

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #164
Monday, February 1, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn

Faculty Senate President Jonathan Dehn called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call for 2009-10 Faculty Senate

Members Present:

ABRAMOWICZ, Ken
ALLEN, Jane
ANGER, Andy
BAKER, Carrie
BARTLETT, Christa
BOGOSYAN, Seta
BROCIOUS, Heidi (audio)
CAHILL, Cathy (audio)
CHRISTIE, Anne
DAVIS, Mike
DEHN, Jonathan
DONG, Lily
HANSEN, Roger
HOCK, Regine
HUETTMANN, Falk (audio)
JOLIE, July
KERR, Marianne
KONAR, Brenda
KOUKEL, Sonja
LARDON, Cecile
LAWLOR, Orion
LEONARD, Beth
LIANG, Jingjing (audio)
MCINTYRE, Julie
NEWBERRY, Rainer
PALTER, Morris
ROBERTS, Larry
THOMAS, Amber

Members Present (cont'd):

WEBER, Jane
WILSON, Timothy
Correction 3/10/2010:
MOSES, Debra (Diane McEachern
was online, late signing on.)

Members Absent:

FOWELL, Sarah
GANGULI, Rajive
HAZIRBABA, Kenan
JIN, Meibing
KADEN, Ute
~~MOSES, Debra (Diane McEachern)~~
RALONDE, Ray
REYNOLDS, Jennifer

Others Present:

Rich Collins (guest speaker)
Colleen Angaiak
Cindy Hardy
Dana Thomas
Linda Hapsmith
Josef Glowa
Eric Madsen
Mike Sfraga
Mike Earnest
Marsha Sousa

Non-voting Members Present:

Tim Stickel
Denis Wiesenburg
Pete Pinney
Martin Klein
Brian Rogers
Susan Henrichs

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #163

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 Approve a Minor in American Sign Language

B. Motions Pending: None

III Public Comments

Linda H. reminded everyone of the Feist/Schamel outstanding undergraduate faculty advisor award deadline of Fri., Feb. 5, 2010.

Vice Provost Dana T. reported on the progress of the committee examining the English placement writing sample implementation related to the motion which the Faculty Senate passed last year. The committee clearly prefers hand-scoring of writing samples over machine-scoring. However, implementing hand-scoring is a great challenge since over 1,000 samples come in during August and September. So, WritePlacer has been chosen for implementation of machine-scoring instead. The next step in the process is to vet that choice in order to obtain feedback, particularly from the rural campuses. After the vetting process, a motion will be brought to the Senate. Reading score placement ranges have been set and requiring a reading score will be included in the motion that will come before the Senate. Jon D. asked about the human- vs. machine-scoring experiment results. Dana said 113 writing samples were machine-scored by WritePlacer and hand-scored by two English faculty members. The correlation between the machine-scoring and either faculty scoring was exactly the same: (.8) as the correlation between the two faculty hand-scores.

As part of the Curricular Affairs Committee's work on the revision to the baccalaureate core, Falk H. and Carrie B. will attend an AACU General Ed conference. They'll bring back information on what's happening in curricular affairs on a national level.

IV A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

Jon D. welcomed everyone to the new calendar year, and mentioned issues of last year, including the bookstore, summer sessions calendar, core revitalization, and the accreditation process which is ramping up, and core accreditation themes. Also, some financial challenges will be coming up this year and some careful consideration needs to be given to how we're going to tighten our belts. Jon mentioned the distance ed legislative audit and suggestions from that to be considered. Upcoming issues include accreditation, reapportionment numbers

for the senate membership, and the Academic Master Plan. There is a mediation workshop taking place next door, in which Jon is participating. Jon recommends faculty involvement in the mediation training, if possible – it provides lots of tools.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

Cathy C. was online, calling from the Anchorage airport. Phone line feedback made it extremely difficult to capture her comments. The gist of her comments had to do with the Follett bookstore which provided books for core and developmental classes on campus at the start of this semester. Generally, feedback on that being done was very positive. Any feedback is invited to help suggest more improvements.

