FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Jayne Harvie
474-7964   jbharvie@alaska.edu
For Audioconferencing:
        Toll-free #: 1-800-893-8850
        Participant PIN: 1109306
Video Conferencing Available

A G E N D A
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #173
Monday, March 7, 2011
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1:00	I	Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn		5 Min.
		A.	Roll Call	
		B.	Approval of Minutes to Meeting #172	
		C.	Adoption of Agenda	

1:05   II   Status of Chancellor's Office Actions   5 Min.
        A.   Motions Approved:
                1. Motion to Amend the Mandatory Placement Policy for Math
                   Placement Test Expiration Date
                2. Motion to Clarify Grading Policy for Graduate Programs
                3. Motion to Accept Students Transferring to UAF with AA/AS Degrees
                   as Satisfying the 100-200 Level Core Curriculum
                4. Motion to Change the Academic Disqualification Policy
         B.   Motions Pending:
                1. Motion to Approve the DANSRD Unit Criteria

1:10   III   Public Comments/Questions   5 Min.

1:15   IV   A.   President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn   5 Min.
              B.   President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill   5 Min.

1:25   V   A.   Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers   5 Min.
            B.   Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs   5 Min.

1:35   VI   Governance Reports   5 Min.
              A.   Staff Council – Maria Russell
              B.   ASUAF – Nicole Carvajal
              C.   UNAC – Jordan Titus
                       UAFT – Jane Weber

1:40   VII   Guest Speakers
              A.   Michelle Hebert, RISE Board   15 Min.
              B.   Megan Damario, UAF Development Office   5 Min.

2:00   BREAK

| 2:10 | VIII | Announcements | 5 Min. |

      A.   OSYA Nominations are Open until Noon of March 25
      B.   Promotion and Tenure Workshop on April 29

Handouts at back table, and information posted at the Faculty Senate site:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#173

| 2:15 | IX | New Business | 10 Min. |

      A.   Motion to Address Faculty Concerns about Electronic Student Evaluations, submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee (Attachment 173/1)
      B.   Motion to Allow Foreign Language Test Exemption and Core Credit Waiver for Qualifying Foreign Students, submitted by the Core Review Committee (Attachment 173/2)
      C.   Nominations for President-Elect

| 2:25 | X | Discussion Items | 20 Min. |

      A.   Course Stacking – Rainer Newberry (Attachment 173/3)
      B.   General Ed Revitalization Committee Update – Dave Valentine (Attachment 173/4)

| 2:45 | XI | Committee Reports | 10 Min. |

      A.   Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair
      B.   Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair
      C.   Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Ute Kaden, Co-Chairs (Attachment 173/5)
      D.   Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 173/6)
      E.   Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair
      F.   Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
      G.   Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks, Chair
      H   Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair (Attachment 173/7)
      I.   Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee –Ken Abramowicz, Chair (Attachment 173/8)
      J.   Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
      K.   Research Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen, Co-Chairs

| 2:55 | XII | Members' Comments/Questions | 5 Min. |

| 3:00 | XIII | Adjournment | |

ATTACHMENT 173/1
UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate, upon the recommendation of the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee, moves to approve the following actions:

- New electronic student evaluations will not be implemented without Faculty Senate approval.

- More research on this issue will be done at the administrative level in order to complement the FDAI committee's concerns and recommendations (attached).

  Rationale:

  During extensive discussions in the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee, areas were identified that indicate that some aspects of online surveys of teaching are unreliable. Reasonable arguments can also be made in favor of electronic evaluations, for example, under the following circumstances:

  - electronic evaluations may be the only practical choice in some distance delivery situations.

  - security has been an issue at UAF with the paper-based IAS forms; however, switching to electronic evaluations will not necessarily prevent this from ever happening again.

  This motion asks for more research on this complex issue that is so crucial to our professional lives as teachers. The motion also seeks to ensure that faculty concerns are addressed before a decision on the implementation of electronic student evaluations is made.

