

MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #172

Monday, February 7, 2011

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

ALLEN, Jane
ANGER, Andy (audio)
ARENDR, Anthony
BAEK, Jungho
BAKER, Carrie
BARBOZA, Perry
BARTLETT, Christa (audio)
BROCIOUS, Heidi (audio)
CAHILL, Cathy
DAVIS, Mike
DEHN, Jonathan
DEHN, Lara (Alex Oliveira)
DONG, Lily (Craig Wisen)
FOWELL, Sarah
GANGULI, Rajive
HANSEN, Roger
HIMELBLOOM, Brian
HOCK, Regine
JENSEN, Karen
JONES, Debra
KADEN, Ute
KERR, Marianne
LARDON, Cecile
LAWLOR, Orion
MCEACHERN, Diane
MCINTYRE, Julie
METZGER, Andrew
NEWBERRY, Rainer
PALTER, Morris

Members Present (cont'd):

RENES, Sue
REYNOLDS, Jennifer
ROBERTS, Larry (audio)
VALENTINE, Dave
WEBER, Jane
WILSON, Tim

Members Absent:

HUETTMANN, Falk (Sabbat.)
JOLY, Julie
THOMAS, Amber
ZHANG, Xiong

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Brian Rogers
Susan Henrichs
Dana Thomas
Mike Earnest, Registrar
Eric Madsen
Doug Goering
Ken Abramowicz
Jordan Titus
Josef Glowa
Latrice Laughlin
Cindy Hardy

Others Present:

ASUAF: Robert Kinnard
Linda Hapsmith, AAC
Joanne Healy (Alternate)
CEM Faculty

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #171

Minutes were approved with revision to attendance. Brian Himelbloom was present by audio at the meeting.

C. Adoption of Agenda

Jon D. noted there will be a third announcement added to the agenda. The agenda was approved.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Specify the Minimum Grade for Baccalaureate Core Courses
2. Motion Recommending Clarification of University Regulation R10.04.090.C.11 on Grade Definition of "Incomplete"
3. Motion to Publicize Grading Policy Regarding "C"

B. Motions Pending:

1. Motion to Approve the DANSRD Unit Criteria

Chancellor Rogers has discussed DANSRD unit criteria with Director Miranda Wright and some of the faculty. They are making some minor side explanations for the criteria, which won't need to come back to the full senate.

Jon gave a summary of the approval of motions that had been pending at the last meeting.

III Public Comments/Questions

Dana Thomas had comments to share about three of the academic motions; and Jon asked him speak to them at the set time on the agenda in order not to lose them because of lengthy discussion expected on the health care dependent audit during this hour.

IV A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

The Academic Master Plan has been one of the largest items Jon has had to address both as Faculty Senate president and as Faculty Alliance chair. The shortened version is now ready to go before the BOR for their approval this month. It should be included in the BOR agenda packets going out today. <http://www.alaska.edu/bor/agendas/2011/feb17-18/> He noted some changes that were made and thanked faculty for their input. If anyone has questions upon reviewing it, please contact him.

Faculty Alliance will soon be addressing the topics of the grading policy on the Incomplete grade, as well as transfer of credits between the three MAUs.

UAA had excitement at the announcement of former dean of the College of Business and Public Policy, Tom Case, as the new chancellor to succeed Fran Ulmer.

UAA Faculty Senate did mention the health care dependent audit motion at their meeting on February 4. Jennifer Reynolds mentioned she was pretty sure that the UAS Faculty Senate had reviewed the motion at their meeting and has passed it last Friday.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

Cathy noted the Executive Leadership Workshop that just took place involving the campus administrators (vice chancellors, deans, and directors). They talked about the processes that have been put in place for the administrative services review as well as the academic and research reviews, and updated where they are with those reviews.

In terms of the administrative review, budget-wise they are ahead of where they were with regard to the unrestricted fund balance (what used to be called “carryforward”).

The academic review is progressing as everyone already knows. The Chemistry department was chosen as an example of what to do in terms of program review. She thanked everyone working on the review committees.

The research review is starting now that VCR Myers is here. He wants to finish the review in six months. Email him at mdmyers@alaska.edu to provide input.

The tuition taskforce is starting up again this semester. They have their agenda consolidated tuition and lower fees for certificates and other programs. Suggestions may be given to Cathy or to Registrar Mike Earnest.

Cathy mentioned the passing of research programmer Kevin Engle who worked at Geographic Information Network of Alaska (GINA). Kevin worked with many research faculty and students, supporting their research data needs. A memorial service will be held on Saturday, February 19, 2011 from 2-5pm at Big Daddy's BBQ banquet hall. A web site has been set up to remember Kevin, and photos and stories may be sent to remembering.kevin@gina.alaska.edu. A moment of silence was given by Faculty Senate to remember and honor Kevin and his many contributions to students and faculty of the university. <http://www.gina.alaska.edu/>

V A. Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers mentioned sharing at last month's Chamber of Commerce meeting about how 2010 was a banner year for UAF in terms of how we are measured by the state legislature and the BOR. For example, the university had an all-time high in student credit hours; research activity is up; high-demand-job graduate numbers are up; the highest numbers of Alaska Natives in the university's history were graduated in 2010; and the highest numbers of doctoral degrees in the university's history were awarded. He noted that it's the university faculty who made this really good year possible.

The university beat its philanthropical goal by raising more than one million dollars above their goal. They signed the largest capital procurements in the university's history which included the SFOS research vessel, and Life Sciences Building, among others. 2011 will be the biggest construction year on campus in two decades. They are currently planning for West Ridge parking to help minimize the impacts of construction this season as work begins on the projects.

The university budget request for the coming year is at a maintenance level. The Regents' request to the legislature does not include funding for any new programs. He sees a maintenance budget as allowing them to maintain momentum, quality and focus, particularly in a year when 45 other states are seeing major reductions in their budgets. He'll go to Juneau later this week, and will have a better sense of how things are going with the request. What he has heard thus far is positive.

Some ongoing issues the legislature wants addressed include transferability of credit among campuses, and the faculty/staff tuition benefit. He will continue to advocate for the continued faculty/staff tuition benefit, however. There is some legislative interest in the Fisher Report; and, once the BOR approves the Academic Master Plan, he also foresees some possible issues arising.

The Regents looked at the Fisher report along with the MacTaggart report at their retreat at the end of last month. The report is not seen as a prescription or to-do list, but as suggestions which they'll look at and take into consideration. Getting more students to graduation more rapidly is one issue he sees them focusing upon in the near term. He noted that the typical university student here in Alaska is not the recent high school graduate seen elsewhere outside the state. That said, there are ways we need to look into (financial aid, course sequencing, and advising, for example) in order to achieve that goal.

The Fisher Report indicates we need better institutional research, with less use of aggregate data and better understanding of what we get in disaggregating data. One example given had to do with apparent low giving rates for our alumni. But, if the data is disaggregated and looked at in terms of giving by associate and certificate degree holders vs. baccalaureate degree holders, it's a very different story. Also, more than half of our degree holders are younger than 40 years of age, but those alumni giving to the university are typically 50 years or older. So, again, if you look at the data stratifying by age, it's a different story.

Two new appointments to the BOR were named, including Joe Heckman (Denali State Bank) and Mike Powers (Fairbanks Memorial Hospital). Both worked as members of the UAF Vision Taskforce, with Joe chairing that taskforce. They'll be good local supporters and both bring good understanding of public higher education to their new positions.

Roger H. asked about only asking for maintenance level budget dollars. The Chancellor agreed there are good reasons to ask for more, but explained why they didn't at this time. While there are no new buildings in the capital request, they are really pushing for an additional \$100 million more than the \$37.5 million for system wide deferred maintenance in the Governor's budget, to address the backlog of building maintenance needs.

Mike D. thanked Chancellor Rogers for sending Todd Paris down to Juneau.

Cecile L. asked about the new dollars for instructional technology. Chancellor Rogers told about finding a bank error which left them with a refund of around one million dollars that they've decided will be used for improvements to smart classrooms and other instructional technology needs. He has heard the faculty requests for this area of need and is glad it can now be addressed.

B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs mentioned some of the items coming before the BOR at their meeting this month. The B.A. in Film Studies is going back before the BOR, and it may have a chance of being approved this time. They'll be updating the Board on their planning efforts to consider offering pre-veterinary courses as there is more demand in that area as well as qualified faculty to teach it from the Institute of Arctic Biology and the Biology and Wildlife Department.

The report on Alaska Senate Bill 241 on Teacher Preparation, required annually, will be given to the BOR. It's prepared at SW with a lot of work done by the faculty and deans of Education from the

three institutions. In conjunction with that, they're presenting a Teacher Preparation plan to improve the quality of teachers being produced, and to increase the number of teachers to the rural schools, and to increase the number of teachers overall, particularly in areas such as special education where it's currently difficult to fill the need that exists.

The revised Academic Master Plan will come before the Board, and probably will be approved.

