

MINUTES  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #159  
Monday, May 4, 2009  
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.  
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I        Call to Order – Marsha Sousa

Faculty Senate President Marsha Sousa called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A.       Roll Call for 2008-09 Faculty Senate

Members Present:

Abramowicz, Ken  
Allen, Jane  
Baker, Carrie  
Barboza, Perry  
Barrick, Ken  
Bret-Harte, Marion  
Cahill, Cathy  
Christie, Anne  
Davis, Mike  
Dehn, Jonathan  
Fowell, Sarah  
Hazirbaba, Kenan  
Huettmann, Falk  
Illingworth, Marjorie  
Jin, Meibing  
Konar, Brenda (Alex Oliveira)  
Koukel, Sonja (Leslie Shallcross)  
Leonard, Beth  
Liang, Jingjing (Julie Joly)  
McEachern, Diane  
Moses, Debra  
Newberry, Rainer  
RaLonde, Ray  
Reynolds, Jennifer  
Sousa, Marsha  
Thomas, Amber  
Weber, Jane

Members Absent:

Barry, Ron  
Bogosyan, Seta  
Heaton, John  
Hogan, Maureen  
Little, Joe  
Lowder, Marla  
Potter, Ben  
Zhang, Jing

Others Present:

Larry Duffy  
Rheba Dupras  
Doug Goering  
Linda Hapsmith  
Susan Henrichs  
Martin Klein  
Katy S. Olsen  
Brian Rogers  
Tim Stickel  
Juella Sparks  
Dana Thomas

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #158

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Reaffirm the Marine Advisory Program Unit Criteria
2. Motion to Reaffirm the Communication Department Unit Criteria
3. Motion to Approve a Certificate in Ethnobotany
4. Motion to Approve an integrated BS/MS Degree Program for Mechanical Engineering
5. Motion to Amend the Mandatory Placement Policy (writing sample)

B. Motions under Discussion: none

C. Motions Disapproved: none

III Public Comments

Dana Thomas spoke about the motion amending the mandatory placement policy to include a writing sample. An ad hoc committee has looked at this motion and made recommendations in a report. [Report is posted on the Governance Meetings page.] They want to compare machine scoring with hand scoring on a sample group of 100 students. AccuPlacer has a component for writing called WritePlacer, which the committee wants to try out as well. Then they'll decide upon one of three options: 1.) accept machine scoring entirely; 2.) use a mix of machine- and hand-scoring for borderline cases; or 3.) use only hand-scoring. Sign-off on the motion has happened in the meantime, because in looking at the cost of implementation in a worst case scenario of all scoring done by hand, costs could be covered this fall.

As part of the transition team efforts begun last summer, there was a request for a plan to further develop academic advising at UAF. An ad hoc group met and then delivered a 38-page report, evidence that change and improvement is needed. Six main topic areas are covered, including: web-based advising, resources and training; student advising development (recommending a new freshman seminar); faculty, staff and peer advisor development; targeted advising for specified student populations; an academic advising council to provide direction for improvement; and assessment of advising. This report will be posted on the transition web site soon, and Jayne will post it on Governance web site in the meantime. [Report is posted on the Governance Meetings page.]

Katy Olson, a UAF senior majoring in Psychology, presented her proposal for recognizing instructors via the Instructor of the Month Award. She described the project as one for all students to participate in, to vote on an instructor each month. Recipients would be

recognized at a public ceremony and would speak about their teaching principles and research. Departments would rotate. The goals of the project are threefold: 1.) to recognize quality teaching; 2.) improve instructor-students relations; and 3.) improve community relations. She's working with ASUAF and Scott McCrea to help launch it. She's designing a research project around measuring the stated goals. Preliminary research indicates that 92% of students believe quality teaching should be recognized, and 79% of students would participate in voting and attending an award ceremony. She's entering the Masters' program in Psychology and will follow through with it. Her email address is provided on the form, and the form is posted on the Governance web site.

#### IV A. President's Comments – Marsha Sousa

Marsha and Jon Dehn met with Terry MacTaggart regarding the evaluation of administration at UAF. It was a good meeting, and they plan to work with him over the summer on this project.

