

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #150
Monday, April 7, 2008
1:00 p.m. – 3:47 p.m.
109 Butrovich Building – BOR Conference Room

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 (Link Olson)
Cascio, Julie
Christie, Anne
Cooper, Christine
Dandekar, Abhijit (Silke Schiewer)
Dehn, Jonathan
Genetti, Jon
Hogan, Maureen
Iken, Katrin (online at Kodiak)
Illingworth, Marjorie
Kingsley, Ilana
Konar, Brenda (Alex Oliveira)
Leonard, Beth
Lowder, Marla (online at Boston)
Lurman, Julie
McEachern, Diane
Newberry, Rainer
Potter, Ben
Reynolds, Jennifer
Roberts, Larry
Rosenberg, Jonathan
Sousa, Marsha
Thomas, Amber
Weber, Jane
Wiechen, Heinz
Zhou, Thomas

Members Absent:

Daku, Michael
Huettmann, Falk
Little, Joe
Zhang, Jing

Others Present:

Castellini, Michael
Dieringer, Deanna
Duffy, Larry
Goering, Douglas
Hamburg, Jake
Hamilton, Mark (Guest Speaker)
Hardy, Cindy
Hapsmith, Linda
Henrichs, Susan
Herman, Susan
Illingworth, Ron
Ivey, Pat
Layral, Sheri
Madsen, Eric
McCrea, Scott
Milke, Diane
Morrison, Joy
Norton, Brody
Patil, Shirish
Redman, Wendy
Ripley, Kate
Sfraga, Mike
Sparks, Juella
Sunwood, Kayt
Sutton, Trent
Thomas, Dana
Titus, Jordan
Vonnahme, Joel
White, Dan
Wiesenburg, Denis
Sun Star Staff

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #149

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II Guest Speaker:

A. President Mark Hamilton

After meeting with Senate leadership, ASUAF and Staff Council, and individuals in Fairbanks, there are some names that have been vetted for the UAF interim chancellor position. He's talked with these nominees and several said no thanks. There's a need to name the interim chancellor relatively soon; giving them the opportunity to demonstrate if they're the right person for the job. This could mean one fewer transition if this person works out; and save a relatively expensive search; although at some stage of the interim process they could talk about a search again in terms of the permanent position. This is a very tough job – harder than any other job in the UA system, including the president's. After 10 years worth of observing the campus and its challenges and successes, he says it's a massive undertaking for any individual. There are so many statewide responsibilities, including those of Land grant, Sea grant, Space grant, CES, KUAC, etc., and the regular politics and the formidable research endeavor, plus running a university. He wants someone who already has familiarity with the state and its political system, and so he'll look internally (within the state). He wants someone quickly who can start on the UAF budget process. Fairbanks hasn't gotten anywhere near the amount of funds needed to run the institution. It continues to be a major challenge. This year they might get some dollars specifically directed to research with some additional amounts directed specifically to Fisheries (this would be #2 and 3 of all the money they've ever been able to obtain from the legislature for research support). Number 1 was the EPSCoR match, a program that was a \$1 million match. It has since produced \$65 million dollars worth of grants. Fairbanks facilities aren't competing well. So he wants someone who's got some ability to pursue the bringing together of people and legislative favor to help us compete. The Anchorage campus has received six dollars for every one dollar that Fairbanks has received for facilities over the last decade. He wants this person to look at the capital budget. Excluding individuals who were named earlier in the process and to whom he's spoken and who've declined to be considered, there are only two names that remain: Brian Rogers and John Davies. They are the only two who remain interested in the job.

He wants this person to do the job for two years – which is not very long. He's here to ask for counsel, input from Faculty Senate. Regarding the idea of having a forum – he's open to it but sooner rather than later. He'll arrange for them from his office if we so choose. He wants time to talk to the new person – he has a lot to tell them about his vision for UAF, and about land grant, sea grant, etc. He wants this decided Soon. Let him know. Wendy Redman mentioned she has requested the resumes of both individuals, along with statements of interest, so that they're available ahead of the potential forums.

Questions and answers from the senate and the public followed:

Ken Barrick asked for clarification about the process beyond the interim appointment. How will the permanent position be handled? President Hamilton says that at this time next year they'll reconvene and see about what they want to do, similar to what he arranged with Anchorage. He'll vet this recommendation back through the governance bodies, and if they're in agreement he'll appoint this person.

Thomas Zhou shared the comments of his colleagues at the School of Management. They are strongly in favor of a national search. The Northwest Accreditation body suggests open search should be used for higher level positions.

Jonathan Rosenberg said that the faculty would appreciate having the open forums. Many of the CLA faculty also want a national search; and if the interim appointee is performing well, they'll certainly be a credible candidate in a national search.

Wendy Redman mentioned that a press release will be going out with the two names shared today.

Ken Barrick asked whether a recommendation from the Senate to start an immediate national search and appoint the interim chancellor for just one year would be considered by President Hamilton. President Hamilton responded that this would only give the person one year which is not long enough. He wants the person to get a budget going and to be in charge to execute it. Ken commented about the importance of considering an appointment that is the very best possible in light of UAF being an international institution. An appointed chancellor becoming permanent in a year's time could possibly limit the chance to hire the very best and brightest person to lead the institution. Ken asked if President Hamilton was concerned about such an opportunity to hire the best person in the world being lost without a search process. President Hamilton responded that it did not worry him that this would happen. From his observations of the skill sets of chancellors selected in national searches, he thinks that it's very difficult for any search committee to take an individual's track record and overlay it on this institution. The chances of figuring out how they will handle the list he's already given would be the luck of the draw. It's a brutally tough job. It takes a long time for them to get started. He has more confidence in the individuals he's put forth. In a year's time they would do very well in the national search process, demonstrating the importance of 'ground troops' for this situation.

Jordan Titus asked the President to comment about his basis of confidence in these two individuals. He commented that it's asymmetric with these two individuals. President Hamilton spoke to Rogers' eight-year term on the Board of Regents. He chaired it for three years. He knows him well. Rogers has done a significant amount of work with the UA system and other institutions in the state. With Davies, he's been here at UAF and has the academic credentials. He doesn't know him well, doesn't know about his abilities to handle all 'the other stuff' with the chancellor position, but he believes he could work with him.

Jon R. asked that if the decision is made to retain the interim person as the permanent chancellor, what criteria will be used by the President to decide this, so that the faculty can help track them and weigh in on the decision as well. President Hamilton responded that this would be a very fair thing and a basis of his contract with the interim. He would welcome emails from faculty on their thoughts.

