AGENDA
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #154
Monday, November 10, 2008
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1:00 I Call to Order – Marsha Sousa 5 Min.
A. Roll Call
B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #153
C. Adoption of Agenda

1:05 II Status of Chancellor’s Office Actions 5 Min.
A. Motions Approved:
   1. Motion to approve a Graduate Certificate in Statistics.
B. Motions Disapproved: none

1:10 III Public Comments/Questions 5 Min.

1:15 IV A. President’s Comments – Marsha Sousa 10 Min.
B. President-Elect’s Report – Jonathan Dehn 5 Min.

1:30 V A. Chancellor’s Comments – Brian Rogers 10 Min.

1:40 VI Guest Speakers
A. Tran Smyth: Honors House Retrofit Project 10 Min.

2:00 BREAK

2:10 VII Governance Reports 10 Min.
A. Staff Council – Juella Sparks
B. ASUAF – Brandon Meston
C. UAFT/UNAC

2:20 VIII New Business 10 Min.
A. Motion to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for Anthropology,
   submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 154/1)
2:30 IX Committee Reports 15 Min.
A. Curricular Affairs – Amber Thomas / Falk Huettmann (Attachment 154/2)
B. Faculty Affairs – Cathy Cahill (Attachment 154/3)
C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar (Attachment 154/4)
D. Committee on the Status of Women – Alex Fitts / Jane Weber
   (Attachment 154/5)
E. Core Review - Michael Harris / Latrice Bowman
F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry
G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – James Bicigo
H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Dana Greci /
   Julie Lurman Joly (Attachment 154/6)
I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Ron Barry
J. Student Academic Development & Achievement - Cindy Hardy / Joe Mason
   (Attachment 154/7)

2:45 X Members' Comments/Questions 5 Min.

2:50 XI Adjournment
The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Department of Anthropology.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately
Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the Department of Anthropology for review. The unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.
Minutes approved from Oct. 6th

Notification from Dana: Change in Honors is expected to arrive in November.

‘Degree Requirements 1991’ were handed out to all participants.

Upcoming Core Curriculum can be labeled as “Core Revitalization & Assessment Committee (CRAC)”

Dana will circulate names of the 13 Members of CRAC.

Expectations and outcome of Core Review got discussed in the light of previous experience and UAF-specific features (e.g. team work for students, inclusion of freshman year experience, native culture requirement option, digitization, Globalization).

Rainer: Courses to take were following philosophy of “Breadth vs. Depth” Science (sensu Paul Reichardt).

Dana: Suggested to set the overall framework first, and then define what courses are required for students to achieve the goal.

Carol: Question about specialty accreditation such as ABET, Business, Society of American Foresters, Education, etc and how its maintenance is assured, regarding students fulfilling core requirements and specialty requirements within a reasonable amount of time.

Rainer: Anchorage core differs from UAF core which differs from the Colleges. Transfer Guide makes sure how to transfer it directly.

The Intent of the Core Review 1991 and purpose of changes made at that time: A book exists on the underlying Philosophy and why and how it was done.

Carrie: Is there any Student Input in the Core Review?

Seta: Was outside, as well as employer input, taken into account?

Dana: Purpose of Core Curriculum is bigger than Baccalaureate, and getting a job; growing mind and personal growth matters, too.

Falk: The Core Review offers a great opportunity to place UAF higher in the national/international University ranking and profile. It shapes our image and profile for years to come.
Amber: Will this review affect, or not affect, the funding to the Depts? It should not affect hiring and positions.

Dana: Core Changes 1991 resulted into 41 new positions. However, funding discussions are closely related to a Core Review.

Review of General Interdisciplinary Studies Degree submitted by Dana. Document was discussed and clarified.

A Degree Completion approach: is it wanted by UAF, e.g. civic engagement?

Carol: Do we want numbers or quality? Should the degree be renamed?

Amber: Speaking in support of a wider degree, and as an alternative to the specific and narrow degree.

Dana: It’s not a new degree but just an option.

Linda: Is it a B.A. or B.Sc.?

Topic will be put on the agenda at the next meeting, Nov. 17th
Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes of Meeting on October 3, 2008

Committee Members Present: Ken Barrick, Marion Bret-Harte, Cathy Cahill, Anne Christie, Mike Davis (via phone), Kenan Hazirbaba, Meibing Jin, Diane McEachern (via phone), Jennifer Reynolds and Roger Smith

Cathy Cahill elected chair of the committee.

