

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #163
Monday, December 7, 2009
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn

Faculty Senate President Jonathan Dehn called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call for 2009-10 Faculty Senate

Members Present:

ABRAMOWICZ, Ken
ALLEN, Jane
ANGER, Andy
BAKER, Carrie
BOGOSYAN, Seta
BROCIOUS, Heidi (audio)
CAHILL, Cathy
CHRISTIE, Anne
DEHN, Jonathan
DONG, Lily
FOWELL, Sarah
GANGULI, Rajive (audio)
HANSEN, Roger

Members Present (cont'd):

THOMAS, Amber
WEBER, Jane
WILSON, Timothy

Members Absent:
BARTLETT, Christa
DAVIS, Mike
KOUKEL, Sonja
LEONARD, Beth
JIN, Meibing
JOLIE, July

Others Present:

Carol Gering
Todd Vorisek
Dana Thomas
Alex Hwu
Walker Wheeler
Heather Curry
Frank Chythlook
Kayt Sunwood
Cindy Hardy
Linda Hapsmith
Cindy West (audio)
Joy Morrison

Non-voting Members Present:

KADEN, Ute
KERR, Marianne (audio)
KONAR, Brenda
LARDON, Cecile
LAWLOR, Orion
LIANG, Jingjing
MCINTYRE, Julie
MOSES, Debra (Diane McEachern)
NEWBERRY, Rainer
PALTER, Morris
REYNOLDS, Jennifer

Tim Stickel
Denis Wiesenburg
Pete Pinney
Adrian Triebel
Martin Klein
Brian Rogers
Susan Henrichs

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #162

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Reaffirm the Journalism Department Unit Criteria

B. Motions Pending: None

III Public Comments

Dana Thomas reported on the progress of the group working on the English writing sample for Mandatory Placement. They've made progress, including conducting and analyzing an experiment between human- and machine-scored writing samples. But, an extension of time to early next semester is needed to finish an implementation plan. Jon D. asked about the results of the experiment. Dana reported that machine and human scoring were identical, with a correlation of .8; however the group prefers human scoring and that's the proposal they're working on.

Linda Hapsmith of the Academic Advising Center reminded everyone that student nominations for the Feist/Schamel Outstanding Undergraduate Faculty Advisor Award were open through Friday, Feb. 5. Flyers with more details and nomination forms were left at the back table.

Linda also announced the capstone workshop (of their academic advisor series) with a panel of five former Feist/Schamel award winners that is taking place tomorrow (Dec. 8). Flyers were left at the back table about that event, also.

Christie Cooper and Kayt Sunwood announced a training on mediation on behalf of Earlina

often mediators are called upon in a year's time, and Christie said about two times. With a larger pool to draw from in the future, though, the frequency could decrease. An effort is made to match those with complaints with a mediator from a different unit who is neutral and has no vested interest. Having more mediators makes that easier to accomplish.

Walker Wheeler, Rasmuson Library's IT manager and Unit 13 Staff Council member, spoke concerning the agenda item about the academic calendar. He requested consideration for IT when planning the academic calendar to allow for maintenance times of systems throughout the year. He had also made this request at the September Faculty Senate meeting and wished to give a reminder since today's agenda included the calendar topic.

IV A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

The Systemwide Governance Council met for the first time this academic year (representing all three MAUs). They elected their chair, Joe Hayes, director of the Alumni Association. This is the first year that the Alumni Association has been included on the Council.

The Faculty Alliance, representing the faculty of all three MAUs, has met and made two motions which have been presented to the Board of Regents. The first motion, passing unanimously, was to support one capital construction project in the university's budget, which is the Life Sciences Building.

They also met with interior legislators and they passed along the info about the motion supporting the Life Sciences Building project to them. The legislators were pleased to see the faculty from all three MAUs united together in this.

The second motion was to encourage progress on the Academic Master Plan. They requested a timeline of when the Faculty Senates and Faculty Alliance would be able to review a draft of the plan. They're still waiting for the feedback from that request, and are hoping to hear back by their next meeting (which is on Friday, Dec. 11).