The accreditation process has begun in earnest. The steering committee (of which Marsha is a member representing Faculty Senate) is charged with developing the process. The units should be providing information about the newly proposed themes under the accreditation guidelines. Comments may be made to either Marsha or the unit representatives on the steering committee about these themes.

The Chancellor's office has created a committee to look at integrating teaching and research in the sciences (CIRTS). Members include Marsha, Perry Barboza, Elizabeth Allman, Terry Chapin, Kim Cox, Mike Harris, Jeff Freymuller, Dani Sheppard, Mike Castellini, Kevin Winker, Tom Kuhn, and Renate Wackerbauer. They're looking broadly at CNSM and the research institutes to see if they're best positioned for the future in the integration of teaching and research in the sciences. A survey from these units will be forthcoming to see what implications can be drawn from working with this smaller cross-section first.

#### B. President-Elect's Report – Jonathan Dehn

Jon mentioned two items for informational purposes:

- 1.) Elections are completed for the next senate term. He's not too excited about the process of the recent elections. He wants election reform.
- 2.) He mentions the following as it relates to planning between the three MAU's. The UAS Interim Provost has stepped down and returned to his vice-provost position. Robbie Stell has returned to the provost position while a search takes place.

Jane W. asked about how he sees changing the election process. Marsha commented about how the bylaws currently delegate the process to schools and colleges. Results from the units don't always return in a timely fashion, and an election process isn't always followed. The administrative committee had discussed last year about running the Senate elections out of the Senate office; however, they wanted to look at the reapportionment issues first. Data for reapportionment did not materialize in time for that to occur. So they hope to look at reapportionment in the fall, in time to try running the election process out of the Senate

office. There's not a way to solve all problems with an electronic election, but that's what they want to try as a means to ensure more participation from faculty in a timely fashion.

Ken B. commented on SNRAS' lack of an election and that the dean apparently appointed someone. Following that, Ken said there was an election, but the process was not followed fairly and this should be investigated.

#### V A. Chancellor's Comments – Brian Rogers

Numbers for admission applications and early enrollments are looking good. The numbers are up significantly (over 10% for first-time freshman), including UA Scholars. Factors contributing to that positive growth include faculty efforts, a good price compared to the competition, and quality education. He thanked those who've done academic advising to help retain students.

Briefly on the operating budget situation, we came through the last piece of the legislative process fairly well, thanks in large measure to Senator Joe Thomas. His work ensured we got CES energy money, some health programs, and some of the pay raise money. There will be a freeze on executive pay at all MAUs. There may be a handful of market adjustments systemwide. The capital budget fared worse. Only \$3.2 million was approved for systemwide deferred maintenance (against a \$50 million annual need). UAF will receive \$2 million for this, meaning only two projects can be addressed. The Federal Stimulus Package provides some opportunities for funds, but not a lot.

The Core curriculum and revitalization issue is very important. He hopes to see the group work on specific issues of how we engage students in the community and internationally, and regarding what the role of sustainability is in our curriculum. The students recently voted to tax themselves for sustainability and resource renewal (energy), and this sends a strong signal. We'll be matching those funds with institutional funds. We want to share in that good decision with them and support it.

On Friday he completed work on promotion and tenure. Announcement letters have gone out and they're waiting for acceptance signatures – then they'll announce results. To award tenure is a big decision by the institution, one that provides hope for the future. It's an important decision because these faculty have the choice to stay here and provide teaching, research and service for as long as they wish to do so. He appreciated the challenge that faculty face putting their files together, and how they teach, do research and serve the public.

Reference was made to two items on the agenda: 1.) with regard to the Department of Mathematics and Statistics (DMS) unit criteria, Brian R. is concerned about the 7<sup>th</sup> page of that which starts getting into a rationale rather than criteria, and he encourages them to look at it before sending it to him to approve. He's concerned about the language and that it could open up a whole new area in unit criteria that hasn't been there before. He doesn't necessarily disagree with the opinion expressed in the unit criteria, but he is not sure opinions should be included in unit criteria; 2.) the Graduate Certificate in Construction Management is a special situation to meet needs expressed by the community. The special tuition will help get the program up and running. It is a graduate program and one in which the

prospective students are already employed in their fields and have an ability to pay for the higher costs (aided by their employers). The use of this special tuition is not something that happens regularly at all.

