

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Jayne Harvie

474-7964 jbharvie@alaska.edu

For Audio conferencing:

Toll-free #: 1-800-893-8850

Participant PIN: 1109306

AGENDA

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #180

Monday, February 6, 2012

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

- | | | | |
|------|----|---|--------|
| 1:00 | I | Call to Order – Catherine Cahill | 4 Min. |
| | | A. Roll Call | |
| | | B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #179 | |
| | | C. Adoption of Agenda | |
| 1:04 | II | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions | 1 Min. |
| | | A. Motions Approved: | |
| | | 1. Motion to approve vg24Jticiceate i Balkng #and Pasty 6Arts | |

2:10	VII	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:15	VIII	Guest Speaker	
	A.	Claudia Lampman, Professor of Psychology, UAA Topic: Student Incivility, Bullying and Aggression	15 Min.
2:30	IX	Governance Reports	10 Min.

Topic:

Student Topic:

Student

ATTACHMENT 180/1
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to more clearly define the academic credit hour requirements for laboratory instruction at UAF and include this definition in the UAF Catalog (currently found in the 2011-2012 UAF Catalog, page 247).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: Redefine the academic credit hour requirements for laboratory instruction to bring UAF academic policies in line with **UA Regulation 10.04.090** (emphases added below):

Evaluation of Student Performance and Course Level Definitions.

- F. Course Numbering system
- 2. Academic Credit Courses

Courses with these numbers count toward undergraduate and graduate degrees and certificates as described below. Each course includes a component for evaluation of student performance. Student effort is indicated by credit hours. **One credit hour represents three hours of student work** per week for a 15-week semester (e.g., one class-hour of lecture and two hours of study or **three class-hours of laboratory**) for a minimum of 2250 minutes of total student engagement, which may include exam periods.

[[]] – Deletion

CAPS – Addition

Underlined – Faculty Senate action from Meeting #175 (May 2, 2011) to be incorporated into the next Catalog.

From the 2011-2012 UAF Catalog, page 247:

Course Credits

One credit represents satisfactory completion of 800 minutes (**1 HOUR/WEEK**) of lecture, 1,600 or 2,400 minutes of laboratory (or studio or other similar activity), whichever is appropriate. (It is understood that an average student will be expected to spend 1,600 (**2 HOURS/WEEK**) minutes of study and preparation outside of class in order to meet the learning objectives for the unit of credit in lecture.)

I3

OR

COMPONENT MUST INCLUDE A JUSTIFICATION (IN TERMS OF REQUIRED STUDENT WORK MINUTES OUTSIDE OF LABORATORY) IF THE LABORATORY DOES NOT REQUIRE AT LEAST 2400 LAB MINUTES PER CREDIT.

The following standards establish the minimum requirements for an academic unit of credit:

1. 800 minutes of lecture (plus 1,600 minutes of study)
2. 1,600 or 2,400 minutes of laboratory (or studio or other similar activity) + **800 OR 0 MINUTES OF OUTSIDE STUDENT WORK.**
3. 2,400-4,800 minutes of supervised practicum
4. 2,400-8,000 minutes of internship (or externship, clinical)
5. 2,400-4,800 minutes of supervised scholarly activity

Credit hours may not be divided, except half-credit hours may be granted at the appropriate rate. For short courses and classes of less than one semester in duration, course hours may not be compressed into fewer than three days per credit. Any existing semester-long course that is to be offered in a “compressed to less than six weeks” format must be approved by the college or school's curriculum

ATTACHMENT 180/2
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

1. Draft UAF Mission Statement:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks integrates teaching, research, and engagement, emphasizing the circumpolar north and its diverse peoples, as it prepares students for careers and leading roles in their communities.

2. Revised Draft UAF Mission Statement:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks integrates teaching, research, and engagement, emphasizing the circumpolar north and its diverse peoples, as it educates students for careers, leading roles in their communities, and lifelong learning.

Current UAF Mission Statement:

The University of Alaska Fairbanks, the nation's northernmost Land, Sea and Space Grant university and international research center, advances and disseminates knowledge through teaching, research and public service with an emphasis on 035 -1aTphasiircumpolar nNrth and iheir pAenricas nrhtc sniversity --prmmoes

ATTACHMENT 180/3
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

1) Student Information

Students shall be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.

