

MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #187

Monday, December 3, 2012

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. at the Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds

A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	YARIE, John (14)
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (13)	
ALEXEEV, Vladimir (13) – G. Gibson arranged	Members Absent:
BRET-HARTE, Donie (13) Falk Huettmann	ALBERTSON, Leif (14)
BROWN, Stephen (13) (audio)	BANDOPADHYAY, Sukumar (13)
CEE, Vincent (14)	CHAMBERS, Izetta (14)
CHEN, Cheng-fu (14)	MARR, Wayne (14)
COOK, Christine (14)	MCEACHERN, Diane (13)
DAVIS, Mike (14)	MEYER, Franz (13) – travel status
FALLEN, Chris (13)	NADIN, Elisabeth (13) – travel status
FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)	WEBLEY, Peter (14) – travel status
GEORGE-BETTISWORTH, R. (13)	ZHANG, Xiong (14)
GUSTAFSON, Karen (13)	
HARDY, Cindy (13)	Others Present:
HARDY, Sarah (13)	Linda Hapsmith
HEALY, Joanne (13)	Debu Misra
HEATON, John (14)	Provost Susan Henrichs
HENRY, David (13)	Interim Dean Alex Fitts
JENSEN, Karen (14)	Chancellor Brian Rogers
JOHNSTON, DUFF (13)	Lillian Anderson-Misel
JOLY, Julie (13)	Paul Layer, Dean, CNSM
LARDON, Cecile (13)	Eric Madsen
LAWLOR, Orion (13)	Lillian Anderson-Misel
NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)	Libby Eddy
NG, Chung-Sang (13) – Brian Rasley	Dani Sheppard
RADENBAUGH, Todd (13) – audio	Elizabeth Allman
REYNOLDS, Jennifer	Gary Gray
SHORT, Margaret (13)	Caty Oehring
VALENTINE, Dave	Doug Schrager
WEBER, Jane (14)	Carol Gering
WINFREE, Cathy (13)	Leslie McCartney
WINSOR, Peter (14) – audio	Michael Daku

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #186

Minutes for meeting #186 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to agree to the discontinuation of the MS degree in General Science
2. Motion to agree to the discontinuation of the MAT degree in Physics
3. Motion to agree to the discontinuation of the MAT degree in Mathematics

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Comments – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer noted that CourseLeaf curriculum and catalog software is being reviewed. CourseLeaf automates curriculum processing and works together with catalog production. The effect on faculty is modest. Libby Eddy, interim registrar, shared the web link for the software: www.leepfrog.com. Individuals from the Office of Admissions and the Registrar, Marketing and Communications, OIT and the Faculty Senate Office have attended a webinar and are in favor of the software. A second vendor demo is scheduled on December 10 at 10:00 am at the Chancellor's Conference Room. Jennifer and David V. will be attending, along with some administrative staff and curriculum council faculty from several of the academic units. UAA has already adopted this package.

With regard to the faculty committee to examine interdisciplinary issues which was described in more detail at the last meeting, a list of faculty members is being put together and a request has gone out to department chairs seeking nominations. A review of the committee's purpose has been posted in the online discussions.

Jennifer reminded everyone of the Board of Regents' meeting on Thursday and Friday this week here in Fairbanks. She encouraged Faculty Senators to attend, noting there are topics in the meeting that may be of interest to them. A convenient web link to the BOR agenda has been included on the Faculty Senate meetings page.

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2012-13-fs-meetings/#187>

B. President-Elect's Comments – David Valentine

David provided an update on the General Education Revitalization Committee. The poll that went out to all faculty had a response from about 250 faculty. Obvious trends included mandates for more flexibility in the core and less credits than the 39 now required – but more than the 34-credit minimum required in BOR regulation. The Anchorage workshop on Jan. 11 and 12 has a full roster of faculty and administrators attending, and he hopes it will help move the work of GERC along.

The GERC poll results have been published online at the Faculty Senate home page:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate>

Evaluation of learning management systems (LMS) is taking place. This issue arose from concerns about Blackboard (BB) as well as the financial costs involved with it. David has been working with Carol Gering at eLearning. They are doing a pilot study at eLearning to test BB against three other LMS

programs which include Desire2Learn, Moodle, and Canvas. A second test will follow involving other faculty who use BB less frequently, asking them to try defined tasks to help evaluate how well they fit with faculty workflows.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers reported that the Fairbanks legislative delegation is positioned the best he's seen it in 30 years with regard to supporting the university in the budget process. And he noted strong support for UAF programs in the budget submitted by the Board of Regents. The rural delegation has some concerns about addressing the needs of the rural campuses. A lot will depend upon what the legislature does in terms of revenue measures and available funds. Capital and operating budget meetings have been taking place. The bulk of new money will be in fixed costs (compensation and benefits), operating costs for Life Sciences, and leasing costs for new facilities in Fairbanks and the rural campuses.

Strategic direction comments were due last week. The Strategic Direction Initiative (SDI) results should go out to the Senates in spring. The UAF strategic plan is on hold until the SDI project is more clarified, but the Chancellor expects a draft plan to come before the Senate in March.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs gave specifics about sharing testimony at Board of Regents meetings. While testimony by students and alumni regarding university programs is particularly effective with BOR members, nothing forbids faculty from speaking about their programs. During the upcoming meeting, a large time segment will be devoted to research carried out by the UA system and UAF. Presentations about various programs will occur over the lunch hour on the first day of the meeting. The quantitative research report prepared for the meeting has also been posted on the Faculty Senate home page (link below). The next Fairbanks meeting will be held in June. If anyone would like to present their research, please let her know.

One of the BOR agenda items is a request for the approval of the Alaska Center for Unmanned Aircraft Systems Integration - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (ACUASI – RDT&E). Other items include asking for the approval of the Nanook Innovation Corporation Board of Directors (for intellectual property development); naming of a new facility on campus; approval of honorary degree recipients and meritorious award recipients for the spring commencement; the elimination of the MAT in Biology program; approval for antenna installation for the Alaska Satellite Facility; and approval for the West Ridge facilities deferred maintenance project (phase two).

Jennifer commented that a lunch buffet is provided at the BOR meeting, and that the research report is posted on the Faculty Senate home page: <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate>

V Discussion Items

A. Reapportionment Results – Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 187/1)

Jennifer described the official results reported in Attachment 187/1 of the recent Faculty Senate reapportionment. There were no changes from the preliminary results covered at last month's meeting.

B. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

Jennifer introduced Dani Sheppard, Associate Professor of Psychology and Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Council. Dani is also the faculty liaison to the Athletics Department, and she serves as the Faculty Athletics Representative to the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA).

[A problem was noted with the audio conference at this point in the meeting. It stemmed from one of the callers putting their phone line on hold. This resulted in “hold” music which greatly interfered with the ability of other callers to hear the meeting, including the guest speaker who was participating via audio.]

Dani introduced Dr. Gary Gray, the new Director of Athletics & Recreation. Dani briefly described the NCAA divisions as they relate to UAF. Beginning next semester, Dani will provide regular updates to the Faculty Senate. She and Dr. Gray are very committed to academic quality for student athletes, seeing them as students first, then athletes. As part of Dr. Gray’s executive team for athletics, and directly reporting to the Chancellor and working with the NCAA, she has good perspective on academic issues affecting student athletes.

Dani has been working to balance complicated academic integrity issues related to class attendance and required athletics absences. She has been participating with the Curricular Affairs Committee (and its subcommittee) to discuss in-depth the academic issues concerning where the responsibilities lie between faculty and student. They’ve worked to develop the motion which will come before the Faculty Senate later today.

[At this point a delay occurred in the meeting while the audio conference was reconvened in an attempt to alleviate the disruption of the “hold” music which was greatly affecting the audio quality. Unfortunately it was not successful and the meeting had to be reconvened using unadvertised audio PINs. During this delay, an informal discussion took place regarding item C, posting of syllabi. President-Elect David Valentine later contacted OIT to request that the hold music be removed or made optional; a trouble ticket was opened.]

Dani reiterated the importance of the topic not only to UAF but to the faculty involved at the national association level who actually vote on legislation concerning academic integrity and student welfare. She also mentioned that Dr. Gray has initiated a five year strategic planning process for the Athletics Department and she will be involved in that effort.

Linda Hapsmith announced that the Academic Advising Center, in conjunction with Athletics, has hired Andrea Schmidt as the new student athlete advisor. Andrea will see all the student athletes for their advising to ensure NCAA compliance. Her backup will be Brandon Uzzell who is currently in training. Dani added that this does not replace academic advising by departments, but is an additional layer to a student’s normal discipline-related advising by their department.

Dr. Gray reiterated the commitment of the Athletics program to academic integrity. He reported that there are 143 student athletes spread across 40 majors here at UAF. Last academic year, the average GPA was 3.13 in fall, and 3.27 in spring. The academic success rate is taken most seriously and will continue to be monitored and reported each semester. Each coach will have academic goals included in their five year strategic plans, and these will be tracked. He invited faculty to feel free to share their concerns and questions with him and/or with Dani at any time.

C. Posting syllabi (or substitute) in a central repository

While attempts were being made to reconvene the audio conference, Jennifer described the topic of posting syllabi in a central repository. Sukumar B. asked how the topic had come up, and Jennifer noted it had come up several years ago during preparations for accreditation. One of the accreditation requirements is for departments to maintain a central file of syllabi, and the time was ripe in 2009 to consider the idea of a digital repository rather than paper. Faculty Senate settled on the recommendation

of a central web site, but there was little enthusiasm for this and there was never a mechanism for its creation. The matter came up again this past spring from Karl Kowalski who suggested utilizing Blackboard as a repository, and the matter was discussed further by Faculty Alliance. It was deemed timely to have the discussion again, especially in light of potentially helping with student advising.

Jennifer announced that a survey about this topic will be sent out to all faculty. She invited comments and suggestions, noting they would help in designing the survey questions.

Brian Rasley mentioned some concerns about the repository idea. Students could view these syllabi as absolute contracts, and would likely tune in on any course changes and question faculty as to why they might do a course differently. He didn't particularly want to be on the receiving end from students if there were various syllabi for some of the larger standard courses posted out there for them to view.

