

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #148

dollars. Downside is once you die, the dollars go back to the system (not an asset of your estate like an IRA). Definition of dependent is the same as at UA for health benefits. This is coming from a non-profit organization called "Emeriti" which has over 50 educational institutions participating -- medicare supplemental policy for retirees with group rates. Jon expects there will be continuing consideration of this plan over the next year.

Jane Weber asked why ORP I isn't included in this. Jon answered that the ORP I contribution rate is supposed to be based on the TRS employer contribution rate which by statute is supposed to keep the TRS system fully funded. With TRS you're supposed to be eligible for state medical healthcare at retirement. With ORP I, some of your contribution helps pay for that option. The consideration of the VEBA program will help ORP II and III folks have a viable health care option, as well as take into account future new employees.

B. President-elect's Comments - Marsha Sousa

The GCC's student success committee has merged with the Provost's student success committee, and meets this Friday. Anyone who would like to have input or become involved is welcome.

V A. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

Susan has some remarks on behalf of the Chancellor, but will begin with her remarks. The GCC has designated some folks to represent students, staff and faculty on the Student Success committee. There is also a group of administrators (including Tim Stickel, Tim Barnett, Bernice Joseph, Dana Thomas and the Provost) who have been talking at the statewide level with similarly-composed groups from the other MAUs. The GCC group and the UAF administrators group are going to merge. Their goal is to come up with proposals to improve student success and take those to statewide and get them into a substantial budget increment request with the FY10 budget request. FY09 had included modest funds for student success, but it didn't get support at the statewide level and didn't make it into the governor's budget. So this group needs to come up with strong proposals that meet students' needs and to present this with justification and university-backing to show it's an important initiative worthy of statewide support. The statewide administrators' group has met twice already; and has agreed on what the issues are that need to be addressed, like financial aid for struggling students, and work to develop learning communities that would increase student engagement with their school and provide student support services in that context. Monthly meetings will take place, the next one taking place on Feb. 1ealthsta, t

legislators about this building project that is a priority for both research and education. She encourages folks to submit comments and messages, (but not with their UAF email address).

Chancellor asked for the announcement to be made that the Bunnell House will stay open this summer, but costs to families will go up. The rate structure will go up to match rates in the community, and the university will subsidize a difference of about a \$100,000/year to cover cost gap. Longer term plan will be to contract to a commercial entity to serve more people here on campus. Looking at least a year's time to get that in place.

Success in raising external funds was announced, with a 43% increase in donations from various sources compared to last year. First six months of the current year show that donations are up 23%.

Ken Barrick asked about the increased user fees of Bunnell house and if they'll be affordable, but Susan doesn't have specifics yet as they're still looking at staffing issues. Fees for care of younger children and infants will go up. Bunnell House will be aligning their fees and fee structure with other facilities in the town. Ken asks about privatization and whether there is a committee to look at this? Susan said there was a committee looking at the closure, but she doesn't know if they continue on with the task of looking at other options.

Jane Weber commented that the original committee does continue on this longer term project.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council - Kayt Sunwood

Kayt mentioned ongoing election verification issues. (Still no online elections.) Hopes to finish by their meeting next week. She and the President-elect and staff representative from Kuskokwim are going to Juneau at end of February for the Cookie Brigade – a lobbying trip with cookies to get into the legislators offices.

They've been working with Faculty Senate and ASUAF on a number of important issues, such as Bunnell House. Staff Council wishes to thank the Committee on the Status of Women and the Senate for their work together to get the issue moving forward and turned around to a positive result.

They continue involvement with the NSSE survey and student success – working jointly with the Senate and ASUAF.

B. ASUAF - Jake Hamburg

No report available.

C. UNAC/ACCFT

Ron Illingworth commented that a contract for ACCFT faculty has been negotiated and is in the process of ratification.

Unofficially announced for UNAC: Also at the tentative agreement stage, which includes an encouraging pay package, but more out of pocket expense for health care. The representative

assembly of UNAC will be meeting this Friday and Saturday in Juneau, to coincide with the BOR meeting. They have set aside some time on Friday to lobby for the full funding of the UA budget.