Jordan Titus asked for a report on the status of program reviews. Susan said they're progressing well and the committee will be reviewing the PAIR data and reports received so far. Six program reviews out of 209 have been completed.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Maria Russell

A report was not available from Staff Council.

B. ASUAF – Nicole Carvajal

Robert Canard spoke as the ASUAF University Relations chair. Currently, they're looking at the grading system changes, and wonder whether there was student input.

Jon D. asked if the university relations chair was a new position at ASUAF. Robert responded that it's one of five committee chairs, and the University Relations chair is responsible for attending the Faculty Senate and Staff Council meetings.

C. UNAC – Jordan Titus

On January 5 the court gave an order basically granting class certification in the ORP case. So, there is no more argument between the union, the state and the university about who makes up the class in the class action suit.

A report has come out today by the chief negotiator for the union, outlining aspects of the tentative agreement reached so far.

Jordan mentioned she was glad to hear that the university is holding strong about the tuition benefit for staff and faculty, despite the Board's position. At the bargaining table, administration had proposed a six-month delay after initial hire to award the benefit, but they are not taking it away.

Regarding the dependent health care audit, faculty should expect a letter in the very near future from the UNAC president, Carl Shepro. A letter will also be forthcoming from Beth Behner at SW human resources, to respond to the avalanche of employee questions and responses.

Cecile L. commented that it's just one piece of the whole thing. She hopes the union will have a response to the earlier memo sent out by Beth Behner at statewide.

Jordan commented about the Joint Health Care Committee's role in the recent process. They had agreed that an audit was a good idea, but had no say with regard to the manner in which it was subsequently carried out.

Information and recent communications about the health care dependent audit and other information related to health benefits may be found online at:

<http://www.alaska.edu/benefits/>

UAFT – Jane Weber

Several faculty (including her) were in Juneau talking to legislators. She talked to about 20 legislators. In general, they were quite supportive.

VII Discussion Items

A. The Fisher Report

Chancellor Rogers noted that the report speaks for itself. Having been a consultant several times before, he knows the resulting reports are only as good as the amount of research and time put into them. Faculty Senate can help identify issues needing more dialog than was present in the work that led to the report.

Jon has suggested to Faculty Alliance that they get faculty input throughout the UA system and write a very measured response. He would like faculty input about where ideas in the report are good; and where they missed the mark. Use the “alaskafaculty@gmail.com” address to send in comments. Anonymity will be preserved. Jon thought there were some good suggestions, but clearly some good surprises and some inaccuracies.

Dennis Filler with Civil and Environmental Engineering shared that he was preparing a response about the Fisher Report, but he has decided to hold off because of how the health care dependent audit was disseminated to the university. The audit illustrates the chasm between employees and the administration and how administration enacts its policies. It makes him question how his feedback would be received, in light of the current handling of the audit. Jon asked that this input be shared with Faculty Alliance. One of their goals is to bridge the gulf between administrative and academic approaches to the flow of communication about important issues.

Chancellor Rogers mentioned that, as a co-author of the MacTaggart report they looked a lot at the system / campus relationship. One of the challenges faced by the system offices is that it’s very easy for them to be disconnected from the information flow and from the academic calendar and sequencing of the activities at campuses. He thinks the communication to the campuses about the audit would have been very different if the campus administrations had been a part of the process and had been able to provide input about the approach.

[NOTE: From this point in the recording, severe background noise from the audio conference made hearing playback of this commentary quite difficult.]

The Chancellor noted how the Fisher Report missed the mark when talking about doctoral programs at UAF. He and the Provost will provide some data and feedback to give a more accurate picture of UAF’s doctoral programs when compared to other institutions.

Dave V. suggested a UAF response is needed, too; not just a university-wide response. Because of areas that are campus specific in the Fisher Report, responding to those points is important. If there is enough detailed feedback, Jon noted that he’s happy to help do that.

Cecile mentioned her own experience with organizational consulting for public and non-profit organizations, saying she's familiar with the "we're different" response. However, she was surprised that a report prepared by academics took such a corporate approach to a university setting. Acknowledging there may be some parallel organizational principles, still she felt the approach that was taken was not appropriate for an educational institution. Leadership in academic institutions has to be different than for a business. Untested, unsubstantiated assumptions were made throughout the report, though ironically they condoned use of data driven information. She noted Faculty Senate should take the important role of responding to the report proactively and defining the institution and their role as faculty. She hopes leadership will engage with faculty in that conversation.

Jon again invited faculty responses to the report. Use the "alaskafaculty@gmail.com" address to send in comments. Anonymity will be preserved.

B. Health Care Dependent Verification

Jon mentioned the motion coming up under New Business about this topic. He acknowledged that employees understand and recognize the need to do the audit. But the important issues are those of process and procedure and the failure to communicate effectively about these to employees. Jon has counted 21 emails in three different threads on this topic so far. Costs of this type of approach are not just on the books; they include impacts to goodwill and the university's name in the community. He hopes the approach of the motion and this discussion will be proactive and help with the handling of the situation.

Dave V. got his notice, and he wondered what to do about financially interdependent partners? He didn't see information about that in the letter he got, but knows it's covered by the university.

Karen J. said people with interdependent partners who she works with have received a different letter. The letters appear to be tailored to the individuals.

Jordan T. said she knows of a colleague who has to submit 15 pieces of paper to verify her dependents: two children and a partner.

Cathy asked about her husband's UA insurance -- she's on his policy, so how do you answer the question that asks if your dependent is eligible for any other insurance? The question doesn't fit their situation.

Orion noted an inconsistency in the framing of the questions. Poor wording makes them difficult to respond to factually.

Morris P. said he has received no notification whatsoever -- he has no dependents. Should he know about this? Should he respond? Jennifer and others noted they got the letter and they're in that same boat as Morris. Others in the room had also not received any notification letter.

Jordan said this discussion is evidence of reasons for concern. What about those on sabbatical who won't hear about this in a timely manner? Chancellor Rogers said they've asked deans and directors to identify people who are away from the campus, though noting that campuses are not in charge of this process. He said the situation does make a strong case for item number one in the senate motion (to extend the response deadline).

Dave V. asked, in light of all the different experiences people are having, that an overview be given after the break about the audit process (what has happened, what is currently happening and what is supposed to happen). Jon said he'll make the attempt to do that.

2:00 BREAK

VIII Announcements

A. Upcoming Senate Vacancies

Jennifer commented on the numbers for reapportionment that were calculated last year; they're almost ironed out and ready for release. While representation numbers will probably remain the same for academic units, there will be changes to the research units.

Roger H. asked about the research unit election process. In the past, where the nomination process failed, it's led to director's appointments. Jon mentioned they want to get away from appointments by directors and have real elections take place.

B. OSYA Nomination Period Opens (Attachment 172/1)

Jon mentioned the OSYA nomination period is now open until after Spring Break.

More information:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#173>

C. Mike Earnest mentioned the March 1 deadline for curriculum items to make the printed catalog. Changes received after March 1 should be made effective for the following fall (2012) rather than fall 2011. Course descriptions in particular are important not just in terms of the printed catalog, but students begin registration in April for next fall.

IX New Business

A. Motion to Address Health Care Dependent Verification, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 172/2)

Jon brought the motion to the floor, noting it was a response to the memo from statewide dated January 31 informing employees of the audit and the February 28 deadline to respond. Some employees have gotten packets in the mail, or emails, while others have been contacted by automated phone messages from ConSova. It was noted that ConSova says employees must waive all liability if the required confidential info gets out of their hands.

Jon has taken the salient points from many messages he's received about the audit and these are included the motion. He's shared it widely with governance groups here at UAF and throughout the system. UAA will be discussing the motion, and UAS has already passed it. The tone of the motion is proactive and focused around the six items listed:

- (1) delay the timeline for response to the audit to June 1;

This addresses the fact that faculty may be abroad or on sabbatical, and recognizes the fact that the February 28 deadline is not feasible.

- (2) utilize existing information at UA, through each HR office, rather than inconvenience every employee at considerable cost;

- (3) do the work in house to ensure the security of personal information rather than through an external vendor regardless of their reputation;
We may not actually have all the necessary resources in-house to make this happen, but better use could be made of the resources we do have already to make the process smoother.
- (4) set up criteria, such as during open enrollment, to verify this data on a regular basis in house;
What's occurring right now is a spot audit, without the long-term in view.
- (5) publicize the requirements in an inclusive and positive manner to avoid misunderstandings in the future;
Life-changing events already require notification to Human Resources, though this is not communicated clearly.
- (6) include employees in decisions regarding their benefits and employment practices through the shared governance vehicle before costly decisions like this are made.

Jane W. asked if the motion will go up to Beth Behner at statewide if it's passed today. Chancellor Rogers commented that he would take the motion up to statewide. He supports the motion except for item #3 in terms of having sufficient staff to do the audit in-house. Jane asked when we could expect a response. Jon said that Faculty Alliance will be keeping this issue on top of the list.

