

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #181  
Monday, March 5, 2012  
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds for Cathy Cahill

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Abramowicz, Ken  
Baek, Jung-ho  
Baker, Carrie (Jun Watabe)  
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar  
Barboza, Perry (audio)  
Bret-Harte, Donie  
Brown, Stephen (audio)  
Cahill, Cathy (Travel status)  
Davis, Mike (video)  
Fallen, Chris  
George-Bettisworth, Retchenda (audio)  
Golux, Stephan  
Gustafson, Karen  
Healy, Joanne  
Henry, David  
Himelbloom, Brian (audio)  
Horstmann, Lara  
Jensen, Karen  
Johnston, Duff  
Joly, Julie  
Jones, Debra  
Lawlor, Orion  
Mathis, Jeremy (audio)  
McEachern, Diane (audio)  
Meyer, Franz  
Moses, Debra (Cindy Hardy)  
Nadin, Elisabeth  
Newberry, Rainer  
Ng, Chung-Sang  
Radenbaugh, Todd (video)  
Renes, Sue

Members Present (cont'd):

Reynolds, Jennifer  
Short, Margaret  
Valentine, David  
Weber, Jane  
Winfrey, Cathy

Members Absent:

Alexeev, Vladimir  
Arendt, Anthony  
Lardon, Cecile  
Metzger, Andrew  
Zhang, Xiong

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Melanie Arthur  
Mike Earnest  
Susan Henrichs  
Paul Layer  
Brian Rogers  
Dana Thomas  
Eric Madsen  
Jon Dehn, Past President  
Robert Kinnard  
Mari Freitag

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #180

The minutes were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with a change to the order of items under New Business. Item F was moved up to follow item B.

II STATUS OF CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE ACTIONS

A. Motions Approved:



- B. Motion to Amend the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science Degree Requirements, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/1)

Rainer N. explained the reasoning behind the motion, noting an attempt to pass a similar one several years ago that was stalled to gain more support from CLA. This time there is more involvement and support from CLA. The motion permits a very limited amount of double-counting of credits, which mainly affects the B.A. degrees and counting “excess” credits in a major to count toward the 18 credits of Social Science and Humanities requirements. Linda Hapsmith commented on the effect the motion will have in Academic Advising. Jane W. asked if this information will be in the advising manual; and Linda noted it will be in DegreeWorks in the fall. Mike Earnest gave some examples of how this policy would actually be applied.

A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

- C. Motion to Amend the Educational Effectiveness Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/2)

Note: Item F was addressed before this item, as per the approved amendment to the agenda.

Rainer brought the motion to the floor with the simple explanation that this needs to be done. Jennifer noted the primary change in the motion is to require programs to report every two years on student outcomes (educational effectiveness).

A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

- D. Motion to Approve an Updated Procedure for the Program Review Process, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 181/3)

Jennifer asked Dana Thomas to outline the motion. Dana reminded the Faculty Senate that the proposal had come before them in fall 2010, providing some history and explaining the need for it. The cycle of review will continue to be a five-year cycle, as per BOR policy. The principle changes include the set of questions which follow the BOR policy, the evaluation form, and confirmation of the five-year cycle of review. Jennifer asked if it was fair to say this is an evolution of the questions and methods used in the current year, and makes the current process permanent. Dana affirmed that the procedure is much cleaner and is an evolution from what had been proposed in 2010.

A vote was taken on the motion, and it carried unanimously.

- E. Motion to Clarify the Academic Honors Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/4)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor, stating it’s a simple clarification, changing “and” to “or” to avoid the misunderstanding that students have had about whether or not they can make both the Dean’s List and the Chancellor’s List. It’s one or the other, not both.

A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously.

- F. Motion to Approve a New “Directed Study” Category of Registration, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/5)

Rainer introduced the motion, stating it's a great idea. In the past, faculty have taught courses as Individual Study to students who missed registering for an existing course, or couldn't take the course in its usual offering sequence. This often requires petitions later on when students need to get the course on their transcripts. The motion makes it possible to offer existing courses as Directed Study, and the course shows up on the students' transcripts with its usual designator and a notation showing it was taught as "DS" (for Directed Study). Dana noted the course would also show up in DegreeWorks as fulfilling requirements.

