joy does not feel that this falls within the parameters of faculty development.

Joy informed us of a 6-part series on Alaska Native Issues and Pedagogy that has already started with only two people participating in the first session. The next session is on October 27. She requested that our committee be more proactive in promoting the presentations offered by the Office of Faculty Development.

Barbara Taylor from the Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Activity (URSA) office did a great presentation today on undergraduate research, but only four faculty attended. In order to discover how faculty would like to have faculty development monies spent, Duff Johnston has volunteered to speak with Cyndee West with UNAC about developing a survey that could be distributed by UNAC to their respective faculty. The survey would also need to be distributed to faculty represented by the University of Alaska Federation of Teachers in order to get feedback from them about faculty development. Items
to include on the survey would be mentoring, travel to conferences that have a specific benefit to faculty, grant writing, proposal writing, publishing, and support for faculty or teaching assistants not educated in the American university system as to what to expect in the American classroom. Duff has experience with this last issue and will discuss it with Cyndee West.

IV. Old Business:

1. Josef Glowa was elected to serve as committee chair.

2. Josef shared our committee’s suggestion at the Administrative Committee meeting that the Provost encourage faculty to attend a minimum of eight faculty development presentations. Some faculty stated that eight was too many.

3. The distribution of the UAF Principle Investigator document should be sent out on the list-serve with a link to the document.

4. Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills – this was tabled for our next meeting.

V. New Business

1. Development of the survey will be on-going. Duff will contact Cyndee West with UNAC to determine their support of implementing a survey to their faculty.

VI. Next meeting: Tuesday, November 15, 2011, 4:00 - 5:00 pm, Bunnell 222

December meeting: Tuesday, December 13, 2011, 10:00 – 11:00 am, Bunnell 222

VII. Adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.
GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate

2011-09-20 Meeting Minutes

Present:
  Voting: Orion Lawlor, Vincent Cee, Elisabeth Nadin, Chung-Sang Ng, Donie Bret-Harte, Lara Horstmann-Dehn
  Ex officio: Timothy Bartholomaus, Anita Hughes, Laura Bender, Larry Duffy
  Visitors: Carol Gering (ED 653 instructor)

Excused: Sue Renes
Absent: Xiong Zhang

Regarding carry over course 115-GNC/CHEM 671, Donie will continue to follow up with the instructor.

Regarding the M. Ed. in Instructional Technology Innovation (GAAC 100-108), a GAAC subcommittee consisting of Vincent, Tim, Orion, and Sue reviewed the updated syllabi for these courses. One brief comment is that “office hours” are implicitly in Alaska standard time: for world-wide students, the time zone should probably be listed explicitly. GAAC welcomes the addition of three synchronous meeting times during the semester for these distance delivered courses, and appreciates the effort the Education department has put into addressing GAAC's concerns. Based on these revisions, GAAC approved GNC 104-108: ED 653, 654, 655, 676, and 677. GAAC also approved the new concentration for M.Ed. in Instructional Technology Innovation.

Regarding GAAC 61-92, the dozens of one credit courses and new certificate in construction management that Bob Perkins is putting together, a subcommittee consisting of Elisabeth, Chung-Sang, and Xiong reviewed the courses. Elisabeth talked with some of the instructors about GAAC's spring 2011 suggestion to renumber the courses. It appears renumbering to the 500 level is not appropriate, because BOR regulations stipulate that such courses cannot be applied to a graduate certificate. However, GAAC still has serious concerns that the courses as described are missing the rigorous journal-level reading and writing of a more typical graduate course. GAAC would also like to see an actual syllabus, including the actual assigned readings and a more detailed schedule. It was also unclear how the repetition for credit would be implemented to be useful for students. Discussions are ongoing, and will continue next meeting.

Regarding example syllabus for "EGG 637", after a few corrections GAAC approved this example syllabus to be posted to the faculty senate website. Lara agreed to prepare a Format 1 for this course by November.

GAAC, acting as the graduate school's curriculum council, approved the proposed LAS 693 special topics course “Data Analysis: Mixed Methods Approach”.

Discussions will continue electronically, but GAAC's next meeting will be Tuesday, October 25, at 3pm.
Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 20, 2011

Attending:
David Maxwell, Curt Szuberla, Alan Morotti, Dana Greci, Cindy Hardy, Amy Barnsley, Sandra Wildfeuer, Sarah Stanley, Diane Erickson, Gabrielle Russell

The committee met and addressed the following:

Meeting times: All of those attending can meet Tuesdays 12:30-2, for at least part of the meeting. Cindy will get together with Jayne to set dates for the semester’s meetings.

Agenda for the year: We brainstormed a list of topics and actions for the year, including continuing work on the learning commons (a subcommittee will meet with library faculty), looking at ways to strengthen advising, looking at the effectiveness of freshman seminars, developing cross curricular support (such as writing across the curriculum), and continued conversation on Sarah’s proposal to record reasons for students receiving Ds or Fs.

Sarah will write up some other ideas she’d like us to address.

We also carried over some discussion from last year:

Re-examining DEVS placement policy to determine when a student would be placed in a study skills class (i.e.: with two DEV placements? As a freshman seminar? As part of orientation?)

Reviewing student success policies that are already in place

Finding ways to support the faculty that teach 100-level classes

Course approval: Diane Erickson presented the course proposal for DEVS 114, Reading in the Humanities and Social Sciences. This course came to us last spring, but Diane asked that we address it in the first meeting of fall, so she could attend the meeting. Right now the course is offered as a special topics course. The committee approved the course unanimously.

Other notes or discussion:
Sandra shared that IAC now has a student success coordinator, Robin Brooks.

Dianne Erickson asked how we relate to the new Alaska Performance Scholarship.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Oct 10, 12:30-2pm