VII Guest Speaker

A. Dani' Sheppard – Community-Based Learning (CBL)

Dani' is the faculty coordinator for this learning based initiative. There has been an invitation emailed to faculty for the Feb. 12 luncheon here at Wood Center (fliers are also on the back table). Also, an electronic version of what this is about has been sent to the Deans. CBL is also called “service learning”, and the idea of CBL fits into the broader umbrella of student engagement. Universities are finding ways to get students into the community and engaged. UAF campus has a lot of conversations going on in many contexts but not in a coordinated manner as an institution. Efforts can fit together and Dani mentioned talking to Pete Pinney about the new Engagement Operations Council which might serve as a larger umbrella to all the different efforts. Involvement from many sides of the campus: Student Affairs, ASUAF, Northern Leadership Center, JJ Boggs/Leadership Development, Faculty Development, Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement, named among other examples.

Foundation of this concept was a reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship with the community. “Engagement” term used a lot: i.e., civic engagement, experiential learning, curricular engagement, community engagement. Key components include credit for learning and opportunities for students to be involved--volunteerism, internships, field service work. At UAF, mission of the CBL initiative team is to open up campus conversation – find out who is doing what. Inventory by Faculty Senate was done a few years ago; and they want to reinstitute that survey. Faculty are encouraged to ask what the role for this is or can be in their units, and to help connect people and groups into this conversation. Spread the word about this luncheon.

The luncheon speaker on 2-12-08 is Dr. Nancy Andes, Director of the Leadership and Student Engagement Service Learning Center at UAA. Will tell us what UAA has accomplished in this area.

Heinz asked about a hypothetical student in physics, for example--why would students get involved if their grades suffered by their involvement. Dani said it's a style of learning and teaching that doesn't necessarily fit every class structure. But it's a means to tie students to what their professional choices mean for their community, if that fits a class or topic. CBL would fit the academic structure of the class and would be embedded into appropriate curriculum. Dana Thomas gave example of college students tutoring high school students in their physics classes. Heinz asked about class grades. Dani said it's up to the faculty member and their curriculum.

B. Linda Hapsmith – Academic Advising Spring Activities

- Faculty Advising Manual – print copies available, and it's also published online:
- <http://www.uaf.edu/advising/>
- Reminded faculty that they will come into your classroom if you need a substitute instructor while you're out of the classroom – they'll teach advising-related topics, like “note taking skills” to your class while you're gone. Two weeks notice preferred and there's a form online to fill out a request.

Jon Genetti mentioned this proposal had been postponed at the last Senate meeting as there had been no one from GAAC to bring it to the floor. He asked if anyone was present from GAAC today, and Joe Little brought the motion to the floor. Joe had reviewed this proposal and he clarified that this proposal will formalize an existing project option for students in NRM and Geography. Steve Sparrow was present to speak about the program.

Steve Sparrow said the program is designed to replace the non-thesis option in their MS program, with two groups of people in mind. First, those working in natural resource management and geography who want to advance themselves in their career. It's totally separate from their MS degree. Second, it's designed for students in the Peace Corp masters' international program as often times what they're doing in the Peace Corp doesn't fit in with a full-blown thesis. This way they don't have to write a full blown thesis and incorporates their Peace Corp project.

Jonathan Rosenberg commented that he had talked to Judith Kleinfeld and Mary Erlander with Northern Studies, and they'd been concerned it would tap into the same constituency who are in their masters' program. Steve responded that they had not talked to him, but maybe they talked to the dean. Steve thought it would be more complementary, and not overlapping. Jon R. mentioned that part of the NS constituency are working in state agencies who want an advanced degree, and this is a broad enough degree with the project option to overlap. Steve feels different audiences are intended by each of the programs.