Follett has been approached to talk about a contract for a brick-and-mortar bookstore. Faculty volunteers are invited to help look over the possibilities. [Jane Weber and Ken Abramowicz have stepped forward to participate in those bookstore talks. Cecile L. asked if Jane and Ken would be handling problems, and Jane asked her to send word to Robert Holden. He'll bring problems to the group which is still being formed.]

Three faculty volunteers are being sought by the Provost's Office, to serve on the Planning and Budget Committee, each representing the areas of teaching, research and outreach. They will meet at least every other week.

Reapportionment will be discussed today. The Administrative Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee have been talking about changes to the Senate bylaws needed to streamline reapportionment. They've talked about coordinating this effort more regularly with the accreditation cycle. Every seven years the faculty numbers would be looked at in terms of reapportionment, since the numbers are being developed for the accreditation cycle already and the efforts would dovetail. If large number changes occurred in a particular unit before that, they could be looked at individually on an as needed basis.

Jon has offered to extend his term as president, which will be a discussion item later today. It's allowed for in the bylaws, though it hasn't taken place in recent history of the Senate. In order to extend his term as president, a two-thirds majority vote of the senate would be needed to approve it.

Jon also summarized Cathy's comments at the end of her time, as she was on audio with a very bad phone connection from the Anchorage airport.

V A. Chancellor's Comments – Brian Rogers

Brian R. mentioned that any bookstore problems should be mentioned to Robert Holden, while the effort continues to find a business model that works for the UAF Bookstore. Faculty advice and input is sought.

The BOR meets here in Fairbanks in two weeks, on Feb. 17-18. For those who were planning to speak to the Board, on the 17th, Wednesday, they'll be in executive session the

entire day. Public comment will only be taken on Thursday. Wednesday will be spent on only the presidential search. Primary UAF action items will primarily include reviewing the UAF master plan for facilities in the future. Please share your ideas, as the master plan is still being built. Drafts of the plan will be presented at this February meeting and again in April, with action likely taking place at the June BOR meeting. They'll be looking at schematics for the Life Sciences building and the Energy Technology facility.

The Legislature (House Finance Committee) meets with the university chancellors to discuss funding for the buildings, particularly financing for the Life Sciences Building, and the bill that would not only fund the planning efforts for engineering facilities in Fairbanks and Anchorage, but also the construction. Anchorage legislators are concerned that their sports arena is not in the Governor's budget. But the BOR is supporting the learning facilities at this time. It will take some effort to the Life Sciences building through the legislative process.

The Governor's Performance Scholarship (GPS) Bill is not looking good in the legislative process right now, which is unfortunate because the experience of other states which have this shows that these programs motivate students to complete high school and to seek a college education for which they're better prepared. He's hopeful that merit-based and need-based portions can be combined in a way to pass the legislature. This will be a challenge for UAF in two ways: 1.) the rural districts will need help to get to a place where they can offer four years of math and science; and 2.) then, potentially getting more college students and handling those increased enrollments. Meeting the new science and math needs is something we can help the rural areas with.

They're taking some steps to make sure they have enough carryforward funds to handle some contingencies for next year. The budget that's before the legislature funds about 60% of the increased costs of salaries and benefits, and 60% of other fixed cost increases; so 40% of the costs need to be met with planning for the future. The Planning and Budget Committee will be tackling this challenge.

Significant faculty concern has been expressed by the Faculty Senate leadership about the lack of faculty involvement in the presidential search. Brian noted that faculty are being treated about the same as administration have been! The Board has narrowed down the number of applicants to less than 10 and they're doing reference checks right now. They will be interviewing the finalists on Feb 27 and 28. Then they'll decide on about 3-4 finalists. The finalists will be available on Mon., March 1 here in Fairbanks at UAF to meet with campus constituencies (faculty, staff, administration, students and community). Feedback from the campus will be accepted for several days after their appearances. The BOR meets March 15 to make their final decision.

