Draft MINUTES NEWBERRY, Rainer

	(15)
BARNES, Bill (15) - audio	PETERSON, Rorik (15)
BERGE, Anna (15)	RICE, Sunny (16) - audio
BRET-HARTE, Donie (15)	SHALLCROSS, Leslie (15) - audio
CASCIO, Julie (16)	SKYA, Walter (16)
CHERRY, Jessica (15)	VALENTINE, Dave (16)
CONDE, Mark (15) – Sabbatical	WEBER, Jane (16)
COOK, Brian (16)	WILDFEUER, Sandra (16)
DEHN, Jonathan (15)	WINFREE, Cathy (15)
DISTEFANO, Diana (16)	
DUKE, Rob (15)	**Members Absent:**
FALLEN, Chris (15)	COFFMAN, Christine (15)
HANKS, Cathy (16)	GIBSON, Georgina (16)
HARDY, Sarah (15)	LAN, Ping (15)
HARTMAN, Chris (16)	RADENBAUGH, Todd (15) - audio
HEALY, Joanne (15)	
HORNIG, Joan (16)	Others Present:
HORSTMANN, Lara (15)	Provost Henrichs
JOHNSON, Galen (15)	Chancellor Rogers
JOLY, Julie (15)	Dean Paul Layer
LARDON, Cécile (15)	Alex Fitts
LAWLOR, Orion (16)	Libby Eddy
LOVECRAFT, Amy (15)	UA President Patrick Gamble (audio)
MAHONEY, Andrew (16)	Cindy Hardy, Tim Wilson
MAXWELL, David (16)	Chris Beks
MCCARTNEY, Leslie (15)	Linda Hapsmith, Carol Gering, Joy Morrison
MCDONNELL, Andrew (16) - audio	Duff Johnston, Patrick Marlow, Colleen Angaiak
MEYER, Franz (15)	Mark Herrmann, Cam Carlson, Martha Mason
MISRA, Debu (15)	

Brian C. asked for an estimated timeline for announcing program changes and cuts this year. The Chancellor responded that the overall budget level from the state will depend upon the decisions made by the Governor and the Legislature. The Governor's deadline is February 17 for any amendments to the budget. His fixed numbers are likely a ceiling for the university. The Legislature is likely to reduce from those numbers. They have until April 20 in their regular session, but the Chancellor expects the House Finance Committee to do its closeout of the university budget on February 24. That will give a good idea of the range between the Governor and the House as to where things come out. The Senate then adopts its budget in March, with final legislative action due April 20. The university will make some decisions over the course of February regarding the academic program review. The earlier they make decisions particularly as they affect positions, the more they will get in savings in the coming year. He hopes to get through the majority of non-academic program review decisions during the month of March. The Provost commented that the faculty committee working on special academic review will submit its recommendations on the academic program review about mid-February. Then the program review administrative committee will work on those recommendations, taking about a month. The final decision process on special program review will take place at Chancellor's Cabinet.

Elizabeth A. asked if faculty will have opportunity for input at the various levels of the reviews. Provost Henrichs responded that initially faculty have had opportunity for input at their respective programs if they are undergoing special review. Then, there is the faculty review committee which will look at the reports submitted by those programs. There also will be a google form set up to take people's general comments. Those comments will be made available to the faculty committee, the administrative review committee, and Chancellor's Cabinet.

Cécile commented that Faculty Senate will have a really important role during all the changes over the next several years. Members have the responsibility to help distribute accurate information about the processes of the reviews, as well as other information, and to forestall gossip that always spread very quickly across campus. She asked members to please stay as informed as possible and talk with their colleagues. Another responsibility of faculty involved in the Senate is to help maintain some morale among faculty. She came to UAF in 1999, at the end of the desert years and felt the fall-out of an institution that had scraped bottom. It took a long time to climb out of that situation and the strong climate of competitiveness for scarce resources. So, it's really important for faculty leaders to help others understand what is happening, why it's happening and how it's happening – to help work through these difficult times.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs noted that information will soon be released by various means about the special program review process.