President Hamilton made a statement about the difficulty of finding someone who knows rural Alaska in a national search.

III Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to a Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography
2. Motion to approve an Associate of Science degree program

B. Motions Pending: none

IV Public Comments/Questions

Jon G. asked how the remote sites were doing with the audio and video. Those at Kodiak and Kuskokwim responded that they were hearing and seeing the meeting just fine.

Abel Bult-Ito commented on the interim chancellor. Likes having two years to evaluate the person and thinks both Davies and Rogers are good candidates. He wants to advocate in favor of John Davies for his academic credentials, and he has a Ph.D. from UAF, and he doesn't have the tight connection with statewide which may be a problem for independent function here at UAF. He knows both of them, and they're highly qualified. When he recalls Brian's role as chair of BOR, in his opinion Brian showed little respect for opinions of faculty. So he leans toward John Davies.

Regarding the Chancellor's Campus Diversity Action Committee matter that was brought to the Faculty Affairs Committee, he feels the FA committee's response was spineless. He's back on the CCDAC committee though, because the committee members want him there.

V A. President's Comments - Jon Genetti

He recently talked with a committee of ASUAF about their concerns. They want earlier access to course syllabi to map out their schedules. Most feel strongly that just the two weeks they have at the beginning of the semester isn't long enough – tied to the textbooks issue. They want to know what textbooks will be required for classes sooner so they have time to consider cheaper options for obtaining them. Both issues are tied together. Most of this is happening because adjuncts are teaching classes and they may not be in place until just shortly before the class starts, so the information can't be up any earlier than that. Budgetary restrictions of departments factor into this situation. In departments where the same faculty teach classes, syllabi and course books don't change as frequently and aren't a problem. Faculty already fill out a form months in advance for their textbook orders. Regarding the idea of having syllabi uploaded to a central location to make them available, the question becomes who would be responsible for that.

Jordan T. commented that faculty aren't back on contract for more than two weeks before classes start.

Jane W. commented that the university should hire more full-time, tenure-track faculty and not hire as many adjuncts. This would solve a lot of problems.

Jonathan R. commented that the textbook issue could be handled by the bookstore who gets the information so early; however, it's unlikely they'd want to participate in reducing their own business. The other possibility is the department offices. ASUAF could gather that information from offices and centralize it for students.

Comment was made about the Bookstore web site which has a menu-driven system to tell what textbooks are on order for each of the classes. Is it accessible to everyone? The issue there is that the site does not include the ISBN numbers, which are necessary for shopping somewhere else. Students want the ISBN numbers to get the right textbooks. Jon G. summarized that for faculty, there isn't a problem with providing the information about textbooks, it's who is going to be responsible for gathering and sharing the information; it's a workload issue for faculty.

B. President-elect's Comments - Marsha Sousa

Looking ahead at the changes and challenges created by having a new interim chancellor is high on her list. Student success will still be a high issue and she hopes there will be funding for it. Implementation of new baccalaureate standards is still high on the priority list and will probably create some changes. Everyone needs to be aware of how it will be handled in each department because it could significantly impact the way we do business with incoming students.

Other issues to be aware of: the IT council is looking at transferring email to Gmail – a trial coming soon; and a single user ID with Blackboard starts April 19 -- no more multiple user IDs. Students taking classes from more than one MAU will have a single ID for logging on. Simplifying communication to students who are enrolled with more than one campus needs to happen.

Janice of SFOS commented that they have their own IT group who asked the UA IT group about the Gmail trial. They were told it wasn't going to happen. Ilana commented that she spoke with Bill Wakefield at OIT just last Thursday about the trial and he indicated they were going to be trying it out with a pilot group. Ilana commented that many other institutions are turning to Gmail, but that doesn't mean we should also do it. Legal counsel should be involved because data will be stored on external servers. What happens to personal data in the long run? Gave the example of Network News, which was later bought by Gmail and all of a sudden her postings from back in the early '90's were visible to everyone via searches. SFOS faculty were also concerned about the same thing. Security, storage and retrieval of data and tons of ads appearing in email are concerns as well. Jon G. pointed out that many of the internet companies that went belly up in the 90's had privacy policies and promised never to sell your data, but bankruptcy courts ruled that was an asset that could be sold. Once they have your data, you no longer have control.

[Note re tape/CD recording: Section VII. Governance reports preceded Remarks of Chancellor Jones and Provost Henrichs as they had not yet arrived to the meeting.]

VI A. Remarks by Chancellor Steve Jones

Spring operating review is in 2 weeks (on April 22). Our task is to talk about the financial status as a university through this point in FY08; where we stand with our performance on PBB; and the plans for FY09 beginning July 1. Go through the plan in the context of the next 3-5 years and how the university should look then with respect to how it looks now. He's out of state April 22, so he's taping his thoughts to be used then. He shared some of what he'll say: the

important factors looking ahead include a looming recession – bottom line is the overall economic climate isn't going to be good for the next 6-12 months. This means an actual further tightening of university appropriations is going to happen. We must be mindful that graduates are going to be operating in a global economy, a flattening world, a global environment. We must be preparing our graduates for more than just a job in Alaska. Must be a bigger scope that includes a global perspective. There's increasing pressure on us to focus on jobs. Right now high schools across the country have a national average of only 69% of 9th graders making it out of HS; and few are ready for work or college. It will get worse, and is worse here in Alaska in terms of HS percentages and their preparation for work and college. One third of our college students need remedial classes in developmental math and English. Another factor needing attention is that when you look at the college-going rate of high school graduates by quartiles of family income, if you're in the upper quartile there's an 80% chance of going to college, and in the second quartile a 70% chance, the third quartile a 60% chance, and if you're in the lowest quartile of family income there's only a 40% chance of going to college if you graduate from high school. Generally our numbers in Alaska lag behind national numbers. We must be accountable for the product we generate here at the university.

Some observations he will make include that UAF has great faculty, staff and students. We have immense comparative location advantages related to our northern vector. Flip side of that is the disadvantages faced with drawing students from elsewhere because of our location and perceived harshness of climate. Think about this context and the factors affecting our future. We're strong in international research. We have pockets of higher potential to exploit. Recommendations he'll make will include: tap those locational advantages, increase student enrollment. The Fall numbers offer a glimmer of hope that we've turned a corner. Enrollment management is critical to our success.