A preliminary list of topics to be addressed by the committee this year includes:

- ORP
- Redistribution of Faculty Senate members
- Formation of a Faculty Senate research advisory committee
- Digital Measures
- Temporary and Adjunct Faculty issues
- Legislative Affairs
- Gmail
- Candidate forums
- Open promotion/tenure committees
- Alternative to university-wide promotion/tenure review process

The committee will prioritize their efforts and identify points of contact for all these issues during the next meeting, October 24, 2008, at 2:15 PM in the Runcorn Room in the Reichardt Building.

Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes of Meeting on October 24, 2008

Committee Members Present: Ken Barrick, Marion Bret-Harte, Cathy Cahill, Anne Christie (via phone), Maureen Hogan (via phone), Marla Lowder, Diane McEachern (via phone), and Jennifer Reynolds

The committee examined the preliminary list of topics generated during the last meeting and identified the topics that the committee needs to address. Committee members were chosen to lead the committee’s efforts towards resolving those topics. The following list summarizes the status of each topic and the committee member leading the effort. However, several committee members were not present so the committee members leading each effort are not complete.

- ORP – This is a union issue so we wish to have union leadership address the Faculty Senate ASAP about the status of this issue.

- Redistribution of Faculty Senate members – Anne Christie and Marla Lowder are leading this effort. We are waiting for data from the Provost.

- Formation of a Faculty Senate research advisory committee – Marion Bret-Harte and ? are leading this effort. They will examine ways to make this committee an effective means for communicating research issues and opportunities between faculty and administration.
Digital Measures – Jennifer Reynolds and Maureen Hogan are leading this effort. They are building upon last year’s committee’s efforts to determine if the issues raised about this software have been satisfactorily resolved or if other means of collecting the required information are better suited for use at UAF.

Temporary and Adjunct Faculty issues – Ken Barrick is leading this effort. He will build upon the efforts of last year’s committee’s efforts and approach Deans and Administrative Assistants to get better data about the use of these faculty members for meeting departmental teaching requirements.

Legislative Affairs – Mike Davis is leading this effort. Staff Council and ASUAF are interested in this topic and would like to work with Faculty Senate to improve our communication with the Alaska State Legislature. Therefore, we would like to invite members of both organizations to attend the next Faculty Affairs meeting and get any information they have already generated. This was identified as an urgent issue.

Gmail – Fait accompli. We do not have any say in this. If training faculty to use the system becomes a problem, we will step in to try to improve training.

Candidate forums – Already organized so we do not need to do anything on this topic.

Open promotion/tenure committees – Memo was sent to administrative units encouraging open promotion/tenure committees. A copy of the memo is attached below. We will arrange to have the memo linked to the Provost’s web page and sent to all faculty.

Alternative to university-wide promotion/tenure review process – Due to time limitations, this topic will be discussed at our next meeting. Before breaking, the consensus was that this topic is tough. We wish to pull in another Faculty Senate member, who has been on the University-Wide Promotion and Tenure committee, in to talk about the workload associated with this committee.

The next meeting will be, November 7, 2008, at 2:15 PM in the Runcorn Room in the Reichardt Building.

***************************************************************

October 20, 2008

To: Marsha Sousa, President, and Faculty Senate
    Jon Dehn, President-Elect, Faculty Senate

From: Cathy Cahill, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

Re: Open Tenure and Promotion Committees

The Faculty Affairs Committee believes it is an important right of faculty members to be able to witness the evaluation of their Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review files. To promote the use of open meetings, we would like to remind all Faculty Review Committees that the Faculty Senate passed a resolution (included below) during UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #146 that encourages open Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review meetings. Therefore, the Faculty Affairs Committee requests that you remind all Faculty Review Committees of this resolution.

Thank you.

RESOLUTION
WHEREAS the members of Faculty Committees are called upon under the concept of shared governance to provide professional review of other faculty candidates undergoing Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Review (Pre and Post-tenure),

WHEREAS the faculty portion of the review process must be fair and reasonable in order to maintain the reputation of the University, and the integrity of the academic process,

WHEREAS open and transparent Committee deliberations facilitate fair and reasonable review,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly requests that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an “open” meeting, and that “mandatory closed” meetings be avoided, including during the 2007-08 review cycle.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty Committee meetings are “open” at the request of a candidate and are consistent with all other relevant UAF rules and procedures.

2. Open meetings provide strong incentives for fair and reasonable review, including the oversight of the candidate.

3. The Committee can query a candidate for clarification of the file, which will greatly reduce the number of false assumptions and errors during deliberation.

