

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #148
Monday, February 4, 2008
1:00 p.m. – 3:35 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jon Genetti

Faculty Senate President Jon Genetti called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Allen, Jane
Anahita, Sine
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar
Barboza, Perry
Barrick, Ken
Barry, Ron
Bret-Harte, Marion
Cascio, Julie
Christie, Anne
Cooper, Christine
Daku, Michael
Dehn, Jonathan
Genetti, Jon
Hogan, Maureen
Huettmann, Falk
Iken, Katrin
Illingworth, Marjorie
Kingsley, Ilana
Konar, Brenda
Leonard, Beth
Little, Joe
Lowder, Marla
Lurman, Julie
McEachern, Diane
Newberry, Rainer
Potter, Ben
Reynolds, Jennifer
Roberts, Larry
Rosenberg, Jonathan
Sousa, Marsha
Thomas, Amber
Weber, Jane
Wiechen, Heinz
Zhang, Jing
Zhou, Thomas

Members Absent:

Dandekar, Abhijit

Others Present:

Dieringer, Deanna
Goering, Douglas
Greenberg, Joshua
Fox, John
Hardy, Cindy
Hapsmith, Linda (guest speaker)
Henrichs, Susan
Illingworth, Ron
Kofinas, Gary
McGinty, Melissa
Morrison, Joy
Norton, Brody
Schuldiner, Michael
Sheppard, Dani' (guest speaker)
Sparrow, Steve
Sunwood, Kayt
Thomas, Dana
Wartes, Denise
Yijiang Zhao

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #147

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with one change proposed by Jon Genetti, which was to have the guest speakers before the break instead of afterward.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to approve an A.A.S. degree in Dental Hygiene.
2. Motion to clarify that Catalog references to a grade of "C" are equivalent to 2.0.
3. Motion to amend the B.A. degree requirements to include American Sign Language as a language option.
4. Motion to adopt a simplified High School Entrance Credit Requirements table in the Catalog (page 27).

B. Motions Pending: none

III Public Comments/Questions

No public comments.

IV A. President's Comments - Jon Genetti

1. Jon served on the advisory committee for the external review of statewide administration. He provided highlights of the report that came out this weekend. President Hamilton and his staff haven't looked at it yet, so it won't be at the BOR meeting happening this week. Slated for the April BOR meeting instead.

Committee members from the three MAUs felt it was a solid report about where UA stands today and, looking at some of the financial realities, about what is ahead for the future, and what needs to change in terms of the administration at statewide to facilitate the university in the future.

Highlights of the report include recommendations in the report from Terry MacTaggart and Brian Rogers. Budget numbers revealed that SW growth rate under Hamilton since FY99 (when Hamilton started) is much higher than all the MAUs. That statewide should shrink to what the growth rate was for the MAUs and then match the MAU growth rate. They looked at three main ways to do that and ruled out these two: 1.) consolidation of MAUs; 2.) rolling out parts of what the MAUs do to other private enterprises. That left 3.) looking at means of reduction and cutting cost.

One of the key underlying things noted was the need for the university to reallocate funds from low-priority programs to meet priority areas for growth. New growth is going to have to come out of reallocation. Tuition, federal grants, and other sources won't continue to cover costs over the next 10 years. Reallocation needs to happen at the system level, not just at the MAUs. It was recommended that statewide reduce itself to its FY99 budget, then reallocate excess to important programs at the MAUs.

The report included a lot about better defining the decision making processes between statewide and the MAUs. Quote along the following lines that seemed to sum up a lot of what the committee felt: "Campuses see a mixing of headquarters, functions, and operational functions with situational floating spheres of influence among statewide offices" – so it's not clear who, or what group or division at statewide is responsible for a decision, making it difficult to talk to anybody who has authority in a matter. Or a matter may appear to have been dealt with but a month later someone else has weighed in on it and makes the decision. Chancellors need to be involved at a much earlier and strategic level of decision making at statewide and have more of a voice in strategic direction. Final recommendation of report was for statewide administration to meet with the chancellors and vice chancellors and hash out how to fix this.

Human Resources and OIT mergers were discussed. UAF should be in charge of Human Resources functions pertaining to UAF and statewide should only be in charge of what's common across all MAUs. It should not be a complete absorption of UAF HR by statewide. Similar conclusion with regard to OIT and UAF IT functions.

UAF has a large base of funded research and it was recommended that the system office's share of the indirect cost recovery should drop well below the current 12.8% that SW is taking from mostly UAF's research dollars and then allocating how they see fit.

As statewide has been a big proponent of performance-based budgeting, there should be a set of metrics for evaluating the performance of the statewide system. The report made some suggestions for those.

Report has not been officially released yet to the public; Jon's copy was received as a member of the committee rather than as president of the Senate. He'll check into making it available. It is supposed to be made public at some point.

2. Last week Jon attended the statewide retirement committee meeting. They looked at providing medical benefits for ORP II and III participants upon retirement, mainly through the VEBA (Voluntary Employees' Beneficiary Association) portions of the IRS tax code. The philosophy for this is that before 7-1-2006, the TRS participants had the choice of health care through TRS, and ORP I had benefits with the rate being tied to the TRS contribution rate. To receive medical benefits under the new TRS program requires 10 years plus of service, you must be of medicare-eligible age, and you have to have directly retired from TRS -- so it's a much higher hurdle to overcome to get the benefits. ORP II and III don't have anything at all because it's just a rate set by the university with no health care component. Through VEBA they would have to make a minimum contribution of one-half of one percent of payroll for the eligible people (as employer contributions) and they would make a fixed amount go in a tax-free account; employees' contributions would be put in as well, with for example a \$500 minimum going in tax-free, and then voluntary contributions possible over that amount going in after taxes. This way, the money remains tax-free at time of use for health care costs by the retiree. So it's essentially a way to pay for health care after retirement with pre-tax dollars instead of post-tax

dollars. Downside is once you die, the dollars go back to the system (not an asset of your estate like an IRA). Definition of dependent is the same as at UA for health benefits. This is coming from a non-profit organization called "Emeriti" which has over 50 educational institutions participating -- medicare supplemental policy for retirees with group rates. Jon expects there will be continuing consideration of this plan over the next year.

Jane Weber asked why ORP I isn't included in this. Jon answered that the ORP I contribution rate is supposed to be based on the TRS employer contribution rate which by statute is supposed to keep the TRS system fully funded. With TRS you're supposed to be eligible for state medical healthcare at retirement. With ORP I, some of your contribution helps pay for that option. The consideration of the VEBA program will help ORP II and III folks have a viable health care option, as well as take into account future new employees.

B. President-elect's Comments - Marsha Sousa

The GCC's student success committee has merged with the Provost's student success committee, and meets this Friday. Anyone who would like to have input or become involved is welcome.