We must grow the research enterprise; it brings in more income along with tuition/credit hours. We can't increase research grants and contracts without facilities to do so, and we've utterly failed to excite and enlighten our legislature in Juneau to that fact. We can't seem to crack that nut. While our message is compelling it's not connecting. BIOS building outlook is near zero in terms of the capital budget in Juneau. There's hope in a general obligation bond, but it doesn't happen often, so he doesn't put a lot of stock in that one. Additional infrastructure is needed to grow the research.

We must more aggressively and completely integrate research with undergraduate education. Graduate education is already interwoven with research, but undergraduate education must be tied in more with research. Last year we were ranked #5 as a small research university – but part of what classified as a small research university was the number of PhDs we produce. With the level of research dollars we have coming in, we're far behind in comparison with other research institutions in producing PhDs for our funding level. There is a disproportionate number of students coming from within our state for a research university our size.

There is the need to increase gifts and donations. We raised 45% more last year than the year before, and this year we're at 23% of last year to date. We can't grow the revenue even at the pace of inflation from the state appropriations.

Lastly, we need increase our international footprint out there in terms of our undergraduate enterprise. Send more of our students out and bring students in from other countries here. Beginning to develop formal relationships with universities in India, China, and through the

University of the Arctic to connect to Russia, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Sweden, Iceland, and others in ways we haven't before.

May 5 is his last time to meet with the Faculty Senate. He will offer some additional reflections.

Ken Barrick asked about private donations and the increase over last year which are very impressive. Do those funds enter the budget in a way that affects everyone, or do those funds get earmarked into certain new programs chosen by the donors. Chancellor Jones said that the vast bulk are dedicated to the donor's wishes. As a result it doesn't come in to the university budget and get distributed to everyone. Funds usually go to restricted uses like endowed scholarships or an internship, for example. Provides for things we wouldn't get otherwise.

Jake Hamburg asked the Chancellor to comment on the enrollment numbers for next year. Chancellor Jones doesn't have the numbers on the tip of his tongue, but he recounted Paul Reichardt's statements over the years – that it's a long time before the numbers take on greater confidence in terms of what we can expect in the fall. But the number of applications and admits are running way ahead of last year to date. But it's still early to count on it right now.

B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

The Provost gave an update on the FY10 budget process. She'll be sending an email to all deans and directors and dept. chairs, asking them to comment on their most-needed items for the FY10 budget request. Each school and college will be asked to forward 1-2 requests. The reason is that SW has come up with a different budget process than was used in years past, which was an open process and allowed for identifying needs from the bottom up; but this time they will focus planning around six areas: engineering, health, teacher preparation, research, workforce development, and student success. Planning groups will include deans and other involved individuals in those six areas and they'll prepare the detailed parts of the budget request. Each of these areas will be planned by a representative group of all three universities in the system. They'll be interfacing UAF needs with other MAUs. The advantage is it'll lead to a coherent, integrated budget request to present to the BOR and to the legislature and the public. They hope that in doing so they'll develop strong support for the universities' needs. The disadvantage is if schools or colleges don't tie in clearly and directly to one of the six areas, it'll be difficult for them to get attention on their need. We do have one to two million dollars identified as undesignated requests from our university. But the way to get a critical need into the budget process is to think about how your need ties into one of the six areas. Think broadly about how your needs fit into the identified areas of budget planning. Of the six million dollar budget increment, only two goes to UAF. It's pretty modest overall in terms of what we can get. The Planning and Budget committee will meet to sift through the needs and incorporate the most critical ones into FY10 process.

The Fisheries BA program and the Fisheries Minor come before the Senate this afternoon. She wants to say these programs have received thorough review from Curricular Affairs. She thinks it's a well thought out and sound program proposal. She wants to point out the broader ramifications of the Senate's decision about this today, which is more than just approving or not approving a degree program. This program is receiving a substantial grant from the Rasmuson Foundation, and one of the conditions for this grant is that the BA and Minor are approved by the BOR by the end of this academic year. If it's not approved at this meeting, we won't be in compliance for the grant. The Provost wants quality to be looked at, but editing small issues at

this point, the consequences could derail this degree program. Changes can be done over time. Another concern about this program is that of committing university to a match of five million dollars. There is an operating budget increment request of one million dollars in the operating budget and everyone's hopeful it will be funded. It's a serious commitment by the university not to be taken lightly. This grant was looked at extremely closely by the Chancellor's Cabinet and the UA system administration. The need for this Fisheries program is great for the state which faces competition from aquaculture and other programs.

Ken asked about the increment of one million dollars and Susan clarified the terms of the match – it's a continuation budget item. Abel asked about what happens if the legislature doesn't come through with the one million dollars; and Susan said it looks good. But it's promised to be an increment in next year's budget if need be -- strategy B. In a worst case scenario the money could possibly be reallocated from some central source; or the grant could be re-negotiated with the Foundation and spreading out the match requirement. It's hard to say how we'd react and there are a lot of "ifs" at this point with that scenario. Ron Barry asked about in five years when the program is over, how much of this money is committed – how much will we have to find? The one million dollars is continuation money to cover the new faculty costs. The rest of the Rasmuson money is for one-time costs for start-up. The Chancellor commented that some of this has already been matched with work going on at O'Neill. CDQs and producing and processing industries may also help with the match. We're not restricted with matching from state dollars. Jon G. asked if SFOS Dean Denis Wiesenburg would like to contribute his comments after the break and provide additional information when the program is brought before the Senate. That was agreed to and the break commenced.

VII Governance Reports

A. Staff Council - Kayt Sunwood

Mentioned the issues being looked at currently and those they're keeping on the forefront. Held a staff council retreat and introduced new members to what they're working on. A report was drafted about 2007-2008 activities and concerns which will be given to the Chancellor. Agenda items include staff training, tuition waivers, internal recruitments, staff handbook, mediation program, and HR redesign.

Staff Appreciation Day happens at the end of May. Staff Alliance issues include: pay grid issues, interim chancellor appointment, among others.

B. ASUAF - Jake Hamburg

Jake commented about textbook issue. They have a good web person and perhaps they can look into compiling the textbook data. Could they get copies of what departments fill out and submit?

Jake talked about 3 students going to Juneau with him to advocate for the scholarship program that they authored and that was introduced in the House by Rep. Guttenberg and Senator Ellis on the Senate side. They had about 25 meetings in 2 days. Realistically it won't pass this session. The Lt. Gov. is pleased with the program, but it's still in the discussion phase. The goal now is to have it heard in the House Finance, asking people to call in support. Working to get it as far along in the process as they can before they have to wait to pick it up next year.