Question was asked if GAAC had looked at potential overlap or synergy with other programs. Joe Little responded that the project was looked at on its' own merits within the construct of formalizing the non-thesis, project option. Katrin Iken said the concern had not come up. Perry Barboza did not recall it being brought up, either. Ron Barry clarified it's for a non-thesis, project option. Steve reiterated that it's not overlapping that they've heard about.

Ken Barrick requested, as the most senior geographer in the department and as a member of the Senate, a roll call vote – he would like his “no” vote recorded with his name. Jon Genetti asked that “no” votes be recorded in the minutes instead just to speed things up. Ken indicated that was fine. Jennifer Reynolds asked for explanation on this request. Ken explained that he's been here at UAF for 23 years and has wanted a master's in geography and worked to have faculty with Ph.D.'s hired to help make this possible, and it's not happened. For reasons of disciplinary integrity and academic quality, he feels a geography master's degree needs to be a geography degree on its' own rather than the combination degree. He doesn't see a single requirement for a geography class for the degree. He prefers that it be an NRM master's degree only. Later, Geography could have a masters program when the proper resources are in place.

Steve wanted to address Ken's concerns. Jennifer Reynolds moved to table the motion and send it back to GAAC for further discussion and to involve the concerned departments. Ken seconded the motion. Jon invited comment on the motion to send the master's back to GAAC. A request was made to hear Steve's comments by one of the senators.

Steve responded: This program will be run by SNRAS. It won't be run by any particular department in the school – they have four departments. When the program was being discussed in the school (Steve and John Fox were chairs of the committee considering this program), several geography faculty mentioned they thought geography should be included in the program, too. So, Mike Sfraga was asked about it and he wanted it included. It wouldn't conflict with a master's degree being developed in the geography department, because this is a professional

degree. Steve feels it could help the development of a Geography master's, that it's not a conflict. The draft program was sent to all faculty, including Geography, and he never heard any complaints. John Fox said he hadn't heard any objections either.

Jon Genetti asked for any other questions, then asked if there was a call to question. Jon Dehn called to question on the motion. Jon Genetti proceeded with the vote on the motion to send the program back to the GAAC committee. (Votes totaled 21 to send the motion back to committee, and ten votes were opposed to sending back to committee.) The motion to send the program back to GAAC was passed.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moved to send the Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography back to the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee for further discussion.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008 and/or
 Upon Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: See the full program proposal #29 from the Fall 2007 review cycle
 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography Program Goals:

The goals of the MNRMG degree are to provide coursework and training for (1) students who are currently working in or wish to work in the NRM/Geography (NRM/G) fields in a professional capacity, but who lack specific training or an appropriate undergraduate degree; (2) students seeking additional skills or advanced training in NRM/G in order to enhance their professional effectiveness and/or advance in their professional careers; and (3) students who wish to pursue the NRM/Peace Corp Masters program and focus on applying existing NRM/G technologies and knowledge in the context of the developing world and in conjunction with the Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography program. The goals of the MNRMG degree are to provide coursework and training for (1) students who are currently working in or wish to work in the NRM/Geography (NRM/G) fields in a professional capacity, but who lack specific training or an appropriate undergraduate degree; (2) students seeking additional skills or advanced training in NRM/G in order to enhance their professional effectiveness and/or advance in their professional careers; and (3) students who wish to pursue the NRM/Peace Corp Masters program and focus on applying existing NRM/G technologies and knowledge in the context of the developing world and in conjunction with the Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography program.

Note: Please refer to the Agenda for this meeting for additional attachments to this motion. The full packet is available for review at the UAF Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

- B. Motion to approve a Ph.D. in Natural Resources and Sustainability, submitted by the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee.

Katrin spoke to the program which is joint one between Natural Resources and the School of Management. Students wanting a Ph.D. in this direction needed to go through the interdisciplinary program. Nation-wide there is a program recognized in Natural Resources and Sustainability, but students from UAF were not being recognized with the interdisciplinary. Wanted to match the national standard – gives title to the degree from UAF.

