I Call to Order – Marsha Sousa

Faculty Senate President Marsha Sousa called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present:</th>
<th>Members Absent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abramowicz, Ken</td>
<td>Barrick, Ken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Jane (KUC)</td>
<td>Bret-Harte, Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Carrie</td>
<td>Hazirbaba, Kenan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barboza, Perry</td>
<td>Heaton, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry, Ron</td>
<td>Illingworth, Marjorie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogosyan, Seta</td>
<td>Jin, Meibing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahill, Cathy</td>
<td>Little, Joe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie, Anne</td>
<td>Liang, Jingjing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Mike (BBC)</td>
<td>Newberry, Rainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehn, Jonathan</td>
<td>Zhang, Jing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan, Maureen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huettmann, Falk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konar, Brenda</td>
<td>John Blake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koukel, Sonja (Juneau CES)</td>
<td>Abel Bult-Ito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard, Beth</td>
<td>Doug Goering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowder, Marla</td>
<td>Josef Glowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEachern, Diane (KUC)</td>
<td>Dana Greci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses, Debra</td>
<td>Cindy Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter, Ben</td>
<td>Linda Hapsmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaLonde, Ray</td>
<td>Joanne Healy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds, Jennifer</td>
<td>Susan Henrichs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sousa, Marsha</td>
<td>Eric Madsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Amber</td>
<td>Joy Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, Jane</td>
<td>Lael Oldmixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pat Pitney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Stickel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juella Sparks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dana Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denise Wartes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #154

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:
   1. Motion to affirm the Unit Criteria for the Department of Anthropology.

B. Motions Disapproved: none

III Public Comments

Dana Thomas addressed the Senate regarding the Mandatory Placement Policy motion to be discussed later in the meeting today. Wording in the motion includes Accuplacer, a placement test that is replacing the Compass test. Whenever a course is mentioned in the motion, there is a need to include the “F” designator for Fairbanks. [These additions were made to the motion as friendly amendments on the Senate floor.]

The Core Revitalization Committee and Assessment Group are looking at major learning outcomes, and not at specific core courses. They will bring a recommendation before the Senate at the April 09 meeting. Six committee members are going to national meetings to learn about addressing core and general ed requirements. He’s encouraged those six members to meet with their deans and directors at department meetings (their names were read at the last Senate meeting and are listed in those minutes). He hopes that all departments are hearing from their representatives on the committee; and their input is welcomed.

One of the recommendations from the interim chancellor’s transition teams was that there be improvement to the quality of advising. After consultation with the Administrative Committee, he’s formed an ad hoc committee to provide a draft list of recommendations to improve advising (due by March 31) and a final list that’s due by December 31, 2009. Input for the recommendations is invited. Email Dana with any suggestions (ffdlt@uaf.edu). Jayne will have a copy of the list of participants on the ad hoc committee.

Jane W. asked who on the committee represents CRCD. Dana gave her the names of Dana Greci (though she may have time conflicts) and Mike Swanson.
A student regent for ASUAF is needed to represent UAF. They’re holding a new election. RA’s and graduate students as well as student employees are eligible to be student regents. Students in paid positions can’t vote on the budget, but would be able to vote on other items. Send the students to ASUAF; or to Marsha or Jon and they’ll forward to Brandon Meston or Adrian Triebel.

The Juneau situation will be discussed with Jon Dehn’s remarks.

At the last meeting, clarification was needed regarding teacher evaluations that are taking place for new faculty – these are voluntary evaluations, using tools which include a pre-evaluation conversation with the new person to talk about what the evaluation will cover. These can be put in the file or not – it is the faculty’s own choice. Peer evaluations are still encouraged. The current tool being used is great for lecture, but not other types of teaching approaches. The FDAI committee continues to work on finding ways to do good peer evaluations. They’ve developed one that addresses the lecture format, so far.

Susan H. commented that the evaluations came out of the provost’s forum on teaching held several years back when Paul Reichardt was provost. The current evaluations being done are formative, not anything that is intended as formal. Josef Glowa (of FDAI) mentioned the wording on the form will be changed to peer teaching observation, rather than evaluation.