Off campus housing list: they've started marketing phase of that. It's on the www.asuaf.org site.

Innovations Challenge: It went well, but turnout could have been better. Students had great projects.

C. UNAC/ACCFT

Ron Illingworth made some comments about the remaining issue since they renegotiated the contract, and that is the number of term-funded, non-tenure-track faculty and lack of efforts to convert these to permanent positions, esp. those who've been around more than five years. Jordan didn't have any election results, but vote is open through 5 PM today or post-marked today.

VIII New Business

A. Motion to approve the Library Science Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Brenda Konar is out of town, so Thomas Zhou brought the motion to the floor. He said there's been a lot of back and forth over the past semester with the criteria. The current version is one the committee is now comfortable with.

Ron asked for clarification on an item under the general criteria, reading a section, "CANDIDATE NEED NOT DEMONSTRATE EQUAL PERFORMANCE IN ALL THREE AREAS BUT SHOULD ATTAIN AT LEAST A GOOD RATING IN TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE." Ron doesn't see the point of that as those aren't valid criteria for post-tenure or tenure process. For a full promotion you must have superior rating in two of those areas so he wants to know how this would be used by post-tenure committees.

Thomas commented that someone mentioned different deans or dept. chairs use different rating scales. These are used for different objectives. Ilana had questioned the 'good' rating herself and whether it was a rating at the university. Ron said it's not for post-tenure and promotion.

Jane W. talked about the UAF regulations vs. union evaluation's requirements.

Ken B. made a motion to refer this motion back to the committee. It was seconded.

Jane W. commented that every unit criteria is going to have different terms. Ken commented that the problem this creates for faculty review committees is that dept. unit criteria supplement the UAF Blue Book, and when they diverge significantly one committee might choose one standard and another committee another standard, leaving the candidate pretty confused. He recommends the effort be made to keep these standards consistent with the Blue Book.

Amber T. commented that it's been observed the Blue Book criteria lean heavily toward the sciences and do not reflect the expectations in humanities. There does need to be some change in the approach to unit criteria.

Vote to refer back to committee was passed by a hand vote of 24; there were five votes against referring back to committee, and no abstentions.

THIS MOTION REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the revised Unit Criteria for Library Science.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately
 Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by Library Science. With some changes agreed upon by the college representative, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

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 the Unit Criteria for the Departments of English, Philosophy, and Humanities, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Thomas Z. brought the motion to the floor. There were no questions or discussion on the criteria. The comment was made by Amber T. that the criteria reflect the need to emphasize the accomplishments of English and Humanities faculty whose publications are not based on scholarly-reviewed articles but based on creative works recognized in literary communities. Motion was called to question and seconded. The motion was passed with one abstention.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for the Departments of English, Philosophy, and Humanities.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately
 Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted jointly by the departments of English, Philosophy, and Humanities. With some changes agreed upon by the college representative, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

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 approve a B.A. in Fisheries, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Ilana brought the motion to the floor, saying that the Curricular Affairs committee has had the program proposal since February 11, 2008. It's been in process much longer in other committees. On the CA committee, six people voted in favor on the program, and four against. Minor edits have been pointed out. Regarding the five faculty tied into the program, what happens to them after the five years. If this isn't base funded then we will have five tenure-track faculty to take care of after that time. On the other side of that, supportive letters were solicited from the fisheries industry and received many letters in response. They are on file. Another issue is that there's already a BS; industry thinks that the BA will be a good addition.

Jane W. asked how they are getting tenure-track faculty when it's grant funded. Ilana said the faculty will bring in research dollars. Rainer commented that ultimately the money is coming from UAF with the matching, the grant is the shoehorn by which they get the money from the legislature so they don't lose the grant.

Jane asked why five faculty are needed. Ilana said that it's to jumpstart the program to encourage outside students to enroll in the program, as well as Alaska students.

Trent Sutton commented that the new faculty are being hired not just for the BA; they have a BS program with 30 students currently. For next fall they have 13 applicants already. They have active graduate Master's and PhD programs. The new faculty will be utilized across these programs, teaching and advising graduate and undergraduate students and be involved in undergraduate research. Trent offered to amend the wording of the program proposal to reflect that fact.

Dean Wiesenburg gave a quick history. In 2004 the SFOS faculty looked at the fisheries degrees that they offer, and fisheries is part of the academic plan of the university and part of the strategic plan. The undergraduate programs were not as strong as the graduate programs, so the faculty put together a plan to improve the undergraduate program and the BA degree program was part of that plan to reach a wider audience than the BS degree. A survey was done of the fishing industry around Alaska. 89% of respondents said that this new degree would be useful and 82% said they would hire people coming out of the BA program. The SFOS faculty then went to the Rasmuson Foundation and asked for their assistance to get the resources. They agreed to if the university would provide matching funds. They need new faculty run this program. SFOS has lost 17 faculty since July of 2004 when Dean Wiesenburg arrived. They've hired seven, so they're down by ten faculty. Trying to get back up to critical mass. The fishing industry has helped support this program in the legislature. It's in the Senate budget with strong support. These funds will be added to the base budget, and this is one of the few opportunities, as President Hamilton pointed out, to get money in the base budget.

Heinz commented that he agrees that Fisheries is an important program. But he has a problem with the fact that they have brought in five new positions which the university must pay for. He sees the danger that other departments will pay for this since the money comes from Juneau. The question was asked about impacts on existing faculty. There are 37 credits from different departments. Trent commented they involved those faculty early on in the process and proceeded with their support.

Rainer was part of the program review of Fisheries a few years back, and one of the fundamental problems with the program historically is that it's been centered in Juneau. There's been one or two faculty in Fairbanks and much of the course delivery has been outside of Fairbanks. There's been very little presence in Fairbanks. The Fisheries faculty said they're going to have to do something major in Fairbanks or close up shop. That's why the new faculty are needed. They won't be 12-month teaching faculty – they'll have a significant research component. It's a gamble, and by invigorating this program it will attract students from outside and industry support to the university. It's a very different kind of program – the bulk of the credits are not in Fisheries per se, they're in economics and management. It's truly an interdisciplinary program, making it unique among UAF programs, but also very unusual with respect to programs in the lower 48 states where this type of degree is not found. There's a good chance that this will succeed, and even succeed well.

