

UANUTES      MINUTES

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #165

The minutes were approved as distributed, with one correction to attendance.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with one amendment: Public Comments will be taken before Break during the first hour of the meeting.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Amend the Mandatory Placement Policy

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

Jon thanked all present for bearing with them during the difficult election process and for helping to resolve the concerns the minority had about the voting process to extend their terms. Both he and Cathy are honored that the supermajority has voted (twice) to extend their terms. He hopes to get an excellent president-elect candidate for the next election and will immediately start on that effort after today's meeting.

The System Academic Council has met regarding the distance education audit, and is working on plans to streamline distance education between the three campuses, aiming to make it more transparent to the students. Also, the Academic Master Plan is on the agenda for faculty suggestions and discussion.

Faculty Alliance is preparing for a change of leadership. They've also been working with SAC on the Academic Master Plan, and the Alliance wants to take the feedback from the three senates, synthesize it into a form supportive of the plan, which would then be shared with the Board of Regents.

Jon's also been working with the UAF Faculty and Student Technology Committee (FAST) that looks at the OIT organization with a view toward making recommendations for improvement.

Erin Trochim, guest speaker at the last meeting, had spoken about the Graduate Student Conference taking place in September. The graduate student abstract deadline is coming up at the end of this month for that conference. Jon encourages the faculty to help their students to participate in this effort, as well as to be involved with it themselves. Flyers are at the back table with details.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

Cathy also thanked the Senate for voting to extend their terms. She is definitely looking for individuals to step up for president-elect next year.

One of the primary things she's been working on the past few months with the executive leadership workshop and the Planning and Budget Committee, is the state of the budget and where we are going to be, given where we are in the legislative process at this time. The budget for the university is not looking good. We as faculty need to be prepared and willing to get our input into the process, helping identify what is good in our programs, what the deficiencies are, and how we can make them run more efficiently. Please share your ideas and suggestions for dealing with the budget difficulties with her, the Provost and the Chancellor. They're looking for ways to save money and still maintain the academic standards that we uphold as the faculty.

IV Guest Report the Cathy Cahill the Provost  
2dir idea6 3execare8n

political atmosphere we're facing. With concerns at the national level that we're going so far into debt, the probability that a new general order bond that says we take on six hundred million dollars of debt is very likely to crash and burn.

Speaking about the future, President Hamilton believes the pipeline is a pipe dream. He wishes that he would be proven wrong on this, because his children and grandchildren are here and he plans to stay here. But, it's a simple matter of supply and demand, and he provided figures and statistics to support it. 2035-2040 is when he believes it will be more realistic that supply and demand will support bringing North SI

facts. The university was founded in 1917, with its first graduate in 1921. But, half of all

Movement away from a bond issue will help the project become a reality this summer, and get it fully funded. The operating budget looks fairly challenging. Clearly, there will need to be some reallocation in the coming year and choices made on where to focus new investment and where to cut back. He's been preparing some briefing papers for the new president on UAF-related issues. If there are any issues they want the president to be aware of, please email the Chancellor's Office.

Lastly, he commented on how President Hamilton used the term MAU, as "major academic unit" rather than the more common "major administration unit" – Brien said we may see more use of the term the way the President used it.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Susan looks forward to senate input on the Academic Master Plan. The plan represents many compromises made by the System Academic Council (SAC) that has put it together. There were extensive and usually constructive discussions during its formation. In giving her input, Susan asked the senate members to be specific and constructive – to please give alternatives and suggestions, not just flat statements about something that isn't liked.

As they go into an operating review to present detailed budget plans, they'll also give a detailed performance review. Related to performance, our graduation rates are not great. The six-year rate for graduation, including first-time freshman and associate and certificate degree seekvincha

## VI Governance Reports

### A. Staff Council – Martin Klein

Martin reminded all that Staff Appreciation Day is coming up on May 19.

He mentioned the ongoing union organization efforts of non-represented staff by two different unions. Statewide Labor Relations has good info on their web site about both of them.

Staff Council members were in Juneau in March and they spoke with several legislators. They were successful in conveying the message that we are one university not three.

A leave share resolution was also passed by SC (identical to the one passed by the senate); and they will bring it up at Staff Alliance shortly.

The Chancellor asked Jon D. and him to appoint folks to serve on the New Facility Naming Committee, and Martin will chair (in his Facilities Services role). He mentioned names of folks on the committee (Cathy Cahill, Maria Russell, Emily Drygus and Deb Horner).

### B. ASUAF – Todd Vorisek

No report was available.

### C. UAFT/UNAC

No report available.

Public Comment (as an item introduced to the agenda at the beginning of the meeting):

Vice Provost Dana Thomas mentioned the Mandatory Placement policy that the senate had passed and that was approved, and that this will be a transitional year of implementing that new policy. They'll work very hard not to impact students who've already taken placement tests this fall with the newer requirements.