B. President-Elect's Report – Jonathan Dehn

Juneau drama continues with regard to the abrupt reassignment of the UAS Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences Pat Brown. The Juneau Empire today told how the UAS chancellor at Juneau has vetoed all motions put forward by their Senate with regard to the role of shared governance. A petition is being circulated among the UAS faculty (to go to the president) saying there is no confidence in the interim provost and chancellor at UAS. Terms used included, “reign in the Senates to executive authority.” The use of plural “Senates” is a real concern. Jon asks Senate members to follow this carefully.

Marsha commented that the UAS chancellor has stated that their Senate’s constitution is not that strong and that’s why he can veto the actions they’re requesting which are outside their authority. Faculty Alliance is going to look at the constitutions to compare them.

Jane W. asked about the UAF Faculty Senate doing a resolution of support for them. Jennifer R. commented they need more details about their situation to do that, though she likes the sentiment. Amber T. commented about the need for faculty to stick together and that we need to be deeply concerned about the administration taking over in that manner. She doesn’t know what their suggested actions were from that Senate, but she feels it’s in our best interests to offer a vote of confidence to those faculty and give our administration a message that we won’t stand for those kinds of actions here at UAF (not that we’re concerned about that happening here). Marsha wants to talk more with Juneau on Friday at the Alliance meeting. They want to draft something soon, after the Friday meeting. Jane W. feels it should be this semester. Amber says she’d be available to help draft a letter after
Thursday. Alliance meets this Friday afternoon. The four would write it and circulate it widely after putting it together.

V A. Chancellor’s Comments – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers remarked on the economic situation and how it affects UAF. PERS and TERS and ORP rates for coming years are all affected, as are many scholarships. The price of oil has a dramatic impact on the state’s budget, as well. With oil below $40/barrel, it will be interesting to see what the Governor will do. She’ll release the budget next Monday in Juneau.

The good news is that the last legislature topped off every saving account we have; and the constitutional budget reserve is at an all time high. Oil has dropped $110 dollars in four months. So, he expects the legislature to utilize the reserve in these circumstances. He expects the operating budget to be lean; but that we’ll be one of the 10 states where there aren’t cuts for higher education next year. Our fixed costs probably won’t be covered, so that will require reallocation at the school and college level to cover them. State compensation funding for raises should happen if it’s general fund; non-general fund pay raises will not be covered. For every dollar in pay raises we’ll get about sixty cents in the governor’s budget. The Governor will probably pick one or two priority areas that she will fund with new money, and he hopes one will be the CES energy money that was vetoed last year.

On the capital budget side, oil prices should rebound by the spring. If that’s the case, we’ll see a tiny capital budget now. But it will get bigger in the spring. Deferred maintenance should be covered at least, right now. Other capital budget items may be covered -- perhaps in the spring.

With state funding down, university earnings down, and endowment/foundation earnings down, it’s very challenging. He met last month with the New York Life Foundation who gave $450,000 over three years for the Alaska Summer Research Academy and the Rural Alaska Honors Institute. The program director told him that a week later they couldn’t have made the gift for these programs as their budget got cut.

We don’t know what the new Obama administration will do with an economic stimulus package and what that will mean for higher ed. Economists say that if you want to get money into the economy quickly, do it with foods stamps, unemployment insurance, and student tuition – so if this avenue is chosen, it could be favorable to students and Alaska higher ed. California and Washington are turning away students.

Word went out last Friday about our participation with the Phase V Federal Demonstration Partnership project. This project’s aim is to let PI’s spend more time on research and reduce the administrative burden on them.
Susan’s remarked about the Fairbanks BOR meeting on Dec. 1 and 2. No fireworks or controversial issues arose. The stock market losses have affected the liquid account of the university (from tuition revenue and other sources) which are invested before use. Income from that account helps fund statewide operations. Endowment funds have been affected as well – they are down 30-40 percent, as are most investments around the nation. About half the funds have lost principal and we won’t be able to offer many scholarships due to this. Discretionary funding will also be impacted.