Jon G. asked for questions and comments. Jonathan Rosenberg commented that the Political Science department hadn't heard of this. The program makes the claim of preparing students for academic positions in political science and mentions a policy emphasis using the term "geopolitical" – these create a concern. He believes this will affect the PS department – probably positively, but that they should have been informed. They weren't consulted as a department. What would PS want to have seen different in this? He doesn't know and the answer could range from nothing to a little bit or a lot—because the department hasn't had the opportunity to look into it. Other than this the program is sound. Jon R. asked if there is any way to allow for their input and possible revision of the program statement without holding up the process?

Jon Genetti said that there could be a motion on proposed changes that would be voted on today. Jon R. did not want to do that.

Jennifer Reynolds asked about a time table for turn around if the motion is tabled. Jon mentioned they are looking at an April BOR meeting. Susan Henrichs commented that normal process includes the new degree program being submitted to the System Academic Council for review and this needs to be accomplished at least 30 days before the next BOR meeting; but with this being a new doctoral program, SAC will possibly want more time – it will be scrutinized more closely being the highest degree offered at the university. So the complete process through the Senate now and onward through the process makes it tough for April without considering a delay of going back to GAAC. Jon G. mentioned the next BOR after April is in June; Senate meets next in roughly 30 days.

Ken says it should be looked at closely and not rushed.

Jennifer Reynolds moved to table the motion and send it back to GAAC and was seconded online. Jon G. asked for comments on this motion. Representatives from the degree committee came forward to comment at Joe Little's request (Joshua Greenburg and Gary Kofinas) and give background and a description of the program. Like the Masters' programs in their department that already exist (Natural Resources Management, and Natural Resources and Environmental Economics) and are similar, this program brings these to the Ph.D. level. Currently there are nine Ph.D. students interested in it at this time who are in interdisciplinary with major professors

(sustainability science, natural resource economics, environmental economics, forestry and agriculture). Students design their program around these and three core courses (two credit courses and a seminar). The question was asked: How much cross-over is there currently with PS department and the existing masters' programs? Answer was that these programs (natural resources and political science) are distinct in their areas of focus. Students in the masters' program might take a political science course (just as they might take a biology course or an anthropology course as well), but he doesn't see a cross-over of the two programs. Natural resources and economics are the areas of focus with these programs and they stand alone as such. If there is an impact on political science, he sees the effect as positive, not competing. There are not requirements in the degree program for courses outside the two departments.

Perry Barboza commented that he supported tabling the other program earlier because it explicitly said geography, but this one is not the same type of case – it does not explicitly say political science. Perry said that GAAC looked at the various resources in biology and wildlife and other areas that program will use. He's not sure he sees an issue here that will be resolved by holding the process up for another month. Doesn't feel it treads on other departments' toes. Mentioned the 7 or 9 students needing the Ph.D. program and using the interdisciplinary approach already. He supports this program.

Jon R. says on the face of it he has no negative comments. But he feels that the specific language of the proposal includes claims for preparation of students for academic careers in political science, which is a concern.

A vote was taken in favor of sending the motion back to committee: 10 local "aye" votes. 3 "aye" votes from off-campus.

Votes not in favor of sending the motion back to committee totaled 16.

Motion to return to committee failed. Senate returned to the matter of the original motion.

Jon R. moved to change language in the proposal: eliminate the term "geopolitical" in the second paragraph below the Preliminary Catalog Sample Course of Study (first sentence); and the term "political sciences" where it occurs at the "Student opportunities and outcomes" section on the BOR summary form. His motion was seconded.

Julie Lurman asked for the responses of Joshua Greenberg and Gary Kofinas to the proposed language strikes before a vote was taken – they said they don't know right off the top of their heads, but they imagine they could live with that. The context of the terms wasn't specific to a course of study but rather to place an issue in the rationale of the program. The term "geopolitical" fits within their disciplines (resource policy and management, resource law) and they deal with policy issues regularly. The disciplinary boundaries blur with the use of this term.