4. Open meetings are educational—candidates who opt to attend their review have the opportunity to learn about academic traditions and practices.

5. Attendance can reduce candidates' anxiety, and make them feel like a part of the process.
Unit Criteria Meeting Minutes
22 October 2008

Attending:
Brenda Konar (chair)
John Heaton
Sonja Koukel
Jing Zhang

Anthropology:
These criteria are currently approved and posted on the Provost web site. The committee and the Provost have given their approval of these criteria.

Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station:

Title Page: Agriculture is spelled wrong

Teaching:
-under Effectiveness in Teaching: instead of “will demonstrate some, but not necessarily all, of the following characteristics in an individual year”.. should be more specific “will demonstrate characteristics pertinent to their workload assignment.”
-Combine F and K. They are very similar.
-Combine C and L. They are very similar.
-H. How is effective advising and mentoring measured?
- The Provost would like to see some gradation between the ranks. “Excellence” is usually reserved for the Professor rank. “High quality”, “highly competent”, or other similar descriptions are usually used at the lower ranks.

Research:
-Components of Research: Section A is very similar to sections N and O. These should be combined.
-The last sentence in Section A seems to negate everything that comes after. An outside examiner may have a hard time with these criteria based on this last sentence.
-Typo in Assistant Professor section. Should read “establish a viable…”
-Associate Professor description. Some clarification needed. Remove the words appropriate, important, and primary. If these are left in, they need to be better described, i.e. what is primary versus secondary literature? What is appropriate versus non-appropriate. The last sentence is vague and perhaps redundant. If the individual were completing the first two points, wouldn’t the third point naturally happen? How else would independence and leadership be measured? We suggest eliminating the final sentence.
-Professor description. Remove “important”. We suggest that “several” be defined. Also, shorten the second sentence. Change “important, senior authored publications in the refereed professional literature” to “first authored peer-reviewed publications”. The last sentence is vague and redundant to previous statements. We suggest removing the final sentence.
-The Provost also would like you to avoid “important” in the description of the Associate Professor (important to whom?) and substitute “high quality”. Also, some units allow papers to be first authored by graduate students with the mentor as the last author to count like a senior authored paper. This is a SNRAS decision.
-The Provost also would like “several” to be better defined in the Professor description. “Several” can be as few as three. That is well below the standard practiced by most of the science/engineering units. You might qualify this, eg “several” if teaching workload exceeds 60%; more if teaching workload is less than 60%.
Service:
- Strike the last sentence in Criteria for Public Service. This is redundant.
- The added section in 1. Public Service is redundant. We suggest it be removed.
- F, L, and O all talk about consulting. Combine.
- M, N and H seem similar, either combine or clarify.
- Were D and E moved? This is part of the standard template. It should remain where it is.
- K and Q are similar, either clarify or combine.
- Pg. 9, #3. Professional Service. Combine D & E with B, as holding these positions would constitute active participation in professional organizations.
- Pg. 10, #4. Associate Professor. Remove "Important" and "Effective" or define terms.
- Professor. Same notation as above.

NEXT MEETING: Nov 17 in 214 ONL from 1-2.
Math and Sciences will be reviewed.
Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station will be reviewed if they are resubmitted.
CSW Committee Meeting Minutes
14 October 2008, Tuesday

Present: Elizabeth Allman, Diane Wagner, Renate Wackerbauer, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Alex Fitts, Cindy Hardy, Kayt Sunwood, Carol Gold, Jane Weber, and Uma Bhatt

1) Luncheon Debrief
- addressed comments about change of time/place
- over 90 attendees; letter to catering to fix problems
- brainstorming for speaker for 2009

2) Brown Bag lunches
- Sept 9 Networking, Debrief? Kayt did a great job moderating. 25 people attended.
- Oct 21, 2008 Balancing Act
- Working on having November Brown Bag on West Ridge, Nov 25th Tuesday, Try to get Runcorn room or 501 IARC, 1-2 Uma try to book 501 today.
- Some people wanted a listserv, or a mechanism to send emails. Discuss this at next meeting.

3) Meeting with Chancellor Rogers on Thursday 3-4 in Gruening 718 - 5 of us can attend. What will we discuss with him?
   A) Family friendly policies,
   B) need to make sure women faculty are put on committees,
   C) quarter time Associate Provost for women's issues Martha West said that women get equal pay when someone is watching, This person would help with recruiting etc., Use a strategy that would get us what we want.
   D) Small number of full professors,
   E) Why do we have so many term faculty? So many are women?
   F) Give him a copy of the Faculty Worklife report,
   G) Thanks for coming to the luncheon,
   H) Partner hires.