The newly appointed members of the Board of Regents will be very good additions. All of them in one way or another have a track record of interest in and knowing the value of higher education. She believes they will be looking out for best interests of the university.

The Governor's budget came out last week, and it was more favorable to the university than to the majority of other state agencies in terms of funding. It illustrates the Governor has placed a priority on higher education. We must wait to see if the legislature shares that priority with the Governor.

C. Interim VC for Research – Dan White

Cécile introduced Dan and asked him what items are on his radar concerning research. He mentioned the ongoing research program review which Orion Lawlor is co-chairing with Rich Collins. He also mentioned that next Monday he'll be in Juneau talking to the Chair of the House Finance Committee, particularly Tammie Wilson who is in charge of the university budget on the House Finance subcommittee side. He will answer her questions about research conducted by the university and how the money essentially comes from the state and federal agencies to fund that research.

David V. asked if Representative Wilson has given any indication of not being serious about cutting university support by 20% or so. Provost Henrichs noted that Representative Wilson is a strong parallels. The Lt. Governor asked if we could put together a menu of what should be looked at regarding the economy for the short and long term (in this case, long term only means five years out).

He will advocate strongly for the $8 million for deferred maintenance and $8 million

VI Governance Reports

B. Motion to approve a new Master's of Security and Disaster Management, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 204/2)

Donie Bret-Harte, GAAC chair, brought the motion to the floor. She invited Cameron Carlson (Cam) to speak to the need for the new program, and SOM Dean Mark Herrmann to address the financing.

Cam described the growth of similar programs in homeland security over the last decade. UAF's homeland security and emergency management (HSEM) program has grown from four students to over 140 now, and is still growing. Providing a graduate degree in this field will be a quantifiable leap for employment of their graduates. These higher ed programs have strong national endorsement, and student interest is growing by the week.

Amy L. asked about how many faculty there are in the HSEM. Cam responded that there are two now, and the remaining members are adjuncts from the public and private sectors. Four full-time faculty are planned and will replace some of the adjuncts. Asked about the online nature of the program, Cam mentioned the courses are hybrid -- combining both lecture in classroom and a group logged in online. They're also using Adobe Connect web conferencing in conjunction with Blackboard. Both undergraduate and graduate courses will be taught by the program faculty.

Dean Herrmann responded to a question about finances for the new program. They have received initiative funds of $145,000 through the reallocation initiative program, and have matched it with another $145,000 from their BEM program which has 140 students. They just received a $50,000 do6( )]TJ 0 -10(a)4($[0t)-2(s)-1(. T)18embhev1(h)-3.9(e2hnj)hnjonnewotepgra d

years between hiring/last promotion and the year during which a case is being considered, or does it mean every year?]

4. Does "satisfactory" vs. "good/better" differ based on where a faculty member is in their career--assistant, associate and full?
5. Is there a direct correlation between the checked boxes on the evaluation and the faculty member's agreed upon workload?
6. How will the new system factor into program reviews prompted by budget concerns (must a department have an overall average of "good" across faculty members in order to remain viable)?

The statement is posted on the Faculty Senate meetings page for FS #204 at:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2014-15-fs-meetings/#204

Anna B. commented that faculty from various departments have said the ratings of “satisfactory” and “good” seem to

ATTACHMENT 204/1
UAF Faculty Senate #204, February 2, 2015
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new minor in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), housed in the CLA Department of Linguistics.