Regarding the UA Presidential Search, Jon had compiled a list of 13 names suggested to him for people to serve, and has taken four names of people who fulfilled the position criteria to the committee. It's still too early to make the list of names public yet. A letter from System Governance Council is being drafted by Martin Klein and Jon, expressing their interest to see the shortlist of names to be submitted to the President (in hopes of having an opportunity to provide feedback) before it goes to the Board of Regents.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

The accreditation core themes are back on the agenda today. Dana Thomas is here to discuss them again with the Senate. Cathy mentioned the reasons for some of the changes made recently by Provost's Council and others. The theme for research, scholarship and creative activity were again split out so that each of those themes could accommodate more objectives and goals, increasing awareness and the ability to set goals for those themes. There will be the opportunity to discuss them today, as there are strong opinions on both sides of the discussion.

that everyone involved agree that these themes are the components of the mission of UAF. The themes have three purposes: 1.) they're a way of structuring our response to the accreditors, to show what we are and what we do as a university; 2.) they're a way to communicate amongst ourselves and that's why agreement is important to the extent it can be achieved; and, 3.) the themes will also be used to represent us to our constituencies, including legislators, citizens, business people, and other

Bookstore meetings, organizing student involvement. He recently met with Earlina Bowden regarding the new mediation program. He's working on ASUAF elections. The student saver (discount) program continues, though progress is slow but consistent. Last Friday he was involved in the meetings on campus with legislators, which Jon D. spoke about previously. Adrian attended that last BOR meeting earlier this month, accompanying the Gay-Straight Alliance as they lobbied for the nondiscrimination policy. They also pushed for the Life Sciences Building at the BOR meeting.

Todd Vorisek, ASUAF vice president, handed out pamphlets about the Student Initiative for Renewable Energy Now (SIREN) fee of \$20 each semester to go toward sustainable projects on campus. The student-initiated fee raises about \$200,000 per semester, and the Chancellor has matched that amount, so right now there's \$400,000 for the program. The fee will be charged for the next 10 years, generating around \$8 million dollars (later in the meeting, Adrian corrected this figure to \$5 million dollars).

excellent idea, noting that iTunes sends its customers to university resources that highlight their unique strengths and UAF should highlight its truly unique classes.

BREAK: 2:10-2:15 PM

VIII New Business

A. Motion to Approve a Minor in American Sign Language (Attachment 163/1)

Ken A., co-chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee, said the committee agreed that having this minor available at UAF is preferred over students going elsewhere to obtain it. There was no opposition to the program whatsoever. It's clear cut and the Foreign Languages department supports it. Jon D. asked for a vote. Orion L. so moved and Falk H. seconded. The vote was unanimously in favor with no abstentions.

B. Motion to Restrict Core Natural Science Courses to Hands-on Laboratory Experiences (Attachment 163/2)

Rainer spoke to the motion. The Curricular Affairs Committee only just found out last week that core natural scie

Regine H. asked about natural science core courses as distance ed courses. Rainer said they could occur as long as they included the hands-on activities. Rainer moved the motion go back to committee.

Brenda K. suggested discussion with those who've created these courses so they have a chance to provide feedback and present their rationale for teaching them. Rajive G. commented about being uncomfortable with the statement that a science course without hands-on activities isn't a science course. Rainer clarified that this motion is referring to core science courses which are required to have labs. Cathy C. talked about delivering chemistry courses by distance where lab components can be made available for hands-on experiments and there are many alternatives for providing hands-on experiences. Some labs in a course may have to be virtual ones based on their subject matter – astrophysics for example. So, the motion needs to be readdressed.

Ute K. commented that she feels this decision is too black and white. Not each science course is equal, and in Alaska not every science course can be delivered equally. She feels it should be done on a course by course basis, not in a way that raises more questions for courses as a whole. She feels it stifles education as well as the judgment of faculty. Rainer agreed that it is a black and white decision in the same way that you can't teach swimming without getting into the water.