Debu M. agreed with Brian R. He noted that the purpose of accreditation compliance regarding syllabi gathered by the departments and colleges did not involve student review. He suggested that perhaps the course catalog could be beefed up instead to provide more information to students.

Todd R. also supported what Brian R. had said, especially with regard to the 100-200 level courses that are taught by many instructors. He urged great care in posting syllabi for the larger courses.

Cecile L. commented that there could be the potential for subtle pressure to make courses easier. Students will course shop and will pick the easier looking courses. She also supported the idea of having beefier catalog course descriptions over the idea of posting syllabi online.

Jennifer asked Libby Eddy about expanded catalog course descriptions, noting the issue of space constraints with the printed catalog. Libby concurred with Jennifer about space constraints but agreed to check into the idea for the next meeting. The possibility of putting expanded course descriptions in the online catalog was mentioned.

Provost Henrichs noted that the catalog is viewed as a contract with the students by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). Anything posted online as part of the catalog would also carry that weight as well. She emphasized that they must be careful about what is put forth as the Catalog. Chancellor Rogers noted that once it's in the UAF Catalog we are committing to it, so he would personally rather see a solution outside the Catalog to preserve flexibility of making changes to courses by faculty.

Cindy H. asked for clarification between the two audiences of accreditation and the students, noting that accreditors see historical documents, while students would be looking at something for the future. Which audience are we intending to serve? Jennifer asked for clarification from Susan H. who responded that accreditors would not review syllabi per se, but wish to see that it's our practice to have information available and on file for potential student requests. It doesn't change our audience, but rather enables them to reach the information more easily.

Jennifer invited further discussion to take place online in the discussion group.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Claudia Koch

A report was not available from Staff Council.

B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag

A report was not available from ASUAF.

C. UNAC – Debu Misra
UAFT – Jane Weber

Debu and Jane both made comments regarding the Joint Health Care Committee (JHCC) motions which were emailed to everyone earlier that morning along with a copy of a response memo from Donald Smith.

Julie J. asked what the passing of these motions meant. Jane answered that it does not mean they are passed. They now go to statewide Human Resources whose task it now becomes to incorporate the motions into the UA Choice plan. For all intents and purposes, they will be the new rules.

Ken A. commented on a matter that perplexed him in which the Supreme Court upheld the federal decision to mandate insurance based on a taxing provision. He does not understand how the university has the legal authority to mandate that persons stay covered in their system (removing the opt-out provision – JHCC motion #6). Has that been vetted by legal counsel? Jane responded that statute may supersede the motions. They are in limbo waiting to see what happens. She noted that while these motions passed, many had voted against them.

Jennifer asked Jane what the rationale was for the motion concerning the opt-out provision. Jane responded that there are about 10% of employees who've opted out, and statewide believes they will save money by getting those employees back under their plan. But, JHCC members had questioned the assumption, noting that no one knows if these individuals are large spenders of health care or not.

Julie J. commented that she had thought this motion would prevent future instances of opting out, and was surprised to hear that it would also force those who had already done so to come back under the university plan.

Debu commented that he has received emails from concerned faculty regarding the spousal surcharge (JHCC motion #5). Abel Bult-Ito had told him that these actions were based on results of the survey distributed to faculty. Debu didn't have data about the survey responses with him, but will follow up with that information.

Cecile L. asked if JHCC motion #4 (concerning the wellness program and health risk assessment) was going to be required of everybody or just those who participate in that program. Jane said it was a preferred pricing measure – those doing the requirements pertaining to the wellness plan would thereby obtain better pricing options.

Debu clarified that JHCC decisions are advisory only, not binding. UA administration doesn't have to approve everything from the committee. However, Donald Smith of statewide human resources has endorsed all of the motions that JHCC passed, per the memo copy that was also distributed today. Jennifer noted that Donald Smith will try to design policies to implement these recommendations, but may run into roadblocks during that process.

David V. asked what budgetary impact these motions will have. Jane said they do not know right now. Debu M. said they will try to get more information to bring back to Faculty Senate.

Ken A. mentioned that if one looks at the reverse of JHCC motion #4 (wellness program and health risk assessment), employees are being asked to pay more to preserve their right to privacy regarding their

personal health information. He questioned the legality of this. Jane said this was also asked at the JHCC, and Debu concurred. Ken wondered why legal counsel isn't brought in earlier to the process, rather than waiting for a possible legal test of the measures in the courts.

Debu announced that December 11 will be Faculty Appreciation Day. Provost Henrichs will be there from 4-5 PM, and one or more of the regents will attend as well. An invitation will be sent out to all faculty.

BREAK

VII Public Comments/Questions

Alex Fitts, interim dean of general studies, mentioned that a request for proposals went out for first year freshman seminars (1 credit courses) for next fall. February 1 is the deadline for submissions.

VIII Old Business

- A. Motion to agree to the discontinuation of the Ph.D. degree in Mathematics, tabled on November 5, 2012 (Attachment 187/2)

Since the tabling of this motion at the last meeting, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics (DMS) had turned in a rationale for continuing the program. However, there has not been time to develop an implementation plan and the Administrative Committee has recommended that this motion be postponed further. The DMS believes postponement until March 4 would give them sufficient time to develop a plan.

Rainer N. asked if there were any harm in postponing the motion. Provost Henrichs indicated there would be no harm. The motion to postpone was unanimously passed.

IX New Business

- A. Motion to approve the Unit Criteria for Cooperative Extension Service, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 187/3)

Unit Criteria Committee Chair Karen Jensen brought the motion to the floor, explaining that a couple of revisions had already been reviewed in committee. There were no questions. The motion was passed unanimously.

- B. Motion to amend the student attendance policy, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 187/4)

Rainer N. explained that the present policy is ambiguous, making it difficult to follow. This motion attempts to clarify to faculty, the athletics department and student athletes what their rights are and to make it possible for student athletes to travel and get as much as possible out of their classes despite the travel. This version is cleaned up a bit but not significantly different from the one presented last meeting.

Chancellor Rogers noted that the policy is still unclear regarding military exercises and ROTC students, the National Guard and deployment of military students. A proposal will be brought to the Faculty Senate in the spring semester to address military-related attendance issues.

Debu M. asked what the difference was between general absences and UAF sanctioned activities. Jennifer gave the example of illness to illustrate a general absence.

Falk H. asked for a specific example to clarify the changed policy. Rainer provided an in-depth example of a student athlete approaching a faculty regarding required sport-related absences, noting the faculty and student either reach an agreement, or the faculty informs the student they must drop their class and find another instead. Ideally this exchange takes place before the final drop/add date. Rainer emphasized that faculty have the freedom to decide, but are encouraged to make reasonable accommodations for student athletes who are required to miss class. Falk raised the issue of students who are not participating at the same level as the instructor expects and deems acceptable of other students, and Rainer responded that instructors have the option of withdrawing students from the course in such cases. He clarified the difference between dealing with absences ahead of the fact, and a student who is not performing at acceptable levels in the course.

Debu M. noted military exercises are not included in this policy, which was confirmed by both Rainer and Chancellor Rogers.

Brian R. asked about absences related to science conferences. Rainer said the policy includes these type of situations. Jennifer noted there must be some advance notice and approval, along with agreement of the instructor to accommodate the absence. Chancellor Rogers noted a key difference in the conference example that a student may not know very far in advance about the absence. He noted the policy addresses absences for known UAF-sanctioned events with the aim of accommodating the drop/add dates.

Ken A. commented that the general absences portion of the policy covered the science conference poster session example adequately. Rainer agreed.

Karen G. expressed her concern regarding some musical performances where the dates might not be known in advance. Rainer clarified that unknown dates would fall under the general absences portion of the policy.

The motion amending attendance policy was passed by majority vote (with one accidental nay vote).

C. Motion to approve a new minor in Interdisciplinary Studies, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 187/5)

Rainer explained that this minor is NOT an effort to create something bogus out of a lot of different courses. It is deliberately designed to help students legitimately fulfill a minor that is different and falls between the cracks of what we currently offer. It is not expected that this minor would be sought very often, but it fills a legitimate need that arises from time to time.

The motion to approve a new minor in interdisciplinary studies was passed unanimously.

D. Motion to approve a new minor in Emergency Management, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 187/6)

Rainer noted that what is distinctive about this new minor is that it has lots of upper division requirements. It's a little bit different from existing minors in not being academic per se, but it has a lot of rigor built into it.

Debu asked who houses this minor, and Rainer and Ken responded that it's the School of Management (SOM).

Javier F. asked what the difference was between this program and the interdisciplinary minor. Rainer said that interdisciplinary minors will be very different from one instance to the next and not occur that often; but that the SOM anticipates a modest number of students will want to get this new minor every year.

Ken A. also mentioned that this minor will be accommodated into SOM's Bachelor of Emergency Management degree.

Cindy H. suggested adding "School of Management" to the wording of the motion and a friendly amendment was then made on the floor. The first sentence will be changed to read, "The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new minor in Emergency Management **WITHIN THE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT.**"

The motion approving the new minor in Emergency Management was passed unanimously as amended.

E. Motion to amend transfer credit policy, submitted by Core Review and Curricular Affairs Committees (Attachment 187/7)

Rainer noted the exact location of the policy change in the attached motion (item #7 of the list contained in the catalog language section of the motion, shown in bolded caps), and explained the scope of the change being proposed.

Julie J. asked about the meaning of the word "regionally" in the new language. Rainer clarified that it means any region which is accredited, not just our northwest region.

Cecile L. asked about students coming in to UAF with uncompleted baccalaureate cores from another institution. Rainer explained that transfers remain all or nothing; incomplete cores are not accepted. Jennifer pointed out that the change takes the acceptance of general ed requirements transferring in from UAS and UAA and expands that to include all regionally accredited institutions.

Paul L., CNSM dean, asked if UAF issues a certificate to show completion of GERs, and if such a thing exists at other institutions to document completed GERs. Rainer responded that the registrar is willing to furnish letters to other institutions regarding UAF GERs, and that we request such from other institutions. Jennifer noted that it is a responsibility of the students to obtain such certification.

Debu M. asked a question about actual transfer of numbers of credit requirements. Jennifer pointed out that this is more analogous to accepting a degree from another institution than an actual mapping of credits transferred.