V A. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

Susan has some remarks on behalf of the Chancellor, but will begin with her remarks. The GCC has designated some folks to represent students, staff and faculty on the Student Success committee. There is also a group of administrators (including Tim Stickel, Tim Barnett, Bernice Joseph, Dana Thomas and the Provost) who have been talking at the statewide level with similarly-composed groups from the other MAUs. The GCC group and the UAF administrators group are going to merge. Their goal is to come up with proposals to improve student success and take those to statewide and get them into a substantial budget increment request with the FY10 budget request. FY09 had included modest funds for student success, but it didn't get support at the statewide level and didn't make it into the governor's budget. So this group needs to come up with strong proposals that meet students' needs and to present this with justification and university-backing to show it's an important initiative worthy of statewide support. The statewide administrators' group has met twice already; and has agreed on what the issues are that need to be addressed, like financial aid for struggling students, and work to develop learning communities that would increase student engagement with their school and provide student support services in that context. Monthly meetings will take place, the next one taking place on Feb. 19, and then March 19, and on into spring months and through to the August budget submission. All ideas for student success are welcomed.

Spring enrollment figures are up 1-2% but most of that is TVC numbers. 5% up at TVC compared to last year. Fairbanks campus is down 1% compared to last year. Pretty encouraging enrollment numbers.

Progress in Juneau – not much has changed with legislature in session. With current funding, there will be just a modest increment of about 2 million dollars extra to UAF beyond fixed costs.

Other issue important to Fairbanks is the BIOS project, but it is not mentioned in governor's budget request. Brian Barnes is working on it in Juneau this week, talking to commissioners, as well as our legislative liaison, Pete Kelly, too. She will go to BOR this week and will talk to

legislators about this building project that is a priority for both research and education. She encourages folks to submit comments and messages, (but not with their UAF email address).

Chancellor asked for the announcement to be made that the Bunnell House will stay open this summer, but costs to families will go up. The rate structure will go up to match rates in the community, and the university will subsidize a difference of about a \$100,000/year to cover cost gap. Longer term plan will be to contract to a commercial entity to serve more people here on campus. Looking at least a year's time to get that in place.

Success in raising external funds was announced, with a 43% increase in donations from various sources compared to last year. First six months of the current year show that donations are up 23%.

Ken Barrick asked about the increased user fees of Bunnell house and if they'll be affordable, but Susan doesn't have specifics yet as they're still looking at staffing issues. Fees for care of younger children and infants will go up. Bunnell House will be aligning their fees and fee structure with other facilities in the town. Ken asks about privatization and whether there is a committee to look at this? Susan said there was a committee looking at the closure, but she doesn't know if they continue on with the task of looking at other options.

Jane Weber commented that the original committee does continue on this longer term project.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council - Kayt Sunwood

Kayt mentioned ongoing election verification issues. (Still no online elections.) Hopes to finish by their meeting next week. She and the President-elect and staff representative from Kuskokwim are going to Juneau at end of February for the Cookie Brigade – a lobbying trip with cookies to get into the legislators offices.

They've been working with Faculty Senate and ASUAF on a number of important issues, such as Bunnell House. Staff Council wishes to thank the Committee on the Status of Women and the Senate for their work together to get the issue moving forward and turned around to a positive result.

They continue involvement with the NSSE survey and student success – working jointly with the Senate and ASUAF.

B. ASUAF - Jake Hamburg

No report available.

C. UNAC/ACCFT

Ron Illingworth commented that a contract for ACCFT faculty has been negotiated and is in the process of ratification.

Unofficially announced for UNAC: Also at the tentative agreement stage, which includes an encouraging pay package, but more out of pocket expense for health care. The representative

assembly of UNAC will be meeting this Friday and Saturday in Juneau, to coincide with the BOR meeting. They have set aside some time on Friday to lobby for the full funding of the UA budget.

VII Guest Speaker

A. Dani' Sheppard – Community-Based Learning (CBL)

Dani' is the faculty coordinator for this learning based initiative. There has been an invitation emailed to faculty for the Feb. 12 luncheon here at Wood Center (fliers are also on the back table). Also, an electronic version of what this is about has been sent to the Deans. CBL is also called “service learning”, and the idea of CBL fits into the broader umbrella of student engagement. Universities are finding ways to get students into the community and engaged. UAF campus has a lot of conversations going on in many contexts but not in a coordinated manner as an institution. Efforts can fit together and Dani mentioned talking to Pete Pinney about the new Engagement Operations Council which might serve as a larger umbrella to all the different efforts. Involvement from many sides of the campus: Student Affairs, ASUAF, Northern Leadership Center, JJ Boggs/Leadership Development, Faculty Development, Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement, named among other examples.

Foundation of this concept was a reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship with the community. “Engagement” term used a lot: i.e., civic engagement, experiential learning, curricular engagement, community engagement. Key components include credit for learning and opportunities for students to be involved--volunteerism, internships, field service work. At UAF, mission of the CBL initiative team is to open up campus conversation – find out who is doing what. Inventory by Faculty Senate was done a few years ago; and they want to reinstitute that survey. Faculty are encouraged to ask what the role for this is or can be in their units, and to help connect people and groups into this conversation. Spread the word about this luncheon.

The luncheon speaker on 2-12-08 is Dr. Nancy Andes, Director of the Leadership and Student Engagement Service Learning Center at UAA. Will tell us what UAA has accomplished in this area.

Heinz asked about a hypothetical student in physics, for example--why would students get involved if their grades suffered by their involvement. Dani said it's a style of learning and teaching that doesn't necessarily fit every class structure. But it's a means to tie students to what their professional choices mean for their community, if that fits a class or topic. CBL would fit the academic structure of the class and would be embedded into appropriate curriculum. Dana Thomas gave example of college students tutoring high school students in their physics classes. Heinz asked about class grades. Dani said it's up to the faculty member and their curriculum.

B. Linda Hapsmith – Academic Advising Spring Activities

- Faculty Advising Manual – print copies available, and it's also published online:
- <http://www.uaf.edu/advising/>
- Reminded faculty that they will come into your classroom if you need a substitute instructor while you're out of the classroom – they'll teach advising-related topics, like “note taking skills” to your class while you're gone. Two weeks notice preferred and there's a form online to fill out a request.