The Academic Master Plan is a topic on the agenda. With regard to that, SAC and RAC will work together to develop a plan for the development of programs, focusing primarily on academics across the system. The charge for this will be discussed later today in this meeting.

Another proposed item from the President’s office to SAC is for a policy regarding the review of requests from programs and departments who seek new or renewed accreditation. It’s more intrusive than what we’re used to in terms of a statewide group; but the reason is because statewide is concerned that in a few unusual cases, accreditation may be used by an institution to duplicate programs that exist elsewhere which we can’t afford. She feels that in most cases it would be a benign review and not affect ability to be reviewed for accreditation. The focus would be mostly on new accreditations, to justify them if a similar accredited program already exists. It’s a proposal before SAC that hasn’t been acted on yet – please give her feedback on it. She’ll be leaving early today for another meeting.

Ken A. asked about invested funds for tuition. Are we going to feel a budgetary effect this year? Brian says yes, we’ll be feeling it right away. Short term cash is invested on a daily, weekly, monthly basis. Over 130 million dollars was in investment, a portion of that in very short-term investments. With the change of the capital markets in the fall, the intermediate term investments lost about 8%. In past years, investments have meant more money has been generated. Statewide now doesn’t have flexible money to give out to address specific needs as they’ve done in the past; their budget calls for them to earn and be able to spend 3 million dollars, but as of today they’re at -4 million; so they’ve got to earn back 7 million over the course of the year which isn’t feasible. Based on our carryforward funds, UAF must reserve 8% now (and this won’t be passed on to UAF units/departments). Effectively, we’ve got little contingent funds to address new problems that could arise. We’re down 1.7 million in contingency funding.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Juella Sparks

Nov. 12 was the last meeting, and they’ll meet this Friday. They’ve done their elections and new members will take their chairs in late January. Discussed at the last meeting were the following:

- Health care benefits and concerns about prescription pricing and rising costs.
- Staff compensation talked about; a 4.5% grid increase for staff next spring. Merit based step increases were talked about.
- Non-retention process.
- Progress made on the staff handbook. HR interim director brainstormed with them about that, which was a very positive direction.
- Staff Development Day – had looked at modeling this after UAA, but have since talked to Scott McCrea, and are now looking at combining these efforts with a Community Service Day, a new staff orientation, and a training/development combination.

B. ASUAF – Brandon Meston

No one present to speak. Chancellor mentioned the student regent position being re-elected. They need strong candidates, especially from UAF. Any full time student is eligible including graduate students.

C. UAFT/UNAC

Abel was present for UNAC. He mentioned the letter regarding the request that the unions sent to statewide administration about underfunding the ORP contributions (in attachment six for Faculty Affairs). Legal counsel for UNAC has sent a letter to identify all faculty affected by underfunding of ORP. UNAC has not heard back yet from statewide. All affected members are working together. There’s a form that can be filled out and dropped off at the UNAC office to become an official part of this ORP-I matter. The more who sign up, the more effective this effort will be.

Jane W. says if you’re in UAFT, call her or the Anchorage office if you’d like to join the union effort taking place that Abel mentioned.

Abel mentioned he wants to visit faculty at their departments to start talking about union issues that they feel should be addressed. He wants to open up a dialog.

VII Guest Speaker

A. Pat Pitney, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services

Pat shared her initial goals for Administrative Services, and her philosophies of what she’d like implemented in Administrative Services.

She thanked Jon D. for discussing some faculty issues with her previously that are related to administration; and she thanked the Chancellor for inviting her to the position. She is from Fairbanks; has lived here 20 years. All her professional life is with the university at the statewide level. Now she can see what statewide has put in place and how it’s affecting the campus level.

In terms of the priority goals:
1. Rationalizing the budget process to align with academic instruction, research and service, to take limited resources and put them where everyone can be the most productive. Show performance and productivity and accountability. Performance based budgeting is something she believes in. It gives us the ability to talk about our budgeting in terms of what we accomplish. The budget development and request processes are under discussion with the Provost, as well as the budget distribution process. She wants principles and overarching philosophies established so that people can know what their revenue drivers are, what their costs are and how to control both sides of that equation.