The motion to amend the credit transfer policy was passed unanimously.

X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements
A. General Comments/Announcements

No comments or announcements were made.

B. Committee Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)
Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 187/8)
Faculty Affairs – Cecile Lardon, Chair (Attachment 187/9)
Unit Criteria – Karen Jensen, Chair
Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair

(Attachment 187/10)
Core Review Committee – Latrice Bowman, Chair
Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair
(Attachment 187/11)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair
(Attachment 187/12)
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
(Attachment 187/13)
Research Advisory Committee – Jon Dehn, Chair

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:44 PM.

ATTACHMENT 187/1
 UAF Faculty Senate 187, December 3, 2012
 Submitted by the Administrative Committee

November 2012

UAF Faculty Senate reapportionment result (changes in bold):

<u>Unit</u>	<u># eligible faculty</u>	<u># Senators</u>	<u>change</u>
CEM	59	3	<i>decrease from 4 senators</i>
CES	31	2	
CLA	130	7	<i>decrease from 8 senators</i>
CNSM + IAB	123	7	<i>increase from 6 senators</i>
CRCD	108	6	
GI	17	2	
IARC + ARSC	22	2	
Libraries	12	2	<i>NEW (previously in CLA)</i>
SFOS	67	4	<i>increase from 3 senators</i>
SNRAS	25	2	
SOE	20	2	
<u>SOM</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>2</u>	
TOTAL	643	41	<i>increase from 39 senators</i>

These calculations are based on faculty counts for each unit as of mid-October, provided by the Provost's Office. Tenure-track faculty, research faculty, and term faculty are eligible for representation on the UAF Faculty Senate. Faculty are counted only in the unit of their primary appointment. Those with tenure-track appointments split between an academic unit and a research unit are counted in the academic unit in which they are eligible for tenure and promotion. The full rules for reapportionment are in the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate.

In October 2012 there were 643 eligible UAF faculty, an increase from 611 in October 2010. Units needed a minimum of 10 eligible faculty to qualify for separate representation. Six units had enough faculty to qualify for one senator and were assigned the minimum of two senators: GI, IARC, Libraries, SNRAS, SOE, SOM.

The results of this reapportionment will go into effect with the elections in Spring 2013.

TABLED MOTION FROM MEETING 186:

The UAF Faculty Senate agrees to discontinuation of the PhD Degree in Mathematics.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE: During the 2010-2011 program review process, the Faculty Program Review Committee recommended that the Ph.D. in Mathematics be continued, but stated “DMS should investigate ways to increase this number [of students] or make clear the reasons for the continuation of this program.” The Administration Program Review Committee and the Chancellor's Cabinet recommended the Ph.D. in Mathematics program be discontinued. The Mathematics Department (which administers this degree) appealed that recommendation, but the appeal was denied by the Chancellor's Cabinet on the grounds that there was no evidence that enrollment would increase or other compelling reasons for continuation.

Background and Information:

There was total of only two Ph.D. in Mathematics graduates during the period from FY06 to present. Enrollment was 7 in FY06, but since then has ranged between 0 and 3 students. As shown below, there has been zero enrollment for a year. Of the students enrolled in 2009-10, two graduated and the other student is not expected to return.

Program Review Enrollment Data

Degree and major sought:	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
PHD					
Mathematics	7	2	3	3	2

Enrollment in the Mathematics Ph.D. Program by semester, 2009-present

Program	Su09	Fa09	Sp10	Su10	Fa10	Sp11	Su11	Fa11	Sp12	Su12	Fa12*
PHD	1	2	1	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	0

*As of October 25, 2012.

Additional factors are that the faculty member who has served as major professor for all recent Ph.D. students has left UAF, and that the program has persistently had low enrollment and graduates. During the previous program review period the enrollment had increased from zero (Fall 1999) to six (Fall 2004), but there were no doctoral degrees awarded. So, over the last 13 years there has been a total of only two graduates. The Program Review conducted in 2005-06 concluded in part:

“We also support continuing the Ph.D. program for the next review period, but it will be subject to a serious re-evaluation in 2010. Several questions that must be addressed at that time are (1) Has a broader group of faculty, especially including some of the recent hires, begun advising Ph.D. students? (2) Has an enrollment of about 5-10 students been sustained? (3) Have a reasonable fraction of the students admitted before 2007 completed their degrees? (4) Have these students had successful outcomes, e.g., employment in their field, publication in peer-

reviewed journals, etc.? Negative answers to most of these questions will probably result in termination of the program, or at least, suspension of admissions until a more favorable climate exists.”

Discontinuation of this program will have little effect on other programs, personnel, students, or budget. The department will be freed from administrative requirements of student learning outcomes assessment and program review. The vacant faculty position can be refilled to focus on other department needs. There are currently no students enrolled in this program, and admissions have been suspended pending Faculty Senate action. Therefore, the program can be discontinued immediately and does not require a teach out period.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the revised Unit Criteria for the Cooperative Extension Service.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013
 Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the Cooperative Extension Service. Revisions were agreed upon by the department representatives and the Unit Criteria Committee, and the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

**UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY
AND COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND INDICES**

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS' CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, PRE-TENURE REVIEW, POST-TENURE REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY ADAPTED FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE FACULTY OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE DEPARTMENT. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS.

CHAPTER I

Purview

The University of Alaska Fairbanks document, "Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," supplements the Board of Regents (BOR) policies and describes the purpose, conditions, eligibility, and other specifications relating to the evaluation of faculty at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). Contained herein are regulations and procedures to guide the evaluation processes and to identify the bodies of review appropriate for the university.

The university, through the UAF Faculty Senate, may change or amend these regulations and procedures from time to time and will provide adequate notice in making changes and amendments.

These regulations shall apply to all of the units within the University of Alaska Fairbanks, except in so far as extant collective bargaining agreements apply otherwise.

The provost is responsible for coordination and implementation of matters relating to procedures stated herein.

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment

Minimum degree, experience and performance requirements are set forth in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV. Exceptions to these requirements for initial placement in academic rank or special academic rank positions shall be submitted to the chancellor or chancellor’s designee for approval prior to a final selection decision.

B. Academic Titles

Academic titles must reflect the discipline in which the faculty are appointed.

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank

Deans of schools and colleges, and directors when appropriate, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit, shall observe procedures for advertisement, review, and selection of candidates to fill any vacant faculty position. These procedures are set by UAF Human Resources and the Campus Diversity and Compliance (AA/EEO) office and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators as a unit.

D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

Deans and/or directors, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit, shall establish procedures for advertisement, review, and selection of candidates to fill any faculty positions as they become available. Such procedures shall be consistent with the university’s stated AA/EEO policies and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators in the unit.

E. Following the Selection Process

The dean or director shall appoint the new faculty member and advise him/her of the conditions, benefits, and obligations of the position. If the appointment is to be at the professor level, the dean/director must first obtain the concurrence of the chancellor or chancellor’s designee.

F. Letter of Appointment

The initial letter of appointment shall specify the nature of the assignment, the percentage emphasis that is to be placed on each of the parts of the faculty responsibility, mandatory year of tenure review, and any special conditions relating to the appointment.

This letter of appointment establishes the nature of the position and, while the percentage of emphasis for each part may vary with each workload distribution as specified in the annual workload agreement document, the part(s) defining the position may not.

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV, evaluators may consider, but shall not be limited to, whichever of the following are appropriate to the faculty member’s professional obligation: mastery of subject matter; effectiveness in teaching; achievement in research, scholarly, and creative activity; effectiveness of public service; effectiveness of university service; demonstration of professional development and quality of total contribution to the university.

For purposes of evaluation at UAF, the total contribution to the university and activity in the areas outlined above will be defined by relevant activity and demonstrated competence from the following areas: 1) effectiveness in teaching; 2) achievement in scholarly activity; and 3) effectiveness of service.

Bipartite Faculty

Bipartite faculty are regular academic rank faculty who fill positions that are designated as performing two of the three parts of the university’s tripartite responsibility.

The dean or director of the relevant college/school shall determine which of the criteria defined above apply to these faculty.

Bipartite faculty may voluntarily engage in a tripartite function, but they will not be required to do so as a condition for evaluation, promotion, or tenure.

B. Criteria for Instruction

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, PARAPROFESSIONAL ADVISING AND TRAINING, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities.

STANDARD ACADEMIC TEACHING IS NOT A COMMON FORM OF INFORMATION DELIVERY IN THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE. INSTRUCTION OFTEN INCLUDES CONTACT WITH CLIENTELE THROUGH DISTANCE DELIVERY METHODS, WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS, TRAINING AND PUBLIC INFORMATION EVENTS. A 10% (4 UNIT) TEACHING LOAD IN EXTENSION IS CONSIDERED 45 TO 50 HOURS TEACHING IN FRONT OF A GROUP.

1. Effectiveness in Teaching

Evidence of excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, evidence of the various characteristics that define effective teachers. Effective teachers

- a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for students AND CLIENTELE;
- b. express positive regard for students, BECOME FAMILIAR WITH THEIR COMMUNITY/PUBLIC, develop good rapport with students AND CLIENTELE, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject;
- c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student AND CLIENTELE participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are sensitive to student AND CLIENTELE diversity;
- d. emphasize regular feedback to students and reward student learning success;
- e. demonstrate content mastery, discuss current information and divergent points of view, relate topics to other disciplines, deliver material at the appropriate level;
- f. regularly develop new courses, workshops and seminars ADDRESSING CLIENTELE AND PUBLIC NEEDS BY DELIVERING INFORMATION RELEVANT TO THOSE NEEDS and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design;
- g. may receive prizes and awards, AND GRANTS for excellence in teaching.

2. Components of Evaluation

Effectiveness in teaching will be evaluated through information on formal and informal teaching, course and curriculum material, recruiting and advising, training/guiding graduate students, etc., provided by:

- a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms, AND/OR TESTIMONIALS, AND/OR LETTERS OF SUPPORT FROM STUDENTS, OTHER PROFESSIONALS,

and at least two of the following:

- b. narrative self-evaluation,
- c. peer/department chair classroom observation(s),
- d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials.