Ken B. is sympathetic with the funding gamble and concerns that underfunded departments elsewhere will have with five new positions being created. He personally doesn't like the idea of grants being used to reorganize priorities; however, he strongly supports this. Alaska must support the fisheries industry and the science of fisheries. He's willing to take that gamble even though he'd like those five positions. He will support this program.

Amber made the comment about the frustration of needing more full-time faculty (not adjuncts), and losing positions. But there's admiration for the SFOS folks for going out and making the effort to get the funding.

The motion was called to question by Jon Dehn and a hand vote was taken. There were 24 votes in favor of the motion, no votes against, and one abstention. The motion was passed to approve the Fisheries BA program.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Bachelor of Arts in Fisheries.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008 and/or
 Upon Board of Regents Approval

RATIONALE: See the full program proposal #54 from the Fall 2007 review cycle
 on file in the governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

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.

D. Motion to approve a Minor in Fisheries, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Ilana brought to the floor. Jon G. noted that the costs of the Minor are rolled into the BA itself, and the existing program. The motion was called to question and a vote was taken. Ayes passed the motion unanimously. No abstentions.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Minor in Fisheries.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008 and/or
Upon Board of Regents Approval

RATIONALE: See the full program proposal #55 from the Fall 2007 review cycle on file in the governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

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.

E. Motion to Confirm 2008 Outstanding Senator of the Year Award Nomination

Sine moves to confirm the motion. Motion was seconded. The ayes were unanimous.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the nomination of Rainer Newberry for the 2008 Outstanding Senator of the Year Award.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The Outstanding Senator of the Year Award Screening Committee has carefully reviewed the 2008 nomination of Rainer Newberry. The committee has concluded that Professor Newberry is a well-deserving candidate for this award. Procedure stipulates that a simple majority vote of the Senate shall confirm the nomination, and a formal resolution shall be prepared for presentation to the recipient at the May meeting of the Senate.

F. President-Elect Election

Jon G. gave some time to the candidates to say why they're doing this, and the candidates made their comments before the Senate. (Their published personal statements are included in the Agenda for this meeting.)

Sukumar mentioned his service on the Senate for over 10 years and now is the time to pay back and do his turn. He wants to keep his promise to do more.

Jon Dehn said that it's an honor to be nominated and it's great to have a choice. He's relatively new here and has been at UAF ten years. He comes from the research arm, though he does teach. Brings an outside of the box vision to Faculty Senate. UAF has a good base to build from, though there's a long way to go serve the needs of faculty and students.

RESOLUTION:

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate ratifies the election of President-elect on the basis of the following ballot.

BALLOT
PRESIDENT-ELECT

Please vote for ONE individual to serve as the President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate for 2008-2009.

_____	Sukumar Bandopadhyay
<u> X </u>	Jonathan Dehn

IX Discussion Item:

10 Min.

A. UAF Interim Chancellor

Jon started the discussion, mentioning he heard President Hamilton say a few things he hadn't heard. Jonathan Dehn asked about the two names and how John Davies' name came up. Jon G. mentioned that they had heard the name about ten days ago when he, Marsha and Juella of Staff Council were invited to talk to the President. Davies' name had come up but it sounded like he was out of the running. The following Friday the names were discussed at the Senate Administrative Committee meeting. Jim Johnson withdrew his name around that time.

Jon G. asked if there were any ideas about the forums. Rainer pointed out that with the President making the decision, does it really matter? Marsha responded that there is the invitation to provide feedback from Governance groups and that it's worthwhile to see if we have useful feedback.

Ken B. shared that he's troubled by the increasing unwillingness for national searches to be done. He's optimistic that someone from a larger pool coming to Alaska could catch on pretty quick, issues like rural Alaska included. He wants to see a broader participatory process for this position. Have these two people apply and see how they stand up with the competition. Our role ought to be to encourage him to do what most universities do, which is find a full range of possible candidates to choose from.

Rainer disagreed with Ken's statement; the job of chancellor takes commitment, which is what has lacked with national candidates. The position needs someone who isn't here for a temporary job and moves on in five years. The job needs commitment. A local person who knows the state and can come into the job and do it from day one is a wonderful idea.

Heinz disagreed with Rainer. International searches are held for all faculty positions. For a position of chancellor why would we just look around in Fairbanks? Rainer interjected that nobody evaluates the university based on who the chancellor is, but rather on who the faculty are. If UAF picked only from its graduates for faculty positions, that would be dumb. But the chancellor is a management position. Jon Dehn added that the chancellor is a manager who represents the university at the legislature. These two candidates that have been put forth have vast amounts of experience with the legislature and that's what we need right now. Earlier statements from Chancellor Jones were not very positive about the budget. Here in the state right now we have a 1.6 billion dollar-surplus and UAA through the same mechanism used here at UAF is doing very well with the legislature and they are succeeding in part because of that. This is our chance to the same. He's very positive about the two local candidates.

Jon R. urges the idea of a national search. It's not a hard job to fill, but it's a hard job to do well. If we're trying to replicate what UAA did, that was a unique situation. That person was in the legislature eight years and clearly had the reputation and experience to make that part of the job work very well; but the absence of the academic background however, may be telling somewhere on down the line. Looking at what we just went through today approving the new Fisheries program and five new faculty, we're all very concerned about the zero sum nature of budgeting at this point, but we supported a good program that was thoughtfully put together, with the hope that top management will manage the costs over the long run so that it won't come out of everyone else's pocket. That's why we need some outside expertise, experience in top academic management. The argument that we're so unique that only a local person can manage us strikes him as pretzel logic; some of our uniqueness is not necessarily some of the characteristics of the institution that we want to preserve forever. Maybe we have things to learn about the way it's done

elsewhere. Rainer commented that is the advantage of the two-year scenario, and if we decide we can do better, we'd know. Give it a shot. It's only two years. We've suffered longer under a series of previous chancellors. Two years couldn't be any worse. Jon responded that he's not objecting to that, because we need to get someone in the seat right away. We need to hold firm on the fact of having a national search. If the local candidate is really good, they'll do alright – they'll have the advantage of the two years we've seen them operate.

Jon G. took a straw vote, after some discussion, on whether there should be a national search and at what point it should be done; if it should be immediate or if it can wait until this time next year.

Option D: One year appointment, start a national search immediately. 3 votes in favor.

Option H: The interim appointment is for two years, but start a search at this time next year to verify they're the best candidate (put ad out in the spring, gather resumes over the summer, continue in the fall with faculty involvement in the process): Majority hand votes were in favor; no votes against.