  ****

Attachment to Motion submitted by the FDAI Committee:

To: Faculty Senate
From: Josef Glowa, FDAI

This is a summary of what has been discussed in our committee regarding the pros and cons of electronic student evaluations. Committee member Melanie Arthur deserves special credit for digging more deeply into this issue, and compiling and summarizing some crucial data (see below). Attached are the two articles that best illustrate the current unreliable state of online surveys of teaching.[1]

- The first attached article compares modes of administration (paper vs online), finding a huge difference in response rates for in-class versus online evaluations (70% versus 29%, in the absence of special incentives for online evaluators). They included two additional groups of online evaluations, one in which the instructor provided an in-class demo of the online evaluation website and another in which a "modest" grade incentive was offered for completing the online evaluation. In the extra credit case, the response rates were comparable for paper and online evaluations. It should be noted, though, that no similar incentive was offered to the in-class students. Perhaps they could have gotten a response rate closer to 90% for the in-class evaluations if they had offered extra credit there? This was a single institution study of business classes and has not, to our knowledge, been replicated.
- The second attached article is a lengthier review of practices, emphasizing the quality of ratings by different modes of administration, and emphasizing the importance of response rates. It reviews studies that have compared in-person and online and finds a difference in response rates ranging from 37 to <1% lower, with an average difference of 23% (notably in the 1% case the in-person evaluation only had a 33% response and included only distance ed courses). The author describes strategies that have been used to raise response rates, but notes in summary that these have typically NOT been used. In their absence, online surveys can be expected to fall well below the acceptable response rate. (Of course, this does not engage the question of students' ability to effectively evaluate their instructors, which is outside the scope of this discussion)
- Acceptable response rates: Survey research methods texts (e.g. Babbie's Practice of Social Research) suggest that an absolute minimum response rate from which to draw valid conclusions is 50%, and 70% is desirable.
- There is precedent (described in the second attached article) for using a combination of paper and online within a single institution. It is worth looking into more deeply if the administration appears completely inflexible in their desire to switch to online evaluation.
- There is a lot more research out there on this topic, and both attached articles include lengthy bibliographies if one wishes to dig deeper. These two pieces appeared to be good representatives of the available literature.
- Of note, UAA has not adopted an effective institution-wide strategy for improving response rates. Instead, they now write on their reports that the data cannot be considered valid for evaluative purposes in the case of low response rates.

---

[1] Curt J. Dommeyer*, Paul Baum, Robert W. Hanna & Kenneth S. Chapman, 2004. Gathering faculty teaching evaluations by in-class and online surveys: their effects on response rates and evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* Vol. 29, No. 5: 611-623.

Duncan D. Nulty, 2008. The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* Vol. 33, No. 3: 301–314.

ATTACHMENT 173/2
UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011
Submitted by the Core Review Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to allow a foreign language test exemption and Core credit waiver for qualifying foreign students entering UAF via a formal transfer or articulation agreement as specified below, by adding the following UAF Catalog statement on page 40, as indicated:

Effective: Fall 2011

Rationale: The UAF Core allows students who have studied a foreign language for two semesters or more to substitute such study for six credits of courses from the Perspectives on the Human Condition portion of the Core. Current Faculty Senate policy allows undergraduate students transferring from other universities to transfer such credit if it is earned at the university level.

****

CAPS and **Bolded** - Addition
[[ ]] – Deletion

After the "Credit for Language Testing" section on page 40 of the 2010-2011 *UAF Catalog*, and before the "DANTES-DSST (Standardized Subject Test)," enter:

- **LANGUAGE TEST EXEMPTION/CORE CREDIT WAIVER – INTERNATIONAL ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS**

STUDENTS WHO ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGES TRANSFERRING FROM PARTNER UNIVERSITIES TO UAF ARE EXEMPTED FROM TAKING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEST TO DEMONSTRATE FLUENCY IN THAT NATIVE LANGUAGE. THE "LANGUAGE EXEMPTION/CORE CREDIT WAIVER" FORM SHOULD BE FILLED OUT AND FILED WITH THE OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND THE REGISTRAR. UPON APPROVAL, THE STUDENT WOULD HAVE SIX CREDITS OF CORE PERSPECTIVES ON THE HUMAN CONDITION WAIVED.

NOTE: THIS APPLIES ONLY TO STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN FORMALIZED ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS ESTABLISHED BETWEEN UAF AND PARTNER INSTITUTIONS.

PROPOSAL FOR DISCUSSION

In order to ensure that 400/600 stacked courses TRULY are two different courses taught at the same time that simultaneously do not overtax undergraduates and sufficiently challenge graduate students, we enact the following requirements for such courses:

Each part of the two courses will have a separate syllabus that contains significant differences justifying 400 vs. 600 level. These differences will be apparent on at least a weekly basis and not merely an extra assignment added at the end of the course (e.g., a term paper). Such differences will be such that each of the different versions will have different (a) reading assignments, (b) homework assignments, and (c) exams and each will be graded separately.