Margaret S. asked about why courses are offered in this manner. She has had requests by students for Independent Study courses, and it's a very time consuming task to take on. Will the creation of Directed Study make it more difficult to turn such requests down? Rainer responded that it's not meant to add pressure on faculty to do this for students. The matter is really between the instructor, the department chair and the dean because faculty workload is impacted. It's intended that the form will require the dean's signature because of the workload issue. From time to time there is a legitimate need for these types of courses because students need a course that's only offered every other year or every third year, for example.

Todd R. noted that there are rural students who need a course that is not offered at a rural campus. Having this mechanism would be beneficial for them.

Sukumar mentioned the usefulness of having Directed Study courses in graduate level programs where student enrollment can be too low for a regular course.

Ken A. asked if there are any restrictions on which faculty can teach a course. Since this gets around the petition process, is there anything to stop a faculty from teaching any course he chooses? Dana and Rainer responded that the plan is to require the department chair and dean signatures on the form.

Melanie A. asked if requiring the department chair's signature is because the course will have to go on the workload. Rainer noted requiring department chair signature serves a number of reasons, including the fact that the department chair is responsible for ensuring qualified faculty teach courses. Dana noted that the department chair can choose not to approve the Directed Study offering, if, for example, it's felt the course is otherwise available to the student and will not hold up their progress.

Elisabeth N. asked about Directed Study being used as a means to teach new courses, and it was clarified that is not the intention. DS can only be used for teaching existing courses.

David H. asked about expected student contact hours for Directed Study. Rainer affirmed that if it's a three-credit course, those contact hours are expected with DS courses.

Dana described his and Eric Madsen's efforts to identify software packages for electronic faculty activity reporting. He shared that his primary motivation is accreditation information gathering, related to both institutional and specialized accreditation. They get requests for many state reports along with ad hoc reports. This requires multiple requests for information to faculty, and other excessive efforts to assemble information from individual activity reports.

Dana and Eric arranged for the demonstration of four packages to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Two packages, FolioTek and TaskStream, were quickly eliminated. He described the two remaining software packages (Data180 and Activity Insight), and brought the handout to everyone's attention. OIT is assessing data security on the two packages. He urged the Faculty Senate to consider presentations from each of the vendors so that a choice isn't made by just a small handful of people.

Eric thanked those faculty who had participated in the vendor presentations to date. He suggested holding presentations that are longer than one hour to allow for discussion and questions.

Jennifer noted the two very different needs that thes

out the co-PIs. Using either of the new systems, Banner could be gradually updated to include all co-investigators.

Dave V. asked, regarding Digital Measures, if its course evaluation option would also be adopted. Dana said that's a separate issue and still to be determined whether it would be included.

Donie B. commented about the software testing with Digital Measures several years ago, recalling that faculty concluded that using the software just took t



UAF Staff Council Governance Report for Faculty Senate Meeting #181 – March 5, 2012

Staff Council is working on a number of important issues this semester:

Staff Council recently passed a motion requesting the University of Alaska re-examine current geographic differentials in light of more recent cost of living surveys. This action will be formally presented to Staff Alliance in March.

UAF Staff Council is reviewing its internal structure to assess whether or not restructuring of the organization is needed for Staff Council to become a more effective organization.

Staff Council officers are working with Vice President of Academic Affairs Dr. Dan Julius and other statewide governance leaders including Dr. Cahill to ensure that, in the wake of Pat Ivey's retirement, the System Governance office has a smooth transition to new leadership.

The Council is working to support its ad hoc Staff Appreciation Day Committee in planning and preparing for 2012 Staff Appreciation Day, which is scheduled for Wednesday, May 16.

B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag, Robert Kinnard

Mari shared about their trip to Juneau, where along with 25-30 students representing all three MAUs, they met with many legislators. They talked about the Governor's budget, particularly the operating budget which had a cut to it of six million dollars. This concerned the students a lot because of its effect on funding for initiatives for improved graduation rates, and the 2+2 veterinarian program. They advocated for needs- and merit-based scholarships as well as deferred maintenance. The speaker of the Coalition of Students and the speaker pro tem spoke before the House finance subcommittee. Representative Faircroft was receptive to their testimony, and she's proposing some amendments to the budget. Because of that ASUAF is rallying students to testify on Wednesday at the Legislative Information Office regarding some issues. She, Robert, and another student leader will return to Juneau during spring break and follow up with their contacts.

The Strategic Direction student listening session went pretty well. They had good comments for Statewide.