Jennifer R. pointed out that Pres. Ham proposed a third option (K): at this time next year have an up or down vote about whether or not to proceed with a search. Wendy R. made a clarifying statement that President Hamilton said he would come back and discuss faculty what direction to take next. A hand vote showed majority against that scenario; no votes in favor.

Jon Dehn was announced as winning the election for President-Elect.

X Committee Reports

A. Curricular Affairs - Ilana Kingsley

The following report was submitted with the agenda:

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes for Feb. 28, 2008

Present: Mary Anne, Deanna Dieringer, Linda Hapsmith, Rainer Newberry, Ilana Kingsley, Amber Thomas, Jane Allen, Carol Lewis, Falk Huettmann

Guests: Trent Sutton, Mike Castellini

Mike and Trent answered questions regarding the proposed BA Fisheries degree program.

- **Naming of the degree:** Fisheries Management, in the field of fisheries, is something specific. It's not management as the layperson thinks of management. The name needs to be kept broad.
- Students may take varying tracks within the program. For example they can focus on the history of fisheries, rural development, how to run a small business, poly sci, etc.
- Why not just have a minor in Fisheries and a major in one of the above tracks? The minor appeals to a somewhat different group of students.

- There aren't other similar programs out there....is this because it's a unique program or their isn't a demand for it.
 - The program may attract students from rural areas or outside to come to UAF.
 - The school has already received a few calls regarding the program.
- **Funding:** This is a Rasmuson Foundation Grant, matched by the university. It's a 6 year period. The hope is for continued funding from the state. The committee was interested in knowing the contingencies for funding if not going to base.
- **Faculty:** 5 new tenure track faculty will be hired with the money from the grant.

Committee concerns/discussions are below:

- Math requirements. Need to verify if calc is required. If so, it shouldn't be for a BA.
- What does industry think of a BA vs. BS degree? In the case of NRM, they want to hire folks with a BS.
- The proposal could be strengthened by:
 - Clarification of the math requirements
 - Industry support letters—documents in the proposal that indicate that industry is looking to hire people with this specific degree.
- There is a low enrollment rate—so where is the demand coming from?

Next meeting is March 24th, 9am, Rasmuson Library Joint Conference Room.

B. Faculty Affairs - Jon Dehn

Jon is trying to arrange for a couple more meetings of the committee before the next Senate meeting. Notes from the last meeting were available as a handout at the back table.

The following report was available as a hand-out at the meeting:

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Rasmussen 341 15:15 Wednesday March 26th.

Dehn, Christie, Hogan, Barrick, Wiesenburg, Reynolds

* Report on from Barrick on adjunct faculty. A series of guidelines were suggested, but no data on the actual conditions at UAF yet gathered. The Provost's office has been requested for this data, we hop to have that in a few weeks. A draft report to the senate will be sent out before the next committee meeting for committee comments.

* Nomination of faculty by the Senate to the Chancellor's committees. Lively discussion again on this topic. In consultation with the Administrative committee, the course of action recommended is to draft a motion requesting the Chancellor in the future give an explanation if the nominee is not appointed. It was not felt by the majority in committees (though we didn't have a quorum in both cases, and there was one strongly opposed to the majority) that further efforts to seek explanation in the case that triggered this would yield meaningful results.

* Automated annual activities reports. Draft of report to the Senate is in preparation, the point most agreed upon is that gathering metrics to represent university achievement and a personal document for each faculty member to guide their careers may be related, but are two separate

functions. Much duplication of current databases exists in the current, yet changing form of the automated annual activities report. We would like to suggest a variant of the automated scheme that provides a measure of the professional output of the faculty members, but does not include any sensitive information, or information already in the Banner System. In addition, following the guidelines laid down for these reports, be easy and efficient for faculty members to fill out. The current form is quite onerous and could require it to be included in the next CBA. Finally, in order to get "faculty buy-in" on the system, we'd like to request more involvement than has been offered in the past for the creation of this tool to best meet the needs of the faculty and administration.

C. Unit Criteria – Thomas Zhou for Brenda Konar

Thomas mentioned the committee is still working on various unit criteria.

The following report was included with the agenda:

Unit Criteria
Meeting Minutes for March 31 2008

Attending:

Brenda Konar
Julie Cascio
Thomas Zhou
Gerri Brightwell
Lee Taylor
Mark Herrmann

Library Science has been approved and will be presented at the next Faculty Senate meeting for approval. Thomas and perhaps Lee and Gerri will be there to answer questions. Brenda will be out of town.

English and Philosophy and Humanities: The committee approves these criteria. They also will be presented at next Faculty Senate meeting for approval.

GPMSL:

Teaching:

Pg 4: Line 6: Change SFOS to GPMSL. The primary mission of GPMSL is graduate teaching; SFOS also has a big undergrad mission.

Pg 4: Line 11: starting with "when compared to undergrad..." This seems antagonistic....."
Eliminate this sentence.

Pg 4: 1. Effectiveness in Teaching: eliminate the bold section. It is redundant and adds confusion.

Pg 5: 2. Components of Evaluation: First sentence in bold is redundant to what is above. Please eliminate.

Pg 5: 2. Components of Evaluation: Middle of paragraph: Substantial is spelled wrong. Put periods into Ph.D.

Research:

Pg 7: Eliminate first two sentences of the paragraph after m. They are redundant and empty. They don't add anything. The workload should be taken into account and this doesn't need to be pointed out here.

Pg 7: The two sentences starting "The primary evidence of high research quality...." Should go under "a".

Pg 8: Add post-doc to sentence that says first-authored by the candidate or graduate student

Pg 8: The end of the added-on paragraph.. "Secondary evidence of research substance.." should go under "b". Last section should go under "a" (... and publications that are not peer-reviewed....).

Service:

Pg 8: 1. Please eliminate the first sentence. It is not needed. Eliminate "professional expertise" from second sentence. Expertise encompasses the university position. Also, add "public" before "service" in this same sentence to clarify.

Pg 8: 1. f. Everything should be in bold except "consulting". Consulting is in the original criteria and as such should not be in bold.

Pg 9: 2. Eliminate e. Redundant to "a"

Pg 10: 2. j. Bold "Junior Faculty"

Pg 10: 4. Evaluation of Service: please eliminate first sentence. Not needed. The rest of the paragraph explains how to access service.

Pg 10: 4. Evaluation of Service: Re-word the part that states "since those who usually perform poorly are not sought as reviewers.." to "Evidence of strong performance is indicated by repeated requests. Make this sound more positive.