2. Customer Service level at Admin. Services. People have described how it’s been more of a roadblock rather than facilitator. She wants more working groups and task forces to get people on all sides, both faculty, staff as well as administration, talking about the constraints. Many roadblocks are compliance related. The front line takes the fall at Administrative Services, and it results in creation of more rules, and more and more rules, usually because one dean has been abusive of the rules. She doesn’t want to continue this habit of putting in more hoops for people to go through because of past abuses of the system. She wants marked improvement by next year of processes and working relationships.

3. New facilities. Chancellor Rogers mentioned the capital requests for the Life Sciences and the Engineering Research building and expansion planning funds. Life Sci is a $102 million facility; and we are indebted for $20.6 million which has to come from revenues we earn – largely indirect cost recovery. This will take funding reallocation to cover in the near term for the first few years. We’ve committed to funding (or bond) $15.6 million from UAF funds on the engineering building, which is a $31.2 million facility. Financing plans are necessary. Not funding our commitments to the facilities would mean continuing to see our research and indirect cost recovery revenue being flat. We’ll communicate to statewide and to the state that when we commit UAF funds to these facilities we don’t have that revenue to fund operations. That revenue to fund operations has been a significant source. Talking about $2.7 million on a $26 million ICR base. $2.7 million is a big-ticket item in the institution. Once we have the facilities, our overall research revenue and indirect cost recovery revenue will grow. But we must get to the building and occupation of these facilities first.

She agrees with the Chancellor’s three principles: 1.) about putting people first: faculty, staff and students. They work heavily with staff in the departments. This supports faculty and students, too; 2.) engaging the community – by serving you; 3.) taking responsible action: there’s been rightful criticism in the past that things get stalled at Administrative Services, so they’re taking the approach of taking action, and if it’s done wrong, we’re better off than doing nothing. It’s still a move forward.

She would like some feedback on what decision areas they feel in the past have been done without involvement of faculty. She asked for high points.

Cathy C. spoke up about FAC’s discussions regarding decisions being made in the summer months when faculty are off contract. Or using faculty as guinea pigs by perhaps doing a
quick survey and calling that ‘faculty input.’ Faculty opinions are not sought in a strong cohesive manner or through a formal process. Cathy gave the examples of Gmail, and the move to an online bookstore. If decisions impact students, faculty or staff, or teaching, research and service, then involve us in the decisions. Faculty need to be made aware and a part of the process. It’s a communication issue. Another issue is the ORP underfunding which impacts a good number of faculty.

Ron B. asked about the new HR director hire. Pat mentioned that Juella Sparks and Marsha S. were named to the screening committee. Ron suggests collecting from faculty some information about HR processes. Amber T. mentioned the four hires in CLA; noting the ever-changing process of hiring over the past four years and how it’s deeply impacted their department. Someone needs to be there in the position more than six months. Consistency is needed in the future, and her department would like to speak with the new person to make them aware of their concerns. Amber talked about the difficulty with change for faculty when it affects how they teach their courses. Administration needs to be mindful about the way it requires changes, particularly with issues like course loads, tenure-ability, what affects their hire-ability within and without the institution. She doesn’t feel the change in how textbooks are ordered fits the level of change she’s talking about; that was a decision she felt comfortable trusting to administration.

Maureen H. asked for Pat’s definition of Performance Based Budgeting (PBB) – and what a possible alternative budgeting philosophy to it might be. Pat answered that she doesn’t believe in the strict definition of PBB, that everything is based on performance. She believes instead, in moving items that will most benefit the institution’s chosen goals (as a collective UAF) to the top. These collectively defined goals must be stated clearly for the institution. So, independent goals in each department should help reach the institutions’ goals. The process used now is a 1% reallocation each year where the campus has the discretion to allocate the 1% to those things that will most benefit progress toward those chosen goals. Aligning annual unit plans to the institution goals has been a good process. Maureen asked about credit hour production being used as a basis for funding. The chancellor said that the president and BOR look at our budget in part based upon aggregate credit hour production, so it does make a difference. But it doesn’t make sense to compare different departments by this factor with each other. It’s looked at by comparing departments over time with themselves. A number of measures must be looked at together, not alone, and not just credit hour production by itself. For example, we have strong goals on retention and persistence of students. A number of measures must be looked at together to assess progress. Research and service are also looked at. Better ways to measure community service need to found, beyond counting hours of service which doesn’t tell us how effective the service was or what was accomplished.