Regarding the H1N1 influenza virus, like every institution in the country, we're subject to the pressures of the politics and science for the public health. There are ten days to go before large gatherings are over with, and he's hoping for clear health in the meantime.

Jane W. asked about the Geophysical Institute layoffs – are there more coming? Will we declare financial exigency or will any faculty be laid off? Brian R. responded no. He was not quoted accurately in the paper. There may be one more unit facing some layoffs, but NOT the university as a whole. We're tens of millions of dollars away from declaring financial exigency for the campus. There are no general layoffs that he foresees. The GI is dependent on non-state funds, which is why it's happened. The last time it happened at the GI it did not even make the newspaper.

Jon D. added that none of the layoffs were faculty positions. The GI director made it quite clear that the goal of the institute is to maintain the university mission of teaching, research and service. The layoffs were made so as not to cripple that ability to keep up their mission.

Jennifer R. asked Brian R. to clarify his statements about the Construction Management Certificate program being started up with special tuition, whether his comments suggested that special tuition is a way to start a program that would later transition over to regular tuition. Brian responded that his goal is for it to be start-up only, and then it would transition over to regular tuition. He's seen four or five programs over ten years or so that began with special tuition, but are all merged now. He personally doesn't believe there should be a long-standing special tuition situation – but it's a way to start a program in special situations. Jennifer is concerned about the favoring of employee-sponsored students – this disadvantages other students; and, the program relies on adjuncts which makes the program appear shaky without hiring faculty. It seems like a reach for practical support for a long-term program. Amber Thomas commented that the Senate should consider that this tuition is in UA policy and regulations and is an accepted form of tuition here – we shouldn't use this program to address that concern. The issue of special tuition is one to address separately.

#### B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

With Dana Thomas' leadership, the process for preparing reports for the accreditation process has started. The work of identifying themes of the institution has begun. Themes are separate parts of the university's overall mission about which we can state goals and objectives and use to devise means to assess and evaluate our progress toward meeting those goals and objectives. She encourages faculty involvement in the process. Accreditation is our statement and evaluation of what this institution does and whether we're achieving what we want our institution to accomplish. She appreciates that it's a lot of additional faculty work, but it's part of the package that we accept when we become faculty members.

The other issue she mentioned is the Academic Master Plan: it was to be brought before the Faculty Senate this spring for review, to approve or return to the systemwide council for

additional work; but, discussion at SAC has been more difficult and complicated than anticipated and this timeline wasn't met. It will be worked on through the summer and brought back before the MAU senates in the fall for their review.

## VI Governance Reports

### A. Staff Council – Juella Sparks

Staff Appreciation Day is a week away. She thanked faculty who've volunteered to work alongside administrators during the event. There have been 400 registered for the morning program, and 500 for the afternoon, as well as 600 people registered for lunch.

At their last meeting they plan to continue with changes to their bylaws; and, they may move to a President and Vice-President arrangement, rather than a President/President-Elect.

Senator Joe Thomas will visit them at this meeting to talk about the legislative session and take questions. Juella invites everyone to participate who'd like to be included.

Martin Klein was formally introduced as the new Staff Council President for 2009-10. He'll take the gavel at their last meeting.

### B. ASUAF – Brandon Meston

Adrien Triebel spoke about the visit to the legislature in Juneau. He spoke to the BOR at Valdez about keeping tuition lower. His platform next year includes the Student Saver program which helps students get discounts at local businesses. They're working with Robert Holden's office on that project. He's interested in outreach to high schools and other institutions to encourage them to send their students here.

### C. UAFT/UNAC – No comments.

Before the break, Marsha announced that Joe Hardenbrook from Senator Joe Thomas' office is present and has brought legislative reports (at the back table).