Chancellor Rogers noted that President's Cabinet meets tomorrow morning, and he could bring it up then.

Cecile L. asked about the June 1 deadline and Jon noted that it allows for additional response time before the end of the fiscal year on the 30th.

Mike D. commented about the cost of this effort, and if its purpose is to capture fraud being committed by a few, then why blanket everyone with the effort. Chancellor Rogers commented that he doesn't know the cost; but based on data about other employers of this size, there could be enough fraud out there to the tune of at least half a million dollars or more, justifying an audit. From an administrative standpoint it makes sense to look into; however, he and other campus leadership were not made aware of specifics about how the audit would be implemented.

Dave V. suggested an Item #7 be added: to audit the audit. Ask statewide to show everyone what dollars have been saved and compare that with the cost of what they did.

Jordan T. mentioned a letter from Beth Behner to the President that quotes a cost amount. The ConSova vendor promises the university a return, and provides 10% off the cost if they don't meet the goal of the promised savings. Jon noted the letter promises savings of at \$500,000 over and above the cost of the audit which is mentioned to be \$65,000 to \$75,000. The company also says if they do not find a number totaling at least 4% of ineligible dependents, they will reduce their fee proportionately. Jon mentioned this sort of calculation does include a wrongful drop, and what a resulting lawsuit could cost, which could easily wipe out any savings.

It was noted that Premera / Blue Cross administers the university's health care plan, but the relationship to the third-party ConSova, if any, is unclear.

Karen J. commented that, with regard to #2 on the motion (utilizing existing information at human resources) HR couldn't provide any information sought by an employee about that employee's financially interdependent partner.

Roger H. asked if faculty guests attending the meeting could comment, and Jon opened the floor. Bob Perkins shared that the audit letter enraged him because he has a contract letter about his compensation that states the facts about his health care. Out of the blue he gets this letter from a third party he's never heard of, stating serious repercussions that include taking away this compensation. He appreciated the opportunity to vent and said the motion is a step in the right direction.

Dennis Fuller shared that he, too, was outraged. For the motion, he suggested consideration of the legal aspects of an out-of-state third party requiring federally and state protected tax information. He also noted that all the liability of lost private information is wide open and the third party does not protect us, nor does the university in this case. Further no provision is made for assisting employees whose information is lost or compromised by responding to the requirements of the audit. From a business perspective, he teaches fundamental principles of HR management in his upper division civil engineering course and how policies and procedures must be in place to protect a company's number one asset – its employees. The letter, not once, but three times threatens a mandate that if information is not provided, his dependents will be dropped in four weeks. In his opinion this violates the fundamental principles of human resource management and is an egregious approach.

Tim W. seconded the last two comments. In light of identity theft, he shares the fears about a third party having and digitizing our data.

Dave V. suggested that item #3 of the motion state more clearly that there be a legal bulwark added by the university to protect us from theft and loss of personal information. If ConSova is telling us we have to waive liability, then someone should have the liability for loss or leaking of our personal data.

Time was spent on the floor to make friendly amendments to the motion. Wording was discussed for adding an item #7 to audit the audit. It was agreed that the wording should frame the request as a cost benefit analysis since the letter by Beth Behner took that approach. "Report the costs and benefits of the audit." Jon asked about adding a time frame to that, and Chancellor Rogers suggested four weeks. Jon then suggested that item #3 focus on the security ramifications of using a third party vendor to gather personal data. "Establish [accept] legal liability for loss or unauthorized release of personal information." There was also discussion about adding "in accordance with state and federal law."

Roger H. asked if this process asks us to release federally protected information, as commented on earlier. Is this something the university can require of us? The legalities were discussed. Jane W. who sits on the Joint Health Care Committee said they agreed to an audit, but details about how it would be carried out were not presented to them or discussed.

Debra J. felt that faculty should seek legal input about responding to this request or not. Rainer asked if that language should be in the motion. Chancellor Rogers noted that the university is self insured and Blue Cross administers the plan. He's concerned about advising people not to comply. Through the claim filing process, employees are already probably saying certain info can be released to process that claim, so several companies already have access to personal info. The employer does

take responsibility for unauthorized release or loss of data. He will work to extend the date for responding and so issues can be further addressed.

Dennis Fuller asked how ConSova got his data in the first place. In the letter he received, they already have his children's birthdates and names – who supplied it? No one had any idea. Dave V. suggested an item #8 for the motion that asks that the legal basis for releasing the protected information to ConSova be shown. There was reluctance about adding more statements. Jennifer R. commented that she's concerned about the legality of other aspects of this process – finding out whether what they're asking for has been constructed in a legal way.

To item #5, Orion suggested language along the lines of ensuring compliance with state and federal law and to avoid misunderstandings in the future.

Voting took place on the friendly amendments to the motion that took place on the floor. Jon noted that items #1 and #2 remained the same. To item #3, the change was "accept legal liability for unauthorized release and/or loss of personal information in accordance with state and federal law." Item #4 remains the same. #5 becomes "publicize the requirements in an inclusive and positive manner to ensure compliance with state and federal law and avoid misunderstandings in the future." Item #6 remains the same. Item #7 has been added which is "report to the senate the costs and benefits of the audit." The amendments were passed unanimously.

The vote to approve the motion to address the health care dependent audit concerns (as just revised) was passed unanimously and followed with applause from the entire room.

- B. Motion to Amend the Mandatory Placement Policy for Math Placement Test Expiration Date, submitted by the SADA Committee (Attachment 172/3)

Cindy brought the motion to the floor and explained why it was coming before them again. Dana T. noted the now-requested change already was our existing policy until two years ago. UAF changed the policy at an earlier request from statewide. We're changing it back again because it turns out the other campuses liked our original policy.

The vote was taken and the motion to amend the mandatory placement policy on a math test expiration date was unanimously passed.

- C. Motion to Clarify Grading Policy for Graduate Programs, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 172/4)

Ken brought the motion to the floor, explaining that there is no change in policy. The motion is a clarification of what is stated in the catalog.

The motion to clarify grading policy for graduate programs was passed unanimously.

- D. Motion to Accept Students Transferring to UAF with AA/AS Degrees as Satisfying the 100-200 Level Core Curriculum, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 172/5)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor. Dana T. spoke in favor of the motion and mentioned the underlying guarantee that students have a similar background to the core is made up of the requirements of institutional accreditation; that broad coursework across the liberal arts, etc. is

standard in virtually all of the accrediting bodies and related community colleges. So the motion will help with recruiting upper division students who've completed their lower division coursework elsewhere. Rajive G. asked for clarification to degree requirements and Rainer noted that motion concerns general ed requirements only. Dave V. spoke to the recruiting aspect of the motion which will benefit articulations with the western community colleges. It will shorten the time to obtain the baccalaureate degree and bring in more upper division students to programs.

Jennifer R. also spoke in favor of it. The last statement in the motion protects and ensures a mechanism of maintaining standards. The registrar's office checks the detail for incoming transfer students.

The motion to approve the acceptance of students transferring to UAF with an AA/AS degree from an accredited institution as satisfying the 100-200 level of general ed requirements was passed unanimously.

- E. Motion to Change the Academic Disqualification Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 172/6)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor. Jon and Dana spoke in favor of it. Dana explained how it fixes a discrepancy in the policy that would keep students from being able to return.

The motion to approve the change to the academic disqualification policy was passed unanimously.

- F. Motion to Amend Bylaws for RAC, submitted by the ad hoc Research Advisory Committee and Administrative Committee (Attachment 172/7)

Orion brought the motion to the floor which would amend the Faculty Senate bylaws and create the Research Advisory Committee as a new permanent committee. Jon noted that one of the ex officio members will always be the VCR. The committee will give faculty a voice regarding the research review process.

The motion making the Research Advisory Committee a permanent senate committee was passed unanimously.

X Committee Reports

- A. Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 172/8)
- B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair

Regarding FS elections – reapportionment data will come out soon.

- C. Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Ute Kaden (Attachment 172/9)
- D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 172/10)
- E. Core Review – Latrice Laughlin, Chair
- F. Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks, Convener

Jon mentioned that the committee is working on creating a repository for administrator review survey questions and best practices for that process.

H Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowka, Chair
(Attachment 172/11)

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee –Ken Abramowicz, Chair
(Attachment 172/12)

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair

K. Research Advisory Committee (no longer ad hoc) – Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen,
Co-Chairs (Attachment 172/13)

XI Members' Comments/Questions

Cindy shared about her discussion with Robert, the student who spoke for ASUAF earlier. He was asking about student membership on Faculty Senate committees. Jon supported involving students.

XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at: 3:10 PM.

For ease of reference, the following pages contain the attachments from Agenda #172. The meeting was recorded and copies may be requested from the Faculty Senate Office by calling x7964 or emailing Jayne Harvie at jbharvie@alaska.edu.