They may reduce their ASUAF senate to 14-16 members instead of 20. They will hold elections during SpringFest at the end of April.

at the same time the employees are running a \$3.5 million deficit which is the underpayment for benefits received this fiscal year. How much can be paid immediately in the next fiscal year is being wrestled with at the Committee. The bottom line is that rates will go up either a lot or outrageously in July.

A general membership meeting is taking place on March 26 to talk about the preventive health care benefit and how to use it.

Jane W. noted the JHCC is only advisory and can only make recommendations to the university. The four unions represented on that Committee are in agreement with each other and working together. They have asked for more information and have not received it yet, so they have to meet again once they get that. Melanie noted that there are not a lot of good choices for them to look at in terms of the rates that will be set. The question is mainly how much rates will go up.

## IX Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

### A. Announcements

Jennifer announced that nominations are open for Outstanding Senator of the Year Award. Send nominations to Jayne. Any volunteers to serve on the OSYA selection committee may also email Jayne. The Committee makes its decision at (or by) the next Administrative Committee meeting which is on March 23.

Dean Layer commented on the student grades appeals policy. The current policy is very clunky and poorly conceived, as well as very frustrating for students. The Faculty Senate needs to look for a better way to craft the policy so that appeals are dealt with more effectively and more quickly. Jennifer said she will discuss it at Administrative Committee. She would like more information, and to get feedback from students who've gone through the process as well as from the faculty and deans who've been involved.

Cindy H. announced that SADA Committee met with the Veterans Service Office. As a result, they are planning to have a brown bag lunch for faculty to address needs and issues of veterans as returning students. The second week in April is when the brown bag lunch will probably take place.

Linda H. described the advising appointment and notes function that the Banner Student group is working on. It will be a function in UAOnline, and there will be training provided. Faculty wanting to use this will need FERPA certification first. Notes entered by this function will not be visible to students (they are visible in DegreeWorks).

### B. Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 181/7)

Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Chair

Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair (Attachment 181/8)

Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 181/9)

Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

Rainer noted the hard work of the committee members in reviewing more than 100 curriculum submissions this year, so far. He also thanked Jayne Harvie for her organizational skills and the time spent on behalf of the committee's efforts, capping it off with a round of applause. He acknowledged the curriculum council chairs as unsung heroes for their units, and encouraged faculty to personally thank them (and

find out who they are, if they don't know). Jennifer also commented positively and



discipline of that major or minor]] may be used to fulfill the B.S. degree requirements in the

ATTACHMENT 181/2

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

- 1) Student Information  
Students shall be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.
- 2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum  
Evaluation of the CORE curriculum shall include course assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.
- 3) Programmatic assessment  
Each degree and certificate program shall establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.
- 4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning  
An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of activities and student support services will be conducted.

The chair of each department (or equivalent as identified by the Dean or Director) shall prepare a report at least **EVERY TWO YEARS** [[four years]] summarizing the Educational Effectiveness program for each certificate and degree program offered by that department. The report shall include a summary of the following:

- A. Student outcome goals and objectives of the program,
- B. The methods and criteria used to evaluate whether the goals and objectives are being met,
- C. A description of what information is collected annually, and
- D. How the results of such information are being used to improve the curriculum.

The report shall be presented to the dean or director's office **AND THE ACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT ASSISTANT IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE BY THE END OF 9-MONTH FACULTY CONTRACTS IN MAY** [[during the month of May]]. At least some information gathering for this process shall occur annually.

Once an educational effectiveness evaluation program has been implemented for the core, the core review committee of the faculty senate shall prepare a report, at least biannually, summarizing the educational effectiveness of the components of the core curriculum. This report shall be similar in content to the report described above for individual programs but shall provide a summary for the components of the core curriculum. The components of the Core may be summarized in the report on a rotational basis, but at least some information should be gathered annually.

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve an updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regent policy and regulations (10.06).

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The existing program review process (Meeting #102, May 2001) does not fully meet Board of Regents policy and regulations on program review (10.06). The proposed process aligns with the new accreditation cycle, is a more efficient process, i.e., it is less burdensome on programs, and is intended to yield more consistent quality of review. The process is intended for a program review cycle of 5 years, in accordance with Board of Regents policy.