BREAK

## VII Core Revitalization and Assessment Committee Update and Panel Discussion

Dana Thomas reviewed the charge and activities of the Core Revitalization and Assessment Committee. They reviewed national trends in the content of core curriculum and general education, and heard from campus constituents on issues related to the current core along with ideas for revising it. They've prepared a summary report with recommendations. They focused on common intellectual experiences that a baccalaureate student should have (not specific courses). Part of the second charge to the committee was to examine alternative holistic assessment processes and make a recommendation for assessing student learning outcomes from the core. The assessment component needs more work by the committee.

[Copies are available on the Governance Meetings web page with materials for Meeting #159.]

Members of the committee were identified as follows: CLA: Karen Grossweiner, Christine Cooper; CNSM: Diane Wagner, Elizabeth Allman; CRCD: Ron Illingworth, Mahla Strohmaier; SoED: Anne Armstrong; SFOS: Trent Sutton; CEM: Charlie Mayer; SOM: Jacob Josef; SNRAS: John Yarie; Faculty Senate Core Review: Michael Harris; Student: Kristin Halpin; and Dana Thomas (Assistant Provost and facilitator).

The first recommendation of the committee is that UAF adopt the AACU Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) Essential Learning Outcomes as the new major learning outcomes from a new hybrid Core curriculum. One example of how it adds to what we have is in the area of Personal and Social Responsibility, which includes civic knowledge and engagement. The group expanded on this concept and this is detailed in the report.

Another significant area of LEAP is Integrative and Applied Learning, including synthesis and advanced accomplishment across generalized and specialized studies, demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems. Dana encourages the Faculty Senate to investigate the AACU essential learning outcomes in the information and report provided.

While course-based assessments are still desired; the committee also wants learning outcomes to take a more holistic approach that addresses the Core requirements and goals. How to do this still needs a lot of discussion.

The committee recommends that the university adopt a hybrid Core Curriculum with more flexibility in the number of choices of student courses in key areas. It's not as broad as a General Ed Requirement, but not as rigid as the current Core is now.

Dana introduced Christie Cooper from the Communication department of CLA: Her perspective about our Core has changed since working with this committee. She came to the committee very satisfied with the Core Curriculum. After reviewing national trends and talking with many others on campus, she saw that the current core is restrictive and becoming less appropriate to the students we serve. Our rigid Core with its set requirements and a General Ed model are two ends of the spectrum. Core Curriculum is about content and common experience, while General Ed is about addressing outcomes for learning. In practice, we're focusing on the experience (what courses were taken, checking it off from a list) rather than a set of outcomes that could be achieved from a set of various courses. Assessment at the program level would be accomplished by embedding the courses with the desired learning outcomes. Then, by sampling from the assignments embedded in the courses, the results for the program overall could be summarized. Finally, regarding the student experience, a strict core does not address the broad range of students we serve. Our current Core impacts A.A. and A.A.S. students in addition to the baccalaureate programs it was originally intended for. The hybrid Core offers advantages from both approaches – maintains some focus in the course offerings so there's a smaller set of common experiences, but it makes transferring courses from other institutions more equitable. So, if we change our focus from common learning experiences to meeting common learning outcomes, we can

focus our assessment, clarifying strengths and weaknesses in these learning opportunities provided for our students, and it will be easier to manage.

Kristen from student government spoke next. She serves on the committee and appreciated having full voting privileges. She came into this process viewing the Core as burdensome and not fitting into her goals. One of the best features coming out of this assessment of the Core is the concept of integration. Integrative and applied learning is essential in a student's education. It will make the Core applicable to more students, including A.A. and A.A.S. students. She endorses the proposal presented today and feels it is progressive and beneficial to the students. Ken B. asked her for suggestions about better educating students about the need for the Core. Kristen mentioned the idea of a one-credit freshman seminar where they learn about the core requirements and how it fits into the bigger picture of their education.