With regard to the budget situation, Cecile L. asked if Brian feels there's more pressure at the state level to support distance education efforts rather than more traditional face-to-face? Brian said there hasn't been any specific effort in that direction. There are legislators who are more interested in that as an access issue for people who are place-committed, more so than a cost-driving issue. There's recognition that distance education is not necessarily less expensive than traditional education.

Amber T. asked about the carryforward money and if something's changed at the state level to make it less feasible for the university to carry funds over into the next fiscal year. Brian responded that under state law, the university can carry unspent funds forward that are not state general funds. Our unrestricted funds consist of state general funds along with tuition and other unrestricted receipts. For example, if there are \$6 of state general funds and \$2 of tuition money totaling \$10, and we spent \$8, is the leftover \$2 state dollars or not? The university's position has been that the leftover \$2 is not state general funds and may be carried forward to the next fiscal year. Because of talk in the legislature about not allowing those dollars to be carried forward, the Chancellor has encouraged deans and directors to reduce their carryforward budgets. Because this was so effective last year, this year there will be no general sweep of carryforward funds as there had been last year. Amber asked about departments being penalized if deans are withholding dollars from departments that are needed for items and they're already working at a lower budget—if the dean becomes very frugal and spends less, and their budget could then be cut permanently. The Chancellor said the numbers for carryforward funds won't be used in making budget decisions. Because next year will be tight, deans know that they will be able to hold on to their carryforward funds as a cushion to help manage the downward process of funding and covering obligations.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Susan H. remarked that the Planning and Budget faculty volunteers will hopefully fairly represent the three areas of teaching, research and service. They don't have to be purely in one stripe, of course, but should have familiarity in the area they represent.

The accreditation themes that were approved before Christmas by Faculty Senate were adopted unchanged at Chancellor's Cabinet. They are the themes that will be fleshed out for the site visit in the fall of 2011. Dana T. is working with his committees on those themes to identify goals, objectives and indicators for them, so that the work on the institution's self study can begin.

The draft Academic Master Plan was completed last July. President's Cabinet felt it needed more work before it could be shared with the faculty senates. SAC has not been able to get together with President's Cabinet since. But, February 10 they will be meeting in Juneau and are optimistic about coming to agreement regarding any necessary changes before the plan can be distributed for review by the faculty senates.

Jon D. asked about who was participating at the Feb. 10 meeting. Susan said it will be with the provosts and the President's Cabinet. Who attends is up to the President.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Martin Klein

Martin had three things to share.

- Staff Council is meeting on Feb. 10 and will hold orientation with 14 new members.

- May 19 is Staff Appreciation Day – please mark your calendars. If you want to do a presentation to staff about your research or try out a new class, please send in your ideas. An ultimate Frisbee challenge was made to the faculty by staff. It's time to form teams. They would welcome help with the BBQ.
- The 2010 Staff Makes Students Count Award is open for nominations. Faculty are encouraged to nominate staff they see helping students. The prize is \$1,000 and two domestic airline tickets. Nominees receive a certificate. March 19 is the nomination deadline.

B. ASUAF – Todd Vorisek for Adrian Triebel

Todd Vorisek is the new president as Adrian has taken an internship in Senator Begich's office.

C. UAFT/UNAC

Jane W. reported that UAFT and the university have finalized their contract effective for six months (through December 31, 2010). This puts all the union contracts on the same schedule with each other for the faculty.

VII Guest Speaker: Rich Collins, Chair, CIRTS Topic: CIRTS Report Update

Rich provided some background on the formation and charge of the Committee on the Integration of Research and Teaching in the Sciences (CIRTS). They just completed a one-year program assessment effort to inform Chancellor Brian Rogers of how their faculty colleagues in CNSM, GI, IAB and IARC are succeeding in research and teaching based on a peer-assessment. The 156-page report just finished has not been officially released as of this date, but is due out shortly. (The committee, almost one year old, has now disbanded as their work is completed.)