UAF has signed up for the voluntary system of accountability – an agreement and process that was reached via the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (which is the new name for NASULGC – the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges). Under the Bush administration, Secretary Spelling (Education) pressed hard for an act like “No Child Left Behind” for universities. A lot of faculty and administrations across the country thought it would ease up after Bush left office, but this is not the case. The motivation for the continuing efforts on this national legislation is that the cost of higher education is growing faster than Health Care even, and so people want accountability. In response to this, a voluntary system of accountability was formed. He urges faculty to look at their site:

<http://www.voluntarysystem.org/>

The site is paired with College Portrait, and taking part requires having a student survey. UAF is using the NSSE survey and has data posted at College Portrait. The other piece of this effort is that in two years they must



Faculty Affairs supports split appointments being dropped for reapportionment purposes. They would be counted in their unit of their primary appointment. This would be the tenure-granting unit, where their rank is determined. There aren't any faculty with split appointments who don't have part of their appointments in a unit that doesn't also grant tenure.

Rainer N. asked about how they go about saying we want to do this as outlined in Motion 161/1 for subsection B.4 of the Faculty Senate bylaws. A motion was made to consider these apportionment changes in 161/1, and then a vote was taken. It was unanimously approved by the ayes (no nays and no abstentions). The two versions outlined in the motion were then discussed. Next, a vote was taken on Motion 161/1, version 1 of B.4, which received no ayes. A vote followed on Motion 161/1, version 2 of B.4 to count faculty by means of their tenure-granting unit for apportionment purposes. The ayes passed version 2 of Motion 161/1 unanimously.

Motion 166/2 for bylaws subsection B.8 was then considered. This amendment addresses the frequency of reapportionment for the purpose of Faculty Senate representation. Currently, the bylaws state that it's done every two years or upon a two-thirds vote of the senate. In practice, though, this is not happening. This motion recommends that reapportionment coincide with the accreditation review year, every seven years, when the Provost's Office is already gathering the necessary data in the accreditation process. The motion was called to question and seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously passed, with no nays and no abstentions.

Motion 166/3 on bylaws subsection C.1 was considered next, having to do with elections of senators in the research units. Currently, the bylaws state all of the elections in the research units are coordinated out of the Faculty Senate office. This procedure worked when the units were very small in numbers and were treated as a conglomerate unit; but, now they've grown and this is no longer practical. This motion transfers the conducting of elections back to the larger research units that will have their own representation on the senate. The motion was called to question and seconded. A vote was taken, and the ayes passed it unanimously, with no nays and no abstentions.

Motion 166/4 on bylaws subsection C.4 was then considered. In reference to election of representatives to the Faculty Senate, this amendment addresses the voting procedure for faculty with split appointments (in multiple units). This motion presented two versions for discussion, and the version selected must be in alignment with the versions of Motion 161/1 which addressed reapportionment. Version 1 received no votes. Version 2 was adopted so that faculty will vote either in their tenure-granting unit (if tenure-track), or in the unit of their primary appointment (faculty with research appointments). The motion (version 2) was called to question and the vote taken. The ayes passed it unanimously.

B. Motion to Reaffirm ANLC/ANLP Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 166/6)

Brenda K. brought this to the floor. The committee thought these criteria looked good and only minor changes were requested. Larry R. called it to question and it was seconded. The vote was taken, and the ayes passed the motion unanimously.

C. Motion to Approve an AAS degree in Drafting Technology, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 166/7)

Ken A. brought the motion to floor. Some modifications were made; after much discussion in committee, particularly regarding the math requirement and resource requirements. Rainer N. called it to question and Jane W. seconded. The motion passed by majority; with one abstention; and no nays.

D. Motion to Approve a Minor in Mining Engineering, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 166/8)

Ken brought the motion to the floor and described it. It had unanimous approval in the committee. Rainer mentioned there is no cost involved, and called it to question which was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

E. Motion to amend the UAF "Policies and Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty" (Attachment 166/9)

Jennifer R. described the background of this motion and the situations creating a need for a promotion procedure for faculty who are not represented. These faculty are usually supervising other faculty and filling an administrative role, but still have 49% academic duties. Faculty Affairs held three meetings of extensive discussion on this topic. They recommend a similar promotion procedure as that for represented faculty. These non-represented faculty should still have 49% faculty duties in their workload in addition to their administrative role.

They talked about issues of unit peer committee representation. A special peer committee will be appointed for these faculty, and a dean or director outside their academic unit will select the faculty. Otherwise, the procedure is just like that for a regular faculty. The criteria for evaluation will be the same as for those with 51% academic duties. Who is on the unit peer committee and how that committee is appointed was addressed to avoid conflicts of interest.

The motion was called to question and seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was passed unanimously.