E. DOCUMENTATION OF THE IMPACTS RESULTING FROM TEACHING ACTIVITY SUCH AS KNOWLEDGE GAINED OR CHANGES IN BEHAVIOR OR ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS THROUGH POST INSTRUCTION EVALUATIONS, SURVEYS, AND TESTIMONIALS.

F. REPEATED INVITATIONS TO TEACH IN A COMMUNITY REFLECTS ENGAGEMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS IN TEACHING.

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE FACULTY HAVE LIMITED OPPORTUNITIES TO CONDUCT TRADITIONAL RESEARCH AND VERY LIMITED ACCESS TO LABORATORIES AND GRADUATE STUDENTS. ADDITIONALLY, BIPARTITE FACULTY MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE A RESEARCH OBLIGATION.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION FACULTY WITH TRIPARTITE RESPONSIBILITIES ARE EXPECTED TO CONDUCT APPLIED RESEARCH OR ENGAGE IN OTHER SCHOLARLY PURSUITS THAT CHALLENGE AND HELP SOLVE ISSUES FACING THE PEOPLE OF ALASKA. MOST GRANTS PURSUED BY BIPARTITE FACULTY RELATE TO SERVICE OR TEACHING ACTIVITIES AND ARE NOT RESEARCH ORIENTED.

1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Whatever the contribution, research, scholarly or creative activities must have one or more of the following characteristics:

- a. They must occur in a public forum WITH RESULTS AND IMPACTS DISSEMINATED TO APPROPRIATE ACADEMIC AND COMMUNITY AUDIENCES.
- b. They must be evaluated, REVIEWED AND VALIDATED by appropriate peers AND BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY.
- c. They must be evaluated by peers external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.
- d. They must be judged to make a contribution AND BE RELEVANT TO ALASKAN ISSUES.

2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Evidence of excellence in research, scholarly, and creative activity may be demonstrated through, but not limited to:

- a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline, AUTHORSHIP OF CES PUBLICATIONS OR ARTICLES WITHIN CES PUBLICATIONS OF HIGH QUALITY BASED ON ORIGINAL OR APPLIED RESEARCH WHICH MEETS THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN CHAPTER III C.1. OF THIS DOCUMENT.

- b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas, these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.
- c. Presentation of research papers before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.
- d. Exhibitions of art work at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics.
- e. Performances in recitals or productions, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.
- f. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations AND IN-HOUSE CES PUBLICATIONS.
- g. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.
- h. Citations of research in scholarly publications.
- i. Published abstracts of research papers.
- j. Reprints or quotations of publications, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline.
- k. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.
- l. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.
- m. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is a fundamental part of the university's obligation to the people of its state. In this tradition, faculty providing their professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge,* is identified as "public service." The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assumes a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service."

* CES FACULTY WORK IS COUNTED AS PUBLIC SERVICE EVEN THOUGH THE UNIVERSITY MAY CHARGE A FEE FOR SOME ACTIVITIES. THESE FEES ARE NECESSARY TO RECOVER COSTS SUCH AS THOSE FOR ROOM RENT, PRINTED MATERIALS PROVIDED TO PARTICIPANTS, EQUIPMENT, AND OTHERS AND ARE NOT PAYMENT FOR FACULTY TIME NOR ARE THE FEES EVER RETAINED BY INDIVIDUAL FACULTY.

1. Public Service

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. It includes all activities that extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing, programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, professional contributions to the community or to one's discipline, or other activities in furtherance of the goals and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- a. Providing information services to adults or youth INCLUDING REPRESENTING AND ANSWERING QUESTIONS AT CES EDUCATIONAL DISPLAYS, BOOTHS AND EXHIBITS AT PUBLIC EVENTS.
- b. Service on or to government or public committees, COLLABORATIONS & PARTNERSHIPS ESTABLISHED WITH AGENCIES AND GROUPS AND UTILIZATION OF DISTRICT OR REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARDS, TASK FORCES, FOCUS GROUPS OR PUBLIC SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS TO IDENTIFY RELEVANT ISSUES AND PROBLEMS.
- c. Service on accrediting bodies.
- d. Active participation in professional organizations.
- e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- f. Consulting AS APPROPRIATE TO THE UNIT.
- g. Prizes and awards, AND GRANTS, for excellence in public service.
- h. Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.
- i. Training and facilitating AT PUBLIC FORUMS, GROUP MEETINGS AND PUBLIC EVENTS.
- j. Radio and TV programs, newspaper articles and columns, CES publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media, INCLUDING WEB SITES DESIGNED AND/OR MANAGED BY FACULTY. CONTENT MAY RESULT FROM COMMUNITY INTEREST OR ISSUES..
- k. Judging and similar educational assistance at science fairs, state fairs, and speech, drama, literary, and similar competitions.
- L. ENGAGE THE PUBLIC IN ASSESSING RESEARCH NEEDS - AND COMMUNICATE THOSE NEEDS TO THE APPROPRIATE RESEARCH UNITS.
- M. MANAGING PARAPROFESSIONAL AND/OR VOLUNTEER PROGRAM TO HELP EXTEND CES RESOURCES OR DEVELOP LEADERSHIP SKILLS.

N. RESPONSE IN EMERGENCY SITUATIONS RENDERED IN AN EXTENSION ROLE, TO CLIENTELE THAT FACED THE EMERGENCY.

2. University Service

University service includes those activities involving faculty members in the governance, administration, and other internal affairs of the university, its colleges, schools, and institutes. It includes non-instructional work with students and their organizations. Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

- a. Service on university, college, school, institute, or departmental committees or governing bodies.
- b. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance for specific projects.
- c. Service as department chair, PROGRAM CHAIR, OFFICE COORDINATOR or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college/school.
- d. Participation in accreditation reviews.
- e. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.
- f. Service in support of student organizations and activities.
- g. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.
- h. Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.
- i. Mentoring.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

3. Professional Service

- a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.
- b. Active participation in professional organizations.
- c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.
- e. Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings.
- f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

4. Evaluation of Service

Each individual faculty member's proportionate responsibility in service shall be reflected in annual workload agreements. In formulating criteria, standards and indices for evaluation, promotion, and tenure, individual units should include examples of service activities and measures for evaluation appropriate for that unit. Excellence in public and university service may be demonstrated through, e.g., appropriate letters of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

SPECIFIC INDICES FOR COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE ACTIVITY, AND FOR PROMOTION & TENURE.

SINCE SERVICE IS THE MAJORITY OF THE WORKLOAD OF CES FACULTY, IN ADDITION TO UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS ON EVALUATION OF PUBLIC AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE ADDITIONAL INDICES FOR DOCUMENTING EFFECTIVE SERVICE FOR CES FACULTY MAY INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF DEPARTMENT, PUBLIC AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE MAY INCLUDE SOME OR ALL, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO III.D.1 AND III.D.2 AND THE FOLLOWING:

1. AUTHORSHIP OF CES PUBLICATIONS WITH A DOCUMENTED RECORD OF PEER REVIEW.
2. DOCUMENTATION OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES PLANNED IN AN ENGAGED, TWO-WAY, CONTINUING PROGRAMMATIC BASIS.
- 3.- TESTIMONIALS & LETTERS DEMONSTRATING OUTCOMES AND/OR EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES.
4. DOCUMENTING PUBLIC NEEDS AND ENGAGING THE RESOURCES OF THE UNIVERSITY AND OTHER ENTITIES IN MEETING THOSE NEEDS.
5. DOCUMENTING IMPACTS WHICH RESULT FROM ENGAGED PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES

FULL PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF LEADERSHIP IN THE SERVICE AREA IS EXPECTED. SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS MAY INCLUDE:

1. INVITATIONAL SERVICE ON NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL BOARDS, PUBLICATION & GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEES, AWARD COMMISSIONS OR SCHOLARSHIP COMMISSIONS.
2. NATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN A PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION.
3. RECOGNITION THROUGH INVITATIONAL SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS WHICH CONSTITUTE PUBLIC SERVICE SUCH AS KEYNOTE ADDRESSES AT CONFERENCES, MEETINGS AND EVENTS NOT SPONSORED BY CES.
4. OUTSTANDING UNIVERSITY SERVICE, SUCH AS SERVICE AS A FACULTY SENATE OFFICER, FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE

CHAIR, CHAIR OF A FACULTY SEARCH COMMITTEE, OR MEMBER OF A MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE SEARCH COMMITTEE.

5. RECOGNITION THROUGH RECEIPT OF PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS, OR AWARDS FOR SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY.

6. RECEIPT OF A NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, USDA, OR PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY SERVICE AWARD.

7. PARTICIPATION IN A VOLUNTARY MENTORING RELATIONSHIP WITH JUNIOR FACULTY TO FACILITATE THEIR PROGRESS TOWARD PROMOTION AND TENURE.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the academic policy regarding Attendance.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE: Previous policy language was ambiguous and subject to misinterpretation. It also clarifies that faculty are encouraged, but not required, to accommodate students absent for official UAF-recognized activities. Military activities will be addressed separately in a future policy proposal.

[[]] = Deletion

Attendance [as currently in the *UAF Catalog*, page 49]

[[You are expected to attend classes regularly; unexcused absences may result in a failing grade. You must have prior written approval to miss the first class meeting or your instructor may drop you. You are responsible for conferring with your instructor concerning absences and the possibility of making up missed work.]]

[[If you are required to participate in either military exercises or UAF-sponsored activities that will cause you to miss class, you must notify your instructor(s) as soon as possible of your absence. You must notify your instructor(s) of all scheduled UAF-required absences for the semester (e.g., travel to athletic events) during the first week of classes.]]

[[You and your instructor will make a good-faith effort to make suitable arrangements to assure that you can make up classes and work you miss and are not penalized for your excused absence. If suitable arrangements cannot be made, you will be allowed to withdraw from the course without penalty. However, your instructor is under no obligation to allow you to make up missed work for unexcused absences or if notification and arrangements are not made in advance of the absence.]]

PROPOSED NEW VERSION:

Attendance

UAF is committed to student success and academic integrity. UAF FACULTY expect that students are committed to academic achievement. You are expected to adhere to the class attendance policies set by your instructors.