Pg 10: 4. Take out reasonable from the last line. This is not needed.

Pg 10: 4. Should there be something added about what is expected for the associate level (to follow format for full)?

D. Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber

Jane reminded everyone about the April 18 Promotion and Tenure workshop; and about the Martha West visit on April 22 at 7 PM, talking about Equity for Women Faculty (Wood Center Ballroom).

The following report was included with the agenda:

**Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes for March 18, 2008**

Meeting began at 1PM 18 March 2008 in Kayak Room of Rasmussen Library

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

Minutes by Uma Bhatt

1) Promotion and Tenure workshop

- Will be on 18 April and fliers were handed out to all to publicize the event. The panel will be Paul Layer, Carol Gold, Diane Wagner and Roxy Dinstell. They will each speak 5-10 minutes on what they feel are key aspects of the process that would benefit the audience.
- There was a discussion on how to ensure that the campus wide committee be open. It was decided that since the decision is left up to each P&T committee, then once the committee is decided they should be lobbied to keep the meetings open unless requested otherwise by the applicant.
- There was some discussion/question on how one gets on the campus wide committee. It seemed that each college deals with it in a different way.
- Carol and other suggested that we encourage the campus wide to be split into several committees, each dealing with only part of the promotion/tenure applicants. Then it may be more appealing to serve to a wider number of faculty.

2) Childcare issue

- The GCC has proposed a task force on childcare. We as the CSW nominate Diane Wagner to represent CSW (as well as Bunnell house) on this task force. Having adequate day care is critical to retain and to hire new/young faculty, as Brenda mentioned since she has just been involved in several searches.
- Uma asked if Bunnell house can take over the newly to be vacant Play n Learn building? It is not campus, but it would help while the new building idea is moving forward.

3) Our next meeting will be April 29th 1-2. Each member of this committee should email Jane and Sine 1-2 ideas of what she would like the committee to address next year.

5) The 'Now You Know Project' will bring Martha West to UAF April 21-25. She is giving her talk at 7PM on Tuesday April 22 in Carol Brown Ballroom in the Union. The CSW would like to have dinner with her at 6PM on the 23rd at the Pumphouse. Sine will be confirming attendance by email before reservations are made. Each pays their own way.

E. Core Review - Michael Harris
No report available.

F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry
No report available.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Tom Clausen
No report available.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement

Larry spoke about the two faculty forums, with attendance of 40 total at both. Interest in the forums is high.

The following report was included in the agenda:

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement Committee Meeting Minutes for March 19, 2008

Participants: Marji Illingworth, Julie Lurman, Michael Daku, Channon Price, Susan Herman, Dana Greci, Link Olson

1. Lily Conference

The conference was dynamic. The presenters were great. We plan to get a few more new presenters for next year. Local attendance was low. Partly that is because it's hard for people to get away for in-town conferences. But the committee hopes to do some work on how to get the word out better next year.

2. Faculty Forums

The forums are coming up on Wednesday, April 2nd and Friday April 4th. Both forums will be held from noon to 2 p.m. Wednesday's will be located at TVC room 442, and Friday's will be located at Copper Lane House. Ron Illingworth and Charlie Dexter will present on Wednesday at TVC; Marji Illingworth will moderate. Susan Herman, Dani Sheppard, and Beth Kersey will present on Friday at Copper Lane House; Mike Daku will moderate. Marji will set up the audio-conferencing for TVC; Joy will set it up for Copper Lane.

The committee decided to focus the forum discussions on the following two questions:

- 1) At the beginning of the course, what specifically do you do to engage students and get them inspired about learning?
- 2) Mid-semester, how do you keep them motivated, excited, encouraged, engaged?

Discussions can focus both on what works and what doesn't work.

It was decided, in a vote with 4 yeses, 1 no, and 2 abstains, that three students will be included in each forum discussion. Students who are not highly motivated will be included. Students who study with those hosting the forum will be excluded. Mike will get two students for Copper Lane; Link will get one. Marji will get students for TVC.

The committee will encourage the Provost and Deans to publicize the forums and encourage faculty to attend. Susan Herman will speak with Susan Henrichs. Marji will talk to Rick Caulfield, Dana to Bernice Joseph, Channon to Joan Braddock, Link to Denis Wiesenburg, Mike to Ron Davis, and Susan to Mark Herrmann. We will encourage faculty in our departments to attend. Mike will call Eric Madsen to encourage Education faculty to attend.

3. Upcoming Meetings

Special meeting with Susan Henrichs is Tuesday, April 8, at 8:30 a.m.
After that, we meet April 16, from 8:15-9:15 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dana Greci, Recorder

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee - Paul McCarthy
No report available.

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement - Cindy Hardy

Cindy reported they're working on a couple of resolutions; and they're working with Faculty Affairs as well.

The following reports were included in the agenda:

**SADA Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes for February 15, 2008**

Present: Mark Box, John Creed, Cindy Hardy, Linda Hapsmith, Dana Greci, Marji Illingworth, Ron Illingworth, Joe Mason, Jane Weber, Sandra Wildfeur

Committee membership elections—clarification of member terms: Because the question of who was up for reelection generated some confusion, we decided to revisit the definition of the committee, looking at how the membership is distributed. Cindy will talk to Jayne and get clarification, and then e-mail the committee. We also clarified whether someone who will be missing a number of meetings (such as those on a one-semester sabbatical) can appoint an alternate to attend the meeting.

Update on Mandatory Placement motion: The motion to amend the mandatory placement process in English was adopted by Senate as revised by our committee. This revision provides an option for students who have a high school GPA above 3.0 but test scores that place them in Developmental English: these students can appeal to the English department Composition Director or rural campus English faculty. We also agreed that reading needs to be part of mandatory placement. Not all members of the committee are comfortable with adjustments to mandatory placement going back to the Faculty Senate, but we will send a memo to curricular affairs clarifying the issues our committee will take on and opening the way to further cooperation and collaboration between our committees. We will continue to look for and discuss other refinements to the original motion as needed.