OUTSTANDING SENATOR OF THE YEAR AWARD (OSYA)

PURPOSE:

The Outstanding Senator(s) of the year award is an award to be given by the UAF Faculty Senate for truly outstanding contribution of service for academic quality at the University. The contribution to be recognized would be far beyond that normally made by an individual in the normal performance of his or her job.

CRITERIA:

The recipient should be a serving member of the UAF Faculty Senate or a serving member of a permanent or standing committee of the Faculty Senate who has made a major contribution to the faculty's and student's welfare, to the faculty's ability to carry out its duties more effectively, to the general betterment of the University outside the teaching and research function, or has shown wise and courageous leadership (and responsibility) in behalf of the faculty and University. This should be an award for service, not teaching or research, above and beyond that normally expected from an individual.

NON-ELIGIBILITY:

The President and President-Elect of the Faculty Senate are not eligible to receive this award in their positions during their years of service.

PROCEDURES:

Any eligible Faculty Senate member may nominate a candidate for the OSYA. The letter of nomination should include a brief list of the Senator's accomplishments and a cover letter that makes the case for the nominee. The nomination should be submitted to the Faculty Senate President by March 25, 2011 [**corrected**].

The Screening Committee will consist of five members. One member will be appointed from the Provost Council by the Provost. The Faculty Senate will select four (4) members one of whom will be the President-Elect, and three others, none of whom is a nominee, in the March meeting of the Senate. This committee will meet prior to the April meeting of the Senate to screen all applicants and select one or two candidates that are recommended to the Senate President.

In the April Faculty Senate meeting, the committee shall move the appropriate resolution(s). After appropriate discussion, the full Senate shall vote by secret ballot on the motions. A simple majority vote of those attending will be necessary for the Senate to confirm an OSYA. The votes will be counted by the President and Secretary of the Senate, and the award is announced by the President of the Senate.

The award is to be presented by the President of the Senate and the form of the award shall be a framed, hand-lettered certificate that contains the resolution passed by the Senate and the signatures of the Faculty Senate President and President-Elect.

ATTACHMENT 172/2
UAF Faculty Senate #172, February 7, 2011
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

Note: The **amended** motion that was passed by the senate is posted under Actions for #172 at:
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#172>

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to request that the System Wide Office address the issue of verification of health care dependents for all employees such that:

- (1) delay the timeline for response to the audit to June 1;
- (2) utilize existing information at UA, through each HR office, rather than inconvenience every employee at considerable cost;
- (3) do the work in house to ensure the security of personal information rather than through an external vendor regardless of their reputation;
- (4) set up criteria, such as during open enrollment, to verify this data on a regular basis in house;
- (5) publicize the requirements in an inclusive and positive manner to avoid misunderstandings in the future;
- (6) include employees in decisions regarding their benefits and employment practices through the shared governance vehicle before costly decisions like this are made.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: A recent request (31 January 2011, see attached) from the Statewide Office of the University of Alaska required every employee to reaffirm the status of their dependents or potentially risk their loss of coverage. The timeline for this was 4 weeks, insufficient time for many in this diverse and dynamic group within the framework of their academic duties at UAF.

Though the need to provide health insurance in a cost effective manner is recognized by the Senate, this approach is neither cost-effective or would even ensure lasting change in the current system. Re-evaluating this policy is recommended to adopt a time-line that would take into account the academic workload and travel for sabbatical and field work, use existing information present at UAF, and prepare a plan to inform employees and update this data using an existing framework.

The current approach is onerous, provides a significant impact on the majority of the employees and was done without recognition of shared governance. As a result it appears to be an ineffective use of precious University resources, financial, expertise and goodwill among the employees.

Attachment referenced in the rationale for Motion about Health Care Dependent Verification (above):

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Michael Humphrey <mjhumphrey@alaska.edu>
Date: Mon, Jan 31, 2011 at 9:09 AM
Subject: [Benefits: UAF] Dependent Audit
To:
Cc: UAA All <benefits-uaa-l@lists.uaf.edu>, sdbutro@alaska.edu, UAS All <benefits-uas-l@lists.uaf.edu>, UAF All <benefits-uaf-l@lists.uaf.edu>

To all UA Faculty and Staff

As part of University of Alaska's ongoing efforts to control the cost of our health plan, we want to ensure that only eligible dependents are enrolled. ConSova is contacting every employee who has one or more dependents enrolled in a UA's health plan and is asking for verification of their eligibility.

It is important that you review the information ConSova is sending you. It is critical you respond to the verification audit by the February 28 deadline whether or not you have all required documentation.

If you have questions after reviewing the information ConSova sent you, call ConSova at 1-866-430-1267.

Thank you for your cooperation during this important project.

Frequently Asked Questions

Who is ConSova?

ConSova is a Human Resources firm that specializes in the dependent eligibility verification process and has conducted many dependent audits for Fortune 500 companies and governmental organizations.

Can I black out my financial information and Social Security number on these documents?

You may cross out all financial information and the first five digits of your Social Security number on any documents you provide. The last four digits of your SSN are required for accurate data match.

What guarantee do we have that our personal documents will be kept secure?

ConSova considers security and confidentiality a very serious matter. They employ state-of-the-art encryption technology to safeguard sensitive data. All documentation received is scanned and maintained on encrypted drives. In the event a ConSova system is stolen, the data is encrypted and will not be accessible to anyone. The server that maintains Dependent Eligibility Verification systems and scanned images is only accessible on ConSova's Local Area Network located in Lakewood, Colorado. This Local Area Network is a closed system and not accessible via Virtual Private Network or any other interactive connection.

ConSova Associates have audited over 1.5 million dependents in the past seven years, and they have never been accused or alleged to have not protected the private personal information of its clients' employees.

University of Alaska realizes and understands that employees may have concerns about releasing this information to a third party. We assure you that every precaution has been taken to ensure your information is kept confidential. This is no different than what our other service providers must prove (Premera, Caremark, VSP). You can help protect your own privacy by following the instructions included with the letter you will receive from ConSova.

Will the submitted documents be retained by ConSova? If so, for how long?

Documentation received from University of Alaska employees will be batched and maintained in a secure location monitored only by ConSova

employees. ConSova will destroy all documentation and wipe all hard drives containing protected health information 30 days after the dependent verification is completed.

Can my local Human Resources Department review my documents to determine eligibility of my dependents instead of ConSova?

No. The University of Alaska will not review any documentation for the verification process. All documents must be provided to ConSova for review.

If I am unable to supply documentation by the deadline for my eligible dependent, will University of Alaska terminate my dependent from the plan?

The University of Alaska will terminate a dependent due to the inability to provide documentation that verifies eligibility. However, if you are in contact with ConSova during the verification process and ConSova is aware of an issue you may be experiencing in gathering the appropriate documents, then your dependent will not be automatically terminated if you do not meet the deadline. ConSova is willing to assist you through this process, including helping you contact agencies to locate the documents you need.

Where should I go if I have questions?

The general information documents that have been sent out will be posted online at www.consova.com/universityofalaska. It may help you to review them. If after reviewing you still don't find the answer to your question, call 1-866-430-1267.

Mike Humphrey
Director of Benefits
University of Alaska
PO Box 755610
Fairbanks, AK 99775-5140

((office): 907.450.8226
((Fax): : 907.450.8201
: (email):mike.humphrey@alaska.edu

<http://www.alaska.edu/benefits/>

Nothing will ever be attempted if all possible objections must first be overcome.
Samuel Johnson

Mike Humphrey
Director of Benefits
University of Alaska
PO Box 755610
Fairbanks, AK 99775-5140

Voice: 907.450.8226
Fax: 907.450.8201
mjhumphrey@alaska.edu

ATTACHMENT 172/3
UAF Faculty Senate #172, February 7, 2011
Submitted by the Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to **AMEND THE 2011-12 CATALOG TO REFLECT** a one year math placement test expiration and revise the following UAF catalog statement under the Mandatory Placement heading on page 33, as indicated:

Effective: Fall 2011

Rationale: Placement test expiration periods are inconsistent across the UA system. Students attending different institutions within the system are confused by the differences. A common message is requested.

Furthermore, it is the hope of the SADA Committee and the Developmental Math and Math faculty that this motion leads to Banner enforcement of prerequisites for math placement.

CAPS and **Bolded** - Addition

[[]] – Deletion

Mandatory Placement

Students who do not meet basic skills standards in reading, writing and mathematics must complete appropriate Developmental Education courses. Such students may not enroll in 100-level or above courses that depend on these skills until they have satisfactorily met the exit criteria of the appropriate Developmental Education course(s).

Students without appropriate standardized test scores (such as ACT Plus Writing, SAT, ASSET or ACCUPLACER), advanced placement credits, transfer credits or prerequisite coursework must have UAF-approved placement test scores prior to registering for classes their first semester at UAF. Placement exams must be taken within two calendar years prior to the start of the course, **EXCEPT FOR MATHEMATICS PLACEMENT EXAMS WHICH MUST BE TAKEN WITHIN ONE CALENDAR YEAR**. Students may not enroll in classes unless they meet the placement requirements. Placement into appropriate developmental or core classes must be done with the help of an academic advisor. Placement tests are available at every UAF community campus as well as Testing Services, the Academic Advising Center, Tanana Valley Campus, Rural Student Services, Center for Distance Education and Northern Military Programs at Fort Wainwright, Eielson Air Force Base and Delta Career Advancement Center.