General Absences: If you miss class, you are responsible for conferring with your instructor as soon as possible concerning your absence, and to discuss the possibilities for arranging alternative learning opportunities. Note that some departments drop students who miss the first day of class and who fail to obtain their instructor's prior approval for the absence.

UAF Sanctioned Absences: If you are scheduled to miss class for an academic requirement or to represent UAF in an official capacity (e.g. NCAA athletic competition, music ensemble performances), you must notify your instructor in writing by the first Wednesday of the semester in which the absences will occur. The notification should list all scheduled absences, and bear the signature of a UAF school official. Instructors are encouraged to make reasonable accommodations for students who miss class to participate in these official UAF-recognized activities. However, it is your responsibility to follow-up the notification of absence by discussing alternative learning opportunities with your instructors before the end of the drop/add period (typically the second Friday of the semester). Doing so will allow you to drop the class and to add another if, after a good faith effort, you and your instructor cannot arrange for comparable learning opportunities that will enable you to be successful in the class.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new minor in Interdisciplinary Studies.

Effective: Spring 2013

Rationale: See the program proposal #90-UNP on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Overview:

The Interdisciplinary Minor is intended to add breadth to baccalaureate programs. It provides flexibility to students who have well-defined goals that do not fit into one of the established minors offered by the university. In addition, many students, especially military students, arrive at UAF with substantial transfer credits in fields where UAF does not have a minor. For example, a service member who has completed medic training transfers in a substantial number of credits; however, many of these credits do not transfer in as UAF's Allied Health courses for several reasons. Creation of this minor would allow such students to complete their programs more quickly by recognizing a body of knowledge and skills they have fulfilled at other institutions.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

Interdisciplinary Minor

1. Contact the Academic Advising Center at 907-474-6396 or 1-888-823-8780 for materials and procedures.
2. Prepare and submit a draft declaration of interdisciplinary minor form and submit it electronically to the Academic Advising Center at uaf.advising@alaska.edu or in person at 509 Gruening Building. This form asks the student to provide a title for their minor, briefly describe the body of knowledge and skills intended to fulfill the minor, including courses specifying the knowledge and skills relevant to the minor title (for example, Food Science minor including relevant coursework from transfer credits in Food Science from a regionally accredited university, as well as credits from chemistry, fisheries or natural resources management, and biological sciences). An interdisciplinary minor cannot be titled the same as an existing minor and must demonstrate a cohesive body of knowledge and skills. The approved title will appear on the student's transcript.
3. Three faculty proposed by the student and approved by the Dean of General Studies will serve as the interdisciplinary minor committee. This committee will ensure that an appropriate and

cohesive body of knowledge and skills is addressed in the planned minor, ensure that the interdisciplinary minor does not overlap with an existing minor, and discuss alternatives with the student as needed. This committee and the Dean of General Studies must approve the draft declaration of minor for it to become effective.

4. Minimum credits required – 18 credits

*Student must earn a grade of C or better in each course.

Relationship to the Purposes of the University:

Creation of the interdisciplinary minor will allow the university to be responsive to demand. For example, sustainability, climate change, biotechnology, indigenous studies, or other developing emphasis areas could become minors initially through the interdisciplinary program, and, with sufficient demand, could be adopted as specific minors.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new minor in Emergency Management.

Effective: Spring 2013

Rationale: See the program proposal #63-UNP on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Overview:

There is an increasing interest among students to obtain additional exposure to the growing field of emergency management. Organizations within the public and private sectors are establishing emergency response policies, continuity of operations plans, and actively building and training emergency response teams. This minor allows students with other primary career interests to develop in the emergency management arena, broaden their base of experience and bring additional skills to their careers and communities.

The selected courses provide a base of understanding in emergency issues and allow students some flexibility in choosing courses which interest them. The options allow them to select courses that focus on communications, on business practices or on planning and response in the event of emergency.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

1. Complete the following: *
HSEM F301 - Principles of Homeland Security & Emergency Management – 3 credits
2. Choose 3 of the following: *
HSEM F412 – Emergency Planning and Preparedness – 3 credits
HSEM F423 – Disaster Response Operations and Management – 3 credits
HSEM F434 – All Hazards Risk Analysis – 3 credits
HSEM F445 – Business Continuity and Crisis Management – 3 credits
HSEM F456W – Leadership and Influence During Crisis – 3 credits
3. Choose at least 3 credits from the following:
GEOS/GEOG F222 - Fundamentals of Geospatial Sciences – 3 credits
GEOS F120X Glaciers, Earthquakes, and Volcanoes: Past, Present, and Future – 4 credits **
BA F317W – Employment Law – 3 credits
BA F490 – Services Marketing – 3 credits
COMM F335O – Organizational Communications – 3 credits
COMM F353 – Conflict, Mediation, and Communication – 3 credits

BA F452W – Internship in Emergency Management – 3 credits
Or course(s) approved by Program Director

* Students must earn a C grade (2.0) or better in these classes.

Note: an Emergency Management minor is not available to students earning a Bachelor of Emergency Management degree.

**May be used to satisfy half of the core science requirement.

Relationship to the Purposes of the University:

Providing a minor in emergency management would meet student demand for those in other programs who have expressed interest in emergency management. Students who have approached the program recognize their future employment requires peripheral knowledge regarding the emergency management profession and that this knowledge would be of benefit in securing employment or promotion.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the academic policy regarding transfer of credits.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE: Note that (a) we currently accept a baccalaureate degree as fulfilling our core and (b) we accept an AA/AS from a regionally accredited school as fulfilling the lower division parts of the core.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Transferring Credits [as currently in the *UAF Catalog*, pages 36-38]

...

The following regulations apply to transfer of credit:

1. Students are eligible for transfer of credit if they have been admitted to an undergraduate degree or certificate program.
2. The applicability of transfer credit to a student's major and/or minor requirements is subject to approval by the major and/or minor department. Transfer students must fulfill the UAF graduation and residency requirements, including those specific to their programs.
3. Undergraduate credits earned at the 100-level or above with a C- grade or higher at institutions accredited by one of the six regional accrediting agencies will be considered for transfer. Transfer credit is not granted for courses with doctrinal religious content or for graduate courses (for undergraduate programs).
4. Transfer credit is awarded for courses in which the student received grades of C- or better. Instructor permission may be required for purposes of registration if the transfer credit courses have not satisfied the prerequisite requirements, or if the transferable grade is not equal to a C (2.0) or better (the minimum grade required for prerequisite courses).
5. Any student who has completed a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution will be considered to have completed the equivalent of the baccalaureate core and the associate of arts core when officially accepted to a baccalaureate degree program or associate of arts program at UAF. These students will also be considered to have completed the equivalent of the

communication, computation and human relations requirements for the associate of applied science and the certificate.

6. Any student who has completed an associate of arts or an associate of science degree from a regionally accredited school satisfying one of the criteria below will be considered as having satisfied the 100- and 200-level UAF general education (core) requirements:

- a. The AA or AS degree is from the University of Alaska, or
- b. The public universities in the state in which the community college is located also waive their core requirements in recognition of completing an AA or AS degree, that is, have established a 2+2 program, or
- c. The community college and/or community college district is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (the agency that accredits UAF), or
- d. The associate program has been approved by the UAF Core Review Committee as satisfying the 100- and 200-level general education (core) requirements.

7. **ANY TRANSFER STUDENT WHO HAS COMPLETED THE BACCALAUREATE GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS AT ANY REGIONALLY ACCREDITED 4-YEAR INSTITUTION IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE COMPLETED THE BACCALAUREATE CORE REQUIREMENTS (EXCLUDING ORAL INTENSIVE AND WRITING INTENSIVE) AT UAF. THE STUDENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING AN OFFICIAL STATEMENT AND DOCUMENTATION CERTIFYING GER COMPLETION AT THE PREVIOUS INSTITUTION.**

7. 8. Students who satisfy UAF core degree requirements by meeting criteria described in 5 or 6 above may still need prerequisite classes or instructor permission in order to register.
8. 9. Transfer credit is not included in computation of the UAF GPA, except to determine eligibility for graduation with honors.
9. 10. Class standing (e.g., freshman, sophomore, etc.) is based on the number of college credits accepted in transfer by UAF, combined with any courses completed in residence at UAF.
10. 11. Credits may be awarded for formal service schooling and military occupational specialties (MOS) based on recommendations in the "Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experience in the Armed Services," published by the American Council on Education. Credit completed through the Community College of the Air Force or Department of Defense courses is included in the category of military experience.
11. 12. A student will be awarded credit for currently valid government and professional certifications that have been reviewed and approved for designated course equivalencies at UAF. A list of these programs is available in the Office of Admissions and the Registrar.
12. 13. Credit may also be awarded for satisfactory completion of training programs, based on recommendations of the American Council on Education and the National Program on non-Collegiate Sponsored Instruction. The award of credit is subject to review and approval of appropriate UAF faculty.

Curricular Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes for 22 October 2012

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry (Chair); Retchenda George-Bettisworth (audio); Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy; David Henry; Todd Radenbaugh (audio).
Voting members absent: Ken Abramowicz; Diane McEachern.

Non-voting members present: Doug Goering (audio); Carol Gering; Libby Eddy (audio); Lillian Misel; Donald Crocker (audio); Alex Fitts; Jonathan Rosenberg (audio – part of the meeting). Jayne Harvie was present (taking notes.)

Guests: Sine Anahita; Kristi Giddings.

1. Approve minutes of last meeting

The minutes for October 8 were approved with a correction to meeting attendance. Retchenda was present via audio conference.

2. Suggested change to Syllabus policy....(from Curricular Review Committee):

"If the course includes project(s) which count for more than 20% of the grade, include general project description(s) and evaluation methods (e.g., rubric)." This would be added to section #10 (see last page of agenda.)

Rainer will modify the syllabus requirement list at #10 – Evaluation, with the proposed statement (above) for the next CAC meeting. There was general support for the addition.

3. GERC-related issues

a. J Rosenberg call in at ~ 9:15 for brief report

b. new GERC business as required (?)