Mandatory placement comparison task force report: Linda Hapsmith reported on the task force comparing COMPASS and AccuPlacer as placement tools. They found that AccuPlacer is truly Internet-based and can be accessed from any computer while COMPASS is has to be downloaded to a server. Kuskokwim Campus is using AccuPlacer this year and have reported few problems. The task force is recommending adoption of AccuPlacer at UAF. This would mean that all three MAU's would be using the same assessment tool. We discussed the problems of administering Internet-based tests in some areas of the state with poor connectivity. Because of these difficulties, the task force is also recommending keeping ASSET or using Companion, the written version of AccuPlacer in addition to the Internet-based format. Linda reported that the task force did discuss specific concerns for students in rural areas taking computer-based placement tests, including finding proctors and students' familiarity with computers. We also

agreed that a writing sample is an important component of a placement test, which can be addressed through ASSET or Companion. Ron noted that NADE recommends that teachers take a placement test to be familiar with what incoming students are being tested on.

ACT re-norming—Reading: Linda Hapsmith reported on the ACT re-norming report she has received in the Advising Center. The report shows the mean ACT test scores of students who have successfully passed various core classes. While the Math and Writing levels needed are in line with current placement levels, the reading levels needed to be successful in 100-level core classes vary widely. For example, for students to be successful in Perspectives on the Human Condition, they need reading scores in the 17-19 range, but for History 100 and Econ 100, students need reading scores of 20. In the sciences, the reading level varies, as well, but, again students need higher levels of reading than are needed for 100-level English or Communication courses. This suggests that not all 100-level classes have the same prerequisites for reading and, further, that students would be better served to take English 111 before classes that demand higher levels of reading and writing skill. We discussed whether reading placement can be required as an admission to the core, or if each core department should add the reading score to class prerequisites. We also discussed the possibility that some core classes list English 111 as a prerequisite. We noted that it's clearly in the mandatory placement language that students must have reading placement.

We also noted that, while reading skills classes are taught on all campuses, they are under-enrolled. Even AAS faculty are reporting that their students have lower reading skills than needed to be successful in their courses. Students assume they can read adequately, but results indicate otherwise. We agreed to send a memo to the Core Committee about reading placement. Cindy and Marji will work on this.

Other committee and taskforce updates:

Cindy reported that the committee addressing the NSSE results has been meeting and is in the process of making recommendations.

GCC Student Success committee is starting to meet.

Cindy attended a meeting on HS/UAF alignment that included Fairbanks High School teachers, UAF faculty, and administrators. The English teachers she met with were very interested in knowing the standards expected of entering students in UAF courses. Ron and Joe reported that rural school districts have been talking to faculty at rural sites, as well, and that there seems to be a misalignment between what's taught in high schools and what's expected at UAF.

Department and program updates: Marji reported that the Developmental Education Department Curriculum committee is developing standards for teaching DEV courses, and also reviewing Developmental courses taught by correspondence.

Linda Hapsmith reported on upcoming events in the Academic Advising Center: Faculty advisor awards, Major Mania, a pre-orientation program for students after admission.

The next meeting will be March 21, 2-3:30.

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee Meeting Minutes for March 21, 2008

Present: John Creed, Cindy Hardy, Joe Hickman, Joe Mason, Brian Rasley, Victor Zinger

The committee met and considered the following:

Committee Composition: We discussed a need for consistent representation of math and reading faculty on the committee. Currently the majority of developmental faculty on the committee teach English, while the majority of developmental students are in Math classes. We also acknowledged a need for continuing reading skills faculty representation. These areas are not specified in the committee membership definition. We will discuss this further in the next meeting.

Brian raised the question of two-year term limits. Does this mean a representative can serve only two years—or does it mean that members are reelected every two years but can continue? If members can't be reelected, then continuity is affected. Members of the committee noted that many of us have served multiple terms. We will check with Jayne Harvie on this.

Update on Mandatory Placement: We discussed how mandatory placement is going to be implemented, and how it is going to impact the different departments/courses. Rural campuses generally have used a form of placement for years; the new placement will reinforce what they've been doing. As recommended by the mandatory placement review committee, Accuplacer will be phased in, first on the rural campuses, then on the Fairbanks Campus. It will take the place of COMPASS.

We discussed new rules for Financial Aid and how they might impact students taking developmental courses. Financial aid is changing the way they count "satisfactory progress toward a degree" to limit the number of credits over 130 they will fund. This can impact those in developmental classes, those in pre-major status, and those who withdraw from classes (Ws will be counted as attempted credits). We will check into whether this is set by Financial Aid here, or if it's a national requirement. Can we change policy so that the progress clock towards a degree starts after developmental courses are completed? Joe Mason reported that the rural campuses face no such restrictions since most of their financial aid comes from regional funding sources.

Cindy reported that at present there is no additional funding to hire new faculty in Developmental Education. Given the onset of mandatory placement, there is a need for more faculty lines. Developmental math, in particular, has difficulty finding faculty willing to teach as adjuncts. We discussed the need for more full-time positions in entry-level courses and agreed that having full-time faculty in those "first contact" classes enhances student success. John Creed reported a system-wide sloughing off of full-time faculty positions in a trend toward hiring adjunct and term faculty. We agreed to send a resolution from the committee to the Administrative Committee to forward to the Faculty Senate. John Creed e-mailed some suggestions to Cindy, who will e-mail it around to the committee, then bring a draft to the Administrative Committee.

We discussed crafting a reading resolution to bring to the Senate. While national and UAF data suggest the need for improved reading skills among students, enrollments in reading classes

remain low, even on rural campuses, where placement is more direct. While reading is mentioned in the original mandatory placement motion, it's only mentioned in one place. The motion does not detail how to implement reading placement. We discussed waiting to flesh this out until after math and writing placement are implemented, but those in attendance feel that starting reading placement in tandem with math and writing placement would be better. However, we need to gather together empirical evidence from the ACT report and from studies done by Ian Olsen to look further at what impact reading scores have on grades for 100-level classes. We will take this up at the next meeting.

Department and program updates: Cindy reported that the Developmental Education Department curriculum committee has been meeting frequently, discussing CDE correspondence classes in developmental math and English. During this process, they have drafted a list of standards for teaching developmental classes. This has yet to be officially adopted by the department, but they are using these standards as a rubric to evaluate the effectiveness of CDE correspondence courses.

Next meeting(s):

Friday, April 11, 2-3:30

Possible meeting or lunch during CRCD face-to-face, May 15-16.

XI Members' Comments/Questions

Jane asked about what the plans are after the next (last) Senate meeting in May. Will there be any plans since it's a face to face meeting. Jon indicated there will be something planned for after the meeting. To be discussed and details released later.

XII Adjournment at 3:47 PM.

Submitted by Jayne Harvie, Faculty Senate Secretary