\*\*\*\*\*

The new program review process will be completed as follows:

1. An initial brief review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit supplied two-page narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere in UA, and any special circumstances that explain features of the centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary (see attached program review template for more details). The information reviewed meets the requirements set by Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; attached). A single Faculty Program Review Committee comprised of one tenured-faculty member from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus five CRCD representatives will review the materials and make one of the following recommendations:
  - Continue program
  - Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
  - Continue program but improve other specific areas or
  - Discontinue program.The committee will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review.
2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and 4 administrative representatives from CRCD will review the recommendations of the Program Review Committee, may request additional information from about the program, and will state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.
3. The Provost will review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:
  - a. Program continuation is confirmed until next review cycle
  - b. Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.



- c. Recommend to discontinue program. Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, when appropriate admissions may be suspended pending action.

-----

Handouts:

1. Program Review Instructions
2. Program Review Evaluation Form
3. Program Review Example

Handouts are posted online at:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#181>

ATTACHMENT 181/4  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Academic Honors policy as indicated below:

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: The current catalog language is vague enough that some students might expect to be on both lists, when the intention was that they are on one or the other, but not both.

\*\*\*\*\*

**CAPS** = additions

[[ ]] = deletions

Page 49, 2011-12 *UAF Catalog*:

**ACADEMIC HONORS**

*Undergraduate and certificate students* -- To be eligible for academic honors at the end of a semester, you must be a full-time undergraduate degree or certificate student who has completed at least 12 UA institutional credits graded with the letter grades A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D- or F. If you have received an incomplete or deferred grade, your academic honors cannot be determined until those grades have been changed to permanent grades. Academic honors are recorded on your permanent record. You will make the chancellor's list with a semester GPA of 3.9 **[[and]]** **OR** the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5 to 3.89. UAF announces the students who have earned honors each semester. Students with incompletes or deferred grades that are changed after publication of honors will not be announced separately. If you've requested that information not be released about you (under FERPA), your name will not be released to the media.

ATTACHMENT 181/5  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new category of registration, “Directed Study,” to allow a student to contract with an instructor to enroll individually in a course that exists in the catalog, outside of the regularly-scheduled sections of the course in a given semester. The difference between “Directed Study” and the current “Individual Study” would be that “Individual Study” would be reserved for contracted 1:1 courses that do not exist in the UAF catalog. Courses taken as Directed Study would be transcribed with the existing subject and course number from the catalog and the suffix (D.S.\*).

EFFECTIVE:        Fall 2012

RATIONALE:        The majority of current Individual Study enrollments are actually for courses that exist in the UAF catalog. The student contracts with an instructor to take an individual section of the course outside of the regular course schedule. These are posted to the student’s transcript as a -97 course number. It then raises questions about course content for transfer credit to other institutions; does not meet prerequisites in Banner; and does not automatically feed into degree requirements in DegreeWorks. Reserving the -97 “Independent Study” designation only for courses that do not exist in the UAF catalog would minimize these problems for students and advisors.

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E, Permanent Committees.2. This amendment updates terminology in the bylaws and removes redundant language from the committee definition.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The current definition of the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee is out of date. This amendment corrects an outdated campus name, removes an unnecessarily convoluted and redundant sentence, and refines the definition of committee membership.

\*\*\*\*\*

**CAPS** = Addition

**[[ ]]** = Deletion

Section 3 (ART V: Committees), subsection E., Permanent Committees:

2. The Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee will include one representative from each of the following units of the College of Rural and Community Development: Bristol Bay Campus, Chukchi Campus, Interior-Aleutians Campus, Kuskokwim Campus, Northwest Campus, and ~~[[Tanana Valley Campus]]~~ **COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE**. One or more of these should be from rural campus student services. The committee will also include one representative from the Department of Biological Sciences.

**Curricular Affairs Committee  
Meeting Minutes for January 25, 2012**

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry (chair); Jungho Baek; Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Brian Himelbloom (phone); Diane McEachern (phone); Todd Radenbaugh (phone); Dave Valentine; Jun Watabe.

Voting Members not present: Anthony Arendt; Debra Moses.

Non-voting Members present: Lillian Anderson-Misel; Donald Crocker; Mike Earnest; Libby Eddy; Carol Gering; Linda Hapsmith; Susan Henrichs (for Dana Thomas); Pete Pinney; Michelle Stalder.  
Not present: Doug Goering.