Anne Armstrong spoke in detail about the purpose and goals of a freshman seminar. It's inclusive and brings students' individual backgrounds to the table. It's collaborative by having small groups work with faculty, which allows for enquiry and allows them to see scholarship and research from that faculty. It's very effective for one credit/one hour per week. It effectively teaches students how to do school (how to manage the semester schedule, for example) and brings in elements of campus life and community activities. It guides them toward doing their own research in the future, helping them look at their baccalaureate goals and beyond. It fosters connection with faculty and the other students they've taken the class with. The students get to see integrative learning firsthand. Some concerns noted on the handout include more on the faculty workload, syllabi to be developed, and the scheduling challenges. Benefits include helping with student retention, and student engagement with the college.

Mahla Strohmeier served on the committee to address the needs of the associates' degree students. Changing the core will significantly impact the associate's degree which is basically the Core. It will affect salability of the degree and student retention. She now sees that the current Core is no longer completely relevant. She feels there is great potential in a new implementation of the changed Core, and with more course choices it may lead to more A.A.S. students going on to baccalaureate programs. The freshman seminar will benefit them as UAF students.

Rainer N. asked Anne A. about the 60-70 faculty that will be needed to make this change happen – does this pool exist now? Anne said that needs to be determined (she almost put that down as a concern herself).

Sarah Fowell commented that there are advantages to the Seminar, but it needs to be applied evenly pedagogically – will there be faculty training? There could be a lot of irregularity in the effectiveness without addressing this. Anne agrees they'll need to work on faculty development and a model for applying it. We need to come up with our own goals and how to address training.

Jennifer R. said she loves the idea because she had that as an undergraduate; but, how was the decision made to make it just a one-credit seminar? Anne said they looked at different models used at other universities. There are a variety of models out there. The idea merits



further study before implementation. The current proposal was put forth as doable in the near future, to launch it.

Dana presented closing issues, mentioning that the report contains a lot more detail on the issues described today. There is a lot more work to do. He mentioned the new senators need to pick this up and carry it on in the fall. Education about these issues needs to happen, as well. Many resources are included in the report. AACU is offering meetings to educate faculty about this. Last year, Dana wrote to a sample of faculty teaching core courses and asked them to show the core donut to students and explain how their course fits in with that – of the dozen he wrote to, four wrote back and told him that they didn't support the core and wouldn't do it. More buy-in is needed! Focus on the learning outcomes, rather than the classes. Most of the current committee members have volunteered to continue with the process in the fall.

Ken B. asked what the next step is for the Senate. Dana said the report contains recommendations, and the hope is that the Senate will look at these and develop motions to make policy changes relevant to the Core. Senate leadership needs to take the next step.

(Note that the referenced attachments may always be found with the corresponding meeting **agenda**, rather than within these minutes. Please use the "Meetings" link at <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov> to access these materials online. Complete copies of new proposals are kept on file at the UAF Governance Office at 314 Signers' Hall.)

VIII Consent Agenda mentioned / already voted upon at start of meeting.

IX New Business

- A. Motion to Reaffirm the SNRAS/AFES Unit Criteria,  
submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 159/4)

Ray Ralonde brought the motion to the floor, explaining that they reviewed this criteria and made suggestions for changes which were accepted by the unit. Julie seconded the motion made by Ray to accept these criteria.

Ken B. brought up his concerns. He feels there wasn't enough faculty participation. The Senate should do far more to be accountable for the use of UC during the P&T process. Ken asked the chair to attend the last faculty meeting at the school. Meeting didn't occur. He's going to vote no to send a message that we need to take a deeper look and allow faculty to bring concerns.

Julie J. asked Steve Sparrow from SNRAS to make comments. He led the development of these UC. Originally, they had been approved in 2003 or 04, and had been serving the school well. Only two very small, minor wording changes were made. One change was to accommodate non-tenure track faculty because of AFES; and the other change was regarding peer reviewed writing was made. He talked about the process used, and said that 70-75% of the faculty did vote to approve it.

Jane W. asked Ken B. if his comments were general about the whole review process. He said no, but believes more accountability for the process is needed and that the Senate should be looking at the process used. Amber asked about how many voted and if Ken was one of them. Ken gave some voting numbers (16 of 45 faculty voted) that did not match Steve's numbers. Ken maintained that approving these criteria is an anointing of a flawed process.