2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum

Evaluation of the CORE curriculum shall include course assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.

3) Programmatic assessment

Each degree and certificate program shall establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning

An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of activities and student support services will be conducted.

The chair of each department (or equivalent as identified by the Dean or Director) shall prepare a report at least **EVERY TWO YEARS** [[four years]] summarizing the Educational Effectiveness program for each certificate and degree program offered by that department. The report shall include a summary of the following:

- A. Student outcome goals and objectives of the program,
- B. The methods and criteria used to evaluate whether the goals and objectives are being met,
- C. A description of what information is collected annually, and
- D. How the results of such information are being used to improve the curriculum.

The report shall be presented to the dean or director's office **AND THE ACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT ASSISTANT IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE BY THE END OF 9-MONTH FACULTY CONTRACTS IN MAY** [[during the month of May]]. At least some information gathering for this process shall occur annually.

Once an educational effectiveness evaluation program has been implemented for the core, the core review committee of the faculty senate shall prepare a report, at least biannually, summarizing the educational effectiveness of the components of the core curriculum. This report shall be similar in content to the report described above for individual programs but shall provide a summary for the components of the core curriculum. The components of the Core may be summarized in the report on a rotational basis, but at least some information should be gathered annually.

		OR 3. Comprehensive assignments of other types, such as a report, a construction project or meal preparation (or....), can be evaluated by a standard rubric.	
	Prepared for career {Optional: Returns tend to be low}	Alumni survey addressing employment, and sufficiency of preparation to carry out job. (Should be specific as to weaknesses and strengths.) OR Written assessment of employers or employer group about skills of employed graduates. (The information can be collected orally...e.g., at an advisory committee meeting... and written down by program faculty or staff.)	Distribute at regular intervals, but at least every two years recommended except for very small programs; must maintain contact with alums to improve response rate. OR Collect information from employers at least every two years.

<date revised and by whom >

Important: At least once per year, the faculty responsible for the program must collectively review the information and decide (1) whether there is an area or area(s) where learning outcomes need improvement and (2) what changes need to be made to bring about the improvement. These could be changes in curriculum (e.g., a new course), but they also might be smaller changes. For example, there could be agreement to add additional reading or writing assignments to a given course, or to change the subject matter covered in part of a course. (3) Any changes made should be documented in the Assessment Summary Report. (4) Further, assessment information should be examined after the change(s) are implemented, to see if they have been effective.

Review is facilitated if the faculty or staff members who are primarily responsible for assessment reporting summarize the information collected before the faculty meet to consider it.

Programs with specialized accreditation that must follow an assessment plan different from this model are free to do so. Programs that have other special needs can request to use a different plan. Programs that

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
<< Baccalaureate Program >>
<<School/College Name Here>>

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose	Intended Objectives/Outcomes	Assessment Criteria and Procedures
---	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------

	be low for surveys.}	employment, and sufficiency of preparation to carry out job. (Should be specific as to weaknesses and strengths.) OR Written assessment of employers or employer group about skills of employed graduates. (The information can be collected orally...e.g., at an advisory committee meeting... and written down by program faculty or staff.)	every two years recommended except for very small programs; must maintain contact with alums to improve response rate. OR Collect information from employers at least every two years.

<date revised and by whom >

Important: At least once per year, the faculty responsible for the program must collectively review the information and decide (1) whether there is an area or area(s) where learning outcomes need improvement and (2) what changes need to be made to bring about the improvement. These could be changes in curriculum (e.g., a new course), but they also might be smaller changes. For example, there could be agreement to add additional reading or writing assignments to a given course, or to change the subject matter covered in part of a course. (3) Any changes made should be documented in the Assessment Summary Report. (4) Further, assessment information should be examined after the change(s) are implemented, to see if they have been effective.

Review is facilitated if the faculty or staff members who are primarily responsible for assessment reporting summarize the information collected before the faculty meet to consider it.

Programs with specialized accreditation that must follow an assessment plan different from this model are free to do so. Programs that have other special needs can request to use a different plan. Programs that want to collect any sort of additional information above and beyond this model are free to do so. Finally, programs that have consistently implemented a different plan for at least three years may continue with that plan if it meets basic requirements (see program review).