4) Listserv, Jayne in Governance set up a listserv for this group.

5) UAF Family Friendly Task Force: Diane gave an update. Chancellor Rogers has established the task force and charged it with recommending actions that will make UAF a more family friendly employer and educational institution. First order of business is childcare. No date has been set for the first meeting.

6) Action plan: Discussion for next meeting. Bring your ideas for next meeting. Mentoring for women may be a good item since this has been requested.

7) AWHE, Alaska Women in Higher Education - Joy would like the president to be from UAF.


Uma S. Bhatt, Assoc. Professor, Dept. of Atmospheric Sciences
tel: (907) 474-2662 fax: (907) 474-2643
bhatt@gi.alaska.edu
Faculty Development & Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 7, 2008

Dana called the meeting to order at 8:15 am.

Attending: Larry Roberts, Link Olson, Josef Glowa, Layne Smith, Joy Morrison, Channon Price, Michael Daku, Julie Joly, Marji Illingworth, Xiyu (Thomas) Zhou, and Dana Greci; Susan Herman joined at 8:25 am; Joy had to leave at 8:50 a.m.

There were no new minutes to approve.

Upcoming Meetings
The FDAI Committee will meet from 8:15-9:15 a.m. on, Nov 4, and Dec 2. Additional meetings may be scheduled as needed.

Joy’s Update
- Joy reported that Ken Bain’s presentation/ workshop on September 12 was very successful. Many faculty from UAF and from around the state attended, in addition to some graduate students from Anchorage. Joy invited Ken Bain over a year ago, after she had read Professor Bain’s widely discussed teaching textbook *What the Best College Teachers Do* (2004 Harvard University Press). The presentation was captured on stream (mms://catstream2.cat.uaf.edu/bain), and a DVD is available, too.

- Joy pointed out that 201 O’Neill at Vera Alexander Learning Center, West Ridge, is an ideal venue for doing workshops. Dan Foley did his last workshop on Thursday, October 2: "Working with 'challenging' students." The presentation could be watched on webcam. And on Tuesday, October 7, Dean James Huessman and the library faculty discussed all the services available to faculty through the different libraries on campus. Going to URL137.229.40.201 and clicking on Single may access the webcam. Feedback on Don Foley’s was very positive. Mike asked if future faculty forums could be held there. In response, Joy pointed out that classes end at 1 p.m. and resume at exactly 2 p.m., so it could be a bit disruptive at the beginning and end of a workshop.

- The next topic was Provost Susan Henrichs' luncheon and informal survey about faculty development. Altogether there will be four luncheons, two luncheons for new faculty, and two luncheons for second and more years of service. The first luncheon is scheduled for Wednesday, October 22 - 1:00-2:00 p.m., or alternatively, Friday, October 24 - 12:00-1:00 p.m. This is for new faculty who were hired in the 2007/2008 academic year. The Provost wants to hear from new faculty as to how they benefit from the faculty development workshops that Joy has scheduled. The event will take place in the Signers' Hall Room 330. An audio conference is also set up for those outside Fairbanks to call in.

- Seven faculty member will attend the EDUCAUSE 2008 Annual Conference, a top instructional technology event in higher education, October 28–31 in Orlando, Florida. OIT brought this conference to the attention of FDAI.

- Congratulations to Susan Hurley-Glowa for organizing a series of engaging social events for the new faculty during September and October.
Thursday, October 16, there will be a mentoring luncheon at the Wood Center, Rooms E/F for new faculty and their mentors. Joy mentioned that Eric Heyne had put together some 20 questions relevant to mentoring. By appropriating these questions, she will review guidelines for mentoring.

Concerned teaching observations: more than 30 new teaching faculty were hired this year. Roy Roehl has been given the task to work with new faculty, visit their classes and observe their teaching during their first year. Susan Herman wondered, if or how the information on teaching was shared. Joy responded that Roy would share his observations with Joy, and if need be, Joy would meet with the observed faculty member in order to make suggestions.

Old & New Business

Dana reviewed the members of the sub-committees to make sure everyone was on the right one. It was agreed upon that sub-committees should meet at least once between the meetings of the FDAI.

Joy suggested we should continue our discussion about possibly developing a mentoring template, if we think we need one.

