

MINUTES

UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #217

Monday, October 10, 2016 1:00 - 3:00 PM - Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

- I Call to Order - Orion Lawlor
- A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Members Present - continued
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (18)	NEWBERRY, Rainer (17)
AGGARWAL, Srijan (18) – Dejan Raskovic	QUICK, Kate (18)
AGUILAR-ISLAS, Ana (18)	REMBER, Rob (17)
ANAHITA, Sine (18)	TILBURY, Jennifer (17) – Andy Anger
ARNDT, Kathy (17)	TOPKOK, Sean (18)
BACSUJLAKY, Mara (18)	TUTTLE, Siri (17)
BARNES, Bill (18) – Galen Johnson	WILDFEUER, Sandra (18)
BENOWITZ, Jeff (18)	ZHANG, Mingchu (18)
BOLTON, Bob (18)	
BRET-HARTE, Donie (17) – via Zoom	Members absent:
CARROLL, Jennie (17)	DIERENFIELD, Candi (17)
COLLINS, Eric (17)	MEYER, Franz (17)
CROSKREY, Wendy (18)	PETERSON, Rorik (17)
CUNDIFF, Nicole (17)	
FALLEN, Chris (18)	
FARMER, Daryl (17)	
GIFFORD, Valerie (17)	Others Present:
HAMPTON, Don (17)	Dana Thomas, Susan Henrichs
HARDY, Sarah (17) – Melissa Good via Zoom	FAC Chair: Andreas Anger
HARNEY, Eileen (17)	RAC Chair: Jamie Clark
HARRIS, Norm (17) – via Zoom	Cindy Hardy, Alt.
HUNT, Steve (18)	Mark Herrmann, SOM Dean
ICKERT-BOND, Stefanie (18)	Chris Coffman, Mike Earnest, Dani Sheppard
LAWLOR, Orion (17)	Faye Gallant; Colby Freel; Carol Gering
LILJEDAHL, Anna (18)	Caty Oehring; Michelle Strickland;
LUNN, Lisa (17)	Heidi Olson, Martha Mason; Casey Byrne
MAIER, Jak (17)	
MAKAREVICH, Roman (18)	
MATWEYOU, Julie (18) – via Zoom	
MAXWELL, David (18)	
MAY, Jeff (18)	

B. Approval of [Minutes for Meeting #216](#) (linked)

The minutes were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was amended at President Lawlor's request to include a resolution on Strategic Pathways (SP) that he and Gordon Williams had been working on. (The resolution was discussed and acted upon after the 2 pm break.)

- II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions
 - A. Motions approved: None submitted
 - B. Motions pending: None

III A. President's Remarks - Orion Lawlor

President Lawlor reported about serving on a Strategic Pathways Phase II team that looked at Institutional Research. It was a productive team. He spoke to President Johnsen about getting more faculty on the teams since they're back on contract for the academic year, and faculty expertise about how the university operates is really needed to accomplish the SP goal of making things better in a reasoned and careful way. He stressed the need and importance of faculty input into the process. This is not a typical year for Faculty Senate, and there is a huge opportunity for contributing to and influencing how decisions are made.

B. President-Elect's Remarks - Chris Fallen

President-Elect Fallen reminded senate members to review the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws. He echoed some of Orion's comments on SP. He served on the Health Committee which was notable because it had been given a charge that allowed for considering expansion in ways that would perhaps grow revenue (rather than simply a charge about consolidation and budget cutting). He encouraged faculty to take more than a superficial cost/benefit analysis approach to examining what the university should keep doing and what should be cut. As faculty try to do more with less, he suggested faculty help each other be more productive in doing the things they have to do, and eliminate what doesn't have to be done or is not central to their mission. He encouraged faculty to take the extra effort in outreach to help regents, community members and politicians understand what we do as a university.

Ken A. asked Chris if he explained the difference between top-down management and shared governance to the members on his SP committee. Chris responded that he tried.

Jeff M. asked what seemed to be the most common way for feedback, ideas and suggested changes to reach the SP committees. Orion mentioned the feedback form on the SP web site, noting that the president does read the comments received from it. He also noted that Faculty Alliance members passed a resolution on some specifics related to that since they all had personal experience on the Phase I teams. Alliance members were glad to see that some of their input was incremented into Phase II (e.g., less restrictive charges, and changes to how facilitation was done). Chris added that he and Orion could also pass along comments through more direct channels they might have access to, as well.