Ray R. spoke to the committee's charge with regard to the unit criteria – it does not include overseeing the process followed in the school or unit. There were no fundamental changes to this UC – just minor refinements. The UC Committee were not uncomfortable with their charge in this case.

Marsha also spoke to the Senate's duties with regard to Ken's comments: the Senate committee receives the unit criteria from the unit without looking at their internal review process; further, the Senate does not look at the implementation or application of the unit criteria within the unit itself – that falls to the promotion and tenure committees.

Marsha asked for a vote. The motion to reaffirm the SNRAS/AFES unit criteria was passed by majority vote. There was one nay vote cast by Ken B.

B. Motion to Reaffirm the Department of Mathematics and Statistics Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 159/5)

Ray brought the DMS unit criteria to the floor and explained the issues that were difficult with it, including: potential Labor Relations problems, potential problems of defining service toward promotion and tenure if one was contracted and paid for it, references to age of faculty, and references to minimum required amounts of time spent in rank. They requested appropriate revisions and these were made. Also, Labor Relations reviewed issues and suggested changes were made. There remains a lengthy section on page 7/8, as was mentioned by the Provost and Brian Rogers. The committee noted that the section was not unauthorized – it's just a long description of what criteria differentiate them as a unit from the other sciences. Does it belong there? It's still a Unit Criteria Committee concern, but it's not enough to keep them from passing it. The problem that remains is whether it will provide precedence for other units to follow.

Jane W. asked if that was what the Chancellor had talked about on page 8. The oddness of the passage in the criteria was noted by the committee.

Jennifer R. asked for confirmation of their reasoning – was the underlying issue that DMS weren't confident that university-wide committees would follow the promotion and tenure process without the lengthy explanation of their criteria? Ray responded that that was an accurate representation. Ray noted a parallel with the Marine Advisory Program, who explain what public service means in their unit since they are primarily an arm of public service in the SFOS.

Falk asked about the impact factor issue that was mentioned in the DMS unit criteria – are other mathematics departments elsewhere also abandoning the use of impact factors? Ray responded that he doesn't know. Falk's understanding is that impact factors are quite relevant for these types of departments and wanted to know how this is being compensated

for. Ray explained that the primary emphasis of this description is rather to differentiate the DMS from other sciences and that's how the committee dealt with it.

Marsha asked for a vote. Majority vote passed the motion to reaffirm the Department of Mathematics and Statistics unit criteria. The unit criteria were passed unanimously.

C. Resolution of Support for a Student Learning Commons, submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee (Attachment 159/6)

Dana G. spoke about the resolution and its 15-year history of development on campus. The collaboration on the plan with the Rasmuson Library and the SADAC has made it stronger. Now, the Library has potential physical space to house it. It's a practical model that has worked well all over the nation. Dana described how it would be structured and the potential benefits of that to the students. She also described how it would complement existing student support services already on campus.

Rainer spoke to the issue of the resolution (as opposed to a motion). Marsha then asked if a proposal will be forthcoming to address the financial implications of the SLC. Rheba Dupras from the Library came forward and spoke about collaborating with the SADAC on this idea. Having the endorsement of the proposal from the Faculty Senate through this resolution would help move this idea forward and bring it to the place of formulating specific budget proposals. A vote was taken, unanimously passing the resolution of support for a Student Learning Commons.

D. Motion to Approve a Certificate in Environmental Studies, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 159/7)

Amber T. brought the motion to the floor and introduced Jodie Anderson to speak to any direct questions regarding specifics of the program.

Perry B. asked if the program will be delivered entirely at Bristol Bay, or will there be other campus participation. Jodie responded that it's distance delivery; there's only one course that's required to be face-to-face. It's a statewide program that articulates into the geography and natural resource management four-year-degree programs.