- For department chairs, they're offering training for their administrative assistants on how to pull up reports about students – like freshmen progress reports, dean's list, etc. – to be held on March 6, Eielson 116 location.
- Nine fliers have been left at the back table for various events and services.
- Linda asked for assistance with the Feist/Schamel Outstanding Faculty Advisor awards this spring (earlier March 7 deadline for applications this year). Needs a faculty member for their committee. Contact Linda at the Advising Center.
- Development Workshops for spring – There's a sequence of them offered for advisors. Advising 101 up thru 401 for advanced advisors. Usually held on Tuesdays between 1-2:30 PM at 409 Gruening. Can audio conference. New workshop mentioned is a panel of Shamel award winners to be held in April (time and location TBD). Will offer tips and advice from them.
- RSS-sponsored webinars mentioned. Next one is Thurs., Feb 7 – help for advisors and administrators on advising gay/lesbian students. Feb. 29, April 17, May 13, and June 11 are future dates for these and they're advertised on their web site.
- 1-credit course mentioned, HMSV 340 – peer advising class (with a practicum in the fall which can be taken for 1-3 credits) also available.
- National Academic Advising Association Region 8 conference will be attended by UAF and RSS in March. They'll give 2 presentations there. She also has information about their annual conference next October.
- Major Mania on March 21 at Wood Center. 11 am - 3 pm. Info sent to departments.
- See Major Explorer on their web site. <http://www.uaf.edu/advising>
- Student workshops available weekly (Tues. and Thurs, 1-2 pm, various topics), esp. geared for newer students.
- Skills Tutor program for students being set up as online tutorials.
- Learning resources flyer is available with broad listing of what's available to students.

Jane Allen asked for materials to be sent to Kuskokwim campus.

Break time 2:10-2:20 PM.

VIII New Business

- A. Motion to approve a Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography, submitted by the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee.

Jon Genetti mentioned this proposal had been postponed at the last Senate meeting as there had been no one from GAAC to bring it to the floor. He asked if anyone was present from GAAC today, and Joe Little brought the motion to the floor. Joe had reviewed this proposal and he clarified that this proposal will formalize an existing project option for students in NRM and Geography. Steve Sparrow was present to speak about the program.

Steve Sparrow said the program is designed to replace the non-thesis option in their MS program, with two groups of people in mind. First, those working in natural resource management and geography who want to advance themselves in their career. It's totally separate from their MS degree. Second, it's designed for students in the Peace Corp masters' international program as often times what they're doing in the Peace Corp doesn't fit in with a full-blown thesis. This way they don't have to write a full blown thesis and incorporates their Peace Corp project.

Jonathan Rosenberg commented that he had talked to Judith Kleinfeld and Mary Erlander with Northern Studies, and they'd been concerned it would tap into the same constituency who are in their masters' program. Steve responded that they had not talked to him, but maybe they talked to the dean. Steve thought it would be more complementary, and not overlapping. Jon R. mentioned that part of the NS constituency are working in state agencies who want an advanced degree, and this is a broad enough degree with the project option to overlap. Steve feels different audiences are intended by each of the programs.

Question was asked if GAAC had looked at potential overlap or synergy with other programs. Joe Little responded that the project was looked at on its' own merits within the construct of formalizing the non-thesis, project option. Katrin Iken said the concern had not come up. Perry Barboza did not recall it being brought up, either. Ron Barry clarified it's for a non-thesis, project option. Steve reiterated that it's not overlapping that they've heard about.

Ken Barrick requested, as the most senior geographer in the department and as a member of the Senate, a roll call vote – he would like his “no” vote recorded with his name. Jon Genetti asked that “no” votes be recorded in the minutes instead just to speed things up. Ken indicated that was fine. Jennifer Reynolds asked for explanation on this request. Ken explained that he's been here at UAF for 23 years and has wanted a master's in geography and worked to have faculty with Ph.D.'s hired to help make this possible, and it's not happened. For reasons of disciplinary integrity and academic quality, he feels a geography master's degree needs to be a geography degree on its' own rather than the combination degree. He doesn't see a single requirement for a geography class for the degree. He prefers that it be an NRM master's degree only. Later, Geography could have a masters program when the proper resources are in place.

Steve wanted to address Ken's concerns. Jennifer Reynolds moved to table the motion and send it back to GAAC for further discussion and to involve the concerned departments. Ken seconded the motion. Jon invited comment on the motion to send the master's back to GAAC. A request was made to hear Steve's comments by one of the senators.

Steve responded: This program will be run by SNRAS. It won't be run by any particular department in the school – they have four departments. When the program was being discussed in the school (Steve and John Fox were chairs of the committee considering this program), several geography faculty mentioned they thought geography should be included in the program, too. So, Mike Sfraga was asked about it and he wanted it included. It wouldn't conflict with a master's degree being developed in the geography department, because this is a professional

degree. Steve feels it could help the development of a Geography master's, that it's not a conflict. The draft program was sent to all faculty, including Geography, and he never heard any complaints. John Fox said he hadn't heard any objections either.

Jon Genetti asked for any other questions, then asked if there was a call to question. Jon Dehn called to question on the motion. Jon Genetti proceeded with the vote on the motion to send the program back to the GAAC committee. (Votes totaled 21 to send the motion back to committee, and ten votes were opposed to sending back to committee.) The motion to send the program back to GAAC was passed.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moved to send the Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography back to the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee for further discussion.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008 and/or
 Upon Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: See the full program proposal #29 from the Fall 2007 review cycle
 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography Program Goals:

The goals of the MNRMG degree are to provide coursework and training for (1) students who are currently working in or wish to work in the NRM/Geography (NRM/G) fields in a professional capacity, but who lack specific training or an appropriate undergraduate degree; (2) students seeking additional skills or advanced training in NRM/G in order to enhance their professional effectiveness and/or advance in their professional careers; and (3) students who wish to pursue the NRM/Peace Corp Masters program and focus on applying existing NRM/G technologies and knowledge in the context of the developing world and in conjunction with their Peace Corps assignment.

Because of the diversity and broad scope of the Natural Resources Management and Geography fields, the objectives of this degree will be tailored to each individual student in a manner similar to our current MS degree. The graduate committee will be the main body that assesses the student's background, individual deficiencies, and specific coursework needs. There will, however, be a minimal number of common courses that all will take, plus a requirement for an individual academic project addressing some existing NRM/G problem or issue. While not requiring scientific experimentation or sampling or the gathering of primary data, the work is expected to involve critical reflection, empirical inquiry, and intellectual honesty. A written product (opus) and an oral presentation demonstrating sound scholarship will be required. Final acceptance of the opus will be by the student's committee and the Associate Dean of SNRAS. It will not require review by the graduate school.

Note: Please refer to the Agenda for this meeting for additional attachments to this motion. The full packet is available for review at the UAF Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

- B. Motion to approve a Ph.D. in Natural Resources and Sustainability, submitted by the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee.

Katrin spoke to the program which is joint one between Natural Resources and the School of Management. Students wanting a Ph.D. in this direction needed to go through the interdisciplinary program. Nation-wide there is a program recognized in Natural Resources and Sustainability, but students from UAF were not being recognized with the interdisciplinary. Wanted to match the national standard – gives title to the degree from UAF.