IV A. Interim Chancellor's Remarks - Dana Thomas

Chancellor Thomas announced that the forum he mentioned at the September 22 State of the University address, is tentatively scheduled for November 1. The forum is about enrollment and growing into our capacity, and will be broadened to discuss other revenue generating opportunities.

The next Board of Regents meeting will be in Fairbanks on November 10 and 11. Public testimony will occur on October 31 between 4-6 pm. He encouraged faculty to listen to that or take part, if possible. There will also be a BOR reception on Nov. 10 in the evening between 5:30 – 7:00 PM in the Globe Room of the Elvey Building.

He encouraged faculty to get out and vote next month.

Regarding this year's budget process, he commented that a lot of information is still lacking. The statewide administration has proposed a budget to the Board of Regents. They will vote on the budget to be submitted to the state at their November meeting. He reminded senate members that the meeting can be watched online. Statewide included a lot of proposals in the budget, and they're anxious to see the Board's reaction to those since it determines their strategy in moving forward. Statewide has not settled on a future benefit rate, yet. They're anxious to know that as it affects the budget significantly. Election outcomes could also influence budget strategy, as well.

He noted this year is particularly challenging. As a public institution, they want to lay out possibilities, vet them, get feedback, revise again and get more feedback, doing so in the shared governance sense. The challenge is the timing issue with SP decisions being made along with budget decisions. If UAF laid out a major budget plan publicly right now, then it would be used to identify areas to cut by the Board. So, they are proceeding cautiously, but trying to involve shared governance.

Ken A. suggested with respect to the submission of early grades, that a window of time be used. Last year he couldn't submit them because his first exam wasn't scheduled until a week later. If the early grade is based on work that is not really reflective of the course grade, it creates a situation where the instructor has to go back and explain that to students. This problem could be alleviated if a window of time were provided to the instructors. Provost Henrichs said she would pass the suggestion on to Vice Provost Fitts. But, extending the due dates for early grades leaves students with no other option except to withdraw from courses. Having an early date gives them a chance to meet with an advisor and make an improvement plan to get back on track.

Sandra W. noted that the SADA Committee is currently working on a motion to revise the dates, and create a window for early progress reports.

B. Provost's Remarks - Susan Henrichs

The Provost reiterated Chancellor Thomas's remarks about wanting suggestions from faculty for making the budget process better, for creating revenue, for ways to cut the budget that aren't harmful, and anything else along those lines.

The Provost noted that many faculty have applied for tenure this year, as well as many having applied early for tenure. She urged faculty on peer review committees to be thoughtful and fair in their deliberations on the committees. She acknowledged that some faculty might be thinking their department would be safer in a climate of budget cuts if it didn't have as many tenured faculty, but these decisions should be based solely on the merits of the candidate. If the budget situation makes it so they can no longer employ the faculty they do now they'll have to make those decisions based on other criteria.

C. Senate Members' Questions / Comments

There were no questions or comments at this point in the meeting.

V Public Comment

No public comments were made.

1:32 VI Governance Reports

A. [Research Report](#) - VC Hinzman (Written report attached)

B. Staff Council - Faye Gallant

Faye reported about SC involvement in the Strategic Pathways teams. She noted actions the Staff Council took at their meeting this morning, and mentioned their discussion about morale and employee engagement. Brad Lobland spoke to them about a new UA-wide performance evaluation for non-union staff. She noted SC is following the use of furloughs in three UAF departments.

C. ASUAF - Colby Freel

Colby reported that ASUAF will be surveying students on several topics, including Strategic Pathways, tuition increases, and Haven training. They have sent representatives to the SP Phase II teams, and were pleased with a more transparent process for selecting who would attend. Governance leaders were given the opportunity to suggest names. He mentioned ASUAF will host a debate between Senator Coghill and candidate Luke Hopkins.