Ten town hall meetings with the faculty were held on West Ridge last year, and then a survey developed. The survey was run in November, with the results being used to write the report. Rich summarized the survey results utilizing PowerPoint slides. The survey had a 70% response rate (96 responses from a diverse and representative group of faculty across the target units). All data was distilled through the committee, including narrative responses made by individuals (there's no raw data in the report).

The 96 faculty were diverse and representative in terms of which research institutes they were from, how many months of their salary they had to bring in on grants, their longevity on campus, and the number of graduate and undergraduate students they're advising. The results showed strong agreement that new research directions must enhance our academic curricula. People are committed to the integration of teaching and research on campus. But, how this is happening reveals significant tension among the faculty. Questions about salary recovery and how they support assistantships in the sciences revealed that faculty feel the

requirement to generate portions of their salary conflicts with their ability to support students. There was disagreement with the survey statement that people receive appropriate workload credit for the number of graduate students they mentor. The ability to support graduate students is seen as critical if UAF is to succeed in teaching and research. Success for undergraduate research depends upon good support in place for the graduate students.

Faculty concerns included that infrastructure isn't adequate to support their research; that there isn't enough flexibility in their workload assignments, and that their appointments are overly rigid between research and teaching. There's concern also for balance between individual faculty and campus leadership in developing new research and how well that's integrated into the development of curricula and the choice in how we hire faculty embedded in programs when large research initiatives are being pursued.

The "elephant in the room" questions were about how institutional resources are allocated between the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and the three research institutes. There are a lot of hard questions concerning how the money moves around and is administered. So, they asked if the college and institutes should be merged into one administrative unit. Surprisingly, the parsed results from the different units showed that it was not a polarizing question – college faculty weren't saying this was a chance to get research institute resources, and institute faculty weren't looking for a chance to get tenure in the college structure. They recognized that changing the structure in that way would be a big deal. There was much more diversity of opinion about this than the committee had expected to get. Pros and cons were identified as follows:

Pros

- increased administrative efficiency,
- reduction of local in-house competition,
- increase in graduate enrollment,
- equal remuneration for research and teaching assistantships,
- uniform assessment of faculty performance,
- equal opportunity for all faculty members,
- and focus on research activity rather than institute programmatic structure.

Cons

- dislocation and loss of productivity during such a major transition,
- damage to current research activities,
- loss of UAF's reputation as a research university
- disbelief that institutional efficiencies would result in tangible benefits to faculty members,
- and uncertainty in the status and role of research faculty in a new merged unit.

A clear result of the survey, however, is that faculty members believe that integration of teaching and research IS happening at the faculty level.

Final thoughts of the committee for the Chancellor: They did not recommend conjoining the institutes with CNSM. Plans for any future success must coordinate efforts across the levels

of administration and clearly identify tangible opportunities at the faculty level where integration of teaching and research actually.

Thanks were extended to many individuals who assisted with the survey, with data gathering, and with reviewing the initial drafts of the report.

Rainer N. commented about summarizing the results of the survey to mean that there is no faculty consensus about anything except that teaching and research are both important. Rich disagreed with the phrasing of that sound bite, saying that while there's a huge diversity of opinion and in the aggregate of the 90 faculty there is no simple consensus, the report has extensively parsed the data more specifically in terms of how long faculty have been here, and how many students they support, etc. This allows more strategic choices to be made based upon how faculty are operating in certain ways.

Cecile L. asked the Chancellor why social scientists/researchers weren't included in the survey. Brian R. responded that the initial genesis was the desire to look at alternate plans for how we deal with the biomedical sciences on campus. The committee took a broader look and the info they gathered is useful for some other issues such as workload flexibility, how indirect cost recoveries are allocated, as well as the need for support of graduate students and programs. He also noted that with major structural changes, we lose momentum. There is not enough of an advantage to justify restructuring units.

Cecile commented on the perception now furthered by this latest effort, that West Ridge research and researchers are more special than those working in the liberal arts and social sciences, in spite of the facts. The Chancellor agreed that there is a perception like that, but gave the example of the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, which did integrate the school with its institutes under a single dean. The models do not necessarily have to look the same across research and teaching; they don't have to look the same across campus and we can learn from that. Cecile noted that research in CLA is increasing, so more faculty have joint appointments.