Ken B. asked about the coordination with the other existing programs such as geography, the existing environmental studies program, and the environmental science programs at Anchorage and Juneau. Jodie commented that the Juneau campus program is for training water quality technicians, whereas the BBC program is more integrated with other sciences. Geography contacts were Patricia Heiser and Mike Sfraga, and they've worked together to integrate this certificate program into the statewide geography degree program. The UAA campus is on the horizon, but not a lot of positive integration has happened there yet.

Ken B. mentioned that he only sees one geography course in the program. He also wondered how it dovetails with other existing programs, and he thinks it needs to go back to committee to work out all the integration with existing programs. He also commented that it's a rigorous degree as it's laid out in terms of science, and he wonders if offering this at a rural

campus through distance delivery will have much student success. Jodie responded that many of their students are already working as technicians in the environmental field in their communities, and they've had five students participate in undergraduate research presentations internationally. Most of their participants are already doing science and it's an opportunity for them to gain more science and benefiting from that in terms of employment, and working toward a bachelor's degree. They do not believe that the rigor of the program or level at which they can expect their students to perform is any different from what would be expected at this campus.

Ray R. noted that he's worked with IGAP programs as a water quality trainer. The agencies they work with always offer many one-credit training courses – will these trainings be integrated into the program? Jodie indicated that they would be.

The motion to approve the Environmental Studies certificate was voted upon. The majority passed it, with one abstention.

#### X Unfinished Business

- A. Motion to Approve a Graduate Certificate in Construction Management, re-submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 159/8)

Doug G. spoke to the motion, mentioning that the certificate meets the needs of a large constituency group throughout the state that haven't been addressed adequately. For the program to be successful, the curriculum needs to be coordinated with these agencies to meet their needs. It needs to be flexible and delivered at workplaces (not just on campus). It needs appropriate recognition as a certificate to give it a framework.

Jennifer R. asked about her understanding of why it's coming forth. It seems that the courses will be taught off-campus by non-university teachers and adjuncts and that the university will just put a stamp of approval on it. How then is it a university program? Doug G. responded that courses will be vetted and approved by the CEM faculty. Because of the special emphasis on construction in Alaska, UAF is uniquely equipped to vet and oversee the quality of the courses.

Tim S. asked for a clarification of the program as a graduate certificate, and whether it could more accurately be called a post-baccalaureate certificate. Susan H. spoke to the graduate standards for admission and that the intent is to offer it as a graduate program, not a post-baccalaureate certificate (which would not require a 3.0 GPA).

Falk asked if the program includes any training about environmental issues. Bob P. responded that he teaches a course on environmental laws and permitting for engineers, but that no, there is no training in that science as the target audience is made up of civil engineers. Falk commented that was his point: the civil engineering field is lacking in training about environmental issues.

A vote was taken and the majority passed the motion. There was one nay.

## XI Committee and Annual Reports

Due to time constraints, the committee and annual reports were not covered in this meeting.

However, Jane W. wanted to ask Faculty Affairs why they did not act on the proposed motion to promote term faculty, and what conflict there was in the CBA for UAFT or the CBA for UNAC alluded to in the FAC annual report (since she did not find any conflicts for UAFT). Cathy C. responded that in the UNAC CBA there is a section noting that these particular appointments' responsibilities are outlined in the contract letter by which they're hired. These letters differ from person to person and unit to unit, as unit criteria will differ from unit to unit. The Faculty Affairs Committee wanted more research to be done about the differences in the hiring letters in the different units. If they institute a process to put in promotions, then they want it be clearly stated what the expectations are and how they differ from unit to unit (or remain the same). While they support the intent of the motion, more research needs to be done and that's why they sent it back to the Academic Council at CRCD.

- A. Curricular Affairs – Amber Thomas / Falk Huettmann (Attachment 159/9)
- B. Faculty Affairs – Cathy Cahill (Attachment 159/10)
- C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar (Attachment 159/11)  
[Annual Report is available online at the Meetings web page.]
- D. Committee on the Status of Women – Alex Fitts / Jane Weber  
(Attachment 159/12)
- E. Core Review - Michael Harris / Latrice Bowman
- F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry
- G. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Marji Illingworth / Jane Allen (Attachment 159/13)
- H. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – James Bicigo
- I. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Dana Greci / Julie Lurman Joly (Attachment 159/14)

J. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Ron Barry

XII Members' Comments/Questions

[Due to time constraints, this comment period was skipped.]