Sine commented that she feels this is being hurried through, and it mentions sociology which she hasn't looked at. It should be taken back to build support for it. Ken mentioned he's not comfortable with word-smithing on the floor of Senate for this and suggested that maybe the school should withdraw the proposal to take it back to the committee for further communication and to build support.

Joshua Greenberg (or Gary Kofinas) expressed his disagreement with that conclusion. It's not possible to bring everyone involved with an interdisciplinary program into the discussion, and this program was put together with a strong rationale.

Amber Thomas commented that students are already taking these courses for the Masters' program that will be offered for the Ph.D. program. The new curriculum for the Ph.D. program will reside within the Natural Resources Management department, and the faculty who are supporting this new program will be managing the Ph.D. students. So she's not clear on what the objections are since students are already taking these courses. Agreement was expressed for Amber's comment – this is giving the degree a name with the department (it already exists as interdisciplinary) so it's more credible when students go outside.

Jon R. commented that interdisciplinary programs recognize “interdisiplinarity” and make no specific claim to cover subject matter or create competencies that are the territories of specific disciplines. He is not objecting to content of the program. His problem is the claim of training in his discipline without consulting his department. If he could revise his motion he would support leaving “geopolitical” in for the reasons that Gary pointed out. He feels there is the matter of process in GAAC, a seeming breakdown in the customary process to think quite liberally about both negative and positive effects of new programs on other departments and existing programs and to inform other departments in a timely manner to give them opportunity for input if they see fit.

Zhang commented about economics and policy – it's broad and there's no way to clearly cut between policy and economics.

Jon R.'s modification motion was seconded, leaving in “geopolitical” and removing “political sciences” from the BOR summary page. Jon Dehn called to question and the vote was taken. The modification motion was passed, with only one Nay.

The Senate returned to the original Motion again and it was called to question and taken to a vote. The Motion was passed with the modifications already voted upon.

Votes to pass the Ph.D. program proposal totaled 25 (22 in the room; from off-campus sites: three.) Votes opposed: None in the room, none from off-campus. There were five abstentions in the room, none from off-campus.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Ph.D. Program in Natural Resources and Sustainability.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008 and/or

4. Contribute to the sustainable development of Alaska's rural and urban environments.

Note: Please refer to the Agenda for this meeting for additional attachments to this motion. The full packet is available for review at the UAF Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

C. Motion to amend the Mandatory Placement criteria for English and Mathematics, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee.

Ilana referenced the wording changes made just this morning that were agreed upon with remote site faculty and the committee. The proposed amendment had read, in part: **“HOWEVER, IF YOUR STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES ARE BELOW THESE MINIMUMS AND IF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL CUMULATIVE GPA IS 3.0 OR HIGHER, YOU MAY ENROLL IN ENGLISH F111X USING THE INSTRUCTOR PERMISSION PROCESS.”**

This was discussed last week and changed to read **“HOWEVER, IF YOUR STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES ARE BELOW THESE MINIMUMS AND IF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL CUMULATIVE GPA IS 3.0 OR HIGHER, YOU MAY ENROLL IN ENGLISH F111X WITH PERMISSION OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMPOSITION OR RURAL CAMPUS HUMANITIES DIVISION DELEGATE.”**

The most recent proposed change of this for consideration today, is: **“HOWEVER, IF YOUR STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES ARE BELOW THESE MINIMUMS AND IF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL CUMULATIVE GPA IS 3.0 OR HIGHER, YOU MAY ENROLL IN ENGLISH F111X WITH PERMISSION OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMPOSITION OR RURAL CAMPUS ENGLISH/HUMANITIES FACULTY.”**

This amendment looks at the high school GPA and takes it into consideration in case a student has poor SAT or ACT scores. They can be placed into English 111 (and Math) if their high school GPA is 3.0 or higher instead of going into the developmental courses. This also affects placement into core science and human condition courses as well.

Cindy Hardy wished to speak to this because the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee also addressed this amendment as co-sponsors with Curricular Affairs. They suggested the change from “instructor permission” to “director of composition or rural campus English/Humanities faculty.” Their concern was that all the English 111 courses taught locally at UAF and most of them at rural campuses are taught by graduate students or adjuncts. They wanted some oversight on that in terms of permission.