Dana T. asked about conclusions from the survey regarding undergraduate research. Did Rich see hard data in his survey? Rich said that 50 respondents said they're mentoring 1-2 undergraduates, and that wasn't counting students being advised in a department. The survey brought out comments to the effect that if you don't have graduate student research going on, you don't have a good basis for the undergraduate research either. It has to be an integrated approach. The graduate students help to bring in the soft money for research. Rich C. mentioned Denise Thorsen is chairing a committee to look at undergraduate research, and that he's offered to bring her all the data he has around that issue.

BREAK

VIII New Business

- A. Motion to amend the Mandatory Placement Policy, submitted by the Student Academic Development Committee and the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 164/1)

Cindy Hardy, SADAC chair, gave the background of the motion, and described the changes being made. Statewide had brought up the issue of differing policies across the system and requested that the expiration dates for placement tests be consistent with UAA and UAS. SADAC also incorporated the writing sample language that was voted upon last spring in the Faculty Senate. The Curricular Affairs Committee has accepted her committee's changes. Dana T. mentioned the difference in expiration dates for prerequisite courses (one year for math and developmental) vs. placement tests (two years).

Rainer N. further clarified the language change two years ago by the Senate regarding lower division and developmental math prerequisites being taken within a calendar year of the required courses (at the request of Math faculty); however, the language "developmental" and "lower division" was never incorporated into the policy back then – leading to confusion. So, this updated motion fixes that problem.

Jane W. asked a question about the differing expiration dates and Cindy answered it, giving the example of a student who takes a placement test in the junior year of high school. By the time they get into college, they're already near the expiration deadline.

Dana T. said he had brought this issue forward at statewide's request, to standardize policy across the system. Jane talked about the one year and the two year deadlines which can be confusing. Cindy said her Math colleagues felt two years for math was too long.

Mike Ernest, Admissions director, mentioned that one of the benefits of regularizing the deadlines and scores across campus is that statewide can write a program in Banner that can flag scores as expired or delete them altogether for advising purposes. This brings consistent score results across all three campuses, benefitting students who transfer across the system.

Linda H. said the Advising Center is behind this motion. They prefer the two-year date for developmental and lower level math, but they will go with the motion as is, if it remains one year. The policy is consistent with other universities that are comparable to UAF. Cindy H. commented that the policy ensures that math students at the development and core level will learn it in a particular way--math students will be advised with some extra attention with the way this is now written.

Mike D. stated that he wanted to bring a proposed amendment of the motion to the floor for consideration, which was to change both expiration deadlines to two years. Jane A. supported the proposed amendment on the floor. Rainer commented that for full involvement of the math folks, it would make sense to send it back to committee for more discussion. He commented that the one year deadline makes more sense with needs of students (especially those in developmental courses), which is a higher priority than consistency with other campuses.

Cindy H. reiterated that instructors always have the discretion of letting students into their classes or not. There are ways to work around the policy if it's a problem for students.

Mike D. mentioned his motion to amend was brought to the floor, but he hadn't heard it seconded. Jane A. seconded it. A vote was taken. There were six votes in support of

amending the motion as discussed on the floor. There were 18 votes for not amending it as discussed on the floor.

Andy A. then motioned to send it back to committee. This was seconded. There were 13 ayes and eight nays. The motion was referred back to SADA Committee for further discussion.

Cindy asked about the 2010-11 printed catalog deadline and Tim S. indicated a vote in early March will be OK with regard to that.

IX Announcements 5 Min.

- A. Outstanding Senator of the Year Award (OSYA) – Nominations are open. Guidelines are available at back table, and online at:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#164

Jon D. mentioned that he wants a more tangible award than just a plaque. Jon's idea is a parking pass, but there is an issue that it's considered a taxable benefit to IRS. Airline mileage is being talked about, too.