How do we improve our community engagement? What are the things that are important in our communities for our institution to address with service. If we do a better job of doing the service and telling the story, this helps us in our efforts to get support from the legislature. We can get inputs (numbers of hours spent doing service), but also must identify outcomes to assess community service so that the productiveness can be measured. Pat listed the necessary things to count: credit hours, retention, and numbers of graduates, research, and other measures. What other measures define us as an institution and our mission as a whole.
Marsha talked about the semester basis that faculty work with; so, could administration keep that in mind for including faculty input throughout a year’s time? Deadline for course fees requirement, for example, is coming out too early when you look at the cycle faculty are teaching on.

Pat talked about business service models. If they can find a business service model that works for research, it will work for everything else because research is the most difficult area to serve. They’re looking at a liaison model, where schools and colleges have a liaison specified with administrative services (to contact for HR and financial systems needs, for example).

Pat mentioned that Risk Management will utilize a safety and compliance committee that will need faculty input. They’re taking a cross-functional approach. It includes departments, lab safety coordinators, faculty with research compliance factors, HR and IT folks, police and fire, environmental health and safety, for a more comprehensive, structured and coordinated view of these functions. They will address what our exposures are and how we may collectively address them. It’s an ongoing work group that is just getting started, with the aim to communicate more effectively about all the pieces that go together in this area.

Falk asked moving to electronic signatures as an official way of doing business, along the line that Marsha commented earlier about aligning faculty needs and input with their timelines. Brian R. said they are partly there in HR. Brian wants it for everything too. Pat could also work with a phone call and a fax, or a simple email. Falk mentioned the fact that faculty do field work off campus and are often abroad – a global focus would help faculty.

BREAK taken at 2:22 p.m.

VIII New Business

(Note that the referenced attachments may always be found with the corresponding meeting agenda, rather than within the minutes.)

A. Resolution of Remembrance for Dr. Heinz Wiechen (Attachment 155/1)

Marsha read the resolution. An affirmation vote was taken in support of the motion and several moments of silence were observed in his remembrance.

RESOLUTION OF REMEMBRANCE FOR PROFESSOR HEINZ M. WIECHEN

WHEREAS, the UAF Faculty Senate mourns the loss of our colleague Dr. Heinz M. Wiechen, Associate Professor of Space Physics and Aeronomy. His passing leaves us bereft of his wealth of experience, teaching and insight; and

WHEREAS, the UAF Faculty Senate wishes to express its sincere condolences and sympathy to the family and friends of Dr. Wiechen; and
WHEREAS, the UAF Faculty Senate honors Dr. Wiechen’s contributions to the Faculty Senate and his service on the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee, and

WHEREAS, The UAF Faculty Senate acknowledges, appreciates, and will miss Dr. Wiechen’s contributions to the State of Alaska, University of Alaska Fairbanks, the College of Natural Science and Mathematics, and the Geophysical Institute; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT, as a token of our respect and our desire to honor his memory, the Faculty Senate dedicates a moment of silence to our friend and colleague, Dr. Heinz M. Wiechen, as we to reflect on the importance of our colleagues in the community of scholars in our lives.