Michael Schuldiner, chair of the English department spoke. The motion is important for the students. Standardized test scores alone won't tell us who the failing students are, though they do tell us who the good students are. This makes sense for English, but maybe not math students. A student who writes well in an hour on a test will have no problem in English 111, but a student who doesn't write well in an hour may do poorly on the test, but perhaps can write well for a long class, over 3 hours or 3 weeks for a paper. The point is that standardized test scores do not work well for placing students in developmental English. The good A and B students coming out of high school could be labeled as developmental unnecessarily due to mandatory placement based on test scores.

Could lead to loss of self esteem for those students. So he feels this change does something for those students.

Marjorie Illingworth wanted to speak against this change for a couple of reasons. First, mandatory placement is not based solely on SAT/ACT's. Students have a writing option if they're on the edge and we don't know where they fit. She said we're talking about 50 students in the fall, and not sure of the number in the spring. The other reason is that she has a real concern about putting any permanent numbers in the motion for mandatory placement. Because she's in the Developmental Ed. department, she'd really like to see this done between English, Developmental Ed., and the Advising Center because every few years they get a report from ACT that gives them the current

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008

RATIONALE: If mandatory placement is implemented using current criteria, a significant number of students will be mistakenly sent to developmental English. Standardized test scores alone are not an indicator of how well a student will perform in the freshman level English course (English 111) at UAF. UAF PAIR data shows that in Fall, 2006, students with standardized test scores of 17 or below on the ACT and 430 or below on the SAT received the following grades: F = 28%, D = 6 %, C = 13%, B = 20%, and A = 33%. Seventy-two percent of students with scores that would require developmental English according to current standardized test criteria passed English 111. This data should not come as a surprise. Many students who will not do well writing for an hour on a standardized test will do quite well, for example, on a research paper that requires extensive rewriting over a period of weeks or months. Adding the high school gpa as additional criteria by which students may enroll in 111 will help remedy the situation, although it will not completely solve the problem.

Implementation: It is understood that the Assistant Provost will work toward instituting a mechanism by which students with standardized test scores below the minimum required for placement in English 111 can be screened for high school gpa. In the interim, the Assistant Provost will inform all advisors to advise all students with test scores below the minimum and a gpa of 3.0 or higher that they may use permission forms to enter English 111.

- D. Motion to revise the Fresh Start policy for returning students, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee.

Ilana brought the motion to floor and described this revision to the catalog to clarify for students the amount of time needing to pass before declaring Fresh Start – it’s two years, not two and a half years. Linda Hapsmith commented that the important change included here is in rationale – two years have elapsed since last attendance and there’s been a complete break in coursework.

Marsha asked about the phrase “request to disregard” and what was meant. Dana explained that the old wording made it sound as if the prior record was automatically disregarded, but the actual meaning is clarified with this wording change which is that with Fresh Start they request the prior record be disregarded. The Registrar’s Office wanted this clarification.

Jon D. called to question and the vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the Fresh Start policy (pages 25 and 28 of the 2007-08 UAF catalog) for returning students.

**Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes Dec. 3, 2007**

Present: Deanna Dieringer, Linda Hapsmith, Beth Leonard, Rainer Newberry, Ilana Kingsley
Guests: Michelle Bartlett, Tim Stickel, Lael Croteau, Libby Eddy, Anne Marie Nacke, Marsha Sousa, Rena Bowers