Jonathan reported that the poll has been sent out, noting it closes on November 2. The magnitude of response will be analyzed for quantitative data and the comments for qualitative data. A model will be formulated from the data results, and the committee will add structure to this model, which will then go back before the faculty. Feedback from current students will be collected by means of focus groups. An exit survey is planned for graduating seniors, and for alumni.

[In response to being asked at the meeting, Alex reported to the CAC via email following the meeting that 135 survey responses had been received to date.]

4. CONTINUING EFFORTS AT ADDRESSING THE ATHLETIC ABSENCE PROBLEM

The problem in a nutshell: UAF requires as a condition to athletic scholarships that students skip class. UAF consequently has a moral obligation to (a) not punish said students and (b) provide them with an education. Providing each team with tutors is a logical, but financially problematic, solution. Pretending that there really isn't a problem has been the historical substitute. . The current wording leaves much to be desired.

Athletic subcommittee has a couple of different versions in the works...here's one

Attendance Policy Language (proposed by Dept of Athletics and modified by DS & RN)

You are expected to attend class regularly. Class attendance policies are set by individual instructors. If you must miss class, you are responsible for conferring with your instructor concerning your absences and discussing the possibilities for arranging alternative learning

opportunities. Note that some departments automatically drop students who miss the first day of class and who fail to obtain their instructor's prior authorization for the absence.

If you are **required** to miss class to participate in official UAF-sponsored activities (e.g., NCAA athletic competition, ROTC), you must notify your instructor in writing by the first Wednesday of the semester. The notification should list all scheduled absences and bear an official UAF signature. If you enroll in a class after the first Wednesday of a semester, you must notify the instructor of all scheduled UAF-sponsored activities on or before the first class meeting following your enrollment in the class.

In cases of these **required** absences, you will not receive an automatic penalty to your attendance grade.// **OR ...** not receive an automatic penalty to the attendance portion of your grade. However, it is necessary that you discuss the provision of alternative learning opportunities with your instructors before the end of the University's regular drop/add period (usually the second Friday of the semester). If, after a good faith effort, you and your instructor cannot make suitable arrangements for alternative learning opportunities, you may drop the course and add another without penalty, provided that you drop within the normal drop/add period.

Attendance (CURRENT VERSION)

You are expected to attend classes regularly; unexcused absences may result in a failing grade. You must have prior written approval to miss the first class meeting or your instructor may drop you. You are responsible for conferring with your instructor concerning absences and the possibility of making up missed work.

If you are required to participate in either military exercises or UAF-sponsored activities that will cause you to miss class, you must notify your instructor(s) as soon as possible of your absence. You must notify your instructor(s) of all scheduled UAF-required absences for the semester (e.g., travel to athletic events) during the first week of classes.

You and your instructor will make a good-faith effort to make suitable arrangements to assure that you can make up classes and work you miss and are not penalized for your excused absence. If suitable arrangements cannot be made, you will be allowed to withdraw from the course without penalty. However, your instructor is under no obligation to allow you to make up missed work for unexcused absences or if notification and arrangements are not made in advance of the absence.

Here's another proposed version

You are expected to adhere to the class attendance policies set by your instructors. If you must miss class, you are responsible for conferring with your instructor concerning your absences and to discuss the possibilities for arranging alternative learning opportunities. Note that some departments automatically drop students who miss the first day of class and who fail to obtain their instructor's prior authorization for the absence.

If you are required to miss class to participate in official UAF-sponsored activities (e.g. NCAA athletic competitions, ROTC), you must notify your instructor in writing by the first Wednesday of the semester. The notification should list all scheduled absences, and bear an official UAF signature. The notification form must be signed by the instructor acknowledging the proposed absences and either agreeing to provide alternative learning opportunities or declining to do so.

Students who are required to miss class because of official UAF activities must discuss the provision of alternative learning opportunities with their instructors before the end of the drop/add period. Doing so will allow the student to drop the class and add another if, after a

good faith effort, the instructor and the student cannot make suitable arrangements to cover the missed classes.

Sine Anahita, professor of sociology, and Kristi Giddings, associate athletic director, were present and participated in the discussion.

There was much discussion of the above policy language which focused on trying to strike a balance between the prerogative of faculty to set their own attendance policy in their courses and accommodating the fact that student athletes (and others involved in university sanctioned events, and ROTC) will have excused absences and an opportunity for making up coursework during the academic year. There is an inescapable contradiction between faculty prerogative and university-sanctioned absences from class.

Sine noted that requiring written notification by students to instructors by the first Friday after classes start was impractical. She presented reasons why the Wednesday before the last day to add/drop courses was more workable, including the flood of emails during the first week that classes start, the fact that many evening courses haven't yet met, and that Wednesday still provides time to drop and add courses. Sine urged the committee to consider trying the Wednesday deadline for at least a year.

That the hockey team almost made the playoffs last year was a fact that brought the importance of dealing with this issue now to the forefront. The hockey team may again make the playoffs this year, and the new restrictive policy English has implemented which conflicts with current policy, both make the issue too big to ignore any longer.

Cindy H. raised the issue of providing tutors to the students. Kristi noted that Division 2 athletics does not make tutoring a requirement as it is in Division 1; however, they would love to be able to provide tutors but it's a budgetary shortage matter. There was agreement that providing tutoring would be a big step in the right direction.

Much discussion followed about providing quality education, the circumstances faced by different levels of course offerings (large 100/200 level courses vs. smaller, more in-depth upper level courses), core course requirements, and the need to protect both students and faculty by means of the policy. Distance solutions were discussed. Karen asked if the idea of having an English course just for athletes had been discussed. Lillian M. noted that there are certain departments (business, psychology, for example) with a higher proportion of student athletes enrolled, and asked if those departments have been spoken with regarding these issues. Options for directed study and individual study were mentioned.

Alex F. commented that overall, student athlete GPAs and graduation rates are good. It's a small number of students who are truly affected.

Karen G. commented that UAF has community outreach and engagement as part of its mission. Out of class activities are a valuable type of learning.

Todd R. asked if there is any data available. Kristi G. responded that there is not. Rainer commented that the size of the problem doesn't change the fact that it must be dealt with.

David H. expressed general support for the proposed version of the policy that Sine had supplied (particularly the first line), but with issues raised by Krisit G., Sine will make some modifications and send a rewritten draft to Rainer for the next meeting.

Excerpt from Syllabus requirements...

9. Course policies:

☐ Specify course rules, including your policies on attendance, tardiness, class participation, make-up exams, and plagiarism/academic integrity.

10. Evaluation:

☐ Specify how students will be evaluated, ☐ what factors will be included, ☐ their relative value, and ☐ how they will be tabulated into grades (on a curve, absolute scores, etc.) ☐ Publicize UAF regulations with regard to the grades of "C" and below as applicable to this course. (Not required in the syllabus, but may be a convenient way to

Everyone REALLY REALLY screaming and shouting...followed by adjournment close to 10:30 am.

Curricular Affairs Committee 5 November 2012 Minutes 9-10 am Reichardt 301

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry (Chair); Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Ken Abramowicz; Karen Gustafson (audio); Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy; David Henry; Todd Radenbaugh (audio), Diane McEachern (audio)

Non-voting members present: Carol Gering; Lillian Misel (audio); Donald Crocker (audio); Alex Fitts; Linda Hapsmith (audio); Jayne Harvie (taking notes.) Absent (Rainer knew of this in advance): Doug Goering.

Guests: Sine Anahita, Gary Gray, Dani Sheppard: members of the ad hoc subcommittee on absences

1. *We approved the minutes of the previous meeting*

2. **CONTINUING EFFORTS AT ADDRESSING UAF-Required ABSENCES**

Attendance (CURRENT VERSION in the UAF Catalog)

You are expected to attend classes regularly; unexcused absences may result in a failing grade. You must have prior written approval to miss the first class meeting or your instructor may drop you. You are responsible for conferring with your instructor concerning absences and the possibility of making up missed work.

If you are required to participate in either military exercises or UAF-sponsored activities that will cause you to miss class, you must notify your instructor(s) as soon as possible of your absence. You must notify your instructor(s) of all scheduled UAF-required absences for the semester (e.g., travel to athletic events) during the first week of classes.

You and your instructor will make a good-faith effort to make suitable arrangements to assure that you can make up classes and work you miss and are not penalized for your excused absence. If suitable arrangements cannot be made, you will be allowed to withdraw from the course without penalty. However, your instructor is under no obligation to allow you to make up missed work for unexcused absences or if notification and arrangements are not made in advance of the absence.

Suggested slightly modified new version

UAF is committed to student success and academic integrity. The university expects that students' primary commitment is to academic achievement. You are expected to adhere to the class attendance policies set by your instructors. If you must miss class, you are responsible for conferring with your instructor as soon as possible concerning your absence, and to discuss the possibilities for arranging alternative learning opportunities. Note that some departments drop students who miss the first day of class and who fail to obtain their instructor's prior approval for the absence.

If you must miss class for an academic requirement or to represent UAF in an official capacity (e.g. NCAA athletic competition, music ensemble performances), you must notify your instructor in writing by the first Wednesday of the semester in which the absences will occur. The notification should list all scheduled absences, and bear the signature of a UAF school official. If you will miss class because of these official UAF-recognized activities, it is still your responsibility to discuss with your instructors alternative learning opportunities that will enable you to be successful in the class. This must be done before the end of the drop/add period (typically the second Friday of the semester). Doing so will allow you to drop the class and to add another if, after a good faith effort, you and your instructor cannot arrange for comparable learning opportunities. Instructors are encouraged to make reasonable accommodations for and to not penalize students who miss class to participate in these official UAF-recognized activities.

Rationale

Previous policy language was ambiguous and subject to misinterpretation.

[more could be written here, but this seems adequate]

Action taken: The new, slightly modified version (above) was unanimously approved for submission to the faculty senate today (as a step towards eventual approval) and to the Administrative Committee of the faculty senate (first step). Also discussed: general changes in athletic-academic interactions.... Gary Gray, new Athletic Director, agreed to meet with CAC next semester to discuss such. Dani Sheppard agreed to attend future CAC meetings as a non-voting participant.

3. Interdisciplinary studies minor: *tentatively approved with slight change in wording*

Key issues: make absolutely clear that (a) student will create a specific title for the minor (NOT 'INTERDISCIPLINARY') and (b) this title will appear on the student's transcript. [Lillian agreed that such was possible and practicable.] Alex Fitts, acting Dean, agreed to provide such wording changes in advance of the next meeting for final approval.