Jon G. asked for questions and comments. Jonathan Rosenberg commented that the Political Science department hadn't heard of this. The program makes the claim of preparing students for academic positions in political science and mentions a policy emphasis using the term "geopolitical" – these create a concern. He believes this will affect the PS department – probably positively, but that they should have been informed. They weren't consulted as a department. What would PS want to have seen different in this? He doesn't know and the answer could range from nothing to a little bit or a lot—because the department hasn't had the opportunity to look into it. Other than this the program is sound. Jon R. asked if there is any way to allow for their input and possible revision of the program statement without holding up the process?

Jon Genetti said that there could be a motion on proposed changes that would be voted on today. Jon R. did not want to do that.

Jennifer Reynolds asked about a time table for turn around if the motion is tabled. Jon mentioned they are looking at an April BOR meeting. Susan Henrichs commented that normal process includes the new degree program being submitted to the System Academic Council for review and this needs to be accomplished at least 30 days before the next BOR meeting; but with this being a new doctoral program, SAC will possibly want more time – it will be scrutinized more closely being the highest degree offered at the university. So the complete process through the Senate now and onward through the process makes it tough for April without considering a delay of going back to GAAC. Jon G. mentioned the next BOR after April is in June; Senate meets next in roughly 30 days.

Ken says it should be looked at closely and not rushed.

Jennifer Reynolds moved to table the motion and send it back to GAAC and was seconded online. Jon G. asked for comments on this motion. Representatives from the degree committee came forward to comment at Joe Little's request (Joshua Greenburg and Gary Kofinas) and give background and a description of the program. Like the Masters' programs in their department that already exist (Natural Resources Management, and Natural Resources and Environmental Economics) and are similar, this program brings these to the Ph.D. level. Currently there are nine Ph.D. students interested in it at this time who are in interdisciplinary with major professors in SNRAS and SOM. Natural Resources is a nationally recognized Ph.D. area and a growing area of study. The program is designed around thematic areas so students can go on tracks

(sustainability science, natural resource economics, environmental economics, forestry and agriculture). Students design their program around these and three core courses (two credit courses and a seminar). The question was asked: How much cross-over is there currently with PS department and the existing masters' programs? Answer was that these programs (natural resources and political science) are distinct in their areas of focus. Students in the masters' program might take a political science course (just as they might take a biology course or an anthropology course as well), but he doesn't see a cross-over of the two programs. Natural resources and economics are the areas of focus with these programs and they stand alone as such. If there is an impact on political science, he sees the effect as positive, not competing. There are not requirements in the degree program for courses outside the two departments.

Perry Barboza commented that he supported tabling the other program earlier because it explicitly said geography, but this one is not the same type of case – it does not explicitly say political science. Perry said that GAAC looked at the various resources in biology and wildlife and other areas that program will use. He's not sure he sees an issue here that will be resolved by holding the process up for another month. Doesn't feel it treads on other departments' toes. Mentioned the 7 or 9 students needing the Ph.D. program and using the interdisciplinary approach already. He supports this program.

Jon R. says on the face of it he has no negative comments. But he feels that the specific language of the proposal includes claims for preparation of students for academic careers in political science, which is a concern.

A vote was taken in favor of sending the motion back to committee: 10 local "aye" votes. 3 "aye" votes from off-campus.

Votes not in favor of sending the motion back to committee totaled 16.

Motion to return to committee failed. Senate returned to the matter of the original motion.

Jon R. moved to change language in the proposal: eliminate the term "geopolitical" in the second paragraph below the Preliminary Catalog Sample Course of Study (first sentence); and the term "political sciences" where it occurs at the "Student opportunities and outcomes" section on the BOR summary form. His motion was seconded.

Julie Lurman asked for the responses of Joshua Greenberg and Gary Kofinas to the proposed language strikes before a vote was taken – they said they don't know right off the top of their heads, but they imagine they could live with that. The context of the terms wasn't specific to a course of study but rather to place an issue in the rationale of the program. The term "geopolitical" fits within their disciplines (resource policy and management, resource law) and they deal with policy issues regularly. The disciplinary boundaries blur with the use of this term.

Sine commented that she feels this is being hurried through, and it mentions sociology which she hasn't looked at. It should be taken back to build support for it. Ken mentioned he's not comfortable with word-smithing on the floor of Senate for this and suggested that maybe the school should withdraw the proposal to take it back to the committee for further communication and to build support.

Joshua Greenberg (or Gary Kofinas) expressed his disagreement with that conclusion. It's not possible to bring everyone involved with an interdisciplinary program into the discussion, and this program was put together with a strong rationale.

Amber Thomas commented that students are already taking these courses for the Masters' program that will be offered for the Ph.D. program. The new curriculum for the Ph.D. program will reside within the Natural Resources Management department, and the faculty who are supporting this new program will be managing the Ph.D. students. So she's not clear on what the objections are since students are already taking these courses. Agreement was expressed for Amber's comment – this is giving the degree a name with the department (it already exists as interdisciplinary) so it's more credible when students go outside.

Jon R. commented that interdisciplinary programs recognize “interdisiplinarity” and make no specific claim to cover subject matter or create competencies that are the territories of specific disciplines. He is not objecting to content of the program. His problem is the claim of training in his discipline without consulting his department. If he could revise his motion he would support leaving “geopolitical” in for the reasons that Gary pointed out. He feels there is the matter of process in GAAC, a seeming breakdown in the customary process to think quite liberally about both negative and positive effects of new programs on other departments and existing programs and to inform other departments in a timely manner to give them opportunity for input if they see fit.

Zhang commented about economics and policy – it's broad and there's no way to clearly cut between policy and economics.

Jon R.'s modification motion was seconded, leaving in “geopolitical” and removing “political sciences” from the BOR summary page. Jon Dehn called to question and the vote was taken. The modification motion was passed, with only one Nay.

The Senate returned to the original Motion again and it was called to question and taken to a vote. The Motion was passed with the modifications already voted upon.