Effective: Fall 2015

Rationale: This new minor will effectively prepare students for careers in English as a second language (ESL) teaching in the U.S. and abroad. See the program proposal #18-UNP on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

****

Overview:

The Minor in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) prepares students for short- and long-term careers in English as a second language (ESL) teaching in the U.S. and abroad. In the minor, coursework in the fundamentals of language, theories of second language learning, and teaching methodology are combined with practical tutoring and instructional work with ESL learners to provide a broad yet practical foundation for future teaching.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Minor

The minor in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) will provide students with a theoretical and practical foundation for the teaching of English as second language in the United States or as a foreign language in other countries. The curriculum will [illegible]

Relationship to Purposes of the University:

The proposed minor will

ATTACHMENT 204/2

HSEM F605	Community Planning in Emergency Management	3
HSEM F607	Vulnerability and Protection	3
HSEM F609	Human Security	3
HSEM F632	Project Management	3
HSEM F665	Strategic Collaboration	3

ATTACHMENT 204/3
UAF Faculty Senate #204, February 2, 2015
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee
Minutes for December 10, 2014 3-4 pm Reich 300

Present: Brian Cook, Catherine Hanks, Cindy Hardy, Dennis Moser, Joan Hornig, Ken Abramowicz, Rainer

Students who want to appeal an academic decision such as denial of admission, faculty-initiated withdrawal, dismissal from program or pass/fail decisions of a faculty committee on non-course examinations (such as qualifying, comprehensive or thesis examinations) must submit an appeal within 30 class days after the beginning of the next regular semester.

To appeal academic decisions, the student should first address the person who made the decision. Often problems can be resolved and misunderstandings cleared up through this step. If the student does not find the informal review decision acceptable, the student may initiate a formal appeal procedure. Formal appeals must be made in writing and must be received by the provost no later than 10 days after the student has learned the outcome of the informal review. The offices of the provost, university registrar, vice chancellor of students or dean of the graduate school (for graduate student issues) can give you advice and answers to questions about the process.

By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the review of the decision, and that the university's administration can not influence or affect the outcome of the review. For the detailed "Appeals Policy For Academic Decisions" go to www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/policies-procedures/appeals-policy-for-academ/."

IV. New business

ATTACHMENT 204/4
UAF Faculty Senate #204, February 2, 2015
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Absent: none

Meeting called to order.

Minutes of November 17, 2014 meeting approved and accepted.
Agenda approved.

Resumption of reviewing department chair comments about the Department Chair Policy. Chris made changes as we went. The committee decided:

Comments from Debra Jones – Part 2, B1. Decided to leave as is.

Comments from Cécile Lardon – her comments are now irrelevant as document has changed since the comments were made.

Comments from John Rhodes – grammar in various clauses amended.

Chris to forward to Administrative Committee.

We have been assigned to revise the bylaws for the committee; reor(e)-3(g)5.6(n-55n)2.2(t(t)-Bo)-6.]TJ 0 meeT-3(s)tte

ATTACHMENT 204/6
UAF Faculty Senate #204, February 2, 2015
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Minutes Wednesday, Dec 3, 2014; 10:30 - 11:30 am, Library Kayak room

questions that weren't of much general interest/value. Discussion returned to idea of original design which has worked so well in the past, with the addition of adding an initial comment that attendees are encouraged to ask questions during the Q&A but given the limited time, we will encourage them to focus on questions of general interest and to save very specific questions for one-on-one after the event (and extend event to 1pm if we can get the room for that long). Also – keep the focus on planning strategically for one's academic career. 5-7 minutes per panelist with a notice given to speakers at the 5 minute mark. Kayt will manage the flier preparation and distribution. Add idea to poll attendees at start, how many are preparing for 4th year review, going up for tenure, or post-tenure?

Panelists were discussed: Ginny Eckert (full), Mary Ehrlander (full), Diana Di Stefano, Ellen Lopez. Derek will ask Diana Wolf. Jane will try to find someone in CRCD (College of Rural and Community Development).

Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes, These minutes are archived on the CSW website: http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/14-15-csw/

ATTACHMENT 204/7
UAF Faculty Senate #204, February 2, 2015
Submitted by the Core Review Committee

Core Review Committee –
Meeting Minutes for Tuesday 11/18/14

CLA:
Jennifer Schell, English (15)
Brian Kassof, Social Sciences (16)
Yelena Matusevich, Humanities (16)
Kevin Sager, Communication (CLA 16)

CNSM:
Leah Berman, Math (16) - Chair
Larry Duffy, Science (16)

LIBRARY:
Tyson Rinio (LIB 15)

At-Large:
Andrew Seitz, SFOS

Unit Core Assessment:
Tony Rickard, CNSM
Kevin Berry, SOM
Ex Officio:
Dean's Council Rep - Allan Morotti
OAR: Caty Oehring
Academic Advising Ctr.: Ginny Kinne

1. Discussed one petition, for a student to use a first-year seminar from 1997-8 with claimed 4 individual presentations and one group presentation to satisfy the COMM 121/31/41 requirement. No syllabus was forwarded to Core Review. Tabled until we get further information.

2. Continued discussion of whether the table of how transfer courses are interpreted vis a vis satisfying Core requirements should apply to Advanced Placement/CLEP/International Baccalaureate courses as well. This table was extensively revised last year by Faculty Senate (meeting #197) (from a motion from Core Review) to allow transfer students more flexibility.

Recommendation: The Core Review Committee recommends that AP, CLEP and IB courses be treated like transfer courses in terms of determining whether they satisfy Perspectives on the Human Condition requirements for the core.

Commentary: In particular, this would allow students who took the US History AP exam to get core credit (instead of it transferring as HIST 131/132 which does not satisfy the requirements of the current Core). Note that this is more in line with UAA.

Meta-commentary: This is also in line with get [illegible] (g)>2N)-13 0Td
c 0.008 Tw 0.221.337 0 Td ( )Tj -0.008 Tc co Td (4(m)-8.17 0 3 Tcl)]TJ6w 0. T48 0 T5-0.00 -0s Tc 0.016 Tw 0.368.4(t)]TJ 0 Tc 0

4. DANSRD had

Petition #4: Use a course on “Political Geography” to satisfy the Political Economy PHC requirement.
Approved.

Petition #5: 2w>y” 920[(1d 3 7(99(P)Td3(7 03 TTc 8(c)-0.8(our)3l)]TJ2 0 Td (1

ATTACHMENT 204/8
UAF Faculty Senate #204, February 2, 2015
Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee (SADA)
Meeting Minutes for December 12, 2014

Attending: Cindy Hardy, Libby Eddy, Alex Fitts, Jennifer Tilbury, Curt Szuberla, Ben Kuntz, Colleen Angiak, Sandra Wildfeuer

The committee met and discussed the following items:

Meeting times: We discussed possible meeting times for next semester. At least for the group gathered, it seems like Thursday or Friday afternoons will work best. Cindy or Jayne will send out a Doodle poll to find a regular monthly time for Spring semester. We may meet the week before classes start

Regional Educational Labs Northwest: We discussed a presentation on a report presented by REL on Developmental Ed in the UA system. REL was contacted by the AK State Board of Education and the Board of Regents and asked to do this study. Members of SADA went to the presentation and agreed to write up a response to the data presented. The committee had the following comments:

The data presented suggested that a combination of HS GPA and Accuplacer gave slightly better course placement than either GPA or Accuplacer alone. However, we noted that there may be some assumptions in the data that need to be clarified. For example, if they are comparing our DEVM data to national data, they need to note that our DEVM 105 (Intermediate Algebra) is considered part of the Math sequence at other universities.

We also noted that the data is only looking at students who recent AK high school graduates. However, one member reported a statistic Dana Thomas related that 70% of developmental ed students are not recent HS grads, so using HS GPA is not the primary placement tool.

We also noted that the study only looks at students intending to get a bachelor’s degree. This means that students who are taking Certificate or Associate programs were not included. Along these lines we wondered if students who were in AA or AS programs were included or if students in the “Bachelors-intended” or premajor programs were included. We discussed the definition of “Bachelor’s Intended”: students who don’t have the core preparation for admission to a degree program. These students are not considered bachelors and not considered associates students, but are in their own category. Since the report is state-wide, we wondered if UAA or UAS have a similar system. We noted that UAF policy in English and Math involves placement by test scores, with a little wiggle room in English. Starting this semester, however, all math placement is done through ALEKS scores.