4. Report from J Rosenberg (GERC) (via email)

"We talked about the NSSE survey results from 2009, noting they called for some tweaking of the Core to deal with deficiencies when UAF is compared to other institutions and some ways in which it falls short of achieving its own stated goals. Most of the meeting was taken up with a discussion of assessment. Jean Richey reported on the Core Review committee's meeting with the Provost; in which the Provost suggested that a standardized test would be the most practical--if not the most desirable way--to do it. Discussion went from what other methods might be available and availability of resources for them (e-portfolios, assessment of individual classes, finding ways for students to demonstrate integration of learning from several GE class, etc.). Ultimately we decided that we needed to move forward based on our poll results and our best judgments as educators about what students should get from GE (the program not the corporation) being mindful of but not obsessed about assessment as we progress. When the poll closes next week we will start to compile the qualitative data and start analyzing it."

As Jonathon wasn't present to take questions, we simply read the statement (most did so without moving their lips).

**As it was already 10:10 am and members were restless....
followed by adjournment.**

Faculty Senate - Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes from October 16th meeting

Voting members present: Cécile Lardon (Chair), Mike Davis, Leif Albertson, Chris Fallen, Julie Joly, Margaret Short, Duff Johnston

1. Grade appeals policy: The committee members will look at the language of the current policy and come to the next meeting with suggested changes.
2. Policy about earning degrees/certificates by staff/faculty in the same unit: Before we can develop any recommendations we need to:
 - a. Meet with affected units – need to find out who we should talk to. (Cécile)
 - b. Talk to individuals who have earned degrees and certificates in this way.
 - c. Get examples from UAF where this has been a problem. (Cécile)
 - d. Get info from other institutions that have similar issues (i.e., trying to “grow their own” in a rural environment) (Duff)
3. Blue Book Review: This is a large and important project. We need to coordinate with the Unit Criteria Committee as they are also reviewing the Blue Book. The best way to avoid duplication and developing very different edits that have to be reconciled it might be easier for each committee to focus on part of the documents. Two suggestions were 1st and 2nd half, or generate a list of topics to be split up between the committees. Cécile will discuss this with Karen Jensen (chair of Unit Criteria Committee) and come back with a suggested way to proceed.
4. Data on non-regular faculty teaching: Margaret will work with the data
Committee members will email Cécile their preference for which larger project they would like to work on.

The next meeting will be on October 29th at 1:00 in the Kayak room.

Faculty Senate - Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes from October 29th meeting

Voting members present: Cécile Lardon (Chair), Mike Davis, Leif Albertson, Chris Fallen, Julie Joly, Margaret Short, Duff Johnston, Bella Gerlich

5. Minutes from last meeting were approved
6. Changes to grade appeal policy were voted on and approved. Cécile will draft the motion to present to the committee for final approval.
7. Blue Book Review: Cécile reported back from her meetings with Karen Jensen and Jane Weber. The committee agreed with the work plan outlined by Karen and Cécile (see attached meeting notes):
 - a. The Google site has already been set up and all committee members can access it.
 - b. Karen & Cécile have an appointment with Abel Bult-Ito and Cyndee West from UNAC.
 - c. Cécile met with Jane Weber who is the UAFT contact on the Fairbanks campus. Karen and Cécile schedule a meeting with Tim Powers and Jane to discuss the process with this union. We will also

meet with Jane Weber and Joe Mason to talk about the Regional Review Process. Jane Weber also requested that we include a process for term-funded faculty to be promoted.

- d. We will develop a timeline for this project and try to schedule 2 or 3 joint meetings for early next year.

8. Policy about earning degrees/certificates by staff/faculty in the same unit: Need to understand the issue more fully.

9. Data on non-regular faculty teaching: Discussion postponed until next meeting.

10. Project assignments:

Blue Book	Degrees/Certificates	Faculty Data
Cécile	Cécile	Margaret
Julie	Duff	Chris
Mike	Leif	
Bella		

The next meeting will be on November 12th at 1:00 in the Joint Conference room.

Faculty Senate - Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes from November 12, 2012 meeting

Voting members present: Cécile Lardon (Chair), Mike Davis, Leif Albertson, Julie Joly, Margaret Short, Duff Johnston

11. Blue Book:

- a. Karen & Cécile have met with Abel Bult-Ito and Cyndee West from UNAC. We went over the documents submitted by the provost; there was only one proposed change UNAC has an issue with. The FAC will keep working with the unit criteria committee and present a draft of the complete document to UNAC for review prior to submitting it to the Senate. We will also contact UNAC if we have any questions. This process worked well at UAA.
- b. Karen has modified the Google site for the project to make keeping track of documents and changes easier.

12. Policy about earning degrees/certificates by staff/faculty in the same unit: Duff sent a letter of inquiry to a university with a similarly dispersed and/or rural campus situation. He has not received a response yet.

13. Data on non-regular faculty teaching: No report

14. Discussion of progress on the three bigger projects: Subgroups need to make more progress in order to complete the projects this year – may need to meet outside of regular committee meetings.

15. New Topic: Should units be able to appoint an alternate after the election? This request came from Joanne Healy in the SOE who is concerned that they have difficulty finding enough faculty to fill their two regular senate seats and the alternate position. The committee developed three suggestions:

- a. Have a special election cycle in the fall before the first senate meeting to fill any empty seats.
- b. No regular special election. If a unit loses a senator and has not alternate to fill the vacancy then, and only then, can they elect a replacement. The details of this need to be worked out.
- c. Survey the senators about what they think.

The majority of committee members (5 out of 6) voted for option b. We will develop this more and discuss again at the next meeting.

The next meeting will be on November 19th at 1:00 in the Kayak room.

Committee on the Status of Women
Minutes Tues, Nov 06, 2012; 2:30-3:30 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Jenny Liu, Derek Sikes, Kayt Sunwood, Jane Weber, Nilima Hullavarad, Ellen Lopez, Shawn Russell, Diana Di Stefano, Mary Ehrlander, Amy Barnsley

Members absent: Megan McPhee

1) Women Center Advisory Board: Chancellor Rogers invited Carol Gold, Megan Carpenter, Don Foley, Brook Gamble, Patty Kastelic, Ellen Lopez, Liza Mack, Cody Rogers and Jane Weber to serve on the new Women's Center Advisory Committee. There is not staff council representative yet. This is both encouraging and exciting. The first meeting will be before December.

2) Rationale for a part-time faculty/administrative position focusing on the issues of women faculty: Written by Carol Gold. Edits were discussed including possible overlap in goals and clarification of distinctions between this position and the UAF office of Equal Opportunity / faculty development. Kayt emphasized the importance that this position come from within / report to the Provost's office. Diana suggested we look at peer institutions that have such a position. Amy and Kayt agreed to do this. Jane emphasized that one of the benefits not currently highlighted in the draft position proposal is that such a position should prevent loss of funds by the university due to non-retention of women faculty. Mary emphasized that deciding on a single goal for the position, such as reduction in non-retention of female faculty, would be ideal. Will revisit this at the next meeting, Dec 4th.

3) CSW Faculty Brown Bag: Next, on "Navigating Differences," is set for Tues, November 20th, 1-2pm. Colorful eye-catching fliers are up throughout campus. A well attended student brown bag held in the Women's Center, on the same topic was held by students inspired by the CSW fliers. Ellen proposed that the Brown Bag committee could meet immediately after the next Brown Bag (2:00-2:30, Nov 20) to plan the next.

Next Meetings - Tues 4 Dec 2012, 2:00-3:00PM

Meeting was adjourned at 3:30; Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/>

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes of October 31, 2012**

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Castellini, Izetta Chambers, Diane Erickson, Cindy Fabbri, David Fazzino, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Eric Madsen, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Amy Vinlove
Excused: Stephen Brown

III. Report from Joy

Joy recently attended the Association of Colleges & Universities conference and then the POD conference and brought back several articles relating to online evaluations. She also brought back ideas on creative financing for increasing the OFD budget. Among other informational items Joy brought back with her is a paper on Mentor and Protégé Relations and the latest POD journal “To Improve the Academy.” She informed us that a teaching group meets every Thursday from 3 – 4 pm to watch short videos on teaching from The Great Courses followed by interesting discussions. She also reports that she has a four-pack set on Student Engagement from Magna 20-Minute Mentor and a web link for free access to it on the OFD website.

Joy is also working on a joint research project looking at all the evaluations of the Lilly Conference for the last ten years.

Joy reports that the tailor-made presentations for October (CNSM) went very well. November will be the College of Engineering and Mines.

IV. Revisiting the discussion on electronic student evaluations

The Faculty Senate has taken on electronic student evaluations once again and forwarded it to our committee. Eric Madsen joined us for our discussion as the Provost asked him to facilitate discussions regarding the topic. The issue is being raised again due to security and costs of UAF’s current paper-and-pencil evaluations. Kelly filled the committee in on our history of examining the issue two years ago. Ultimately the FDAI committee strongly recommended not switching to electronic evaluations due to their abysmally low response rates. Franz remarked that UAA is using an online evaluation system but they are not happy with their response rates. We discussed how we should approach the issue this time, such as what criteria should we use to guide our research? Some suggestions included not examining cost, looking for ideas to improve response rates, independent research on electronic evaluations, and gathering information from peer institutions already using the electronic format to learn how it’s working for them and how they are increasing their response rates. We also decided to find out what happens to the electronic data – where is it stored and how is it used?

Eric informed us that he has found about a dozen systems so far and would like to set up some demonstrations from the vendors. He noted that their respective websites are mostly advertisements.

Amy wondered if there was a Smart phone application for students to simply fill out the evaluation in class using their cell phones, noting that we could supplement this with other options for students not having a cell phone that supports such an app (or no cell phone at all). Andrea wondered how the open questions would work on a cell phone app (i.e. the “yellow sheets”). While these are not quantifiable data, they do represent the most useful aspect of the evaluation for faculty members. Diane opined that she liked the IDEA system used at UAA because she could add her own questions to the quantifiable part of the evaluation. While we can do that now with the current evaluation system at UAF, we wondered if that is available with all electronic systems and how easy is it to use?