F. Motion of Confirmation for Outstanding Senator of the Year Award,  
submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee (Attachment 166/10)

Cathy spoke to the motion as chair of the selection committee. Both Jennifer Reynolds and Anne Christie were nominated. The committee felt that both were deserving of recognition for taking on the herculean task of addressing reapportionment issues. Resounding ayes

time competing for new programs in this case. If you put UAF against UAA in light of student demand numbers, Anchorage would win. This could really impact distance campuses when justifying instructional programs. Programs are needed to train people for jobs in high demand in an area, but may not necessarily be economical to offer at an area. Susan responded that the idea was that the demand would be proportionate to the resources, so that if you were serving fewer students, say 50, you wouldn't need all the resources that you would need if you were serving 100 students. It's problematic for a program such as Dental Hygiene, which is quite expensive and can only have six students admitted per year compared to the expenses of offering it; vs. a low program startup cost for something like History. She'll look carefully at how it's been presented. The intent is that student demand would be just one criteria among others to be looked at, it's one part of the puzzle. You must also consider state needs and a variety of other factors before making a decision one way or the other.

Jon D. emphasized that it's important to look over the master plan – it's the foundation upon which other plans will be built. He spoke to some of the things affecting development of new programs that are contained in the plan. One must go to the BOR to pre-approve developing a new Ph.D. program, for example. If this requirement is approved, it will substantially affect how new programs are developed. It's not meant to inhibit program development, but rather to keep programs from investing time and efforts on something that will not have much chance of success. It needs to be carefully and clearly worded, however.

Cecile L. asked whether there's sense of competition among the faculty about developing Ph.D. programs, or if that is occurring at the administrative level. Jon responded that the majority of faculty realize developing a Ph.D. program is no trivial undertaking. While some at UAA may want to deliver Ph.D. programs, they're not accredited to do so. The matter was an administrative point of contention, not a faculty one.

#### B. Peer Observation Form – Josef Glowa (Attachment 166/11)

Forms are posted online at:

[http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10\\_senate\\_meetings/index.html#166](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#166)

Jon shared about some of the discussion that took place in Administrative Committee. It's not a form that's required in any way, nor one that would likely be included in one's promotion and tenure file. It was developed for use among peers, and it can also be used as a self-observation form. It's useful to read over during the semester, especially when offering a new class. He really likes it and it's a useful form in many ways.

#### C. Update on Follett Bookstore – Ken Abramowicz, Jane Weber

Ken A. shared about the proposal by Follett to bring books back to the campus. The UAF Bookstore also has one. Ken and Jane W. are on the bookstore committee and evaluated the proposals. Follett's was more a proposal to make a contract, and he and Jane advised against it, unless Follett extended the UAF Bookstore with its current employees. But the decision is at the Chancellor's Cabinet level. There are lots of ideas under discussion, and they're still hoping for a full-fledged bookstore on campus.

Rainer asked if anything will happen in the next couple of months. To Ken's knowledge, no decision has been made yet by Chancellor's Cabinet. Rainer noted that potentially decisions could be made during the summer when faculty aren't around. Jon mentioned he's been very vocal to the Chancellor and Provost about the need for a physical bookstore at this university. He promises the Administrative Committee will watch it closely over the summer.

Ken commented that it came up loud and clear during their committee meetings that the administration doesn't think there's any problem. As time goes by, people resolve problems in other ways and the faculty and students do the best they can. He doesn't want the administration to think the problem has gone away and encourages faculty and students to be vocal about any problems with books to the administration.

Robert Holden reiterated that there has been no resolution to the issues which have been brought up. They are working towards bringing books back to campus, no matter what. Jon asked for any numbers on how it went this semester. Robert agreed that it was quiet this semester. He, too, asked for people to make problems known. Only a limited number of people took advantage of the books brought on campus, but, the effort helped students taking core classes and those testing into classes. Robert said that Loly Tilly Commons would be an ideal space as a bookstore.

#### D. Update on the Core/LEAP discussions

Ken said there will be a meeting next Monday and they'll go line by line on the Core objectives. They will then invite faculty comments. Next year they'll plan to discuss how to implement the core objectives into courses. Ken's hope is that they complete objectives so they can get into discussion on courses next year.

#### X Committee Reports

Jon recommended reviewing minutes, and reminded folks about the annual reports due at the next meeting. NOTE: All referenced attachments are contained in the Agenda #166.

- A. Curricular Affairs – Falk Huettmann, Ken Abramowicz  
(Attachment 166/12)
- B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 166/13)
- C. Unit Criteria – Brenda Konar (Attachment 166/14)
- D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Alex Fitts  
(Attachment 166/15)
- E. Core Review – Latrice Laughlin
- F. Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks
- H Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa  
(Attachment 166/16)
- I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Rajive Ganguli
- J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy
- K. Ad Hoc Committee: Advisory Research Committee – Roger Hansen

## XI Members' Comments/Questions

Tim Stickel mentioned Fairbanks registration opened today; and the new Banner implementation impacted servers for registration. OIT worked on it and so far things are again working great.

Commencement is on May 16; and currently there are 889 graduation applications and they've completed 603 degree audits to date, with more to be done by mid-April.

Jon mentioned they went to yellow on Mt. Redoubt this morning, so be aware of that if traveling.

## XII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 PM.