

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #177
Monday, October 3, 2011
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Catherine Cahill

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Abramowicz, Ken
Alexeev, Vladimir
Arendt, Anthony
Baker, Carrie
Barboza, Perry
Brown, Stephen
Cahill, Cathy
Davis, Mike
Fallen, Chris
George-Bettisworth, Retchenda
Golux, Stephan
Gustafson, Karen
Healy, Joanne
Henry, David – Patrick Marlow
Himelbloom, Brian
Horstmann, Lara
Jensen, Karen
Johnston, Duff
Joly, Julie
Jones, Debra
Lardon, Cecile
Lawlor, Orion
Mathis, Jeremy – Sarah Hardy
McEachern, Diane
Metzger, Andrew
Meyer, Franz – Gerhard Kramm
Moses, Debra
Nadin, Elisabeth
Newberry, Rainer
Ng, Chung-Sang
Radenbaugh, Todd (audio)
Renes, Sue – Christine Cook

Members Present (cont'd):

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

Members Absent:

Baek, Jungho
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar
Bret-Harte, Donie
Zhang, Xiong

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Brian Rogers
Susan Henrichs
Jon Dehn, Past President
Mike Earnest
Jordan Titus
Paul Layer
Mari Freitag
Robert Kinnard

Guest Speaker:

UA President Pat Gamble

Others Present:

John Clendenin
Claudia Koch
Joy Morrison
Robert Holden
Flora Grabowska

Committee Reps:

Josef Glowa (FDAI)
Cindy Hardy (SADAC)
Peter Webley (RAC)

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #176

Minutes were approved; however note for next year to change the dates for the resolution itself.

C. Adoption of Agenda

Approved as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Approve a New Minor in Marine Science
2. Motion to Reaffirm Unit Criteria for CEM

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – Cathy Cahill

Cathy reminded everyone of the motion passed last spring requiring all course compressions to be reviewed at a senate curriculum committee. There have been instances of courses being over-compressed, including a core course. Please remind your departments.

Cathy mentioned the Faculty Alliance task force formed to address distance delivery of labs. UAF has three tenured members on it. She would like volunteers or nominations of other faculty who are actually doing distance delivery and who would be willing to share their knowledge with the task force about the issues and their practical experience with what the technology allows in terms of labs.

Faculty Alliance also wishes to address issues of faculty retention. The Provost has some data, but they're seeking more information. They'll be potentially asking faculty on a broader scale to gather more data.

Jane W. mentioned that CSW is also looking at the issue with regard to why women faculty leave, and will share that information.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer announced that a full discussion on program review and student assessment is going to be put off for now, allowing the units more time to provide responses to the Provost on how their reviews came out.

With regard to the university-wide promotion and tenure committees, there has again been a shortfall in the number of faculty available to serve on the committees. There will be a second round of requests from the Provost's office asking faculty to serve. Please share any concerns with Cathy and Jennifer about how committees are functioning.

Chancellor Rogers expressed his appreciation for the senators from out of town who are available to meet with the accreditation team members, noting that unfortunately the accreditors have not chosen to travel to any rural campuses.

He mentioned the favorable response to the proposed engineering building projects by the BOR facilities and academic committees, but the challenge will be the juxtaposition of maintenance projects with new projects and what becomes the BOR schedule for those. They hope to learn more at the November meeting.

Thanks were extended to those who participated in the diversity workshop held last week, where they explored how search committees can help make the recruitment process more open and attractive to a more diverse body of candidates.

Terry MacTaggart returned recently to do a follow-up review of UAF. He was here two years ago and had created a report at that time.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Accreditation activities were mentioned, along with reminders of the open forums with the accreditation team for students, staff, and faculty. The closing remarks of the accreditation team will be shared on Wednesday morning at the Davis Concert Hall.

Susan spoke about the Board of Regents meeting in Juneau which took place in September. The Facilities and Land Management Committee met along with the Student Affairs Committee to review the proposed new buildings on the UAA and UAF campuses. While the reviews were favorable as to the need for and design of the buildings, there was not a decision to place a new request in the capital budget request this year because the President wishes to focus on deferred maintenance at this time. She also mentioned the Board's approval of the A.A.S. in Paramedicine which the senate had passed last year.

C. Vice Provost's Remarks – Dana Thomas

Dana was engaged in the accreditation site visit and not present at this meeting.