Further, these regulations and examples of contrasting types of assignments will appear in the course and degree handbook.

Rationale:
   STACKED 400/600 LEVEL COURSES ARE VITAL TO OUR MS PROGRAMS. That said, existing regulations are too vague to provide insurance that 400 and 600 levels are actually both presented when stacked together.

Existing Faculty Senate regulations relative to stacked courses:
400 level (senior) courses may be double listed ("stacked") as 400/600. The 600 level version of the course must require additional student effort, such as a seminar or a term paper, to reflect the greater acuity that we expect from graduate students.

Courses are also sometimes offered simultaneously at different levels (100/200 or 400/600, for example) with higher level credit requiring additional effort and possibly higher order prerequisites from the student. Such courses are referred to as "Stacked" courses and are designated in the class listings by "Stacked with _____". In the case of 400/600 level stacked courses, graduate standing or permission of the instructor is required for graduate enrollment and a higher level of effort and performance is required on the part of students earning graduate credit.

GERC Working DRAFT on recommended student learning outcomes as of 2011.03.02

Outstanding issues:

A. All changes are provisional pending explicit finalization by the GERC

B. Student learning outcomes have not yet been addressed in groups 3 and 4

C. At least some items will require elaborating paragraphs to include how the GERC interprets the broad goals. For example, it was suggested that an appreciation for the various ethical dimensions of the increasingly pervasive role of technology in society might be included in one of the "personal and social responsibility" goals. Similarly, basic technology literacy might at this point be viewed as a prerequisite rather than as a goal for general education at the university level.

1. **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World**
   - through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages and the arts

2. **Intellectual and Practical Skills across the curriculum, including**
   - inquiry and analysis, information literacy
   - critical and creative thinking, problem solving
   - written and oral communication (including the current upper division oral and writing intensive requirement),
   - quantitative literacy,

collaborative learning.

3. **Personal and Social Responsibility, including**
   - civic knowledge and engagement—local and global (including globalization, sustainability, knowledge of Alaska and Alaskan issues, and the current understanding of global economic interdependence Core curriculum component),
   - intercultural knowledge and competence,
   - ethical reasoning and action, and
   - foundations and skills for lifelong learning

—anchored though active involvement with diverse communities and real world challenges;

4. **Integrative and Applied Learning, including**
   - synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

—demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems (through, in part, first year courses).

Deleted: —focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring

Deleted: <#>information (and technology) literacy, teamwork

Deleted: and problem solving
—practiced extensively across the curriculum in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects and standards of performance

Minutes Unit Criteria Review Committee - 21 February 2011
Perry Barboza, Karen Jensen, Ute Kaden, Julie McIntyre, Tim Wilson

<u>Next Meeting</u> 23 March 2pm.

<u>SFOS Revision</u>

Page 5. Please clarify the intent of the following section. "Additional evidence of teaching ... publications based on student's thesis or dissertation research" We understand that publication indicates the quality of work in a thesis and therefore reflects the quality of the instructor or mentor. However, the convention for promotion and tenure files is to list a product only once as evidence of either teaching or research. This section of the document would make it possible to use the same set of publications to demonstrate both teaching and research performance by the advisor. It seem more appropriate that publications co-authored with a student should only be counted either as scholarly work or as evidence of teaching but not as both. Student publications that are not coauthored by the advisor/ instructor could be used to demonstrate the quality of instruction in a writing class or the editorial guidance of the advisor. How does the unit want to use student publications to evaluate the faculty - only research, only teaching or both research and teaching simultaneously?

Please remove all comments from the margin.
Please add page numbers for ease of reference.
The final documents are distributed as black and white copies. Please convert the red text to bold or underlined font for clear copies.

<u>Music Criteria</u>
The committee would like to discuss revision of this document at the next meeting. We would appreciate the attendance of a representative from the music department to assist with questions about the criteria.

- The formatting of this document is difficult to follow and is not consistent with those of other units. Please consult the criteria for the Department of Theater that was approved in May 2010 (http://www.uaf.edu/provost/promotion-tenure/unit-peer-criteria/).

- Page 3. Please distinguish between "local" and "surrounding community"

- Page 3 **PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION DOCUMENT SUMMARY OF UNIT CRITERIA DESIGNATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS**

- This summary is very difficult to follow in this format. Please follow the format used by other units by including the expectations for teaching (B), research (C) and service (D) in the appropriate sections. Define expectations for Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and full Professor that are specific to the unit and additional to the established criteria for UAF. This document will be used to evaluate faculty for tenure and promotion. Criteria for evaluation of non-tenured faculty should be removed from the document to avoid confusion.