We discussed coming up with a list of vendors we might find acceptable as well as a list of definite rejects and decided to begin an online discussion via email to set up a working list of criteria items and to begin setting up demos. Franz, Andrea and Eric (who will continue to work with our committee regarding this issue) volunteered to research electronic evaluations and choose vendors to present demonstrations. Kelly volunteered to attend all demonstrations. Eric pointed out that we are looking for an evaluation system that works as well as possible for UAF – whatever that system is electronic or paper-and-pencil. Franz wondered if there was a way to find out how many institutions are using electronic evaluations and from which vendor. Joy volunteered to ask the POD folks who they’re using.

V. Discussion on the potential inclusion of postdocs into FDAI activities

Mike informed us that John Eichelberger is very keen on this subject, and Joy noted that she has already sent out a six-question survey to all postdocs and received an impressive 31 responses out of 48.

VI. Other business

Andrea explained the difficulty in finding samples of successful NSF grant proposals to utilize as templates. Whereas NIH posts successful grant proposals on its website, he notes that the NSF does not. He wondered if UAF should have a repository of successful grants by UAF faculty. He will continue to look into this.

VIII. Our next meeting is Wednesday, November 28, 1 – 2 pm.

IX. Adjourned at 2:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 15, 2012**

Attending: Jayne Harvie, Tim Bartholemaus, John Eichelberger, Lara Horstmann, Mike Daku, Laura Bender, John Yarie, Vince Cee, Karen Jensen, Donie Bret-Harte, Libby, Elisabeth Nadin, Cheng-fu Chen

The minutes from last meeting were approved.

Lara gave us an update from the last Administrative Committee, which she attended because Donie was out of town. The Administrative Committee reviewed our motion on Master's degrees with theses or projects. Because it turns out that the Faculty Senate already passed a motion requiring central archival of projects (though the language has since disappeared from the catalog), the Admin Committee thought that we should drop the requirement for archival from our motion, and instead pass a resolution reaffirming the previous motion. Further, because master's degrees with thesis vs. project are already distinguished by the course number of the research credits, we should revise the motion to make more clear the distinction that is desired. Since prospective employers will not necessarily understand what the course numbers mean, what is needed is a distinction in the title of the degree on the transcript.

GAAC revised and then passed the motion on distinguishing between master's degrees with thesis vs. project.

We discussed all of the reviews that were in progress.

MS Geological Engineering program change. Overall this looked good, but it needs clarification on potential impacts with regard to numbers of students in mining 673, and a consideration of impacts on other resources. GAAC passed it pending addition of a statement on the impacts, which is currently missing.

ANTH Language and Prehistory: Vince identified a bunch of typos. The length of semester is not correct. Lara noticed that there is no language on policies, other than plagiarism. Vince has contacted the instructor, who is now at a different university. He will contact the Anthropology Department.

After discussion, GAAC passed the following items:

42-GPCh Program change: M.S. fisheries

1-Trial Biol F694 – Advanced Landscape Ecology

2-GPCh Program change M.S. – Marine Biology

3-GCCh Course change: Fish/Biol F650 – Fish Ecology

Readers were assigned for all of the items posted on the curriculum review page, other than the program eliminations. These assignments are given in a Table in the agenda for today, sent out to committee members separately. GAAC will wait for the ongoing discussion about the process for program eliminations to be resolved.

ATTACHMENT 187/13

UAF Faculty Senate 187, December 3, 2012

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**Minutes of the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
October 25, 2012**

Attending: Sandra Wildfeuer, David Maxwell, Andrea Schmidt, Cindy Hardy, Dana Greci, Sarah Stanley, Gabrielle Russell, John Creed.

Visiting: Will Updegrove, Jennifer Tillbury, Desiree Simons, Provost Susan Henrichs

After a brief check-in on the Learning Commons, the Brown Bag subcommittee, GERC, and Accuplacer Alignment, the bulk of the meeting was devoted to a conversation with Provost Henrichs about President Gamble's concerns with "remedial" education. These minutes summarize the highlights of the conversation.

President Gamble has stated that remedial education doesn't help students graduate. As part of his Strategic Directions Initiative, he has called for a comprehensive examination of Developmental Education to make decisions on whether the resources spent are appropriate.

Provost Henrichs stated that this challenges us to do a couple of things. One is already being done by the Dept. of Developmental Education with the NADE study on the impact of developmental education on the success of UAF students. She suggests that, beyond the information in this study, we need to gather data on the 6-year graduation rates of students who have taken Developmental Ed classes. She notes that statewide these graduation rates are well below those who don't take developmental ed. However, she notes that at UAF the graduation rates of developmental ed students are only 10% lower than non Dev Ed students and that UAF graduation rates overall are better than UAA or UAS.

She noted that UA has a more permissive admission standard than peer institutions. She expects that our graduation rates will go up once we've passed six years from the point when we raised admission standards for the Bachelor's.

She made the following suggestions for action in response to the President's concerns:

First, continue to get data on what's happening to our DevEd students.

Second, try different approaches to developmental classes. She's not suggesting that we throw out current approaches, but encouraging us to see if there are other approaches that work better.

Two suggestions she made are to try accelerated learning approaches where a Developmental class parallels an academic class. She notes that research supports this method.

Another strategy she suggested is bridging programs such as the Math Bridge.

She encouraged faculty to give a whole-hearted effort, and noted that everyone has the desire to see students succeed.

Discussion followed, with the following points and questions:

--How does this concern fit with the GERC process?

SH: It's unlikely that the core revision will do away with a computation requirement and there will continue to be a Freshman composition requirement. We may need to make modifications to our program in a couple of years, but she anticipates that the GERC process may go on for many years. She noted that the BOR and Gamble are

discussing making Gen. Ed. requirements uniform across the UA system, such as with uniform course numbers. This will make the GERC process take longer.

--We noted the recent Accuplacer English Alignment Community of Practice meeting in which all three MAUs agreed to adopt a new set of standard cut scores for ENGL 111X and DEVE classes.

--We discussed how to implement Accelerated Learning classes.

We raised the question of classroom space if we try to run classes on the accelerated learning model in the fall. The way Baltimore does this is to hold classes in a computer classroom or lab. They also use longer periods of instruction. SH noted that once we get out of the standard class hour in scheduling classes, it impacts other classes. This is easier to do if it's not mid-day. She suggested that the registrar may be OK with non-traditional blocks if they are notified by fall.

We noted that students want to take classes during the day, and asked if there is a building where we can create a computer writing lab. SH suggested laptop carts. We noted that CTC has computer classrooms. SH noted that there have been discussions about adding computer classrooms to the Library Space (part of the Learning Commons proposal) but that this involves construction. She noted that, once the Life Sciences building opens in Fall 2013, there will be some major moves. It will take a year for the dust to settle. There is also construction of the new Engineering Building, but that will involve taking some of Bunnell off line while this is being completed. She suggested that the first opportunity for dedicated writing classrooms will be in 2015.

We raised the question of the feasibility of changing the DEV designator to be in line with ENGL or MATH. We discussed the history of the DEV designator; these classes were changed from MATH and ENGL designators in 1990.

--We raised the question of whether there was talk of separating DEV Ed students from the four-year degrees and placing them in AAS or Certificate programs.

SH: Dana Thomas has proposed this model where we would direct only students who might succeed in a Baccalaureate program to DEV classes, and direct others to the AA/AAS path. We noted that, in Alaska, only 30% of the population has an AA degree or higher. To raise the bar for everyone, we need to address students who are coming to us where they are coming to us. Although we have raised K-12 standards in AK, it will take four years before we see these students at UAF. By tracking students into lower degrees, we don't raise expectations for our students overall. SH noted that the percentage of Alaskan HS students entering college is lower than the percentage of adults with higher ed degrees in the population as a whole. She added that among the options for students would be to work toward the AA. This "tracking" is not necessarily about blocking students from BA/BS degrees, but is about pointing out options. She further noted that, regardless of test scores, a HS B average predicts success in higher ed, and indicates a student who is well organized and completes work.

--We asked if Pres. Gamble has asked for an examination of Developmental Ed.

SH: He's implemented this, looking at statewide statistics on Developmental Ed. This is in parallel to the Strategic Directions Initiative (SDI), and he has commissioned a study of Developmental Ed grad rates, among other items. In the listening sessions he raised question about Developmental Ed: what it does, how it does it, and what needs to be changed. He raised questions about reducing the need for Developmental Ed by better coordination with high schools.

--We asked where this leaves non-traditional students.

SH: Gamble doesn't speak to that. We need to provide opportunities for non-traditional students; people without HS diplomas can come to UA and will need DevEd in the future. We want to offer them the best form of DevEd that we can.

She agreed that it's common for students to take DEVM 105 instead of freshman math and that it's common for students to enter UAF after a break having forgotten math.

--*We asked about funding or grants to support changes in Dev Ed.*

SH: We need to look at things that won't cost more money. Gamble wants to spend less money, not more. However, she noted that no administrator is opposed to grant funding. If we identify sources of funding, she can target grant writers to develop proposals. We encouraged her to think about funding DevEd as an investment in students. SH suggested that there is support for a model that's dramatically effective and small in cost.

--*We noted that the President wants to put less money into DevEd, but our data shows that students are doing well with DevEd. Is reducing funds going to take away opportunities for students?*

SH: He's expressed what he wants, but the MAUs develop their own budgets. She noted that he can be persuaded by evidence, not verbal arguments. Her goals are:

Trying some experiments,

Telling Gamble that we are responding by "taking his message to heart,"

Developing an answer to his question of what's the best way to do Developmental Ed.

Other business: We concluded the meeting by touching base on some SADA business:

How to get advisor contacts for students listed on UAOnline,

The suggestion that we invite Alex Fitts to a later meeting,

An update on the Learning Commons meeting with the Library dean, and a need to review our original proposal and make a new one to the Library,

An agreement to list SADA as a sponsor on the upcoming Wounded Warrior Brown Bag,

A heads up on the Accuplacer Alignment recommended DEVE/ENGL placement changes,

An update on the GERC committee.

We will take most of these up at our next meeting, November 15.