V Guest Speaker

A. Pat Gamble, UA President
Topic: UA's Strategic Direction

President Gamble explained why the current process underway is being called strategic "direction" as opposed to "plan." He spoke about issues regarding cooperation and coordination between the three MAUs; and about the difficulties students encounter to obtain the e-learning we've advertised (for example), while facing huge hassles in the process. The focus of these efforts is what we can do to facilitate student ability to obtain their education throughout the UA system. Service and value are important to the students, and their ability to choose where to go and obtain e-learning is improving, including in the rural communities where the infrastructure is being updated. We can shift in strategic direction to accommodate more student needs – we can match their needs instead of forcing them to fit into our style.

Communication is a huge part of this; with the goal of being able to tell students what we will be doing before we do it, being able to tell them what we're doing while we're doing it, and being able to tell

about what we've done and how it turned out afterward. An ongoing dialog at every level throughout the system is necessary. To that end, the report by Terry MacTaggart is being sent out system-wide. The report is from the "ten-thousand-foot" level and sets the stage for what is being done strategically.

MacTaggart's report is posted online at:

http://www.alaska.edu/files/research/Shaping-Alaska's-Future_100311.pdf

President Gamble reiterated that this is change in motion; not just goal-setting and coming to the end of those goals. Fundamental to that change is outreach throughout the state to get information from all different groups throughout the state, from small business to large corporations, employers and the workforce, the public at-large, and students. Common threads from the information gained from all these groups will give us direction and help us frame problem statements, find solutions and improve outputs (e.g., improving the efficiency of our support system to increase student success).

President Gamble noted the problem is not in the classroom. We are turning out good students. But we need to help more students get through their programs more quickly. Students need to see that getting higher education in Alaska is doable and affordable at the same time.

Brainstorming is his preferred method for addressing the issues he has mentioned, and he hopes to include faculty, staff and students in that effort which will occur after the outreach effort and publicizing problem statements.

After giving some examples of education hurdles that students face currently which were gleaned from recent meetings with students, President Gamble took comments.

David V. mentioned the fact that a recommendation in the Fisher Report was that general education requirements be harmonized throughout the three MAUs, and wanted to know what the President foresees about that. President Gamble acknowledged that the issues were large, but it was important to address the first two critical years in college which greatly affect student success. He noted that most of the problem issues such as this one fit into the middle of a bell curve – issues affecting the greatest number of students at a critical time in their educational careers. So he agrees that it only makes sense for our system to harmonize about what the requirements of general education are and that it would go a long way toward helping students.

Cecile L. commented that she was glad the president had mentioned the cost of books – which she called part of the "educational industrial complex" because it involves things which cost a great deal of money that are outside of the university's control. She shared her thoughts on a couple of points related to the president's comments. Turning students out in a way that they really get educational value for their investment may not necessarily be an efficient process in terms of graduation metrics (it is in terms of quality). Having more students in the classroom, which would be more efficient, means there is less time to spend with each student and the student does not get a deeper learning experience in that environment. For example, she knows of a senior student who never had to utilize the library and she has seen juniors and seniors who have never had to write a term paper because their classes are too large for instructors to require those tasks. In that sense, increasing enrollments does not equate to more value or better learning experiences for students. Similarly, how we go about the process of e-learning is critical to turning out good students. We cannot continue the add-on approach where e-learning might be an overload in a faculty workload or courses are otherwise taught by adjuncts. To take e-learning seriously means it needs to be part of regular faculty workloads and faculty need to have the pedagogy behind both face-to-face and e-learning instruction. We don't want the University of Phoenix approach – she has seen syllabi from those courses and they were appalling. The university needs to excel in e-

learning and invest in it vs. just offering a bunch of distance courses for the sake of offering them. The efficiency of e-learning can collide with the value of the learning.

President Gamble responded that the problems Cecile outlined need to be boiled down to problem statements that can be examined analytically to reach an academic solution set that everyone involved can agree upon. This is fundamentally an academic problem. Brainstorming sessions are needed to start looking at the problems and how to resolve them. He noted the example of fiber optic cable improvements in West Virginia which dramatically increased the demand for e-learning. We, too, have to prepare for that increased demand here in Alaska. The system needs to be part of the solution in addressing the dichotomy of the work in the classroom environment vs. the work associated with distance learning. The information technology dimension needs to be taken into account as well. Once in place, we have to be prepared to utilize it effectively.