Votes to pass the Ph.D. program proposal totaled 25 (22 in the room; from off-campus sites: three.) Votes opposed: None in the room, none from off-campus. There were five abstentions in the room, none from off-campus.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Ph.D. Program in Natural Resources and Sustainability.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008 and/or
 Upon Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: See the full program proposal #30 from the Fall 2007 review cycle
 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

Brief Statement of the Proposed Program Ph.D., Natural Resources and Sustainability

Alaska and the Circumpolar North face increasingly complex challenges in use and management of natural resources. These challenges require the education and training of high-level professionals with skills for considering the interaction of social and natural systems and informing the development and implementation of practices and policies that enhance natural resource management. The proposed Ph.D. in Natural Resources and Sustainability (NRS) at the University of Alaska Fairbanks would prepare future leaders as academic researchers, educators, agency and industry professionals and analysts of non-governmental organizations and communities for careers at the frontiers of science in the management of natural resources and environment. The program objectives and its curriculum center around three thematic areas of study, i) resource economics, ii) resource policy and sustainability science, iii) forest and agricultural sciences. In the proposed Ph.D. program, each student draws on a common set of core courses, and with his/her graduate committee, develops a program of coursework and research that produces a unique intellectual contribution to the applied field of Natural Resource and Sustainability. Students elect to focus on one of the three thematic areas or they choose to integrate themes to develop their areas of knowledge and dissertation research.

The proposed Ph.D. program builds on existing resources at UAF and directly complements and supports the mission of several funded university and national initiatives. The Ph.D. program would require the addition of only one new course and no new faculty. It would complement the Resilience and Adaptation Program at UAF, which is funded by NSF -IGERT and focused on Ph.D. education and training in the integration of social and natural science to address questions of sustainability in the North. Students of the program would be eligible for support through the newly funded EPSCoR (Phase 3) "Resilience and Vulnerability of a Rapidly Changing North," which is now being launched and for the next three years will fund approximately 22 graduate students per year. The EPSCoR program emphasis is on building the research capacity at UA to integrate social, biological, and physical sciences. Other initiatives and current research projects relevant to this Ph.D. program include The Alaska Center for Climate Assessment and Policy, part of NOAA's national Regional Integrated Science Assessment program; the newly funded Scenarios Network for Alaska Planning project at UAF, which is funded by UA and part of a circumpolar IPY program, and the Center for Global Change at IARC, which funds graduate student research on global change. Our research indicates that at least 37 current UAF undergraduates would consider applying for this program if it were offered and, at least 30 current UAF graduate students, most in the UAF Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Studies program, would consider transferring into this program if it were available. Likewise 46 current UAF graduate students indicated that they would have considered applying had the program been available at the time of their application. The program therefore builds on the existing strengths of the university to fill a needed niche in Ph.D. studies.

Program objectives are:

1. Educate and train scholars at the Ph.D. level with in-depth and integrated knowledge in research and management of natural resources.
2. Develop leaders who will direct the use and management of natural resources in Alaska and other northern latitude settings.
3. Create a nationally recognized program in the natural resources and sustainability that will contribute to science and inform public decisions.

4. Contribute to the sustainable development of Alaska's rural and urban environments.

Note: Please refer to the Agenda for this meeting for additional attachments to this motion. The full packet is available for review at the UAF Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

- C. Motion to amend the Mandatory Placement criteria for English and Mathematics, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee.

Ilana referenced the wording changes made just this morning that were agreed upon with remote site faculty and the committee. The proposed amendment had read, in part: **"HOWEVER, IF YOUR STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES ARE BELOW THESE MINIMUMS AND IF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL CUMULATIVE GPA IS 3.0 OR HIGHER, YOU MAY ENROLL IN ENGLISH F111X USING THE INSTRUCTOR PERMISSION PROCESS."**

This was discussed last week and changed to read **"HOWEVER, IF YOUR STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES ARE BELOW THESE MINIMUMS AND IF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL CUMULATIVE GPA IS 3.0 OR HIGHER, YOU MAY ENROLL IN ENGLISH F111X WITH PERMISSION OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMPOSITION OR RURAL CAMPUS HUMANITIES DIVISION DELEGATE."**

The most recent proposed change of this for consideration today, is: **"HOWEVER, IF YOUR STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES ARE BELOW THESE MINIMUMS AND IF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL CUMULATIVE GPA IS 3.0 OR HIGHER, YOU MAY ENROLL IN ENGLISH F111X WITH PERMISSION OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMPOSITION OR RURAL CAMPUS ENGLISH/HUMANITIES FACULTY."**

This amendment looks at the high school GPA and takes it into consideration in case a student has poor SAT or ACT scores. They can be placed into English 111 (and Math) if their high school GPA is 3.0 or higher instead of going into the developmental courses. This also affects placement into core science and human condition courses as well.

Cindy Hardy wished to speak to this because the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee also addressed this amendment as co-sponsors with Curricular Affairs. They suggested the change from "instructor permission" to "director of composition or rural campus English/Humanities faculty." Their concern was that all the English 111 courses taught locally at UAF and most of them at rural campuses are taught by graduate students or adjuncts. They wanted some oversight on that in terms of permission.

Michael Schuldiner, chair of the English department spoke. The motion is important for the students. Standardized test scores alone won't tell us who the failing students are, though they do tell us who the good students are. This makes sense for English, but maybe not math students. A student who writes well in an hour on a test will have no problem in English 111, but a student who doesn't write well in an hour may do poorly on the test, but perhaps can write well for a long class, over 3 hours or 3 weeks for a paper. The point is that standardized test scores do not work well for placing students in developmental English. The good A and B students coming out of high school could be labeled as developmental unnecessarily due to mandatory placement based on test scores.

Could lead to loss of self esteem for those students. So he feels this change does something for those students.

Marjorie Illingworth wanted to speak against this change for a couple of reasons. First, mandatory placement is not based solely on SAT/ACT's. Students have a writing option if they're on the edge and we don't know where they fit. She said we're talking about 50 students in the fall, and not sure of the number in the spring. The other reason is that she has a real concern about putting any permanent numbers in the motion for mandatory placement. Because she's in the Developmental Ed. department, she'd really like to see this done between English, Developmental Ed., and the Advising Center because every few years they get a report from ACT that gives them the current success rates of students based on those scores, so placement is modified on a regular basis already. She feels what is currently in place addresses the students with low scores already. She doesn't feel permanent legislation is needed. She wants flexibility to address changes as they happen.

Amber Thomas commented she thought this was a strong initiative and adds one more way for students coming in who are on the edge to get into English 111, who've maintained a good GPA.

Rainer commented there are a couple of issues such as why are we rushing this – to get it into the catalog for next year. Why are there numbers in there? It's nice to know the rules for right now even though they may change in several years. As Marjorie pointed out, the real problem is how to keep this flexible, so it's not a process of bringing it before the whole Senate every time. How do we make sure enough faculty have some input so that when something is changed they don't feel like the rug has been pulled out from under them? The concept is real straightforward – we want some flexibility. Yet the execution of exactly what words show up in the catalog and who decides what words show up in the catalog is the real problem. He recommends two things; first, we pass this and if it doesn't work we'll change it again; and second, that we should consider a better mechanism for making these types of policy changes without having to drag it through several committees and then the Senate in order to make a modest, minor procedural change.