Absent: Falk Huettmann, Diane McEachern, Amber Thomas, Carol Lewis

1. Discussed topic of travel abroad courses through other institutions and credit. This is something that doesn't have to go through Curr. Affairs or FS. Deanna will write up a process to follow, with the hopes that it will make it into the next catalog. UAF students will be able to register for travel abroad courses through Berkeley or Arizona through UAF and get credit through UAF.
2. Motion to accept the Dental Hygiene AAS program.
3. Motion to allow American Sign Language courses be used to satisfy the 'Foreign/Alaska Native language' option that can be used instead of the BA Minor requirement.
4. Discussed the Governance Coordinating Committee (GCC) change to return to a Thursday start date for Spring 2009 (Thursday, January 22). The change is due to complaints of starting the first day of instruction the day after Alaska Civil Rights Day.
5. Modified the "Baccalaureate Degree Worksheet" that appears in the course catalog. Under **Bachelor or Arts Degree** removed the wording "Up to 12 credits in a non-English language OR AK Native Language OR ASLG and a minimum of 6 cr in Social Science(s)." Removal of this sentence will make the requirements less confusing.

Outstanding Issues:

- CLEP (Dana)
- Freshstart (Dana)
- School of Management's Sports Management Minor in Business (Deana)

B. Faculty Affairs - Jon Dehn
Jon mentioned that the first meeting of the semester is Friday, Feb. 15, at WRRB 101.
No report attached to agenda.

C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar
Brenda mentioned that the first meeting hasn't taken place yet. No report attached to agenda.

Joy's Report:

1. Joy participated in an audio conference with Anne Sukamoto, Statewide Staff and Faculty Development Coordinator, and the faculty development folks from UAA and UAS. They discussed ways of cooperating, sharing speakers, and web/video/audioconferencing. Anne will be meeting with Statewide Academic VP Dan Julius and will report back to us on that meeting.
2. Joy and Sine Anahita wrote a NSF grant proposal to improve the situation of women STEM faculty. Joy sent in a request for speaker funds to Statewide Academic VP Dan Julius.
3. Ken Bains is scheduled to talk on teaching on September 12, 2008.
4. Jordan Titus and Jerry McBeath are the new United Academics reps for the Travel Committee.
5. Joy is seeking volunteers to assist with the faculty travel proposals. Channon Price, Dana Greci and Julie Lurman volunteered to assist on January 18, 2008.
6. Joy has found someone to assist her in the Office of Faculty Development for Fall 2009 with teaching observations.

Committee Reports:

1. Dana offered to be the point person on the Faculty Peer Assessment working group.
2. The Faculty Forum working group came up with two themes which they'd like the forums to work around: (1) academic rights and responsibilities and (2) specific tools we can use in our work. They would like to propose to the Faculty Senate that it sponsor a forum in late March (3/25 & 3/26) on student retention and engagement. This forum would be audio accessible, with a.m. and p.m. sessions, and maybe offered twice. There is still some question as to whether this will be a Faculty or a Provost forum.
3. The group reviewed a working agenda draft of the Lilly Institute on Teaching/Learning.
4. Link talked with Ann Christie, whose committee is reviewing the new electronic activity report forms. FDAI and her group will interface to look together at that method of generating activity reports.

Other Business and Updates:

Dani Sheppard, Coordinator of the Community-based Learning Initiative, is bringing Nancy Anders up on 2/12/08 to talk about what the UAA Center for Community Engagement is doing with community-based learning in Anchorage.

**Faculty Development, Assessment, and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes – January 23, 2008**

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. and opened with a roll-call.

Attending: Michael Daku, Channon Price, Larry Roberts, Dana Greci, Julie Lurman, Susan Herman, Christie Cooper, Eric Madsen

Faculty Peer Assessment

The Faculty Peer Assessment subcommittee will meet next week.

Faculty Forums

The Faculty Forums subcommittee presented ideas to the committee and we worked together on further development of a pilot faculty forum, to bring to the faculty senate administrative committee for approval. Tentative dates are 3/26 at TVCC and 3/28 on main campus, both noon to 2:00 pm and including audio-conferencing for rural participation. We will ask Jake Poole's office for assistance with advertising and lunch and aim for about 35 people per forum. There was discussion as to whether some students should be included; people seemed mostly in favor of some, limited student participation, perhaps only in the form of a survey distributed before the forum. The group agreed the forums should be focused on providing a safe environment to explore ideas about education and/or on advancing in one's career. A tentative title for the first one is "Hook 'em, Hold 'em, Educate 'em: What's Your Bait?" Another title suggested was "Raising Your SOI Scores without Dumbing Down Your Course." The group discussed the idea of rotating themes for faculty forums, among the themes of teaching, research and service.