Jordan T. stated her interest in how value for the dollar will be defined here. She gave the definition used now in the state of Texas, and the president responded about the “seven solutions” attempt in that state. He agreed about the problems with the methodology of that approach. He emphasized that the value issue should be determined by the students and, ultimately, their success. He said we’ll know what we implement is working when the state legislature receives good feedback from students and their parents, and then the legislature, in turn, is supportive when he goes to Juneau with the budget. Part of that success (and value for our effort) is defined in terms of system efficiency and student retention, along with students being able to get the education they want when they want it. Jordan respectfully disagreed, stating that students aren’t in a position to judge value – they don’t know what they need to

Break and photo shoot: Faculty Senate photograph by Todd Paris on Wood Center Lower Level, followed by short break.

VI Public Comments/Questions

Flora Grabowska, Keith B. Mather Library's librarian, announced Open Access week in October (24-30), and described briefly what it is: "open access" allows anyone anywhere to read one's work online without having to pay for expensive journal subscriptions. The reasoning behind it is that no library can afford all the publication subscriptions to the information that people require. Switching to open access improves access to information which also benefits authors by increasing citation rates and downloads of information. Princeton just unanimously approved open access of their work; and, Harvard did so in 2008. Flora mentioned the goal of this time next year for UAF.

Cecile L. asked Flora about the process of how to become an open access university. Flora noted the process is probably different at each institution, but she suggested that perhaps a subcommittee of Senate look at this and propose a mandate. She's happy to work with them. To move in this direction needs everyone's support from administration to faculty.

Peter W. noted that when he submits a journal article, he's asked if he wishes to make it available via open access. To do so, however, costs about \$3000 an article (versus paying the journal subscription fashort bT:0008 Tc-.0008 Tw[(Peter W)9lty.

Jennifer shared the observation she made when looking at this data in greater detail. She focused on the 181 course sections having more than one incomplete granted in those sections. She paid attention to how many students were in the courses, which programs were involved and where courses were given. She was able to break that down further to the percent of enrollment in each course that was given an Incomplete. Overwhelmingly CDE and the rural campuses are represented by the data.

Rainer N. commented that there are two different issues before them: what to do about Incomplete turning to F, and what to do about all these Incompletes (which is a longer discussion).

Jennifer noted the Faculty Senate needs to address what criteria will be used to determine if an extension can be granted to the one-year period the student has for course completion with the Incomplete.

Jane W. asked Mike E. what percentage of the Incompletes given have further extensions granted beyond one year. Mike didn't have the exact figure, but said it was less than 10%.

Cathy recommended the issue go to Curricular Affairs Committee for more in-depth discussion and to get criteria in place about extensions.

Cathy took a quick hand vote which showed that the majority of senators want the Incomplete to turn to an F as stated in the current policy. So, she will continue to reaffirm at Faculty Alliance that UAF will stick to this grading policy. In light of the President's comments about aligning MAUs, this may be difficult, but UAF will fight for its standards.

Karen G. noted that she is often providing special music at commencement. Would this also be desired at the new hooding ceremony?

Cecile L. was concerned about having two ceremonies, one for the undergraduates and one for the graduate students. Having a service just for the masters' students might be a lesser event than that for the others. Cathy responded that they had talked about that. They want the ceremonies to show off the unique breadth of accomplishments of UAF students. The masters' students would still participate in the larger commencement, but also having the smaller event would provide a chance to more fully recognize their achievements.

Lara H. expressed her concerns about the time commitments of both events and whether faculty would turn out for the Thursday ceremony. Jennifer noted that the opposite situation had also been brought up in earlier discussions – that more faculty might turn out for the shorter ceremony which would have more graduate students participating.

Ken A. asked if the issue of faculty giving final exams on Thursday evenings had been considered, and Cathy responded that they had.

Chancellor Rogers noted the fact that this discussion concerns two severable issues, and there hadn't been comment about the move to a Saturday commencement.

Lara H. suggested reading the title of each master's thesis at the commencement, which would make it more special but not take as long as reading an abstract.