- Page 4. Statement of Purpose for the unit should be placed at the beginning of the document before Chapter 1. Please confine comments to the specifics of your department.

- Page 7 and following: Please integrate the description and evaluation of each activity in the existing format for Scholarly Work (7-10) and Service (14-16)

- Page 8. Please remove italics or clarify the need for the different font.

- Page 10: 1. "Achievement in research. 1.c. They must be evaluated by peers ...

- 1.c.1. and 1.c.2. Music criteria .." Please combine the criteria into one statement. Use 1.c.i. to avoid confusion with the main category.

- Page 7. Please clarify the following statement "**MAY ALSO BE MEASURED BY WHATEVER METHODS FOR EVALUATION ARE IN PLACE FOR A PARTICULAR EVENT.**"

- Page 10. A better definition of "knowledgeable persons" as peer reviewers would be helpful.

Committee on the Status of Women,
Meeting Minutes for Fri, Feb 18, 2011; 1-2 pm,
Library, Kayak Room (408)

Members Present: Derek Sikes, Jenny Liu, Kayt Sunwood, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen, Melanie Arthur, Nicole Cundiff, (online - Shawn Russell), Nilima Hullavarad, Dan White
Members absent: Jane Weber

1. Cecile Lardon presentation on Women in STEM Disciplines project. co PI
Joy Morrison
see PDF of presentation ppt.

Some of the Statistically significant findings: More women than expected in term / soft money positions. More women in lower rank tenure track positions than men and more men in higher tenure track ranks than women.

On survey men and women agreed on all questions but there were significant (and predictable) differences in the strength of their agreements.

Salaries at each rank were different between genders with men being higher, however, this was explained by the men pool having had more years at each rank, which when factored in removed the significance of the salary differences. However, ranks weren't analyzed separately and sig diffs in salary at some ranks might be swamped by lack of sig diff at higher ranks.

Also, salaries were 'annualized' - hourly salary multiplied to represent 12 months. What about variation between 9month vs 12 month and variation in summer salaries from grants? Can compare rates of pay but not actual take home pay because the latter data are hard / impossible to obtain.

Largest differences in salary is explained by discipline and time in rank. Really interesting discussion. Meeting was adjourned at 2:07;
Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-onthe-status-o/

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes February 16, 2011

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:10 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Mike Castellini, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Channon
Price, Larry Roberts
Excused: Julie Joly, Alexandra Oliveira

III. Report from Diane

There was a good response to and turnout for Eugenie Scott's visit. Around 25-30 faculty members
attended. Diane is working on getting information out to faculty on upcoming events. Statewide is
taking care of advertising Neil Howe's Millenials presentation. Faculty are already signing up! Larry
reminded us that Neil Howe will also be part of the upcoming Lilly Arctic Institute.

Diane mentioned that she is getting requests for travel funding but that there is no longer any money
available. UNAC used their extra funding to pay for Neil Howe's visit. CP noted that the number of
requests (and value, if known) should be sent along to the Provost.

People are indicating an interest in calling in for Don Foley's upcoming talk on working with
challenging students.

IV. Old Business

Josef informed us of the Faculty Senate's reaction to our motion regarding electronic student
evaluations, namely that the Senate felt the wording was not strong enough. It was suggested that we
change the word "input" to "approval". After some discussion our committee tentatively decided on
splitting the motion into two main bullet points: a) electronic student evaluations will not be
implemented (mandated) without Faculty Senate approval; and b) more research will be done at the
administrative level. Josef will update the motion based on our discussion and email the new version
to committee members for more input.

V. New Business

Lilly Arctic Institute: Larry informed us that the registration fee for the Lilly Arctic Institute (March
3-5) will be waived for FDAI committee members, and while we are free to come and go as it fits
our schedules, please register for the sessions you will be attending so as to keep track of the number
of faculty expected.

Sub-Committees: After some discussion, it was decided we would not form sub-committees for
electronic student evaluations and the upcoming Faculty Forums. We decided on a plan of action for

the first Faculty Forum (see below), and the issue of electronic student evaluations will require the energy of the whole FDAI committee.