Cecile L. asked if computer science courses are part of these core courses. They are not. She asked about computer modeling in the scientific fields. Rainer noted the process should start with reality first, then proceed on to modeling.

Ken A. observed that if totally virtual labs are allowed for core science courses, you've practically eliminated the lab requirement. Some hands-on is required and expected. This is what distinguishes the core requirement at UAF from other universities.

Jon D. mentioned that he'd like to see a list of criteria for labs, conceding that there are cases for virtual labs in some situations, but questioning if it should be the entire lab experience.

Ken A. and Falk H. invited all interested faculty to come and talk about this with them at CAC, and particularly in conjunction with the ongoing Core-LEAP discussions.

Rainer's motion was seconded and a unanimous vote sent this item back to committee.

IX Discussion Items

A. Faculty Senate Reapportionment - Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 163/3)

Jennifer outlined what was done and why it was coming before Senate now. The need for recalculating the Senate representation numbers from units was due, especially since five years had passed since the last calculations. Bylaws state that it should be done every two years according to a very specific formula. Faculty Affairs suggests that this intensive process and two-year timeline should be

discussed. Currently, the recalculation was completed by Anne Christie and Marla Lowder for Faculty Affairs this past fall.

To do this required data from the Provost's Office and every single faculty contract letter had to be reviewed to pull the required data out according to faculty appointments for each unit. There are 617 faculty qualifying for representation, and each appointment letter had to be reviewed to determine percentages of appointments in the units. Two corrections must then be applied to the results to determine unit representation totals, which Jennifer explained. The fulltime faculty equivalent (FTE) calculation was used as specified in the bylaws, and this data changes from year to year. Because it's very difficult to get the needed level of data to run the calculation specified in the bylaws, other procedures were also looked at, using the same data set to compare what the end results would be utilizing a simpler procedure. All the results are in the attachment, shown in the tables for comparison. The larger table shows the results following the specified procedure in the bylaws. The second smaller table shows just the units that had changes and the difference for each of those units depending upon the method used to calculate the representation numbers.

Almost all the unit representation numbers remained the same, except for CNSM and CLA whose numbers were reduced. CNSM faculty rep numbers mainly dropped because of looking closely at the split appointments and assigning time to the research units (GI, IARC and IAB) according to the bylaws. This changes the representation numbers for research faculty and would provide the GI, IARC and IAB with their own representation. If the specified data corrections are not used, the GI and IARC would still have their own representation, but IAB would remain in CNSM for representation on the Senate.

The issues identified and options for dealing with them are included in the attachment. Some modification of the senate bylaws is needed because of the issues they identified in the process. Faculty Affairs wants the Senate to look at the options and discuss these as a body. Jon asked the Senate for suggestions for bylaws and constitution changes. Give feedback to FAC and Administrative Committee members. Jon solicits faculty input over the next semester.

B. Update on the Accreditation Core Themes – Dana Thomas
(Attachment 163/4)

Dana T. brings two issues back to the Senate for discussion. First is the issue raised earlier by the chancellor and provost about splitting the *Discover* theme so that research is set apart from other scholarship and creative activity. The splitting of that theme into two is favored by Provost's Council and Chancellor's Cabinet.

A second item is the word "sustainable" that was added by the Senate to "economic development" in the *Engage* theme at the November Senate meeting. Provost's Council and Chancellor's Cabinet favor removing "sustainable" from the theme.

Carrie B. read a statement from the Theatre Department faculty:

The faculty already considered splitting research away from scholarship and artistic creation. The reasons "we the faculty" had for wanting these unified in a single theme do not change, and "we the faculty" feel that splitting the themes into two categories is a problem. To the Chancellor's Cabinet, just as a thought experiment, we would like you to consider the idea of reversing the verbs and the themes in the expressed format. If one were to say:

DISCOVER: Through Scholarship and Artistic Creation including an Emphasis on the North and its Peoples

EXPLORE: Through Research

Most researchers would probably feel like they are being sub-ranked below scholars and artists. "We the faculty" feel like they would be

given UAF's emphasis on research. So, we wouldn't get the same kind of feedback and guidance that could be obtained if they were separate.