D. UNAC - Chris Coffman

[UNAD Report](#) - Katie Boylan (Written report attached)

UAFT - Kate Quick

Chris C. reported that negotiations with the university are now underway. The bargaining unit members will be sent more information as it becomes available. Members are welcome to attend the negotiation sessions. They are archiving their negotiation documents online and updating the union web site. She hosted a general membership meeting, noting that turnout was good. Tony Rickard's slides are now posted from that meeting, and she highlighted some of the notable facts from that presentation. She mentioned some of the changes to the bargaining agreement changes being discussed by the teams. She announced the next general membership meeting.

Katie B. noted there is a UNAD report attached (see link above). Kate Q. did not have anything to report concerning UAFT.

E. Athletics - Dani Sheppard

Dani S. introduced herself and described her role as the Faculty Athletics Rep (FAR) for UAF. It's her sixth year in this position. The big news over the last six months has been the Strategic Pathways process. She noted the Board of Regents voted in September to have no elimination of athletics, but they are looking at a restructuring to address budget issues. They are in the process of petitioning the NCAA for waivers to the mandated minimum number of teams. She announced that the cumulative GPA of their students is 3.12 across all sports. The spring semester GPA was 3.23. The number of teams averaging a GPA of 3.3 or more has risen from three to four. All of the student athletes have received the Green Dot training. She gave details about the efforts of coaches of the court sports (volleyball, basketball) to change their competitions from Thursday and Saturday to Friday and Saturday instead, to decrease class absences. She reported about being nominated and selected by a national committee to be a FAR Fellow, for which she attended a leadership institute. She has had the opportunity this year to meet with all the teams individually (rather than in one mass group) to talk with them about how to work with their course instructors regarding class absences due to team travel. She hopes to continue working with the Curricular Affairs Committee to improve communication between the department and Faculty Senate. She invited anyone interested to let her know of their interest in helping to form a faculty athletics advisory committee, or to get involved in the Nanook Athletics Advisory Committee to strengthen the faculty presence.

F. Senate Members' Questions / Comments

Anna L. added a comment to the UNAC report, noting that the last two Thursdays she and others met with part of the negotiation team, focusing on the non-tenure track union members who make up nearly half of the membership. They talked about the promotion process, and having non-tenure track faculty be evaluated by their peers at the university-wide committee level. And they communicated that term faculty often have worked in term positions for quite a number of years. They would like the language in the CBA to better reflect their position.

Jeff B. commented that research, clinical and other bipartite faculty have career positions, so it's awkward for faculty to be called "term" when one is with the university for so many years.

VII Discussion and Information Item:

Program Review Process Revisions - Rainer Newberry

1. [Suggested Revisions to Program Review](#) (linked)
2. Orion's resolution was added; discussed at length, and passed after the break.

Rainer described the issues which had arisen in discussions about the current process for academic program review along with Faculty Senate's role. The matter has been further discussed at the Curricular Affairs Committee which wanted to make the full senate aware of the discussions that have taken place, and provide some information on clarifications and potential changes. The goal today is to get feedback for CAC, which will then work to formulate a motion for Faculty Senate to vote upon at a future meeting.

The current process specifies the involvement of tenured faculty, but this grossly cuts down on the number of available faculty to serve on the faculty review committee.

Another issue concerns step 3. which outlines the Provost's role. At step 3.c., the Faculty Senate rather suddenly comes into play, but the process is not clear about how that happens. They'd like to see the Faculty Senate piece in its own section to make it clearer. It should also be pointed out that regardless of what the Faculty Senate decides concerning a program elimination, as in many issues, it's the Chancellor who actually has the final say after all is said and done.

In the current language, it says program deletion will require Faculty Senate action, but doesn't specify what the process is or what happens if the Senate decides to do nothing. What they've tried to spell out in the document is that the Senate is going to make a recommendation about program deletion. For that to be taken seriously in the case of a recommendation not to delete a program, however, they need to include a reasonable alternative.

Sine A. expressed grave concerns about the lack of faculty involvement in the process. She'd like to see more faculty involvement in the process, increased transparency in the process, and for the programs under review to be allowed to have a seat at the table. She suggested that the faculty review committee meetings be open, and that an official member of Faculty Senate be present. Under the Provost's section of the document, she'd like for the affected program to have the opportunity to sit down with the Chancellor before final decisions are made. Rainer asked her to draft up some language to share with the committee. She responded that she has already done so and will share it with the committee.