- B. Senate Elections – Continuing and Expiring Terms (Attachment 164/2)

Jon asked people to think about the seats opening up at their units. The high rate of turnover on Faculty Senate plays to the administration's advantage. Right now there's a good chance for the Senate to cement their role with the newer, more benevolent chancellor.

X Discussion Items

- A. Extension of FS President's Term – Jon Dehn

Jon D. talked about his reasons for wanting to extend his term, as provided for in the current constitution and bylaws. That said, he stated he is not averse to stepping down. Jane W. talked about it making sense for the terms to be two years, but it would require change to constitution and bylaws.

Amber T. thanked Jon for his willingness to do this, noting that it's difficult for those senators who are still in pre-tenure status and working on that track.

Ken A. was initially reserved about this idea. But, he now realizes as a co-chair of a senate committee, how the administration has the upper hand. It takes a long time to get up to speed. It would go a long way toward equalizing the senate's power with administration's by extending the term. Ken said he would wholeheartedly support the idea.

Cecile L. noted that Cathy's term would be extended as president-elect, also. Cathy stated that she is willing to do that. Jon D. also mentioned he has approached four individuals to see about their interest in running for president-elect, and all turned him down.

Mike D. talked about the basic structure of the president and president-elect being tied to one-year terms. He feels this works, and that extending terms limits peoples' capacity to participate. He wants to know what other folks think about it.

Jon noted that the two positions are very different. The president-elect spends a year learning to be just that, and then becomes president, learning how to do that simultaneously with the job. He also acknowledged the stress it adds to people's time commitments and workloads. He has a little more flexibility as a research faculty, and he sees a time of big changes ahead with the change in UA president, two-year accreditation underway, a newer chancellor, among other reasons for considering it.

Amber T. agrees with statements about not changing policy on the terms, but she urges everyone to consider it in this current situation for the term to be extended as Jon has offered. She noted her concerns that the four individuals he had approached had said no.

Jon noted that current policy allows the extension with a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot, and he is not proposing any changes.

Cecile L. commented about the lack of interest in running for this position. Could there be more mentoring opportunities for senators who might have some interest in the role? Jane W. noted it's always been hard to get people to run for president-elect. Jon talked about the committee chairs historically being nominated for president-elect, particularly the Faculty Affairs Committee chair or the Curricular Affairs or GAAC committee chairs.

Rainer mentioned it's an arm twisting business every year. Rainer thought it would be a wonderful experiment to extend Jon's term. It should **be** tried out. **Correction 3/10/10**

B. Proposed Changes to Senate Bylaws

Jon D. talked about the reapportionment data included in the summary included with the last agenda at meeting #163. Changes to the Senate bylaws are needed to accommodate the recommendations from the summary. The end effect would be an increase by four senate representatives, by adding two more representatives for two of the institutes.

Anne C. mentioned the bylaws need to change first before the change can occur – so this would affect voting next year rather than this year.

XI Committee Reports

A. Curricular Affairs – Ken Abramowicz / Falk Huettmann

Ken mentioned the academic calendar changes being discussed. They're talking about starting the semester before MLK day in some years only. He invited feedback and anyone who's interested may attend their committee meeting, or please send comments to him and Falk.

B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 164/3
Minutes are attached.

C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar, Julie McIntyre
Minutes at back of room as a handout.

D. Committee on the Status of Women – Alex Fitts / Jane Weber
(Attachment 164/4)
Flyer for the Brown Bag Lunch is at the back table as a handout.

E. Core Review - Latrice Laughlin
No report was available.

F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry
Rainer had no comments.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks
No report was available.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa
No report was available.

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Rajive Ganguli
They're effectively meeting by email right now.

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy
They're still discussing the Student Learning Commons, and will be talking about the
Mandatory Placement amendment again.

K. Ad Hoc Committee: Advisory Research Committee – Roger Hansen
They still want a representative from CLA. There is an opportunity available for research
grants for people who would like to do social surveys of tsunami warning center messages.

XII Members' Comments/Questions

Tim Stickel mentioned that there will be a major Banner upgrade in March. UAOnline and
Banner will be down for a week.

XIII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:02 PM.