XIII Announcement of Award Recipients

A. Presentation of the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award

B. Announcement of the Usibelli Awards (Attachment 159/15)

C. Announcement of the Emeriti Faculty Awards  
(Attachment 159/16)

D. Recognition of Senate Service

E. Presentation of Resolution of Appreciation for Marsha Sousa

The attachments and resolutions may be found in the meeting agenda for #159, which is posted online at:

[http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/08-09\\_senate\\_meetings/index.html](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/08-09_senate_meetings/index.html)

XIV Adjournment of the 2008-2009 Faculty Senate

## XV 2009-2010 Faculty Senate Members Take Their Seats

### A. Roll Call of 2009-2010 Faculty Senate

#### Members Present

ABRAMOWICZ, Ken  
ALLEN, Jane (Bethel)  
ANGER, Andy  
BAKER, Carrie  
BARTLETT, Christa  
BROCIOUS, Heidi  
CAHILL, Cathy  
CHRISTIE, Anne  
DAVIS, Mike (Bristol Bay)  
DEHN, Jonathan  
FOWELL, Sarah  
HAZIRBABA, Kenan  
HOCK, Regine  
HUETTMANN, Falk  
JOLIE, July  
KADEN, Ute  
KERR, Marianne (Leslie Shallcross)  
KONAR, Brenda (Alex Oliveira)  
KOUKEL, Sonja (Leslie Shallcross)  
LARDON, Cecile (Melanie Arthur)  
LAWLOR, Orion  
LEONARD, Beth (online)  
MCINTYRE, Julie  
MOSES, Debra  
NEWBERRY, Rainer  
PALTER, Morris  
RALONDE, Ray  
REYNOLDS, Jennifer  
THOMAS, Amber  
WEBER, Jane  
WILSON, Timothy

#### Members Absent

BOGOSYAN, Seta  
GANGULI, Rajive  
HANSEN, Roger  
JIN, Meibing  
LIANG, Jingjing  
ROBERTS, Larry  
ZHAO, Yijiang

#### Others Present:

HENRICHS, Susan

B. President's Remarks – Jonathan Dehn

Jon thanked Marsha Sousa for serving as Faculty Senate president and helping to prepare him for his role.

Normalizing the election process to ensure fair representation and full participation by the faculty is one of the first things he plans to have the Senate look at.

Faculty are encouraged to come to him as well as the Administrative Committee members with concerns or issues. He would like to see more of the spirited debates take place in the appropriate committee, rather than on the floor of the Senate with its time constraints.

Actions of the Senate should keep focused on the university mission of education, research and service.

There will be some changes to the Senate committees by fall when faculty return. And, Jon mentioned the plan of forming a Research Advisory Committee in the fall.

C. President-Elect's Remarks – Cathy Cahill

Cathy thanked all for this opportunity to serve as president-elect. She shares Jon's focus on the primary university mission of education, research and service.

XVI Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

Susan welcomed the new faculty serving on the Senate. She also expressed her gladness for the returning membership, as she appreciates the mixture of the new Senators with the 'old' and she looks forward to the energy the new membership brings with it. She looks forward to working with everyone in the coming year.

XVII New Senate Business

- A. Motion to endorse 2009-2010 committee membership, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 159/17)

No changes were brought to the floor. The ayes passed the 2009-10 committee membership.

- B. Motion to approve the 2009-2010 Faculty Senate Meeting Calendar, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 159/18)

The ayes passed the motion to approve the 2009-10 meeting calendar.

- C. Motion to authorize the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate during the summer months, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 159/19)



The ayes passed the motion to authorize the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate during the summer. The committee membership remains the same over the summer with exception of the Jon as the president and Cathy as president-elect. The Faculty Affairs Committee will need to appoint a new chair since she now chairs the Administrative Committee.

#### XVIII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.