Mara B. also agreed with Sine's comments, and reiterated that these decisions are going to be made with or without us, so it's better to have more faculty presence and have governance involved throughout the process. She expressed support for removing the requirement for tenured faculty, as many faculty have careers spanning upwards of ten years who are not tenure track, as Anna L. had pointed out, who have a right to participate in these processes.

Jamie C. observed that perhaps the requirement of tenure was not so much to exclude non-tenure track faculty as it was to protect junior faculty. Orion noted that it was intended for the latter, but ended up doing the former as well.

Ken A. expressed a concern that the faculty role in program deletions has been diminished, if not circumvented, by the use of program suspensions in lieu of deleting programs. He had heard directly from a past chancellor about this. Doing so circumvents the Faculty Senate role in the process, as well as the important role faculty play in designing the curriculum of the university. He asked if a policy change had occurred.

Provost Henrichs responded that there's been no policy switch, and acknowledged that people are rightfully more concerned about the policies and procedures used in program review because at this point all programs are on the line, not just small ones with low enrollments. Regarding suspending admissions into programs, that is practiced across the system and has been used for a long time. It's basically there because some programs have fallen below a critical mass of faculty or students or facilities, meaning the university can no longer successfully offer the program. There needed to be a way to protect students from entering a program that was no longer working very well. Now, however, the situation is different and

some of these decisions are largely being driven by financial problems. The Board of Regents has recognized that suspension of programs by administration in this climate is something they no longer want to allow to occur. So, she suspects that the BOR will decide that university administrations will no longer be allowed to suspend admissions to programs.

With regard to faculty participation in the program review process, the current process was discussed and agreed to by the Faculty Senate several years ago. She understands that the circumstances have changed such that people are more concerned about how program review is conducted. She reiterated how faculty are involved in the process currently, both at the program level and at later stages of the review process. The concern she's hearing now is that this involvement is not enough. If the Faculty Senate chooses to require more faculty involvement, the administration would likely agree to that within reason. There is a need, however, for a process which can be completed in a reasonable time frame and doesn't unnecessarily prolong decisions that must be made.

Sine A. commented that faculty involvement early in the process of program review, particularly of a troubled program, would allow faculty to be more proactive and come up with alternative structures. Then it would be less likely that it came down to a last stage effort occurring at Faculty Senate.

The Provost reiterated that it is the practice to involve program faculty in cases of special academic program review. She is willing to do more of that if people do not feel they've been provided sufficient opportunity to come up with creative and innovative ways to improve a program and its enrollments. But, there is an element of practicality, also, because there are not enough resources to staff and sufficiently support even highly enrolled programs at this time. Ideas for improvement need to be tempered with what might be practical for the university to provide.

Orion reminded senators that the point of the discussion today was to get the conversation started and for senators to talk to their constituents. The point of contact for ideas and feedback is Rainer Newberry. Faculty Affairs Committee members are interested in being involved in CAC discussions, as well.

ANNUAL PHOTO SHOOT and BREAK

New Business Item added to the agenda at the start of the meeting:
Resolution on Strategic Pathways

The proposed resolution, prepared by President Lawlor and Gordon Williams, was shared and feedback invited.

Chris F. shared information about the SP team process that's being used. The first part of each phase is the team meetings. Their charge is to generate a list of options that potentially meet the charge, but not to generate recommendations. Then, they develop elements to those options (who and what is affected), and then they evaluate the options with a list of pros and cons. Ultimately, the implementation and the choice of one or more options fall upon the President. Team members have been instructed not to talk about the options being considered. This is causing some tension in their roles as faculty, and is part of what is driving this resolution.

Rainer asked who the resolution is being addressed to, and Orion clarified it's being directed to the President. To be directed to the Board of Regents, it would go through the Faculty Alliance.

Sine asked how teams are selected. Orion was not sure, and noted he had been surprised when Colby F. shared that ASUAF had been asked to submit names. Chancellor Thomas commented that UAF administration has been asked to submit names for both Phase I and Phase II teams, noting that selections aren't always made from the provided names. He's reached out to separate groups and asked for suggested names, but it's not generally under their control.