For placement into English F111X or any developmental English course, students must also have a scored writing sample such as an SAT or ACT writing sample, or a UAF-generated writing sample given along with ASSET, COMPASS, or ACCUPLACER or other placement tests.

Students who enroll in a developmental or core course without meeting the requirements may be withdrawn from the course through the faculty-initiated withdrawal process. Prerequisite courses must be taken within two calendar years prior to the start of developmental and lower division core math courses. Students may not enroll in Perspectives on the Human Condition courses unless they meet the placement requirements for English F111X (including reading). Students may not enroll in core science classes unless they have placement at DEVM F105 or above and placement into English F111X.

ATTACHMENT 172/4
UAF Faculty Senate #172, February 7, 2011
Submitted by the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to replace the “Grades and Grade Point Average (GPA)” paragraph on page 201 of the 2010-2011 UAF Catalog with the revision shown below.

Effective: Fall 2011

Rationale: Some faculty and students have found the current grade and GPA requirements needed to earn a graduate degree to be vague. Potential confusion could result in delayed graduation and significant cost to complete degree requirements that a student thought were already completed.

UAF Catalog, page 201:

- **Grades and Grade Point Average (GPA)**

You must have a cumulative GPA of 3.0 in the courses identified on your Advancement to Candidacy form to remain in good standing and to graduate. In addition, for the purpose of satisfying degree requirements you must earn a B (3.0) or better (no P grades) in each F400-level course and a C (2.0) grade or better in each F600-level course.

NOTE: A B- is below a 3.0 and, if obtained in an F400 course, will not count for meeting degree requirements; likewise, a C- is below a 2.0 and, if obtained in an F600-level course, will not count for meeting degree requirements.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to consider students transferring to UAF with an Associate of Science (AS) or Associate of Arts (AA) degree from a regionally accredited school satisfying one of the criteria below, as having satisfied the **100 and 200 level** UAF General Education (Core) requirements.

Effective: Fall 2011

Rationale: We recognize that UAF's Core Curriculum is a means to an end: ensuring that UAF graduates have a broad liberal education. AA and AS degrees which meet one of the requirements listed below have been purposefully designed to include a broad, liberal education component similar in purpose and scope to our own Core Curriculum. Students graduating from these programs have some exposure to math, science, humanities and social sciences and are adequately prepared to enter upper-division coursework at a 4-year university. Applied degrees (such as AAS) are not included, as they do not have the same broad liberal education component. This policy will allow UAF academic units to create 2+2 articulation agreements with qualified community colleges, and attract qualified students to finish bachelor's degrees at UAF. The goal is to attract students who have demonstrated success at the community college level; who have completed the intermediate goal of the AA or AS; who are ready to step into upper-division standing (where we have significant capacity) and who are likely to succeed and graduate from UAF programs.

Students transferring to UAF with an Associate in Science (AS) or Associate in Arts (AA) degree from a regionally accredited school satisfying one of the criteria below will be considered as having satisfied the **100 and 200 level** UAF General Education (Core) requirements.

1. The AA or AS degree is from the University of Alaska
OR
2. The public Universities in the State in which the community college is located also waive their core requirements in lieu of completing an AA or AS degree, that is, have an established 2+2 program.
OR
3. The community college and (or) community college district is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. (This is the one we are in.)
OR
4. The associate program has been approved by the Core Review Committee as satisfying the 100 and 200 level General Education requirements.

HOWEVER, schools and degree programs which meet the above criteria but supply inadequately prepared students may be designated 'unacceptable' if so voted by the Core Review Committee.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following changes to the readmission of academically disqualified students policy described in the *UAF Catalog* (below):

Effective: Fall 2011

Rationale: Current catalog language is too vague to be helpful to faculty and staff in advising students who have been academically disqualified. It also provides no benchmarks to measure a student's suitability for readmission.

As always, students with extenuating circumstances could request special consideration for readmission. Exceptions to the policy could be made per professional judgment of the Dean, Registrar or Provost/Vice Provost at the request of the student's Advisor.

UAA currently requires completion of 12 credits for readmission to any level program, but is considering a change in their policy to allow readmission after 9 credits. UAS requires raising cumulative GPA to 2.0 for readmission, regardless of the number of credits required to get there.

Current *UAF Catalog* language: Page 48

Academic Disqualification

Undergraduate students -- Undergraduate students on probation whose semester and cumulative GPAs are less than 2.0 at the end of spring semester will be disqualified from degree-seeking status. Disqualified students may continue their enrollment at UAF only as non-degree students, are limited to a maximum of 10 credits per semester and must register in person. Credit load overrides are permitted under certain circumstances. To be eligible for reinstatement in an academic degree program, the student is expected to earn at least a C grade (2.0) in all courses taken as a non-degree student. To be restored to degree-seeking status, the student must apply for readmission. A student may be reinstated but may still be on probation.

PROPOSED catalog language:

Academic Disqualification

Undergraduate students – Undergraduate students on probation whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below a 2.0 for two consecutive regular (Fall/Spring or Spring/Fall) semesters will be placed on Academic Disqualification. Academically disqualified students may continue their

enrollment at UAF only as non-degree students, are limited to 10 credits per semester, and are ineligible for most types of financial aid.

To be eligible for readmission to an academic degree program, the student must:

1. Complete nine (9) credits for a baccalaureate or associate program, or six (6) credits for a certificate program, with a 2.0 GPA or higher for those credits, after being disqualified. The courses may be completed at UAF and/or another regionally-accredited institution and must be letter-graded. Grades of 'P' or 'CR' will not be considered. In considering students for readmission, deans will look for coursework taken that relates to the student's intended program.

Students seeking readmission into an occupational endorsement program must have a 2.0 cumulative GPA.

OR

2. Achieve a 2.0 cumulative grade point average by repeating courses at UAF previously failed and reapply for admission

Readmission to a degree program is not automatic or guaranteed. The student must reapply and the application must be approved by the dean. The student may apply to the same program from which they were disqualified, or to a different program or level (e.g. baccalaureate, associate or certificate). Readmission may be granted with a status of "probation" or with other conditions as specified by the dean. It is vitally important for academically disqualified students to work closely with their academic advisor in developing a realistic and timely educational plan.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend Section 3 (Article V: Committees, Permanent) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws by adding the Research Advisory Committee.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately.

RATIONALE: UAF is a nationally ranked research university, and its faculty should have a voice in setting research policy and a vehicle to guide administrators in the needs of the research enterprise. The committee will serve as a conduit of communication both for faculty at large to address issues and needs as well as a sounding board for administration to get a response from faculty on research matters. The committee can also work with and advise other senate committees with regard to research.

[[]] = Deletion
CAPS = Addition

Sect. 3 (ART V: Committees)

PERMANENT

8. THE RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONSISTS OF UP TO TEN VOTING MEMBERS, A CHAIR AND CO-CHAIR, ALONG WITH AT LEAST ONE EX OFFICIO MEMBER WHO IS THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH. THE COMMITTEE EXISTS TO REVIEW ISSUES OF RESEARCHERS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS AND TO PROVIDE REPORTS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESOLUTIONS TO THE UAF FACULTY SENATE ON BEHALF OF THE UAF RESEARCH COMMUNITY. THE RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE WILL PROVIDE A CONNECTION BETWEEN THE FACULTY AND THE UAF VICE CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH, AND ADVISE THE VCR ON DEVELOPING PRODUCTIVE RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE DIFFERENT RESEARCH FACILITIES ACROSS UAF.

ATTACHMENT 172/8
UAF Faculty Senate #172, February 7, 2011
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting

Meeting Minutes for Jan. 18, 2011 Kayak room 2-3 ish pm

Present: Lili Anderson-Misel, Jungho Baek, Carrie Baker, Anita Hughes, Libby Eddy, Jayne Harvie, Rainer Newberry (Chair), David Valentine, Mike Earnest, Dana Thomas (guest)

Audio: Brian Himelbloom, Diane McEachern

1. Set meeting Day/time for Spring Semester ---suggested:

Wednesday afternoon starting at 2:00, 2:30 or 3:00 PM, **or**
Friday mornings, 9-10 AM, **or** Friday afternoons starting at 1:00 or 1:30 PM

New meeting time on Wednesdays at 1:00, starting Wednesday January 26th.

2. Get General Education Revitalization Committee going

Members:

1. Dave Valentine
 2. Carrie Baker
 3. Chris Coffman
 4. Bob Arundale
 5. Latrice Laughlin
 6. Diane Wagner
 7. Kate Quick
 8. Rajive Ganguli
 9. Anne Armstrong
 10. Linda Hapsmith
- (+ SOM rep + SFOS rep?) + Dana Thomas – ex officio + Mike Earnest – ex officio

I'd like pressure Dave Valentine into being the temporary chair and organizer....