Cindy commented about the original motion passed in the spring of 2006 states that placement will be made based upon currently accepted ACT/SAT/COMPASS scores with an advisor. The original motion allowed for such things as advising and the conversation Amber was talking about. All of this is overridden by the fact that anybody who really wants to could persuade a teacher to let them into their class. Any faculty member can give permission to let a student into their class. They're tightening that up a little for classes taught by grad students. Secondly, a little bit about process in response to Rainer's comment. There is a process. Because we have this as a motion of the Senate there is this policy. There are a couple of committees discussing this: Curricular Affairs and Student Academic Development and Achievement committees have been working together closely. They had been working on some language that would have been taken back to the English department for their consideration, but this came up before that happened. She hopes that in the future this would come through their committees in an appropriate way and not be such a rush.

In response to Marjorie's comment about test scores, Ilana said she doesn't see in the original motion where it says if your scores are low you can get in another way, which is the point of this proposal. Marjorie pointed out that the Compass Asset test is a free test that can be taken easily and quickly in less than an hour. Advisors do take into account the GPA.

Michael S. agrees that a procedure is needed that makes more sense than what currently exists. There is the advantage of having this in the catalog so all parties know what the situation is and that GPA can be used to get into English 111.

Cindy raised a concern brought up in the SADA committee, which is that in Alaska the GPA is not a constant standard across districts/schools. They want a tighter net, a way to address placement issues before students get here and offer writing samples on the first day of class, then possibly have to find another spot in another class. They're willing to go with it, but have questions about GPA accuracy.

Michael S. points out the GPA will be looked at in conjunction with SAT scores. Also there is the diagnostic test all students take in English 111, which has worked well for as long as he's been here. There have been no complaints about it in the four years he's been department chair either. He understands mandatory placement is necessary for the institution to function efficiently, but doesn't want students sacrificed to have mandatory placement.

Jon D. called to question and the vote was taken on the motion with amended language that Ilana provided at the beginning of the meeting. The motion (with the most recently amended language) was passed, with one nay and six abstentions.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Mandatory Placement criteria for English and Mathematics (page 33 of the 2007-2008 UAF Catalog).

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS

On the basis of test scores, you may be required to take developmental English and/or mathematics. These courses are designed to help you achieve competencies necessary to succeed in college-level courses. [[Generally,]] You will be placed in [[developmental]] English **F111X** if your ACT English score is [[below]] 17 **OR ABOVE** (or **YOUR SAT verbal score is [[below]] 430 OR ABOVE, OR YOUR SCORE ON ANOTHER UNIVERSITY-APPROVED PLACEMENT TEST IS EQUIVALENT**). **HOWEVER, IF YOUR STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES ARE BELOW THESE MINIMUMS AND IF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL CUMULATIVE GPA IS 3.0 OR HIGHER, YOU MAY ENROLL IN ENGLISH F111X WITH PERMISSION OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMPOSITION OR RURAL CAMPUS ENGLISH/HUMANITIES FACULTY.**

Mathematics course placement will vary according to the type of degree you are planning to pursue and the corresponding math course(s) needed (see the requirements for your degree program for more detail). ACT, SAT, COMPASS or ASSET test scores and your previous mathematical background are used to determine your math placement. Minimum test scores for placement into math courses are listed in Table 2 on the following page.

It is best to consult with your advisor or faculty in the English or math department(s) if you have questions regarding the appropriate course placement.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008

RATIONALE: If mandatory placement is implemented using current criteria, a significant number of students will be mistakenly sent to developmental English. Standardized test scores alone are not an indicator of how well a student will perform in the freshman level English course (English 111) at UAF. UAF PAIR data shows that in Fall, 2006, students with standardized test scores of 17 or below on the ACT and 430 or below on the SAT received the following grades: F = 28%, D = 6 %, C = 13%, B = 20%, and A = 33%. Seventy-two percent of students with scores that would require developmental English according to current standardized test criteria passed English 111. This data should not come as a surprise. Many students who will not do well writing for an hour on a standardized test will do quite well, for example, on a research paper that requires extensive rewriting over a period of weeks or months. Adding the high school gpa as additional criteria by which students may enroll in 111 will help remedy the situation, although it will not completely solve the problem.

Implementation: It is understood that the Assistant Provost will work toward instituting a mechanism by which students with standardized test scores below the minimum required for placement in English 111 can be screened for high school gpa. In the interim, the Assistant Provost will inform all advisors to advise all students with test scores below the minimum and a gpa of 3.0 or higher that they may use permission forms to enter English 111.

- D. Motion to revise the Fresh Start policy for returning students, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee.

Ilana brought the motion to floor and described this revision to the catalog to clarify for students the amount of time needing to pass before declaring Fresh Start – it's two years, not two and a half years. Linda Hapsmith commented that the important change included here is in rationale – two years have elapsed since last attendance and there's been a complete break in coursework.

Marsha asked about the phrase “request to disregard” and what was meant. Dana explained that the old wording made it sound as if the prior record was automatically disregarded, but the actual meaning is clarified with this wording change which is that with Fresh Start they request the prior record be disregarded. The Registrar's Office wanted this clarification.

Jon D. called to question and the vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the Fresh Start policy (pages 25 and 28 of the 2007-08 UAF catalog) for returning students.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Fresh Start for Returning Students

Fresh Start can offer a new beginning for students who performed poorly at UAF when enrolled at least two years ago. Those who withdrew from school or were dismissed for academic reasons may apply for readmission [[by disregarding]] **AND REQUEST TO DISREGARD** their entire prior academic record. Those who apply on this basis begin their college study anew with no credits attempted or earned, and no quality points reflected in future GPA calculations. Fresh Start may be used only once.

Fresh Start application forms are available at the Office of Admissions. Admission on this basis requires that at least two years have elapsed since the [[end]] **BEGINNING** of the last semester the applicant attended UAF [[full time]].

[[Prior academic records]] **ALL PRIOR COURSEWORK WILL** remain part of [[a]] **THE** student's overall academic record and appear on transcripts, but none of the previously earned credits can be used in a new program. These credits will be included only in GPA computations for graduation with honors (see Graduation with Honors, page 118). A student admitted under Fresh Start may be allowed advanced standing or a waiver of requirements just as any other student, but will not be allowed credit by exam for courses lost in Fresh Start.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008

RATIONALE: There are two issues that both appear in the following sentence: "At least two years must have elapsed since the END of the semester in which the applicant was last in FULL-TIME attendance." Institutional memory suggests the original intent of this policy was to accommodate students who got a rocky start at college, went away for a few years, then returned more mature and motivated to do well. As written now we commonly get requests from students who were disqualified two years ago but attended part time each semester since. We also get a lot of students who come in and say "My gpa is too low, I need to use Fresh Start to raise it so I can get financial aid." Thus, the "full-time" attendance issue is questioned. In addition, the "end" of the semester is typically confusing to students because this implies about 2 and 1/2 years must pass before they can reapply using Fresh Start. A complete break from classes is supported by the registrar, admissions, RSS, and the Academic Advising Center.