B. Motion to Approve a Master’s of Education in Special Education submitted by the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee (Attachment 155/2)

Ron B. brought the motion to the floor. He commented that the program is articulated with the State of Alaska’s licensure requirements for special education. Maureen H. commented about the discussion she had with Joanne Healy earlier today about the program’s impact on the graduate faculty in the School of Education. She had a word of caution about both the M.Ed. and the certificate programs. Joanne is alone as faculty for these programs and she is not tenure-track. She will need a lot of collegial support for the programs. Maureen mentioned not advertising the M.Ed. program until there is another faculty member to support it who’s tenure track; but also notes that putting it into the UAF Catalog is essentially advertising it. She thinks it would be alright to proceed with the certificate program, but not the M.Ed. if there’s no tenure-track faculty on board.

Joanne Healy responded to Maureen’s comments. There is currently a search committee reviewing 15 applications for hire in the fall of a tenure-track faculty for the program. Maureen commented that it’s been an unsuccessful search for three years, though. Dean Eric Madsen commented that it’s not a stand-alone program and that they’ve worked closely with UAA and UAS in developing it. The whole point is to have a collaborative program because of the need across the state and with at least two faculty at each of the campuses associated with the program, there’s a broader pool of expertise inclusive of UAA and UAS. He is anticipating a successful search with viable candidates according to the report he’s received from the search committee (who’ve mentioned four very good candidates in the pool).

Ron B. noted other programs conditional on the hire of new faculty; for example, at Fisheries in SFOS. Amber T. noted that at English they’ve had students in programs without specialists in specific programs like ‘Nonfiction’ – they do the best they can to get visiting faculty.

Eric M. mentioned that students would need to work through the licensure part of the program first, before entering the M.Ed. portion for which six additional credits are required.
Maureen H. asked about the program being stand-alone or not in light of Eric’s comments. Joanne H. commented that she has talked with the deans and faculty at UAA and UAS and has been encouraged by them to proceed with stand-alone programs for a certificate and M.Ed. at UAF to help meet the state’s great needs in this area. They’ve coordinated regarding which courses should be taught at different semesters to benefit all three MAUs, and what the core courses need to be and what they’ll accept between the campuses as far as courses and transfers. The efforts with UAA and UAS have been very cooperative.

Eric Madsen elaborated about the area of emphasis at UAF which was decided upon in concert with UAA and UAS. Because UAA and UAS already specialize in early childhood special education, and have a generalist in special ed and a leadership in special education, they asked us to focus on the area of Low Incidence, which was why Joanne was hired. The president convened a statewide education planning group that included the education deans from Anchorage and Juneau, and the top priority jointly identified was a special education position for Fairbanks. The FY10 budget process in statewide supports a faculty position for special ed in Fairbanks.

Jennifer R. asked about whether or not the success of the programs depend upon UAA and UAS resources. Joanne answered no, they’re standalone programs. However, to accommodate as many students as necessary, the courses are set up for distance delivery. They do not replicate other programs and meet a greatly recognized state need. Eric mentioned the common core being offered at all three campuses, freeing up faculty expertise for the specialty areas. Everyone has their own niche in this area with primary, intermediate and secondary ed students who may have needs in areas of autism, emotional disturbance, or severe and profound issues. Jane W. called the motion to question. A vote was taken and the program passed unanimously.

C. Motion to Approve a Graduate Certificate in K-12 Special Education, submitted by the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee (Attachment 155/3)

Ron B. brought the motion to the floor. Ayes passed the motion unanimously.

D. Motion to Amend the Mandatory Placement Policy, submitted by the Student Academic Development and Advisory Committee (Attachment 155/4)

Cindy brought the motion to the floor. It’s a motion to amend the placement policy for English to include a writing sample. Cindy mentioned minor corrections that will be made, including the “F” designator before the course numbers and “X” with core course. She spoke about the goals of the motion, aiming toward a more effective placement of students into English courses. Amber T. clarified that they’re voting at the area in bold – not the entire wording of the policy. Logistics of carrying out the change in the policy need to be ironed out. Cindy will meet with the Provost to discuss implementation and budget implications. The English position hire will be integral to making this work. Accuplacer will be included in the rationale, the second paragraph.
Maureen noted that the SAT has a written component, but Cindy noted that in the past it hasn’t been counted. The ACT does have a written component as well, which hasn’t been required. But as both are scored by humans (and not computers), they could be used and this would facilitate implementation of the policy.