It was suggested that the Provost should be invited to meet with the whole committee. Dana will call Doris Nichols in order to arrange a meeting for November 4.

Marji proposed a back-up plan. If Susan Henrichs was not able to come to the committee, an individual should meet with her. (In the meantime, Dana reported that the November 4 meeting with the Provost will work out.) As another back up, Mike suggested to invite Roy to our meeting to talk about teaching.

Status and current make-up of the committees:
Faculty Peer Assessment: Christie, Dana, Julie, Channon, Link
Provost Faculty Forums: Larry, Michael, Marji.
Lily Adult Learning Institute: Larry, Susan.
Generating Activity Reports: Link.
Developing a Mentoring Form Template: Joy, Susan

There is no work for the Generating Activity Report committee right now. It is on hold.
Mike and Channon suggested that Josef should join Faculty Forum Committee.
There were no reports by the sub-committees.
Channon asked if there were any resources available to help the FDAI with its work. He further suggested that Susan Henrichs should share her plans regarding future early faculty development program with the FDAI. Perhaps faculty beyond their fourth year should also participate in faculty development.
Larry will provide more information on Lily conference, March 4-6, 2009.

Next Meeting
The next FDAI meeting will be November 4 from 8:15-9:15 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted on October 11, 2008
Josef Glowa, Recorder
Meeting Minutes
Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
October 2, 2008

Attending: Joe Dupras, Curt Szuberla, Cindy Hardy, Dana Greci, Marji Illingworth, Nancy Ayagarak

The committee met and addressed the following:

Mandatory Placement updates:

We updated returning committee member Joe Dupras on the process that led to the implementation of mandatory placement. He requested data on the effectiveness of placement tests as predictors.

We also addressed a proposal on including a writing sample in writing placement, forwarded from the Department of Developmental Education. We made language changes in the proposal and forwarded it as a draft to the Developmental Education Curriculum committee and the English Department Composition committee. We will be crafting this as a motion to forward to the Senate after input from the departments involved.

We then addressed the issue of reading placement, especially as it concerns student placement into core classes. We have forwarded a memo on this to the core Review committee, but have gotten little response. They seem unclear about how to proceed with this. We agreed that we should have reading levels as a prerequisite for core classes, but that a place to start is with reading levels for English 111. We will review the ACT reading cut scores in the next meeting and go to the departments with the suggested cutoffs. Cindy will take the memo to the next Administrative committee meeting.

Cross-Regional Catalogs:

These are out. Are they available on line? Cindy will ask Linda Hapsmith.

Next meeting: Friday, October 24, 2:15-3:30pm.

Meeting Minutes
SADA Committee
10/24/08

Attendees: Joe Mason, Ron Illingworth, Brian Rasley, Jane Allen, Jo Dupras, Dana Greci, Cindy Hardy, Nancy Ayagarak, Linda Hapsmith, Stephanie Lewis (Sun-Star reporter).

The committee met and discussed the following:

Course approvals: The committee received New Course and Major course change paperwork for DEVS111 and 112 and DEVE109. We also discussed that DEVE060/070 will have title changes: Preparatory College Writing I and II and that DEVE109 will be Preparatory College Writing III, and it is roughly equivalent to DEVS104. Since these courses came to us late in the week and not everyone was able to follow the weblink, we could not consider these in depth. In general the committee was supportive of these courses and changes. Cindy will e-mail the link to the forms and will bring the courses forward after questions on DEVS111/112 are addressed.
Writing Sample motion (DRAFT attached):

The committee discussed the best way to include a writing sample in Mandatory Placement Policy. We referred to both the Mandatory placement policy passed by the Faculty Senate in the Spring of 2006 and the revision to catalog language passed last February. There was some discussion about which was the best strategy and about the history of the two motions. After much discussion, the committee decided to forward an amendment to the policy motion, and work through the departmental curriculum committees (DEV Education and English) to propose catalog changes. Rural campus faculty made a strong case for keeping language about referring to GPS for writing placement, for students who do not test well. The committee also agreed to recommend that language specifying test scores in the catalog be replaced with a chart that shows placement scores for the various tests used for placement.

Reading placement:

The committee received a summary of ACT reading cut scores for student success in a series for core and DEV classes. We began discussion of whether to add reading placement as an amendment to the Mandatory Placement motion (above) or to forward a separate motion. Time was short, and we decided to postpone full discussion until our next meeting, when Marji Illingworth will be able to attend and add her expertise.

Next meeting: Thursday, November 20, 1-2:30