IX Committee Reports

A. Curricular Affairs - Ilana Kingsley

Ilana mentioned that upcoming business of the committee includes the BA and Minor in Fisheries. The following meeting minutes were available as a hand-out:

**Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes Dec. 3, 2007**

Present: Deanna Dieringer, Linda Hapsmith, Beth Leonard, Rainer Newberry, Ilana Kingsley
Guests: Michelle Bartlett, Tim Stickel, Lael Croteau, Libby Eddy, Anne Marie Nacke, Marsha Sousa, Rena Bowers

Absent: Falk Huettmann, Diane McEachern, Amber Thomas, Carol Lewis

1. Discussed topic of travel abroad courses through other institutions and credit. This is something that doesn't have to go through Curr. Affairs or FS. Deanna will write up a process to follow, with the hopes that it will make it into the next catalog. UAF students will be able to register for travel abroad courses through Berkeley or Arizona through UAF and get credit through UAF.
2. Motion to accept the Dental Hygiene AAS program.
3. Motion to allow American Sign Language courses be used to satisfy the 'Foreign/Alaska Native language' option that can be used instead of the BA Minor requirement.
4. Discussed the Governance Coordinating Committee (GCC) change to return to a Thursday start date for Spring 2009 (Thursday, January 22). The change is due to complaints of starting the first day of instruction the day after Alaska Civil Rights Day.
5. Modified the "Baccalaureate Degree Worksheet" that appears in the course catalog. Under **Bachelor or Arts Degree** removed the wording "Up to 12 credits in a non-English language OR AK Native Language OR ASLG and a minimum of 6 cr in Social Science(s)." Removal of this sentence will make the requirements less confusing.

Outstanding Issues:

- CLEP (Dana)
- Freshstart (Dana)
- School of Management's Sports Management Minor in Business (Deana)

B. Faculty Affairs - Jon Dehn
Jon mentioned that the first meeting of the semester is Friday, Feb. 15, at WRRB 101.
No report attached to agenda.

C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar
Brenda mentioned that the first meeting hasn't taken place yet. No report attached to agenda.

D. Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber

Sine mentioned the upcoming April P&T Workshop and brought flyers.
The following report was attached to the agenda as Attachment 148/5:

CSW Minutes
January 22, 2008

Present: Kayt Sunwood, Alex Fitts, Jane Weber, Sine Anahita, Uma Bhatt, Carol Gold, Diane Wagner, Renate Wackerbauer, Cindy Hardy.

Minutes by Sine Anahita

Bunnell House update:

- Diane is hopeful that Bunnell House will be kept open this summer after all
- has attended many meetings, including one with two V-chancellors (Ro Bailey and Bernice Joseph) and parents where concern ran high
- still no decision about summer 08, though Chancellor Jones is due to make his decision by the end of January
- the committee needs indication of need among faculty for childcare; another survey? rely on data already accumulated, with emphasis that this would be an undercount
- childcare is important issue for retention/recruitment, critical need for infant care, school-age kids, dangers of unlicensed facilities

T&P Workshop:

- third annual workshop scheduled for April 18, 1:00-3:00
- E-Live offered; Kayt will coordinate
- suggested panelists: Carol Gold, Alex Fitts, Diane Wagner, Rich Collins; Roxie Dinstell; Kara Nance

Women Faculty Luncheon

- fourth annual luncheon scheduled for October 7
- keynote speaker idea: Fran Ulmer; Carol will invite her

Tenure Decision-Making Process study

- SA collected comments from committee members who test-drove the survey, will revise accordingly
- expected launch: February 4, close February 25, with reminders
- discussion about how to interpret the data; crosstabs will be the most complex so as to ensure lay understanding of the results

Promotion to full professor

- need for this issue to be addressed; women, especially, tend to get stuck at associate level
- workshop? panel? included in survey? included in T&P workshop?
- Kayt: NWSA Journal has special issue on this topic; will send to committee members

Martha West visit

- Kayt and Sine wrote AAUW proposal that was funded; Martha West will be a keynote speaker for the campus project on gender equity in employment

- Jane passed out copies of the AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators Report, of which she is co-author
- Equal Pay Day is April 22; West's visit is April 20-23; she has agreed to meet with Provost and also the Deans Council

Meetings:

- Tuesdays, 1:00-2:00
- 2-19; 3-18; 4-15; May TBA

E. Core Review - Michael Harris
No report attached to the agenda.

F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry
Rainer mentioned that over 120 courses were dealt with, including some from the Geography department. Anticipating another program to come before the senate soon. No report attached to the agenda.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Tom Clausen
(No report attached to the agenda.)

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - Larry Roberts

Mentioned the faculty 2-hour forum that's being developed for the end of March or first week of April. Topic is "Hook 'Em, Hold 'Em and Educate 'Em – What's Your Bait?" All are invited. And reminded folks of the March Conference for which a flyer is available at the back table. A link to information about this is posted at the Faculty Senate main page as well as at:

http://www.uaf.edu/crcdhealth/conference/2008/conference_2008.htm

The following reports were attached to the agenda: 12/5/07 as Attachment 148/6; and 1/23/08 as a handout:

**Faculty Development, Assessment, and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes – December 5, 2007**

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. and opened with a roll-call.

Attending: Michael Daku, Marjorie Illingworth, Link Olson, Channon Price, Larry Roberts, Dana Greci, Joy Morrison, Julie Lurman, Susan Herman, Christie Cooper

Joy's Report:

1. Joy participated in an audio conference with Anne Sukamoto, Statewide Staff and Faculty Development Coordinator, and the faculty development folks from UAA and UAS. They discussed ways of cooperating, sharing speakers, and web/video/audioconferencing. Anne will be meeting with Statewide Academic VP Dan Julius and will report back to us on that meeting.
2. Joy and Sine Anahita wrote a NSF grant proposal to improve the situation of women STEM faculty. Joy sent in a request for speaker funds to Statewide Academic VP Dan Julius.
3. Ken Bains is scheduled to talk on teaching on September 12, 2008.
4. Jordan Titus and Jerry McBeath are the new United Academics reps for the Travel Committee.
5. Joy is seeking volunteers to assist with the faculty travel proposals. Channon Price, Dana Greci and Julie Lurman volunteered to assist on January 18, 2008.
6. Joy has found someone to assist her in the Office of Faculty Development for Fall 2009 with teaching observations.