Jeff B. noted that he personally made suggestions to the President, and the individuals were chosen.

The Provost added that the President constructed the teams from categories, so administration was invited to suggest names for certain categories, and governance groups were invited to suggest names for other categories. No one group was charged with suggesting all of the names for a particular committee. Another factor is that the President is of the mind that it's very difficult to get a large group to make a decision, and that was why the groups have been kept small.

Jak M. commented that small committees need more input from outside their limited membership to be able to have a broader perspective in order to make good decisions. She supports the request that the faculty members be allowed to talk with their constituencies throughout the process (not just about the process) to help the committee members be as informed and engaged as possible.

Ken A. suggested that a stronger focus on financial analysis be included in the recommendations. The process seems to be driven by lack of budget, but committees' hands are tied as far as doing a true cost / benefit analysis to better inform their decisions.

Orion noted the Engineering task force had 58 pages of data from PAIR about credit hours produced and student counts, etc., but nothing to really inform them what the effects on number of majors or student credit hours, for example, would be from reorganizing how Anchorage and Fairbanks deliver the programs. Chris added that in Phase 1 of the Research Administration committee, it was very difficult to evaluate or compare numbers because of the different structures of the three universities and how the data from each is gathered. It was frustrating to try to work from unclear data.

The motion was moved forward for voting. With no objections it was unanimously approved.

VIII Discussion and Information Items

A. Q&A with Dana Thomas: Student Recruitment & Retention

Chancellor Thomas reiterated that growing into our capacity is one way to reduce the impacts of budget reductions, along with growing research. He mentioned the consideration of potential new programs and expanding existing ones as additional ways to address the situation.

Another idea that's been discussed is possibly providing scholarships for new students who have earned their associate of arts (AA) out of state, to attract more students. Doing so would potentially help fill more upper division courses for baccalaureate degree programs. He shared several examples of creative program ideas that he has learned about from several of the schools and colleges. He invited faculty to share their ideas with the Provost and himself.

Provost Henrichs added that they're aware that they can't spend more money on increasing enrollment than the tuition they might take in. So, their emphasis is on looking for ways to attract students that are reasonably low in cost and will mostly bring students into the upper division where there is more room in the class sections. If they were able to meet the enrollment targets that they've tentatively set they might achieve \$8-10 million in additional tuition revenue. It won't be easy, however. Investing real money into this effort is essential for success.

Chancellor Thomas mentioned that not having sufficient scholarships for juniors and seniors in baccalaureate programs impacts their retention of those students, as well as overall enrollment. Elements like these need to be on the table during such discussions.

Orion shared an example from Computer Science that helped with graduate student enrollment. There are only about 200 institutions that offer baccalaureate programs in computer science, and they mailed out posters advertising their graduate programs. It was a targeted effort that helped bring in a dozen students.

Chancellor Thomas mentioned the fact that the Department of Defense wants to double the number of students in cybersecurity in the next five years.

Wendy C. asked about incentivizing new students from outside with out-of-state-tuition waivers. Chancellor Thomas responded that they're open to suggestions. He noted that they've discussed some ideas specifically targeting states with high in-state tuition, such as New Hampshire. Alaska would be very competitively priced for those out-of-state students.

Anna L. asked for comments concerning recruitment and retention of graduate students. Provost Henrichs responded that they've set a tentative target of increasing graduate students by 20%. There's been a small decrease in the past few years because of increased difficulty in obtaining research funding, so not as many students are being funded on grants. There has been a decrease in Fund 1 dollars available for teaching assistantships, also. They do want to increase their graduate enrollment and faculty ideas are invited. It seems that the combination of having more teaching assistantships and research assistantships available is part of that effort. They're also looking at starting more professional types of graduate programs where students would pay tuition and wouldn't expect an assistantship to support them. In order to be successful, those would almost certainly need to be delivered online to draw sufficient student numbers.

Please send in ideas to the Provost and she will compile them. Chancellor Thomas noted they're interested in hearing about other potential revenue streams as well. He mentioned, for example, that the President has put in a plan to support a handful of things out of next year's budget allocation, including President's professorships; the Alaska Center for Energy and Power; and the Institute of Social and Economic Research. They've provided feedback saying that they like the idea of President's professorships, but could they break that up a little bit and

use some money for post-docs and for start-up of new faculty because those are areas which can lead to increased research dollars.