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

**A. OLD Business**

1. Is this an ok day/time?? If not....suggestions?

This item was not discussed, though mentioned briefly. [Wednesdays from 2-3 p.m. accommodates the most members, based on the Doodle Poll results.]

2. Recent GERK issues and such —comments by Dave

Dave reported that GERK is meeting weekly this semester.

They are hearing about faculty frustration with the lack of writing skills being exhibited by students in upper division courses. Is ENGL F111X enough preparation for upper division courses? The idea of utilizing TAs from the English Department as a resource in writing-intensive courses was discussed. It was noted, however, that English graduate students are working on creative writing, not scientific writing. Rainer suggested bringing the English department into the discussion.

Jun asked if the issue of student plagiarism is being discussed at GERK. Dave indicated it's not been brought up.

Susan Henrichs asked if the frustration with student writing skills is echoed in the arts and humanities and social sciences, as well. The consensus was that that this frustration is shared there, as well.

Pete and Carol mentioned strategies they are using at their units to address reading and writing skills in various courses. Linda asked how such courses might translate to the Core requirements. Dave mentioned that GERK is reviewing several Core models and how learning outcomes will be identified for Core. Susan stressed the need for a Core structure that is identifiable and transferable.

Pete mentioned that Mike Koskey can not serve on GERK and wanted to know what procedure to use to replace him. It was agreed that Miranda Wright will follow up and see that a statement of interest is submitted by a candidate to fill the CRCD seat.

3. 'Stacked' courses -- comments by Tony? [Item postponed. Anthony was traveling.]

**B. NEW Business**

**1. Proposed motion #1**

**Change this:**

One academic credit hour of non-laboratory instruction at UAF will consist of a minimum of 800 minutes of instruction" (FS meeting #3, March 25, 1988). It is understood that an average student will



## **2. Proposed motion #2 on Educational Effectiveness**

Susan spoke to the committee about the motion. The cycle of assessment needs to be addressed because of the recommendation by the NWCCU accreditation team. Student learning outcomes assessment must be continuously performed, not sporadically (as has been the case). While many units are gathering data, there is no evidence to demonstrate that data results are being applied. Many surveys are being used which are too generalized (e.g., student exit surveys). The two year interval is proposed by this motion because department chairs serve two-year terms, and aligning the cycle with the term will help ensure that assessment is regularly addressed and not skipped over. Susan has also encouraged the deans to put assessment duties into workloads.

She explained the larger picture which includes higher education accountability and standards, and the fact that if universities do not take the initiative in the near future, it could become mandated by government down the road. Currently, UAF must take the NWCCU recommendation very

Comments postponed for next meeting.



already exists and would retain its catalog number. A flag in Banner could be used to indicate that the student took the course as Directed Study (as opposed to taking it in a normal class setting).

The data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty. Furthermore, no student shall be denied graduation based solely upon information gathered for the educational effectiveness evaluation process.

Each faculty member's activities in developing and/or implementing programmatic and institutional educational effectiveness efforts may be summarized in the instructional section of annual evaluations and promotion and tenure files.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

- 1) Student Information  
Students shall be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.
- 2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum  
Evaluation of the CORE curriculum shall include course assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.
- 3) Programmatic assessment  
Each degree and certificate program shall establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.
- 4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning  
An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of activities and student support services will be conducted.

The chair of each department (or equivalent as identified by the Dean or Director) shall prepare a report at least **EVERY TWO YEARS** [[four years]] summarizing the Educational Effectiveness program for each certificate and degree program offered by that department. The report shall include a summary of the following:

- A. Student outcome goals and objectives of the program,
- B. The methods and criteria used to evaluate whether the goals and objectives are being met,
- C. A description of what information is collected annually, and
- D. How the results of such information are being used to improve the curriculum.

The report shall be presented to the dean or director's office **AND THE ACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT ASSISTANT IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE BY THE END OF 9-MONTH FACULTY CONTRACTS IN MAY** [[during the month of May]]. At least some information gathering for this process shall occur annually.

Once an educational effectiveness evaluation program has been implemented for the core, the core review committee of the faculty senate shall prepare a report, at least biannually, summarizing the educational effectiveness of the components of the core curriculum. This report shall be similar in content to the report described above for individual programs but shall provide a summary for the components of the core curriculum. The components of the Core may be summarized in the report on a rotational basis, but at least some information should be gathered annually.