Linda H. said the biggest issue is implementation. Writing tests have been done at some of the rural campuses with a writing sample developed two decades ago, and it’s used in conjunction with another test at rural campuses. Linda said that the timeline of Fall 2009 will be tough.

Cindy commented that the committee has been going back and forth on the effective date. To be practical they would have to phase it in. Jane W. mentioned the example of a similar date requirement on a motion a couple of years ago. Add “phasing in” as Fall 2009 is too soon to be practical. Cindy preferred leaving the date as is, though it will have to be phased in. The motion was called to question. Ayes passed the motion with friendly amendments made on the floor, unanimously.

[See Actions for Meeting #155 for the motion including amendments.]
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/08-09_senate_meetings/index.html#155

IX Discussion Item

A. Electronic Research Proposal Process

John Blake with the Office of Sponsored Programs spoke about the topic of finding an electronic means to process research proposals in an effort to decrease administrative time on them. He read from a report on survey results that stated 32% of research time was spent on pre- and post-award administrative duties. The goal of this effort is to reduce that time and increase time for actual research efforts. Electronic research administration is something currently being developed by federal agencies. The question is do we want to spend the time and dollars here at UAF to tap into this process more efficiently. He asks faculty to read the handout and ask him questions. He’d like faculty help in deciding the direction to go for the future. OSP has developed e-forms, but still don’t have the data management capabilities that some of the software packages would allow them to have.

Jennifer R. asked if this is applying to federal grants only. John said the concept of electronic research administration has come out of the federal sponsors (National Science Foundation, NIH, and Department of Education) but a number of the foundations are now following suit. They’ve been looking at tools geared to federal agencies which come preloaded with all necessary federal forms. They could be used with state agencies, too. Or they could be printed off and sent out. A lot of this is compliance oriented or focuses on pre-award. Grants and Contracts office is looking at various tools to assist with grants management. And there are pre-award and post-award management software packages available. Marsha asks folks to let John know about any questions or suggestions.

John mentioned they are still trying to determine and evaluate real costs involved in utilizing these tools. Jennifer R. mentioned that she had talked to some of the proposal people at SFOS about this, and the response was cautious. They’ve seen administrative changes that
increase the burden on the researchers. They don’t want to see that take place with this effort. John agreed wholeheartedly with her. But this addresses more the federal side of it. Cost effective and usefulness to faculty are the issues they want to address, and reduce the burden on researchers across the whole process.

B. Revised Charge for the Academic Master Plan (Attachment 155/5)

The full revised version of the charge is attached to the agenda. SAC and RAC will jointly develop this and then it will go to each MAU Senate for approval. She encourages everyone to read it and be prepared to discuss it. For the purposes of approving this, both Jon D. who is the Faculty Alliance RAC representative and Jill Dumesnil from Southeast who is the SAC representative, will have voting privileges on that committee just for this matter. Let Jon D. know if you have questions.

X Committee Reports

A. Curricular Affairs – Amber Thomas / Falk Huettmann
No report available.

B. Faculty Affairs – Cathy Cahill (Attachment 155/6)
Another set of minutes are at the back table (in addition to those included with the agenda).

C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar (Attachment 155/7)

D. Committee on the Status of Women – Alex Fitts / Jane Weber (Attachment 155/8)

E. Core Review - Michael Harris / Latrice Bowman (Attachment 155/9)

F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry
No report available.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – James Bicigo
No report available.

H Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Dana Greci / Julie Lurman Joly (Attachment 155/10)

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Ron Barry’
No report available.

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement - Cindy Hardy / Joe Mason (Attachment 155/11)
Cindy mentioned that Marji Illingworth and Jane Allen will co-chair the committee during the spring 2009 semester, as she will be on sabbatical.
XI  Members' Comments/Questions
Tim Stickel reminded everyone that spring registration starts next Monday; course schedules will be out by Friday.

XII  Adjournment
Motion to adjourn by Jane W. Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:15 p.m.