Carrie strongly suggests Dave! Dave accepts (with hesitation ☺)

3. work on the 'AA, AS = core transfer business...'

Motion: Students transferring to UAF with an Associate in Science (AS) or Associate in Arts (AA) degree from a regionally accredited school will be considered as having satisfied the **100 and 200 level** UAF Core Curriculum (General Education) requirements

Ways suggested by Mike Earnest to get around the 'gack!!! Any!!!???? AA/AS????!!'

- We could designate in the motion that the core waiver applies only to AA or AS degrees earned at approved community colleges (or community college districts). We could start by approving a few fairly large districts, and then add more to the list later with approval of core review committee.

-- We could put in some language to the effect of: we will waive the core if public universities in which the community college is located do the same under established 2 + 2 programs. There are such statewide Associate to Baccalaureate transfer agreements built into the public higher education systems in many states, including WA, OR, CA and AZ. These AA and AS degrees have evolved over the years with input from the 4-year universities over the past couple of decades to match, as closely as possible, the first two years of a BA/BS program. (It really IS possible for a student to earn a bachelor's degree as a 2+2 in those systems.) Putting in some language of this kind, with reference to agreements within state systems, reduces the possibility of having to deal with a "virtual" community college such as University of Phoenix. We could also add in the word "public" in describing the community colleges from which we will accept the AA/AS. It seems redundant to say "public community college" but at least that would preclude arguments to waive core for degrees earned through the private, virtual colleges unless they undergo additional review by Core Review Committee

One by one review not desirable at all.

Mike: Seattle area CC's , Maricopa CC District (largest in the country) are examples of large CC districts. If student completes AA or AAS degree, the student completes the degree requirements for BA programs. How many districts would NOT be included? Dozens.

Dana: This needs to be included as part of the core discussion. Math, science and lab requirements are not consistent among our own programs. One approach-select large districts where our cc transfers come from. Accept them with addition of two courses.

*Agree that the Core should prepare for upper division **and** provide a liberal education.*

Start with NW Commission-guidelines-‘must have’ list

*Those that have a 2+2 agreement with home state university **or** regionally accred w NW Commission*

***or** large area cc district? Expand beyond the NW assn? Dana’s staff can provide info from the assn for the group.*

Admissions has been pursuing 2+2 agreements with CC’s already, namely the Seattle Area CC district.

BOR policy-gen ed must amount to 34 credits?

4. MOTION to amend catalog language for readmission of academically disqualified students.

Submitted by Mike Earnest, Registrar, and by Dana Thomas, Vice Provost, January 14, 2011.

MOTION: The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following changes to the readmission of academically disqualified students policy described in the catalog:

Current UAF catalog language:

Academic Disqualification

Undergraduate students -- Undergraduate students on probation whose semester and cumulative GPAs are less than 2.0 at the end of spring semester will be disqualified from degree-seeking status. Disqualified students may continue their enrollment at UAF only as non-degree students, are limited to a maximum of 10 credits per semester and must register in person. Credit load overrides are permitted under certain circumstances. To be eligible for reinstatement in an academic degree program, the student is expected to earn at least a C grade (2.0) in all courses taken as a non-degree student. To be restored to degree-seeking status, the student must apply for readmission. A student may be reinstated but may still be on probation.

PROPOSED catalog language:

Academic Disqualification

Undergraduate students – Undergraduate students on probation whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below a 2.0 for two consecutive regular (Fall/Spring or Spring/Fall) semesters will be placed on Academic Disqualification. Academically disqualified students may continue their enrollment at UAF only as non-degree students, are limited to 10 credits per semester, and are ineligible for most types of financial aid.

To be eligible for readmission to an academic degree program, the student must:

complete nine (9) credits at UAF and/or another regionally-accredited institution with a GPA of 2.0 or higher and reapply for admission (Note: Grades of ‘P’ or ‘CR’ do not count; all 9 credits must be letter-graded.) [In considering students for readmission, deans will look for coursework taken that relates to the student’s intended program.] **At least 3 credits must satisfy core requirements or be in the students intended program.**

OR

1. achieve a 2.0 cumulative grade point average by repeating courses previously failed at UAF (may be less than 9 credits) and reapply for admission

Readmission to a degree program is not automatic or guaranteed. The student must reapply and the application must be approved by the dean. The student may apply to the same program from which they were disqualified, or to a different program or level (e.g. baccalaureate, associate or certificate). Readmission may be granted with a status of “probation” or with other conditions as

specified by the dean. It is vitally important for academically disqualified students to work closely with their academic advisor in developing a realistic and timely educational plan.

Effective: Fall 2011

Rationale

Current catalog language is too vague to be helpful to faculty and staff in advising students who have been academically disqualified. It also provides no benchmarks to measure a student's suitability for readmission.

Registrar and advising staff discussed the possibility of a 12-credit requirement for baccalaureate readmission, and a 6-credit requirement for associate/certificate readmission. There was some concern, however, that having a two-tiered readmission plan might lead to large numbers of students seeking associate status temporarily as a way to obtain financial aid. The 9-credit requirement was settled on as a compromise between the two levels to keep the policy as simple as possible. *(Note that this brings the readmission policy into alignment with the reinstatement policy for financial aid.)*

As always, students with extenuating circumstances could request special consideration for readmission. Exceptions to the policy could be made per professional judgment of the Advisor, Dean, Registrar or Provost/Vice Provost.

UAA is also considering a change in their policy to allow readmission after 9 credits. UAS requires raising cumulative GPA to 2.0 for readmission. It would be helpful if policies were similar across MAU's, since we have quite a few students who move from one to another.

Discussion:

Many conversations back and forth, including Admissions, Academic Advising, and Deans-this represents best 'advice' on how to clarify this policy.

Benefit of 9 credit requirement-lines up with financial aid requirements

Removing P or CR from consideration

Suggest at least one course

Remove last sentence and make suggested changes to the language- noted above in bold with underline

Provide comments by next CAC Jan 26 or Admin committee meeting Jan 28th

Handout from Rainer at the meeting:

Suggested Guidelines for the design and approval of Stacked 400-600 level courses.

This document is posted online for the 1/18/2011 Meeting as a handout:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/curricular-affairs-commit/>

Discussion regarding current regulations on stacked courses

Asking Senate to more tightly regulate stacked courses. Accrediting evaluators currently review stacked courses as well as institutional accreditors. Dana to check accreditation standards and review ABET accreditation.

Two separate syllabi. GAAC to discuss on Monday the 24th of Jan.

Review and discuss for next CAC-Jan 26

Pre-amble? Why stacked courses? Benefits for small undergraduate and/or graduate programs. 'Fuzzy areas' Faculty workload-teaching to two audiences and getting credit for one three credit course....Count as 1 ½ times workload?

Undergrads take course and pay the undergraduate fees. Get the exposure to a graduate level course? CAC asks Dana and Carol to bring this up at next Dean's council.

ATTACHMENT 172/9
UAF Faculty Senate #172, February 7, 2011
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

**Unit Criteria Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 24, 2011**

Attending: Ute Kaden, Julie McIntyre, Debra Jones, Karen Jensen, Perry Barboza.
Mark Hermann submitted comments on the SFOS criteria by e-mail.

- Next Unit Criteria meeting on 21 February at 2-3pm. (Jayne, please arrange a venue).
- Pending criteria: Debra and Ute will inquire from CES and SOE about status of criteria preparations. Perry will call Music about their pending criterion.
- SFOS Unit Criteria document was discussed. An annotated document is attached. Please let me know if you can read these comments. If not I will transcribe them into a separate document.

[Note: SFOS Fisheries unit criteria annotated document is posted at the committee's web site and has been forwarded to Fisheries.]