Jeff B. commented that as a soft money research faculty member, he writes grants and brings in money. If he mentors someone in writing a grant, there's no financial incentive for him. No part of that goes into his salary, and he might actually be competing in the same program. Yet, clearly, mentoring is going to make a difference in how many grants they get. There could be some sort of program where they align successful researchers with researchers who have potential to be successful but need mentorship. Jamie C. noted that the Research Advisory Committee is working on making proposals for the Vice Chancellor for Research on those very issues.

VIII B. Information Items - continued:

- [2015-16 Promotion and Tenure Review Results Summary](#) (linked)
- [Faculty Alliance Report to Faculty Senates](#) (linked)

IX Public Comments

No public comments were made.

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

No general comments were made.

B. Committee Chair / Convener Comments
(An active link is added if minutes are submitted.)

Administrative Committee - Chris Fallen, Chair
([Minutes for 09/02/2016](#) linked)

Curricular Affairs - Jennie Carroll, Chair ([Minutes for 08/24/2016](#) linked)

Jennie mentioned that a motion will be coming from CAC regarding Athletics and the academic calendar.

Faculty Affairs - Andy Anger, Chair

Andy announced their next meeting and invited agenda items.

Unit Criteria - Mara Bacsujlaky, Chair

Mara noted she's in Flagstaff at the moment, but the committee will be meeting next week when she's back. They are drafting recommendations for the joint appointment primacy issue, as well as the Blue Book promotion process for non-tenure track faculty.

Committee on the Status of Women - Ellen Lopez, Diana DiStefano - Co-Chairs
([Minutes for 9/15/2016](#) linked)

Core Review - Andy Seitz, Chair

Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry, Chair

Rainer mentioned the committee has already approved five items.

Student Academic Development and Achievement

- Sandra Wildfeuer, Chair ([Minutes for 9/08/2016](#) linked)

Sandra shared that they're drafting revisions concerning the early progress reports. They are also looking at the repeating courses policy, the pre-major status policy, and the English alignment and placement.

Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement

- Franz Meyer, Chair

Graduate Academic and Advisory - Donie Bret-Harte, Chair

Sean Topkok, Co-Chair ([Minutes for 9/09/2016](#) linked)

Donie reported the committee has met twice, and will meet next week (Sean will chair). They've approved one item, and are reviewing a long list of others.

Research Advisory Committee - Jamie Clark, Gordon Williams - Co-Chairs

([Minutes for 8/26/2016](#) linked)

Jamie reported they're hammering out their agenda, which will include initiatives the VCR's office could support to help make grant-making more successful. They don't have any representation of peer research faculty on the committee this year. They are interested in finding some soft money members.

Information Technology Committee - Siri Tuttle, Chair

Siri announced she's been elected the chair. They will be looking at how Strategic Pathways will potentially impact the tech infrastructure.

XI Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned on time at 2:45 PM.

Research Report provided by Vice Chancellor Larry Hinzman:

September and October are great months for Alaskan science. There have been many very high level meetings and UAF has played a central role in almost all of them.

President Obama used Alaska as a setting to promote his concern and agenda with climate change. Since that time, many high level cabinet members, ambassadors, and agency leads have visited UAF. These include the President's Science Advisor, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of Energy, Administrator of EPA and Director of NSF. UAF has become synonymous with Arctic expertise.

We are also many other things including a fine undergraduate institution that works hard to provide our students with research experience and the knowledge and training necessary to secure a place in the nation's workforce as productive members of society. We are central to Alaska's evolving economy, stimulating economic diversity by introducing new discoveries, patents, licenses and the capable workforce to move these ideas to reality. To demonstrate that capability, on September 20, we invited all of Alaska's legislators to visit UAF to learn more about our expertise and facilities. The primary purpose of this event was to demonstrate to our legislators and other community and state leaders that UAF is producing research that has practical value and positive economic impact for the state. They toured many of our laboratories and visited faculty, staff and students to better understand our capabilities. We also hosted a round table discussion to learn how we may better serve the state and help Alaska recover from this financial crisis. We prepared many fliers from units throughout the university to emphasize our value and productivity. These will be shared with those legislators who were unable to participate in person. It is essential that our people continue to communicate with all our legislators to persuade them make the changes needed to stabilize our economy.