This led to a discussion of placement and advising in Math and English overall, including differences in placement for rural and urban Native students, advising work-arounds to current placement policies, and questions about whether the assessments for DEVE cover what students will be covering in their classes. We noted that UAF, UAA, and UAS are three different schools with different student populations. We questioned why, with our departments looking at data and analyzing it, outside researchers were called in to generate this report. We also asked why ACT and SAT scores were used in the study, when they are not designed as placement tools and are poor predictors of success in particular classes. We noted that the ACT, SAT, and WorkKeys are now taking the place of the HS Qualifying exam; however, only the ACT and SAT are used for College admission.

Statewide Alignment: Sandra reported that the statewide committee to align Math/DEVM courses met and agreed to some alignment of courses. The committee is made up of the chairs of Math departments and developmental math departments or programs at all three Universities. They have agreed on a system of common numbering, based on UAA's current numbering. They are still discussing a common designator; however, both UAA and UAS currently use MATH as their developmental math designator, so the designator change only needs to be resolved at UAF. These changes still need to be approved by the campuses. They anticipate these changes being ready for the Fall 2015 catalog

Cindy reported that the alignment committee for ENGL/DEVE has not yet met, but has exchanged e-mail. The committee consists of the chairs and program heads of ENGL, DEVE, and Composition from all three Universities. The committee wil take up the work of the Community of Practice, which resulted in placement changes and alignment in ENGL and DEVE across the UA system. Cindy noted that, for ENGL 111, 211, 213, there is already alignment of course numbering and designator. The difficulty will be in aligning developmental courses: UAF uses DEVE, UAA uses PRPE, and UAS uses ENGL. UAF also has reading classes under a separate (DEVS) designator. Cindy notes that she is leaning toward proposing a new designator that would encompass all academic writing and reading classes, such as WRTG.

We also noted that the GERC process is on hold, waiting for a statewide group to be appointed by Faculty Alliance to reach agreement on alignment of general education requirements.

Survey of obstacles to student success:

ATTACHMENT 204/9
UAF Faculty Senate #204, February 2, 2015
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for December 8, 2014

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm.

II. Roll call

Present: Bill Barnes, Diana DiStefano, Cindy Fabbri, Andrea Ferrante, Brian Himelbloom, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Franz Meyer, Channon Price, Amy Vinlove
Excused: Chris Lott, Trina Mamoon, Joy Morrison, Leslie Shallcross
Absent: Mark Herrmann

III. Report by UAF eLearning & Distance Education on recent faculty development activities (Chris was out sick but emailed his report to Franz.)

There are two iTeach Clinics being offered (March 6, 9, 11, 13 and May 18 – 22). Applications can be found at http://iteach.uaf.edu/about/

Andrea reported that the ECAI Committee has met four times now and is creating a set of new core questions as well as defining a cohort of students for the initial trial this spring. He noted that ECAI will need to have a draft list of questions prepared by mid-February so that eXplorance can have them ready by April. He shared information hegot from Alex Fitts indicating that the core questions are all that are absolutely necessary for spring, and then we can have more complete surveys for Summer Sessions with a list of questions departments can choose from to add to the core questions.

Andrea has requested data to help ECAI define the first cohort. He also noted that the committee is comparing the literature and using it to guide us on what we think will be best for UAF. Duff noted that we should set deadlines for each part since the overall timeline is rather compressed. CP opined that in reality UAF will not have just one pilot but several semesters’ worth of them. Duff noted that the committee has discussed the need for a student focus group to garner feed0.6(2 (a)-3.3(th)10.3(th)10.3(th)10.3(th5.3-0.7(0.)-6.7(m)-6J 0.8(p)-0.e6.4(e)