Note that for large programs or classes, it is fine to subsample; it's not necessary to collect or review *every* paper or exam from a class of 100 students; a sample size of 10/year should be adequate and more than 20 per year of a particular assignment is probably not going to add a lot of additional information. Consider culling the work of "F" students from the sample, since by definition it's not expected that they have met the intended learning outcomes.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
 << Graduate Program >>
 <<School/College Name Here >>

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose	Intended Objectives/Outcomes	Assessment Criteria and Procedures	Implementation (what, when, who)
<p>MISSION STATEMENT: Unit specific</p> <p>GOAL STATEMENT: Prepare students to be effective researchers or faculty members or to have leading roles in [subject area]. (Will vary)</p>	Strong technical writing skills in field	Thesis or project evaluated according to standard rubric	Graduate advisory committee and department chair, when reviewing final draft of thesis or project.
	Ability to formulate a research topic, gather data, and interpret it according to the standards of the field OR Capable of creative writing or performance	Thesis or project or performance or exhibition evaluated according to standard rubric (also may include evaluation of thesis proposal if that is a requirement of the department)	Graduate advisory committee and department chair, when reviewing final draft of thesis or project.
	Conduct research at the national standard of quality for the field (most appropriate for Ph.D. programs) Prepared for career {Optional: Publication not a priority for some programs}	Student or alumni refereed publications in journals or other appropriate venue for field, based on research while a student	Publication list, perhaps including impact factors or other assessments of the quality of the publication venue. Update at least annually.
	Strong oral communication (or teaching) skills, to both technical and student or public audience.	1. Oral thesis or project defense evaluated according to standard rubric OR 2. Classroom teaching or public presentation	1. Audience evaluates according to standard rubric 2. IAS and mentor evaluation OR audience evaluation
	Expert knowledge of the discipline	1. Comprehensive examination evaluated	1. Comprehensive exam committee

		<p>according to rubric; this should be somewhat specific as to any deficient areas.</p> <p>2. OR Thesis/project + oral defense evaluation; this should be somewhat specific as to any deficient areas..</p>	<p>2. Thesis/project committee</p>
--	--	---	------------------------------------

Prepared for career in field
 {Optional: Returns tend to be low}

Alumni survey addressing employment, and sufficiency of preparation to carry out job. (Should be specific as to weaknesses and strengths.)

OR

Written input from local employers or employer organization on specific strengths and weaknesses. (Might be gathered orally and summarized in writing

Programs with separate accreditation that must follow an assessment plan different from this model are free to do so. Programs that have special needs can request to use a different plan. Programs that want to collect any sort of additional information above and beyond this model are free to do so. Finally,

ATTACHMENT 180/5
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes
Nov 23 2011, 3:30-4:30 pm Kayak

academic career, and charging points against their grade for an extension. The problem of repeat offenders was mentioned.

Proposed motion:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to require that all new courses offered wholly or in part by **ASYNCHRONOUS** distance delivery, and all existing courses adapted or converted to **ASYNCHRONOUS** distance delivery, must be approved by the appropriate subcommittee of the Faculty Senate -- continue sitting on this puppy???

Several committee members noted that their faculty feel this is a departmental issue and departments should police it. Rainer noted the issue had actually come up because of an undergraduate course being offered by a department that doesn't have an undergraduate program. Currently there's nothing to trigger a review of courses that is associated with delivery mode changes. It's not obvious from looking at the catalog descriptions, for example, what various modes of delivery exist for courses.

(This topic was the last to be discussed right before it was time to adjourn the meeting.)

Review of BOR policies lab credit hour distribution --we're not in compliance!!

Transfer policies -- not in compliance? A+??? **ANYTHING ELSE????**

B. NEW BUSINESS:

1. SUBMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF

3. Suggested change in FS Bylaws:

Add to CAC's one-sentence membership statement in the bylaws, the sentence:

"In addition to the ex officio member(s) appointed by the Provost, the committee may add ex officio members for one-year terms as deemed necessary."

The committee agreed to add the statement to their bylaws. Rainer will take a motion to the Administrative Committee and then to the Faculty Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 PM.