ATTACHMENT 181/8  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by Unit Criteria Committee

**Unit Criteria Committee  
Meeting Minutes for Friday 3 February 2012**

Attending: Cathleen Winfree, Vladimir Alexeev, Stefan Golux, Mark Hermann, Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Debra Jones, Perry Barboza

Minutes prepared by P. Barboza

1. BOR document comments on 04.04
  - Some redundant passages that could be clarified regarding fractional appointments (P040403. G).
  - No other comments regarding conflicts with governance and unit criteria
2. SOE criteria
  - Format CAPS BOLD ITALIC per template
  - Comments and suggested edits were discussed and added to a word document.
  - Return to SOE for amendment. Committee will consider modified document for vote by e-mail.
3. CES criteria
  - The document diverges from the established template in length and scope
  - Additions to the preamble must be shortened to only describe how this unit differs from what is already described in general terms for all units.
  - The unit should review approved criteria for CEM and Fisheries that are posted on the FS site.
  - Invite a representative of CES to meet with Unit Committee
4. Pending criteria and other issues
  - Barboza will meet with Music Faculty on 14 February to discuss revisions to Criteria
  - Next meeting tentatively scheduled for 9:30 am Friday 10 February

ATTACHMENT 181/9  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by Committee on the Status of Women

**Committee on the Status of Women,  
Meeting Minutes for Fri, Feb 17, 2012; 10:00-11:00 am, Gruening 718**

ATTACHMENT 181/10

UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee  
Meeting Minutes for January 31, 2012**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:15 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Julie Joly, Franz Meyer, Channon Price

Excused: Mike Castellini, Stephen Brown, Joy Morrison, Alexandra Oliveira

III. Report from Joy

Joy was unable to attend as her flight was delayed.

Travel proposals were due January 31 at 5:00 pm. Duff and CP volunteered to assist in evaluating the proposals on February 1 at 3:30 pm.

There is an upcoming seminar on Student Incivility, Bullying, and Aggression on Monday, February 6

Types of sessions/presentations were discussed and it was agreed that practical sessions vs “information dumps” are more attractive and helpful for faculty. We also discussed the possibility of encouraging and facilitating a bottom-up, grassroots approach by inviting current faculty members to present sessions in their area of expertise or have them share their viewpoints and techniques that they are using. These sessions could be limited to the professor’s department or opened up for all faculty members. What are the possibilities of having such sessions scheduled through, and sanctioned by, the OFD? There are small groups of faculty members meeting already.

Josef informed us that Dana Thomas indicated that the accreditation report suggests that we need a stronger focus on Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment. A new Educational Effectiveness program should be implemented in the future. However, the draft motion submitted for discussion to the faculty senate states that the “data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty.’

V. Next Meeting (tentative): Tuesday, February 28, 2012, 8:15 – 9:15 am, Bunnell 222

Committee members are encouraged to utilize Google Calendar so convening our upcoming meetings will be more easily facilitated.

VI. Adjourned at 9:17 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 181/11  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate  
2012-02-10 Meeting Minutes**

Voting Members: Orion Lawlor, Susan Renes, Doni

ATTACHMENT 181/12

UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee  
Meeting Minutes for February 2, 2012**

**Attending:**

Sarah Stanley, Dana Greci, David Maxwell, Cindy Hardy, Amy Barnsley, Sandra Wildfeuer, Curt Szuberla, Gabrielle Russell, Nancy Ayagarak

Not attending: Diane Erickson, Deseree Salvador, Erin from Nome, Elizabeth Izaki, David Veazy, John Creed, Alan Morotti

**Approval of December minutes:**

Approved by acclaim.

**Motion on Committee Definition**

We discussed how to encourage rural faculty to participate in this committee. We decided to list all those who don't attend meetings along with those attending. Cindy will contact specific people to see if they are continuing to represent their campus on the committee.

The motion to revise and update the committee definition was approved.

**Learning Commons update**

Library is setting up tables with dividers, white boards. They will do that in March.

**Ideas on support for student success**

This is an ongoing item on our agenda. We discussed the Very Early Warning and Freshman Progress Reports. Let's encourage our departments to participate.

Sandra suggested a rural student award as means of encouraging student success. This may already be done through CRCSD.

Gabrielle mentioned that there have been changes to the withdrawal process, such as the elimination of the drop/swap. She asked whether these policy changes are getting out to faculty and advisors.