Cecile L. commented that she continues to struggle with this bifurcation. The use of the word "research" in what she's heard expressed today is almost a code word for "funded research" which puts it in a different category. While some of her research is funded, there is still a lot of research that is meaningful and important though not externally funded. It's important to have this conversation and clarify what we mean within our institution. As a social scientist she sees herself as sitting in almost in the middle of this because she has funded research that is important to her, but she also does unfunded research and scholarship. Are we singling out funded research? If that is the case, then we should call it what it is.

Dana T. said he asked that same question specifically at Provost's Council, but the response was no. Buck Sharpton brought in the accreditation definitions of research, scholarship and artistic creation and argued from that perspective, right out of the accreditation handbook. Part of the discussion was that scholarship encompasses all of these areas. Research and artistic creativity belong to scholarship...

Jennifer R. asked if these themes have a life beyond the accreditation process. The Provost said that the expectation of the accreditors is that the university does a lot of communication with the outside world about our mission. It's anticipated by the leadership group that we would talk widely about our mission and the accreditation themes that have been chosen. They're not written to be solely internal to the university. The extent to which we'll base publications on them and so forth depends upon what we're trying to say to our external constituencies. Jennifer noted that if we're using the themes to develop a mission statement, that's a different matter; but, if we're just developing them for the accreditation process then it's really important to keep in mind the implications that were shared today about how they'll be used in the accreditation process. The Provost responded that 80% or more of the theme development is for the accreditation process and they'll drive the work of getting the accreditation documents together.

Dana T. noted the time constraint issue the university is facing, forcing the process for developing and discussing these to be drastically shortened. In 2012 a whole new set of themes could be developed.

Ken A. spoke about addition of the "sustainability" word to "economic development" in the *Engage* theme. He supports sustainable economic development, using the example of what's being done at Chena Hot Springs. But, given its viability because of our location, it's not feasible to focus exclusively on that. Other faculty at SOM have voiced this same concern, also, about having the word "sustainable" be a qualifier of the phrase "economic development." The need is acknowledged for development of sustainable energy sources in the long-term as the pipeline declines. At this point, though, we need to focus on economic development as a whole for the state.

Rainer commented that recent research has shown that the temperature of water at the hot springs is dropping because of the extraction of so much hot water. It is not proving to be sustainable. What does and does not constitute "sustainable" can be a very tricky matter. He supports removal of the word from the theme. Jennifer R. differentiated between

“environmental” and “economic” sustainability, and stated that if environmental sustainability is what is being referred to in the theme, it should more clearly state that fact, or vice versa. Andy A. echoed Jennifer’s statement that “ecological” and “economic” sustainability are two very different things.

Jon D. asked for two votes. The first vote was whether or not to retain the word “sustainable” in the *Engage* theme. The Senate voted unanimously to take out the word “sustainable” from the *Engage* theme, with one abstention.

The second vote was regarding the issue of separating the *Discover* theme. There were five votes in favor of separating the *Discover* theme as discussed; and 14 votes against separating the *Discover* theme. There were three abstentions.

C. Recap of the AC Meeting with Follett Bookstore Reps, and the Open Forums – Jon Dehn

Jon recapped the results of the Administrative Committee’s meeting with Follett representatives. A “pop-up” bookstore will be available at the beginning of the semesters when classes are starting. They are going to have their own manager for that store. They’ll also scan more first chapters and make those available to students. It should work more smoothly without the email switchover problem.

D. Academic Calendar Issues – Falk Huettmann, Ken Abramowicz

Ken A. mentioned the problem they’re having with the academic calendar: all the semesters and the new ’mesters are adding up to 53 weeks needed to operate them all. Faculty Senate had voted to have spring semesters start after Martin Luther King Day, so in order for Summer Session I (SS I) to end by the Fourth of July, it means that in many years there would have to be a five-week SS I or it overlaps with the two-week Maymester. They must consider the options of having a one-week Maymester, or have it overlap with SS I, or have a five-week-long SS I.

Amber T. commented that the English depart