Committee Reports:

1. Dana offered to be the point person on the Faculty Peer Assessment working group.
2. The Faculty Forum working group came up with two themes which they'd like the forums to work around: (1) academic rights and responsibilities and (2) specific tools we can use in our work. They would like to propose to the Faculty Senate that it sponsor a forum in late March (3/25 & 3/26) on student retention and engagement. This forum would be audio accessible, with a.m. and p.m. sessions, and maybe offered twice. There is still some question as to whether this will be a Faculty or a Provost forum.
3. The group reviewed a working agenda draft of the Lilly Institute on Teaching/Learning.
4. Link talked with Ann Christie, whose committee is reviewing the new electronic activity report forms. FDAI and her group will interface to look together at that method of generating activity reports.

Other Business and Updates:

Dani Sheppard, Coordinator of the Community-based Learning Initiative, is bringing Nancy Anders up on 2/12/08 to talk about what the UAA Center for Community Engagement is doing with community-based learning in Anchorage.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m. **We will meet again in January 2008. Members agreed to send Larry our schedules for next semester.**

Minutes respectfully submitted by Dana Greci, Recorder.

Faculty Development, Assessment, and Improvement Committee Meeting Minutes – January 23, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. and opened with a roll-call.

Attending: Michael Daku, Channon Price, Larry Roberts, Dana Greci, Julie Lurman, Susan Herman, Christie Cooper, Eric Madsen

Faculty Peer Assessment

The Faculty Peer Assessment subcommittee will meet next week.

Faculty Forums

The Faculty Forums subcommittee presented ideas to the committee and we worked together on further development of a pilot faculty forum, to bring to the faculty senate administrative committee for approval. Tentative dates are 3/26 at TVCC and 3/28 on main campus, both noon to 2:00 pm and including audio-conferencing for rural participation. We will ask Jake Poole's office for assistance with advertising and lunch and aim for about 35 people per forum. There was discussion as to whether some students should be included; people seemed mostly in favor of some, limited student participation, perhaps only in the form of a survey distributed before the forum. The group agreed the forums should be focused on providing a safe environment to explore ideas about education and/or on advancing in one's career. A tentative title for the first one is "Hook 'em, Hold 'em, Educate 'em: What's Your Bait?" Another title suggested was "Raising Your SOI Scores without Dumbing Down Your Course." The group discussed the idea of rotating themes for faculty forums, among the themes of teaching, research and service.

Adult Learning Institute

Information about the institute is up on the website:

www.uaf.edu/crcdhealth/conference/2008/Agenda.htm

The institute will be held March 5-7, 2008, and includes three full days of workshops, etc.

Generating Activity Reports

No further progress since the last meeting was reported.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m. **We will meet again in February 2008.**

Minutes respectfully submitted by Dana Greci, Recorder.

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee - Paul McCarthy
No report was attached to the agenda.

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement - Cindy Hardy

Cindy commented that the bulk of their recent discussions was regarding mandatory placement. Minutes for the most recent discussions will be available soon. They'll be meeting in two weeks.

The following report was attached to the agenda as Attachment 148/7:

**SADA Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes -- December 14, 2007**

Attending: Mark Box, Dana Greci, Linda Hapsmith, Cindy Hardy, Joe Hickman, Marji Illingworth, Ron Illingworth, Joe Mason, Carol Murphrey, Victor Zinger

The committee met and addressed the following:

Updates from represented departments and programs—Carol Murphrey from RSS reported that they have instituted a Friday night Healthy Connections program to provide students with positive activities on weekends. They are hiring two peer advisors for the spring 08 semester.

Mark Box reported that the English department is in the midst of a composition director search. He was asked about a "Virtual Writing Center" and he will check to see if this is something different from the Telefax Tutoring, which is very successful with rural students.

Dana Greci reported the new DEVE class, DEVE 193, is going well and will be offered in the Spring. This is a bridge class for students who need an additional semester between DEVE 070 and English 111 or students who have low English 111 placement or who have been unsuccessful in English 111 and need additional writing instruction.

SSSP reports that there are only 15-20 slots open and they anticipate a waitlist. Their tutoring center is swamped now that ASUAF is no longer offering tutors.

Linda reports that the Advising Center will hold its peer advising training course in the Spring and is looking for students to apply. They also have Skills Tutor up and running—a tutorial brush-up for students, especially those needing COMPASS test scores.

Ron reports that Interior Aleutians is running some linked reading and discipline courses for their students. They are also running a bridge program with a local high school, teaching English 111.

Joe Mason reports that Nome has new DEVM faculty this semester, Mike Rutledge. He may be joining our meetings next semester.

Mandatory Placement—According to a memo from Dana Thomas, this will begin in the fall semester for DEVM, DEVE, 100-level core Math, and English 111. We discussed the implementation of this, including the reservations of some in the English Department. All concerned are in agreement that a writing sample should be an important piece of this process, but there is disagreement on how this should be done. Linda is chairing a task force comparing COMPASS and Accuplacer to see which would be best at UAF. She reports that ACT has sent a new analysis on the ACT cut scores for English 111 and she and Dana Thomas and Mike

Schuldiner are trying to arrange a meeting to go over this. Ron reminded the committee that for years TVC did English 111 placement through the ASSET writing sample, which is scored using a rubric. We discussed the possibility of using a similar system to evaluate students who had no test scores or who fell below a determined cutoff. This could be scored by graduate students in the Writing Center over the summer as they come in. Mark agreed to forward this recommendation to the English Department Composition Committee.

Marji reported that the biggest hole in the mandatory placement process is reading. Core classes don't currently have reading scores listed in their prerequisites. Though reading is mentioned in the original mandatory placement motion, it is not separated out in the placement guidelines in the Advising Manual, except for COMPASS scores. We discussed the need for instruction in reading at the college level—including the ACT report that, nationally, 51% of HS grads taking ACT fell below college reading levels. We discussed the possibility of Banner enforcing reading placement if it's not separated out in the ACT and SAT scores. One suggestion to explore is to require those with DEVE 070 placement to take a reading class as well. Marji wrote a memo for the Core review committee suggesting placement cutoffs in reading, writing, and math for core offerings.

NSSE—Cindy reported on the meetings of the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) committee. There are some concerns with the data on the survey, particularly with how the data was gathered. Ron asked if rural students were included in the survey. Cindy suggested that some of the information was useful in thinking of student success, especially the number of students who reported working more than half-time and the number caring for dependents. The committee will be drafting recommendations and have a report by mid-February.

Next meeting: TBD, Next semester!

X Members' Comments/Questions
No comments.

XI Adjournment

Motion made to adjourn and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at approx. 3:35 PM.

Submitted by Jayne Harvie, Faculty Senate Secretary