Faculty Forums: The planned first Forum was cancelled due to too many things happening at once, so March 1 from 1:00 – 2:00 pm will be the new first Forum (IARC 417). Diane has emailed a link to a PDF file of the book *Start Talking: Difficult Dialogs in Higher Education* to committee members. The first Faculty Forum will focus on bridging academic freedom with difficult classroom experiences and discussion questions in chapter 1. Mike, Josef, and CP can attend the Forum and help guide the discussion.

Electronic Student Evaluations: Melanie urged us to resubmit our motion as soon as possible with the new, assertive language. We have been working on this for over a year and do not want the issue to be put aside.

VI. Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 9, 2011 at 8:00 am, Bunnell 222.

VII. Adjourned at 9:02 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

GAAC Meeting Minutes
February 14, 2011
9:00-10:00 a.m.
408 Rasmuson Library (Kayak Room)

Voting members present: Ken Abramowicz (Chair), Donie Bret-Harte (phone), Lara Dehn, Orion Lawlor, Sue Renes, Amber Thomas (phone).

Ex officio members present: Larry Duffy, Laura Bender, Anita Hughes, Karen Jensen

Guests: Rainer Newberry; Jayne H. (note-taking)

1. The agenda was adopted with a revision to move item #7 (99-GCCh_BIOL F675/475) up with the item #5 discussion topic of stacked courses guidelines to solicit comments Rainer (since the course had already been reviewed by the Curricular Review Committee).

2. The minutes of the 1-24-2001 GAAC meeting were approved without modification.

3. It was noted that the following proposals were approved by email.
• 31-GCCh_PSY F652 - Practicum Placement - Clinical I, change repeatability
• 32-GCCh_PSY F653 - Practicum Placement - Clinical II, change repeatability
• 35-GPCh_M.Ed. -Remove Reading and K-12 Reading Endorsement Specialization

4. Discussion topic: UAF Catalog statement on academic dismissal of graduate students

Laura noted that the UAF Catalog lists reasons that students may be academically dismissed from graduate programs, but that it's not stated clearly that an academic dismissal is noted on the student's transcript. Language was suggested for addition to the Catalog, along with clear language about the ramifications of an academic dismissal.

Ken suggested that along with the transcript statement about academic dismissal, that reasons for it also be included, particularly a reason such as exceeding the time limit for the degree program. This leaves less to guesswork on the part of those seeing such transcripts. Amber disagreed, noting that the reasons could be many and varied. Laura responded that it takes a lot of paperwork to actually do a dismissal, and the first two reasons are almost never used alone (exceeding maximum time limit, and not being registered for at least six credits). Ken asked committee members to share their comments with Laura via email and she could present a revised proposal in the future.

6. Discussion topic: suggested guidelines for stacked 400-600 level courses

Rainer Newberry brought suggested guidelines to the GAAC and shared the reasons that the Curriculum Review Committee would like to see some guidelines put into place. Particularly, the college and school curriculum councils would find guidelines helpful. Often courses proposed for stacking are either too rigorous at the graduate level for undergraduates, or not rigorous enough for

the 600-level. Rainer noted the need for more truth in advertising for both levels of a stacked course.

Amber Thomas commented that more input should be gathered from department chairs first. Lara Dehn asked for more concrete examples of what is good or bad in terms of course submissions and syllabi for stacking. She also noted that financial cost was a factor for students who take stacked courses, noting some may not be able to afford the graduate tuition. She asked about obtaining student feedback on stacked courses.

Orion noted that stacked courses are often a means of providing graduate level electives by different programs.

There was not a consensus about stacked course requirements in the group, but requiring a syllabus for each level of the 400/600 course was not opposed. Rainer was encouraged to have the Curricular Review Committee study this issue further before taking any action.

7. Preliminary discussion of review process for the 53 new courses proposed by Civil and Environmental Engineering

Ken commented that this group of courses appeared to be focused on providing continuing professional education, and this is the very definition of 500-level courses. The consensus of the committee was that these courses did not meet the requirements of 600-level courses. Ken will talk to Bob Perkins about the matter. Laura suggested using them for an undergraduate certificate. Orion suggested creating a Special Topics course at the 600-level for the graduate certificate program instead. It was questioned, however, whether the majority of a program should be comprised of Special Topics courses. The committee did not want to approve these as 600-level courses.

8. As the scheduled end of the meeting neared, it was noted that a March 1 deadline for catalog submissions has been established by the Office of the Registrar. Thus, the GAAC members agreed to hold another meeting on February 21 to maximize the number of proposals that could be approved before the catalog deadline.