Ken noted problems which have been discussed in the Curricular Affairs Committee about the spring semester calendar, particularly concerning start and end dates of spring semester as well as the issue of final exams on the Saturday before commencement. Any change should be reviewed at Curricular Affairs. Chancellor Rogers noted that reading the titles of theses would probably add about 15-25

www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#177

The main topic of this conference was to promote understanding of academic freedom and the role of shared governance in providing and protecting the voice of faculty, and the underlying tension between faculty and administration that occurs.

She also announced that the executive board meets October 12, and an announcement will go out more broadly soon. There is an October 10 health care meeting for general membership at Gruening 202, to be led by Melanie Arthur. And, the representative assembly will have its meeting in Anchorage in mid-October.

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane announced that their executive board is meeting this Friday in Anchorage.

IX Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

- A. Open Accreditation Forum on Tues., Oct. 4 (3-4 PM, WC Room E-F) – Cathy C.
- B. Chancellor's Diversity Action Committee (CDAC) – vacant seat for Faculty Senate Representative. Cathy asked for a volunteer.

C. Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 177/4)

Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Chair

Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair (Attachment 177/5)

Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair

Jane mentioned the Women Faculty Luncheon tomorrow.

Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

Faculty Appeals & Oversight

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowka, Chair

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair

(Attachment 177/6)

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Convener

Research Advisory Committee – Peter Webley, Chair

D. Other Comments

David V. mentioned that the General Ed Revitalization Committee is looking for a chair. Please send him suggestions. He suggests, in terms of qualifications, that they be tenured faculty, preferably full professor, willing and able and with broad interest and commitment; as well as supportive of the student learning outcomes passed last spring.

Todd R. mentioned the recent American Association for the Advancement of Science Arctic Division 2011 Annual Meeting (AAAS) conference in Dillingham. Topics included rural energy issues and the Pebble Mine issue. More information may be found online at:

<http://www.arcticaaas.org/meetings/2011/index.html>

X Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:08 PM.

ATTACHMENT 177/1
UAF Faculty Senate #177, October 3, 2011
Information from the Registrar's Office

| TERM | 201001 | | | | | |
|------------|---------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Row Labels | Sum of ENR | Sum of INC_GIVEN | Sum of FAILED | INC as % of Enrolled | % of INC's rolled to F | |
| Fairbanks | | | | | | |

ATTACHMENT 177/2

UAF Faculty Senate #177, October 3, 2011

From: "John C. \"Jake\" Poole" <<mailto:jake.poole@alaska.edu>jake.poole@alaska.edu>

Date: September 16, 2011 3:28:27 PM AKDT

To: Catherine Cahill <<mailto:cfcahill@alaska.edu>cfcahill@alaska.edu>

Subject: **Masters Hooding and Commencement 2013**

Cathy,

We discussed both of these topics earlier this summer. Here is the latest info.

Grad school with support from Advancement is planning the event for the Thursday evening before commencement (May 11); this will be the first event of commencement weekend. The Ceremony will take place in the Davis Concert Hall with a reception in the Great Hall; we are currently working on a time line.

Students will sit by college/school and their faculty advisor/committee chair will come forward with the student and be hooded by the faculty member and the Dean. The Chancellor, Provosts and VC's will be on stage with the Deans.

Commencement 2013

The cabinet has been presented with the proposal to change the Commencement Ceremony starting in 2013 to a Saturday event from a Sunday event. The main reason for the change is to allow parents Sunday to travel home, staff and faculty not working on Sunday and not have the Mother's Day conflict. Finals and grades will not be affected.

Rehearsal and the student picnic will be held on Friday with other pre commencement activities on Saturday morning. All parties involved including Fairbanks High Schools, registrar, student service, Provost and university advancement have said this is a good idea. We are looking into changing the start time to 1pm this would ensure that we would not conflict with Monroe High School's graduation that take onr nrem t 4:30.a

e to maensure the facultysSenatehis suppoi

me

Signers Hall

bank,fAalaskg99775()TjT*0140 Tc0 Tw907-474-2600 Offvic

ATTACHMENT 177/3
UAF Faculty Senate #177, October 3, 2011
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

DRAFT MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered wholly or in part by distance delivery, and all existing courses adapted or converted to distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the Faculty Senate. Furthermore, if the mode of distance delivery changes, then the course must be re-reviewed by the appropriate committee.

Modes of distance delivery are those defined by the UA Office of Academic Affairs & Research: Independent Learning/Correspondence; Audio Conferencing; Video Conferencing; Web Meeting; Live Television/UATV; and Online/Web Delivered.