UAF remains a research powerhouse, as demonstrated in several recent reports from U Arctic:

Funding: <https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3811224>

Altmetric <https://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.3811242>

Scopus https://www.elsevier.com/_data/assets/pdf_file/0017/204353/Arctic-Research-Publication-Trends-August-2016.pdf

Last week, several UAF researchers participated in events supporting the White House Arctic Science Ministerial. We were repeatedly told that this international meeting of ministers found its seed in discussions held at UAF in August 2015. There is more information here: <http://www.arcticobserving.org/news/225-the-white-house-arctic-science-ministerial> and already there are active discussions regarding collaborations for implementation.

This week, the Arctic Council Senior Arctic Officials will meet in Portland, Maine to continue to promote advances in Arctic science and policy. One product was creation of a digital elevation map of Alaska. <https://www.nga.mil/MediaRoom/PressReleases/Pages/Arctic3DAlaska.aspx> The need for improved elevation mapping was a high priority for UAF researchers and we pushed emphatically to have this included among the priorities of the US Chairmanship. This mapping capability will be expanded to include the whole Arctic.

The Arctic Council led by the US Chair continues to make good progress in achieving the goals laid out nearly two years ago, including an international agreement on Scientific Cooperation.

<http://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/our-work2/8-news-and-events/408-sctf-ottawa-july-2016>

Everyone expects this agreement to be signed at the next Arctic Council Ministerial, to be held in Fairbanks in May 2017. So, this agreement is likely to be called the Fairbanks Declaration.

Listening Sessions were held with those who had concerns or suggestions for the Office of Research Integrity, the Office of Intellectual Property and Commercialization, the Animal Resources Center, and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research. Several were quite well attended and good ideas were solicited and will be acted upon.

Larry Hinzman

--

Larry D. Hinzman
Vice Chancellor for Research
Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering
University of Alaska Fairbanks
PO Box 757270
909 Koyukuk Drive
Fairbanks, AK 99775-7270

Phone: 1 907 474 6000

Office: 212 WRRB

<http://www.research.uaf.edu/>

Adjunct Union (UNAD) Report
Submitted by Katie Boylan

The adjunct executive board met from September 23-24 in Anchorage. The main topic of discussion was upcoming negotiations since UNAD's current contract will be expiring at the end of February. The board received negotiation training from an AFT instructor. Before the meeting concluded, the board assembled its negotiation committee. Meetings with management will begin in early December.

At the end of next week, several members of UNAD's e-board will be meeting in Anchorage for Caucus. During this time, the board will meet again to continue preparing for negotiations.

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, for Strategic Pathways to be successful and credible, it needs to be seen as fair and deliberate, and reflect the diversity of viewpoints needed to collect the necessary information and carefully study the impacts of the recommendations being considered; and

WHEREAS, while the Phase I Strategic Pathways Task Forces were formed during the summer when few faculty were on contract or available, and the work was preliminary in nature, this is no longer the case; and

WHEREAS, Strategic Pathways implementation committees are continuing to meet and make decisions and recommendations to implement the recommendations from Phase I, but the composition and operation of the task forces is essentially unchanged; and

WHEREAS, faculty have not been given an opportunity to choose their own representation, and those faculty who are involved have been given instructions that limit their capacity to freely discuss the work of these committees with their colleagues; and

WHEREAS, changes currently being proposed do not always reflect an understanding of vital information about the impact of major changes on students, and faculty can help provide that understanding; and

WHEREAS, as an example, at the last Board of Regents meeting the BoR recommended the elimination of the BA program in education, but much of the material provided to the Board at the meeting contained significant erroneous information or lacked important context; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,

The UAF Faculty Senate requests that:

- Faculty members be free to discuss the contents of Strategic Pathways options with the community so that they can collect the necessary feedback to ensure that the conclusions reached by these committees will be well informed and considered,
- Membership in Strategic Pathways Committees affecting academic programs have a plurality of representation from faculty in those programs, and
- Faculty members in Strategic Pathways Committees be selected by their respective constituencies.