Adult Learning Institute

Information about the institute is up on the website:

www.uaf.edu/crcdhealth/conference/2008/Agenda.htm

The institute will be held March 5-7, 2008, and includes three full days of workshops, etc.

Generating Activity Reports

No further progress since the last meeting was reported.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m. **We will meet again in February 2008.**

Minutes respectfully submitted by Dana Greci, Recorder.

I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee - Paul McCarthy
No report was attached to the agenda.

J. Student Academic Development & Achievement - Cindy Hardy

Cindy commented that the bulk of their recent discussions was regarding mandatory placement. Minutes for the most recent discussions will be available soon. They'll be meeting in two weeks.

The following report was attached to the agenda as Attachment 148/7:

**SADA Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes -- December 14, 2007**

Attending: Mark Box, Dana Greci, Linda Hapsmith, Cindy Hardy, Joe Hickman, Marji Illingworth, Ron Illingworth, Joe Mason, Carol Murphrey, Victor Zinger

The committee met and addressed the following:

Updates from represented departments and programs—Carol Murphrey from RSS reported that they have instituted a Friday night Healthy Connections program to provide students with positive activities on weekends. They are hiring two peer advisors for the spring 08 semester.

Mark Box reported that the English department is in the midst of a composition director search. He was asked about a “Virtual Writing Center” and he will check to see if this is something different from the Telefax Tutoring, which is very successful with rural students.

Dana Greci reported the new DEVE class, DEVE 193, is going well and will be offered in the Spring. This is a bridge class for students who need an additional semester between DEVE 070 and English 111 or students who have low English 111 placement or who have been unsuccessful in English 111 and need additional writing instruction.

SSSP reports that there are only 15-20 slots open and they anticipate a waitlist. Their tutoring center is swamped now that ASUAF is no longer offering tutors.

Linda reports that the Advising Center will hold its peer advising training course in the Spring and is looking for students to apply. They also have Skills Tutor up and running—a tutorial brush-up for students, especially those needing COMPASS test scores.

Ron reports that Interior Aleutians is running some linked reading and discipline courses for their students. They are also running a bridge program with a local high school, teaching English 111.

Joe Mason reports that Nome has new DEVM faculty this semester, Mike Rutledge. He may be joining our meetings next semester.

Mandatory Placement—According to a memo from Dana Thomas, this will begin in the fall semester for DEVM, DEVE, 100-level core Math, and English 111. We discussed the implementation of this, including the reservations of some in the English Department. All concerned are in agreement that a writing sample should be an important piece of this process, but there is disagreement on how this should be done. Linda is chairing a task force comparing COMPASS and Accuplacer to see which would be best at UAF. She reports that ACT has sent a new analysis on the ACT cut scores for English 111 and she and Dana Thomas and Mike

Schuldiner are trying to arrange a meeting to go over this. Ron reminded the committee that for years TVC did English 111 placement through the ASSET writing sample, which is scored using a rubric. We discussed the possibility of using a similar system to evaluate students who had no test scores or who fell below a determined cutoff. This could be scored by graduate students in the Writing Center over the summer as they come in. Mark agreed to forward this recommendation to the English Department Composition Committee.

Marji reported that the biggest hole in the mandatory placement process is reading. Core classes don't currently have reading scores listed in their prerequisites. Though reading is mentioned in the original mandatory placement motion, it is not separated out in the placement guidelines in the Advising Manual, except for COMPASS scores. We discussed the need for instruction in reading at the college level—including the ACT report that, nationally, 51% of HS grads taking ACT fell below college reading levels. We discussed the possibility of Banner enforcing reading placement if it's not separated out in the ACT and SAT scores. One suggestion to explore is to require those with DEVE 070 placement to take a reading class as well. Marji wrote a memo for