ATTACHMENT 172/10
UAF Faculty Senate #172, February 7, 2011
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

**Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes for January 20, 2011**

In attendance: Kayt Sunwood, Jane Weber, Melanie Arthur, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jenny Liu, Derek Sikes (on phone), Nicole Cundiff, Nilima Hullavarad, and Dan White

- 1) P/T workshop April 29th from 10a-12p
 - a. IARC is reserved but we are working on another room in BUTRO
 - b. Panelists: Roxie Dinstel, Chris Coffman, Paul Layer, Diane O'Brien, Sine Anahita
- 2) Chancellor's Women's Professorship Program
 - a. Is CSW interested? If so, need memo to Chancellor
 - i. Why would having such a program be important
 - ii. What is needed? (i.e. mentoring/departmental areas/funding)
 - iii. 1 page memo with no immediate deadline
 - b. Memo should be based on NSF Presentation by Joy Morrison
 - i. Statistics not available as of date.
 - ii. Good hiring of female faculty, but no retention
 - iii. Lack of mentors
 - iv. Opportunity to have mentoring built into workload
- 3) Meeting attendance needed for CSW representation due to member travel
 - a. Derek to fill in at CDAC Committee for Jenny
 - b. Melanie to fill in at Senate Admin Committee for Jane
- 4) Next meeting s: Feb 18th 1-2 and March 25 3-4

ATTACHMENT 172/11

UAF Faculty Senate #172, February 7, 2011

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 18, 2011**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Castellini, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Julie Joly, Alexandra Oliveira

Excused: Melanie Arthur, Channon Price

Absent: Eric Madsen, Larry Roberts

III. Report from Diane

Diane reported that the Faculty Development website has been updated and includes current information regarding Director of the National Center for Science Education Dr. Eugenie Scott's upcoming visit. While Dr. Scott's visit will not include an evening presentation due to her travel schedule, she will present a lecture/discussion "The Evolution of Creationism" for students and faculty on Thursday, 1-27-11 from 9:45 – 11:15 a.m. in Schaible Auditorium (Bunnell) and a Faculty Workshop on "Teaching Evolution" for science faculty on Thursday, 1-27-11 from 1:00 – 2:00 p.m. in Butrovich (this workshop will also be available for faculty at rural campuses). Science teachers from the FNSBSD have also been invited. Diane will forward an informational flier to committee members to forward or print and post to help spread the word. UAF Marketing will also email the fliers UAF-wide.

Anne Sakumoto (United Academics) is coordinating with Statewide HR to bring best-selling author and speaker Neil Howe to UAF and UAA. Howe will present a lecture on learning differences between generations on March 3, 2011 at UAF and March 4, 2011 at UAA. He has written several books and has some new ones coming out dealing with "Millenials."

Regarding our upcoming Faculty Forum discussions on Difficult Dialogs, Diane reported that Abel Bult-Ito is calling meetings this week to organize discussions on the same topic, but we have not been able to coordinate our efforts with his.

IV. Old Business

Faculty Forums (possibly up to 4) on Difficult Dialogs in the Classroom will be held on the following dates: Tuesday, 2-15-11 (Rasmuson 340), Tuesday, 3-1-11 (IARC 417), and Tuesday, 3-22-11 (IARC 417), along with an additional follow-up forum on Friday, 4-15-11 (IARC 417) as interest warrants. If there are enough questions and concerns after the first forum, we will go ahead with the next scheduled forum and continue the discussion at each forum as necessary. Dr. Eugenie Scott's presentation should generate plenty of ideas and concerns for discussion. Diane will purchase several copies of UAA's faculty book *Difficult Dialogs in Higher Education* to have on hand for interested faculty to borrow.

V. New Business

Dr. Eugenie Scott's presentations were discussed with Diane's report.

VI. Next Meeting: Josef will Doodle committee members so we can determine the best day and time for our Spring semester meetings.

Additional item: Josef will present the FDAI Committee's compiled information regarding electronic student evaluations at the Faculty Administrative Committee meeting next week to ensure that faculty concerns are heard before any decision is made. It was suggested that we include the fact that faculty are having a hard time getting evaluations from their off-campus, video/audio conference students since there is no one to administer the evaluations as in a face-to-face class. Mike C. wondered what Alex Hwu uses at CDE since faculty there face a similar situation.

VII. Adjourned at 2:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 172/12

UAF Faculty Senate #172, February 7, 2011

Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes November 29, 2010**

Voting Members Present: Ken Abramowicz (Chair), Donie Bret-Harte, Lara Dehn (phone), Orion Lawlor, Jen Schmidt, Xiong Zhang (phone).

Ex-Officio Members Present: Laura Bender, Anita Hughes, Lillian Anderson-Misel, Libby Eddy.
Also present: Jayne Harvie (note-taking)

1. Discussion/modification/approval of agenda.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

2. Discussion/approval of 11-15-2010 meeting minutes.

The revised minutes were approved.

3. Discussion topics.

- A. Graduate grading policy. Page 201 of the UAF Catalog delineates the grades and GPA average required to graduate. Should GAAC clarify this paragraph in an attempt to mitigate the concerns related to the use of the “+/-” grading scale for graduate students. Should GAAC pass a motion modifying the “+/-” grading scale for graduate courses?

Laura B. confirmed that the statements in this section of the Catalog were correct, though they are confusing. Lara D. pointed out that funding grants require a 3.0 overall GPA, adding to the confusion. Advancement to Candidacy requires a GPA of 3.0, but Orion pointed out the requirements for the BS/MS are unclear. Students can have many varying 400-level course grades.

Ken asked if there were interest in eliminating the use of +/- grades at the graduate level, or in getting rid of “C-“ and “B-“, or perhaps using a modified system. Donie thought it would be worthwhile to clarify the existing policy.

Ken and Orion will work together to come up with a motion for the next meeting.

- B. Special topics courses and seminar courses. Are these courses meeting the needs of departments that desire flexibility in course content in specialized circumstances? Is GAAC’s review process for these courses adequate?

Laura B. confirmed the fact that GAAC does not review graduate level Special Topics (-693) and Seminar (-692) courses. These allow the departments flexibility with changing subject matter, and usually are graded Pass/Fail and are repeatable for credit.

Ken noted holes in the process and how courses can be created while circumventing review by the senate curriculum committees. How do we address the potential for academic integrity to suffer as a result? Suggestions included having a similar curricular affairs committee for the graduate level concerns (similar to CAC and CR for the undergraduate level); and perhaps working down the chain

by contacting curriculum review councils at the colleges and schools and reminding them of academic standards.

4. GAAC proposals ready for acceptance were approved by the committee, including:

- 1-GCCh. – BIOL F618/F418 (cross-listed with Geography)
- 3-GPCh. – Certificate of Completion for the Post-Baccalaureate K-12 Special Education Licensure Program.
- 4-GPCh. – Program Change to the Master’s in Education.
- 33-GPCh. – M.S. M.A.T – Change Name to Biological Sciences

5. Review of GAAC proposals from prior meetings.

- 19-GNC: ATM F666 - Atmospheric Remote Sensing (Donie)
Status: Waiting on changes to be received from the submitter. Donie will email them again.
- 24-GNC: FISH F631 - Data Analysis in Community Ecology (Ken and Lara)
Status: Approved by the committee.
- 26-GCCh: WLF F625 – Analysis of Vertebrate Population Survival and Movement (Jen)
Status: Approved by the committee with revisions that have been received.
- 36-GNC: EE F614 - Numerical Methods for Electrical Engineers (Lara)
Status: Hold for next meeting.
- 37-GNC: EE F643 - Selected Topics in Computer Engineering (Lara)
Status: Approved with changes by the committee, including a new title.

6. Discussion of new GAAC proposals (as time permits).

- 25-GNC: ATM F678 – Mesoscale Dynamics (Xiong)
Status: Discussed by the committee, and the syllabus still needs work in areas of devising a clearer grading statement, and providing a more detailed class schedule.
- 18-GCCh. – Atmospheric Radiation (Xiong)
Status: Discussed by the committee, and the syllabus is inadequate for a stacked course, and needs a plagiarism statement. Lara noted it needs a clear attendance statement; Xiong noted the schedule needs to include deadlines. Jen suggested the cheatsheet have a size constraint included.

The following Special Ed courses were postponed for discussion until Sue Renes returns.

- 05-GCCh: EDSE F605 - Early Childhood Special Education (Sue)
- 06-GCCh: EDSE F610 - Assessment of Students with Disabilities (Sue)
- 07-GCCh: EDSE F612 - Curriculum and Strategies I: Low Incidence (Sue)
- 08-GCCh: EDSE F622 - Curriculum and Strategies II: High Incidence (Sue)
- 09-GCCh: EDSE F624 - Social/Emotional Development, Assessment, and Intervention (Sue)

- 10-GCCh: EDSE F625 - Teaching Mathematics to Special Learners (Sue)
- 11-GCCh: EDSE F633 - Autism: Communication and Social Disorders (Sue)
- 12-GCCh: EDSE F640 - Collaboration and Consultative Methods (Sue)
- 13-GCCh: EDSE F642 - Autism and Asberger Syndrome: Social and Behavioral Issues (Sue)
- 14-GCCh: EDSE F677 - Reading Assessment, Curriculum and Strategies (Sue)

Ken asked everyone on the committee to review the new MA program request and the associated new courses in Political Science. These need the full input of the committee. Ken noted the courses are stacked. There also appears to be an internship option, and who its targeting should be considered. Concerns were expressed that the required paper is only 15-pages long, which doesn't seem to a true project or internship at a Master's level. After everyone on the committee has reviewed these, Ken would like to invite the program faculty to a meeting (possibly in January) to discuss the concerns and have questions answered.

- 28-GNC – Political Science Research Design and Methods (Ken)
- 29-GNC – Arctic Politics and Governance (Ken)
- 30-GNC – Internship in Public Affairs (Ken)
- 27-GNP – M.A. Political Science (Ken)

The PSY courses and M.Ed. program will be discussed when Amber (and Sue) are back.