Effective: Spring 2012

Rationale: The Faculty Senate has primary authority to initiate, develop, review and approve academic criteria, regulation and policy (Faculty Senate Constitution, Article 1, Section 1). This includes curriculum review.

Distance delivery methods are fundamentally different methods of communication than face-to-face instruction. Effective instruction by distance delivery requires adapting or designing content for new formats and modes of communication. It cannot be assumed that a course approved for face-to-face delivery automatically passes review for a different mode of delivery. The structure and content of courses intended wholly or in part for distance delivery must be separately reviewed.

This motion applies to all distance delivery courses within UAF, whether listed by an academic department, a rural campus, or the Center for Distance Education (CDE).

ATTACHMENT 177/4
UAF Faculty Senate #177, October 3, 2011
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes CAC meeting

Dana T. noted that he is willing to send one or two members to the annual AACU General Education meeting taking place in late January or early February.

Dana asked about what sense of a timeline David and Carrie had for accomplishing the tasks ahead. Carrie and David expressed guarded optimism about what could be accomplished this academic year.

Dana shared some good suggestions about how to approach assessment: 1.) NSSE results cover the areas of teamwork and globalization; 2.) Writing and Oral components could be built into the Ethics piece or capstone courses or [English] 211 / 213; 3.) ETS proficiency profile tool could be used. Another approach would be to put writing projects in every capstone course within a degree program. LEAP also speaks to assessment. It was noted that 211 or 213 could be used as the capstone for the AA degree. Baccalaureate capstones would be more specific to majors, of course.

Dana mentioned sending a web link related to program by program techniques in use (such as portfolios) to integrate core requirements into university education.

Everyone agreed that a simpler, holistic approach is needed. Carrie noted that a new standing committee is needed just to assess the new general education core, and that Core Review Committee has enough to do with regular semester-to-semester business with petitions and curriculum.

B. 'Stacked' courses -- Postponed discussion for next meeting.

C. Courses taught at high schools for high school students with UAF 100-level designators

Dana suggested bringing in guests for discussing this topic (Tech Prep, instructors like Victor Zinger or Shannon Atkinson). Doug Goering mentioned that there is now an Engineering Curriculum Academy in one of the high schools. He's partial to the AP model which doesn't fit with the academy approach. The idea with the academy is that students would take several 0xx-level courses which would add up to receiving some college credit (such as being able to skip the intro-level engineering courses). That high school students could earn 3 college credits is a big selling point for the academy with parents because they didn't have to pay for the credits.

Ideas mentioned in the discussion included: bring h.s. students to the campus for courses; if taught at the high school, the same UAF college midterms and finals must be used. Cons noted: having no authority over a high school faculty teaching a college course; how would such a course be assessed; students miss out on the 'college pace' of the course when a semester course is taught in the high school over nine months. Some areas are pretty fuzzy, for example what course would constitute 'entry-level' math? Lillian recommended using CLEP in the process.

4. New business: discussion of Dean's Council suggestions for GERC

(Points of the recommendations touched upon in the discussion at 3.A. above.)

ATTACHMENT 177/5

UAF Faculty Senate #177, October 3, 2011

Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Unit Criteria Meeting Minutes

4pm 30 August 2011

Attending: Winfree, Golux, Bandopadhyay, Jensen, Jones, Alexeev, Barboza

Visiting from CEM: Chen, Misra

1. Discussion of CEM Criteria

Page 4. 11 lines from bottom of page. Insert "FOR EXAMPLE" after parentheses

Page 4. Remove "i. ENGAGE IN ADVISING AND MENTORING STUDENTS" as it is redundant to the general description of teaching criteria in B.

Page 5. The following statement in the specific teaching criteria for Professor is not clear and should be revised. "THERE SHOULD BE A RECORD OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF ADDITIONAL

ATTACHMENT 177/6

UAF Faculty Senate #177, October 3, 2011

Submitted by the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee

**GAAC: Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate
2011-08-31 Meeting Minutes**

Present:

Voting: Orion Lawlor, Vincent Cee, Elisabeth Nadin, Chung-Sang Ng, Sue Renes

Ex officio: Timothy Bartholomaeus, Anita Hughes, Laura Bender, Larry Duffy