9. Before the meeting was adjourned, a brief review of previously discussed courses was held.

• 18-GCCh_ ATM F613 was approved.

• 36-GCCh_EE F614 was not approved because requested syllabus revisions were not made.

• 19-GNC_ATM F666 was discussed, but questions about the syllabus remained.

• 25-GNC_ATM F678 were discussed, but questions about the syllabus remained.

19-GNC, 25-GNC and the remaining proposals on the agenda that were not discussed will be placed on the agenda for the next GAAC meeting on February 21.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 10:00.

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
February 21, 2011 GAAC Meeting
9:00-10:00 a.m.
341 Rasmuson Library

Voting members present: Ken A. (Chair), Sue Renes, Lara Dehn (phone), Amber Thomas
(phone), Jen Schmidt (phone), Orion Lawlor, Anupma Prakash
Ex officio members present: Larry Duffy, Laura Bender, Anita Hughes
Guest: Jayne H. (Notes)

1. Discussion/modification/approval of agenda
98-GCCh _ GEOG F612 - Geography of Climate and Environmental Change, listed under item 4
of the agenda, has become a trial course submission (#II-Trial).

2. Minutes from 2-14-2011 meeting were approved.

3. GAAC proposals approved (review leader is listed first, followed by the secondary
reviewers).
• 41-GPCh_ Ph.D. - Fisheries Modify Admission Requirements (Amber, Lara, Jen)
While it was noted that the changes raised the bar to get into the program, this was seen as
positive by the majority of the committee. It was noted that a student without any published papers,
can still be admitted to the program with faculty endorsements. Larry mentioned that the number one
predictor of success in Ph.D. programs is undergraduate research. The proposal was unanimously
approved by GAAC.
• 42-GPCh_M.S. Fisheries - Expand elective course requirements (Amber, Lara, Jen)
Amber noted this one consisted of straightforward changes to electives. Lara provided some
background to the changes. The unit is adding a human dimension component to the electives as
they have some Rasmuson Foundation funding. The proposal was unanimously approved by GAAC.
• 43-GNC FISH F680 - Marine Sustainability Internship (Amber, Lara, Jen)
While there was a question about the summer and fall parts of the course, Lara resolved
this issue and the proposal was unanimously approved by GAAC.

4. GAAC proposals discussed, but not yet approved.
• 19-GNC ATM F666 - Atmospheric Remote Sensing (Donie, Jen, Xiong)
The course syllabus needs modifications (e.g., goals and outcomes, determination of
points in course). Jen will email the instructor.
• 25-GNC_ATM F678 - Mesoscale Dynamics (Xiong, Jen, Sue)
The syllabus needs modifications (e.g., concern about tone of the syllabus, lack of
alignment between the grading table and the projects that are listed). Ken will follow up on this
course.
• 38-GNC_EE F646 Wireless Sensor Networks (Orion, Donie, Lara)
While the instructor is working on a revised syllabus, there was agreement that this
proposal can not go forward until more detail is added to the syllabus.
• 39-GNC EE F668 Radar Systems (Orion, Donie, Lara)
The course syllabus needs modifications. While the course is similar to an existing
Geoscience course, the material is a subset of that course. If changes aren't received, it may be
best to ask the instructor to re-submit this course as a new proposal after the required changes are
made.

• 40-GNC_EE F675 Robot Modeling and Control (Orion, Donie, Lara)
Orion has received some changes. Lara noted that there are no course policies included in the syllabus. Review was delayed unit the next meeting.

• 27-GNP MA in Political Science and related courses (GAAC proposals 28, 29, and 30)
Ken commented on the facts that a new dean will be coming to CLA in the near future, and that UA President Gamble has stated that he will not forward new program funding requests to the legislature. The support of Northern Studies faculty for this new program is conditioned on Northern Studies keeping its current TA positions. Since the proposed MA in Political Science requires new TA positions, approval of this program by the administration is doubtful unless new funding is found. There are also concerns about the quality of the new program related to the number of stacked courses in the degree requirements and the appropriateness of the internship option as an alternative to the traditional thesis requirement. Finally, it was noted that the number of required credits differs between the two options (i.e., 31-33 for the Environmental concentration, 34-36 for the Arctic Policy concentration. Approval of this program does not need to be rushed. Therefore, the issues will be discussed with the provost and will be discussed again.

Due to lack of time, the remaining items on the agenda were not discussed and will be added to the agenda for the next meeting on February 28.

Meeting was adjourned at 10 AM.