- 31-GCCh. – PSY F652 – Practicum Placement - Clinical I, change repeatability (Amber)
- 32-GCCh. – PSY F653 – Practicum Placement – Clinical II, change repeatability (Amber)
- 35-GPCh. – M.Ed. –Remove Reading and K-12 Reading Endorsement Specialization (Amber)

Approved:

- 34-GPCh. – Biological Sciences: Remove Biology/Botany/Zoology concentrations (Jen)
Status: Approved after review by the committee. Jen had spoken with Christa Mulder.

7. Other items:

Ken asked for volunteers to take items that Regine had signed up for last time. She won't be able to attend the committee meetings in December.

Attachment 172/12 – continued:

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Approved Meeting Minutes for December 13, 2010**

Voting Members Present: Ken Abramowicz (Chair), Lara Dehn (phone), Jen Schmidt, Sue Renes

Absent: Donie Bret-Harte, Orion Lawlor, Amber Thomas, Xiong Zhang.
(Regine Hock needs to step out for rest of term due to illness.)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Laura Bender, Larry Duffy, Anita Hughes.

Also present: Jayne Harvie (note-taking)

1. Discussion/modification/approval of agenda.

Without a quorum present, the meeting was confined to discussing the grading policy motion, and some of the new curriculum which could be addressed by those present (as noted below).

2. Discussion/approval of 11-29-2010 meeting minutes.

Not approved since quorum not present.

3. Discussion topics.

A. Meeting date and time for January GAAC meeting.

January 14, 2011, Friday, at 9:30 – 10:30 AM has been proposed for discussion on the new master's program in Political Science. Larry D. suggests that NORS faculty Mary Erhlander be invited to the discussion, since approval would affect the Northern Studies program. This is also recommended by the Provost, per Larry. Some preliminary discussion took place regarding current concerns, but complete discussion of the proposed program was delayed until the next meeting.

B. Graduate grading policy. Continued discussion of changes related to "+/-" grading scale for graduate courses.

Ken will email a revised version to the group. The statement, upon approval, should be included in both the printed Catalog and the Graduate Study Plan Form used at the Graduate School. Points to clarify include that 2.0 "C" or better must be earned in graduate-level courses; a 3.0 "B" or better in 400-level courses, and that a 1.7 "C-" does not count toward advancement to candidacy.

4. Proposals approved by email since last meeting

- 05-GCCh: EDSE F605 - Early Childhood Special Education (Sue)
- 06-GCCh: EDSE F610 - Assessment of Students with Disabilities (Sue)
- 07-GCCh: EDSE F612 - Curriculum and Strategies I: Low Incidence (Sue)
- 08-GCCh: EDSE F622 - Curriculum and Strategies II: High Incidence (Sue)
- 09-GCCh: EDSE F624 - Social Emotional Development, Assessment, and Intervention (Sue)
- 10-GCCh: EDSE F625 - Teaching Mathematics to Special Learners (Sue)
- II-GCCh: EDSE F633 - Autism: Communication and Social Disorders (Sue)

- 12-GCCh: EDSE F640 - Collaboration and Consultative Methods (Sue)
- 13-GCCh: EDSE F642 - Autism and Asberger Syndrome: Social and Behavioral Issues (Sue)
- 14-GCCh: EDSE F677 - Reading Assessment, Curriculum and Strategies (Sue)

5. Review of GAAC proposals already discussed in prior meetings.

- 18-GCCh.: Atmospheric Radiation (Xiong)
- 19-GNC: ATM F666 - Atmospheric Remote Sensing (Donie)
- 25-GNC: ATM F678 - Mesoscale Dynamics (Xiong)
Note: Revised syllabus received and posted online.
- 27-GNP :M.A. Political Science (Ken)
Email Ken with written concerns which he'll share with the group to prepare for the GAAC meeting with Political Science faculty.
- 36-GNC: EE F614 - Numerical Methods for Electrical Engineers (Lara)
#36 still needs work, per Lara D.

6. Discussion of new GAAC proposals (as time permits).

- 31-GCCh. - PSY F652 - Practicum Placement - Clinical I, change repeatability (Amber)
Sue noted that #31 is good to go.
- 32-GCCh. - PSY F653 - Practicum Placement - Clinical II, change repeatability (Amber) Sue noted that #32 is good to go.
- 35-GPCh. - M.Ed. -Remove Reading and K-12 Reading Endorsement Specialization (Amber)
Sue noted that #35 is also good to go.

Since GAAC proposals 31, 32 and 35 appear to be ready for acceptance, they will be submitted to GAAC via email for approval by negative confirmation.

- 38--GNC: EE F646 Wireless Sensor Networks (Orion)
Lara notes that #38 still has minor issues to be addressed. She'll email Orion about it.
- 39--GNC: EE F668 Radar Systems (Orion)
Lara notes that #39 has some larger issues and needs to be held for discussion.
- 40-GNC: EE F675 Robot Modeling and Control (Orion)
Lara noted that #40 has some issues; she had questions about resources and computer lab / software needs.
- 41-GPCh.: Ph.D. - Fisheries Modify Admission Requirements; Enter After BS (Amber)
- 42-GPCh.: M.S. Fisheries - Expand elective course requirements (Amber)
Jen S. noted questions about FISH F425 and F650 courses that are required.
- 43-GNC: FISH F680 - Marine Sustainability Internship (Amber)

ATTACHMENT 172/13

UAF Faculty Senate #172, February 7, 2011

Submitted by the *ad hoc* Research Advisory Committee

**University of Alaska Fairbanks *ad hoc* Research Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes, 2010-12-09**

In attendance: Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen, Sarah Hardy, Kris Hundertmark, Peter Webley

Absent: Mike West, Bernard Coakley, Tom Weingartner, Margaret Darrow, Anita Hartmann

(1) Discussion with our new Associate Vice Chancellor for Research (AVCR), Daniel White, regarding intellectual property:

- A bit of history: the UAF [Office of Technology Transfer \(OTT\)](#), previously operated by Diane McLean, was in charge of *all* things intellectual property for all of UA: copyrights, licensing, material transfer, ITAR, etc. OTT got moved into Bob Shefchik's office, and Ms. McLean left the position. AVCR White is now trying to take a step back and build a system that meets the needs of both the university and faculty.
- Today, [ITAR](#) and compliance board issues are now handled by AVCR John Blake, director of the Office of Research Integrity.
- AVCR White is building a brand new UAF Office of Intellectual Property and Commercialization (OIPC), in the Denali building on College. Goal is to build a mechanism to bring in outside investors (angel investors, venture capitalists) to use UA IP to build new research programs, products, and collaborations.
 - Open positions:
 - IP specialist, to help UAF stay compliant with law(s).
 - Faculty advocate, to help faculty stay in the loop.
 - OIPC works with two IP firms to do patents; it costs UA about \$10K to file a provisional patent, \$50K for a full patent application.
 - UA President Gamble specifically asked AVCR White to build an *inventory* of IP available at UA—a surprisingly hard dataset to collect!
- We also discussed other UAF IP and external collaboration, consulting, and employment issues
 - The blue form is for your dean/director to agree that an outside collaboration "will not interfere with your work".
 - Then, if the field is related, you need to file a notice of potential conflict. The statewide lawyers check this for possible ethics act violations.

(2) Update on tuition increase. [President Gamble recently proposed](#) a 7% undergraduate, and 3% graduate tuition increase, which is more in line with our recommended 10% cap. Our November resolution was too research-specific for the Faculty Senate administrative committee, and we didn't get enough committee votes soon enough to pass last week's modified resolution up to the full senate. But Committee Chair Orion Lawlor did try to convey the committee's position on tuition's impact on research during public testimony at the Board of Regents meeting on Friday at 9am.

Draft tuition resolution, not yet approved by the committee:

WHEREAS tuition is not covered by scholarships for more than half of all UAF students,
WHEREAS excessive tuition rates may decrease total tuition revenue by driving students away,
WHEREAS moderate increases in the tuition rate do help align tuition with the cost of
education,

WHEREAS current graduate tuition rates make graduate research assistants approximately as expensive as postdoctoral research staff in new research grants,
WHEREAS excessive tuition increases break the budgets of existing years-long funded grants,
WHEREAS excessive tuition rates harm UAF's ability to compete for new research funding,
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate disagrees with dramatic year-to-year increases in the tuition rate.

(3) We updated our committee membership, by accepting Mike West's resignation.

(4) The committee approved Roger Hansen's updated version of our official Faculty Senate bylaw lines, which once accepted by the full Faculty Senate will make RAC a permanent committee:

"8. The Research Advisory Committee consists of up to ten voting members, a chair and co-chair, along with ex officio members. The committee exists to review issues of researchers at the University of Alaska Fairbanks and to provide reports, recommendations, and resolutions to the UAF Faculty Senate on behalf of the UAF research community. The Research Advisory Committee will provide a connection between the faculty and the UAF Vice Chancellor for Research, and advise the VCR on developing productive relationships with the different research facilities across UAF."