**SADA data requests**

We continued our discussion of gathering data on student outcomDavid 5 -1.125 T8.14s on d ask5 0e.5(aD rge ou



## Prep Courses

We looked over a list of “Prep” courses at Mike Earnest’s request, and, in general, all of the courses listed are preparatory or developmental. We discussed how some courses with different designators (ABUS, ECE, TTCH) relate to other content courses such as DEVM or DEVE courses. We raised the question of how “Prep” is defined on this list. We noted that some of the courses listed are required math courses for specific certificate and associates degrees, not “preparatory” for those degrees. We discussed how this request links with discussions of pass rates. Dana G suggested that this fits with our discussion of how to study D/F/Ws. We could limit it to two variables: those not doing well because of trouble learning the material and those not doing well because of external factors.

## UAA Questions

We discussed a list of questions UAA faculty sent to UAF DEVE faculty in preparation for meeting to discuss aligning assessment in our programs.

David noted that, in the past, Math and DEVM faculty enforced prerequisites by manually checking student prerequisites in UAonline. Mandatory placement has not improved their pass rates, but has eliminated this process and students’ need to change classes early in the semester.

Curt said he teaches upper level Physics classes, so placement isn’t really an issue. He does teach some 200 level classes, but he can talk with individual students to help with placement issues. He does not want to block a student who wants to try a class, though it may take three times before they successfully complete the class.

In response to the notion of state-wide standardized placement, Sarah recommends a more rounded look at each student in deciding placement through advising. We discussed the benefits of a locally designed placement test and of student self-directed placement.

We noted the advantages of Accuplacer, as well: no need to argue over placement, better reflection of current knowledge than HS transcripts (which may be out of date or mean varying things).

To further address placement issues, we will invite Linda Hapsmith to the next meeting. We will also invite Dana Thomas to the April meeting, once we have looked the data on hand and can formulate further questions.

**Next meetings:** Those in attendance agreed to 3:30 to 5:00, the first Thursday of the month. Semester meeting dates will be March 1, April 5, and May 3.

ATTACHMENT 181/13  
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012  
Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

**Research Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes - January 25<sup>th</sup> 2011**

Attending : Orion Lawlor (co-chair), Peter Webley (chair), Joanne Healy and John Heaton

Unable to attend: Kris Hundertmark, Sarah Hardy and Roger Hansen

Visitor: Flora Grabowska (GI Librarian)

Location : IARC 417

Started at 10:02 am

1. Open Access policy at UAF

Flora came to present to the committee on the Open Access for journals. Flora had presented to the Faculty Senate in the public comments at the October 2011 Faculty Senate meeting and it was felt that Flora should come to talk to the Research Advisory Committee.

Flora provided a detailed overview of what Open Access is and that every year there is Open Access week in October. Flora pointed out that if a paper is open access then there will be more citations than if it was kept in a 'Toll Access' journal.

The question is how do we allot those in UAF to have open access papers? John Heaton made the point that researchers should get to determine their journal of choice and what is this is always open access. Peter Webley spoke about that he submits to journals that offer open access but only at a cost of up to \$2000 per journal.

Flora pointed out that she was only advocating that UAF faculty, staff, students whom do submit to journals to be encouraged to make them open access papers. this will not only help the citation index of the paper but will help promote UAF research

Peter Webley stated that it might be institute, department, college level advisement to researchers to aim to include papers for open access rather than a faculty senate statement or policy decision. Might those with grants to write aim to include additional 'publication fees' only with those for printing color pages to manuscripts associated to that grant directly to also cover open access fees so that the paper can then be open?

Flora pointed out to all on the committee that the GI now is able to assist researchers in getting their manuscripts as open access.

2. Discussion on Policy and Regulations request from Admin Services Committee

Discussion on the requested sections of the UAF Regents Policy and Regulations documents from the UAF faculty Senate Administrative services committee. Orion Lawlor showed his edits and queries to several of the items and these were discussed by committee members attending. Orion will send his

version to all members and they will send edits to Peter Webley, Chair, by Friday am so that the edits can get the Administrative services committee.

### 3. Timing of monthly meeting

Request to have monthly meeting at similar time of the month. February meeting aimed to be 15th. Flora has offered GI Library conference room. Peter Webley, chair, will get response from full committee to get a time on February 15th.

The aim is for following meetings is 2nd to 3rd Wednesday of each month, Location: GI Library conference room

Ended at 11:17 am