¹Nov. 23, 2011 GERC Notes
Committee members Fall 2011:

Dave Valentine, SNRAS	Carrie Baker, CLA (Bethany Marks SP 2012?)
Leah Berman, CNSM	Derick Burleson, CLA
Anne Armstrong, SoED	Gerald McBeath, CLA
Alex Fitts, CLA – Chair	Sarah Fowell, CNSM
Greg Goering, SOM	Linda Hapsmith, Academic Advising Center
Dana Thomas, Vice Provost	Mahla Strohmaier, CRCD
Mike Koskey CRCD ?	Still no member from CEM

The committee's charge for this year is to implement the Student Learning Outcomes and Objectives that were passed last year. We are beginning by looking at a few different models of how some other institutions have handled this (mainly schools that have also adopted LEAP objectives). This could take the form of a strict core, a distribution model, a series of designators, a hybrid model, or even something entirely different. We have also discussed the possibility of a first-year experience and/ or a capstone experience. For the next meeting, committee members have been asked to come up with a draft of what a model that would work at UAF might look like, given Board of Regents policy, degree requirements, deans' recommendations, and ramifications for transfer students from within the UA system and from elsewhere.

²Bethany Marx is an Assistant Professor of Theatre in her third year at UAF. She is willing and able to serve as Carrie Baker's replacement on GERC for Spring 2012. During her time at UAF, Bethany has revised existing courses and designed many new courses for the Department of Theatre and served as the point person to the appropriate committees for those curricular changes.

ATTACHMENT 180/6
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes for Tues, Dec 13, 2011
1:30-3:00 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Melanie Arthur, Ellen Lopez, Shawn Russell, Derek Sikes, Kayt Sunwood,
Jane Weber, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Nilima Hullavarad
Members absent: Jessica Larsen, Jenny Liu, Johnny Payne

BOR Policy and Regulations

CSW has been assigned the task to review some of the Board of Regents Policy and Regulations, details found on website: <http://www.alaska.edu/bor/policy-regulations/>.

Shawn mentioned at the last meeting that only some sections have mention of 'sexual orientation', whereas some sections have left it out. Changes were suggested to various sections including:

P04.01.020 to improve the treatment of the term 'discrimination' and make it consistent with usage throughout the Policy and Regulations. To reduce redundancy this section was referred to

ATTACHMENT 180/7

UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Minutes of the Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee

November 15, 2011

Attending: Cindy Hardy, Dana Greci, Sandra Wildfeuer, Amy Barnsley, Sarah Stanley, Curt Szuberla, David Maxwell, Deseree Salvador

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

BOR Policy: Cindy e-mailed the portions of the BOR policy we have been asked to review for the Faculty Alliance. We will address these at the next meeting.

Learning Commons Update: The Learning Commons subcommittee met with Bella Gerlich, Dean of the Rasmuson Library. She suggested that the Learning Commons might be more appropriate on the 4th floor rather than the 3rd floor, as we had been discussing. She noted that the Learning Commons is on the Library Strategic Plan, which will be discussed in January. She also wants to evaluate student needs, though the subcommittee did a needs assessment last year before she arrived. She does not want to rush the process, though she acknowledged all that we have done in this process.

Gerlich has offered us two tables and dividers to be set up on the third floor next semester. These can be reserved for tutoring and may be used by students when they are not reserved.

We discussed the delay of the learning center/learning commons process—and this means more delay since the original Faculty Senate motion mandating the establishment of a learning center. We discussed strategies for moving this process along. Some frustration was expressed.

SADA Committee definition: We looked at the committee definition in the Faculty Senate Handbook. description and considered changes. We reviewed the representation of interested group membership. Cindy will draw up a draft motion to change the committee definition at the next meeting.

Data requests: Dana Greci reported on data being requested by the Department of D

possibility that—at least in math classes—failure is often simply a matter of lack of skills. We will continue this discussion and develop action items at the December meeting.

Next meeting: December 13, 12:30-2pm.

ATTACHMENT 180/8

UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for December 13, 2011**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 10:05 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Castellini, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Julie Joly, Alexandra Oliveira, Channon Price

Excused: Stephen Brown, Joy Morrison

Absent: Franz Meyer

III. Report from Joy

Joy will be gone for December and January.

Diane reported that Libby Roderick's presentation on Difficult Discussions was well attended: over 20 faculty members came and enjoyed the hands-on workshop. There were a lot of questions, and faculty indicated further interest in this topic.

UNAC will be sponsoring the next faculty development opportunity in February on the topic of bullying.

IV. Old Business

1. Faculty survey

Josef met again with Cyndee West to discuss UNAC putting together the survey on faculty development, but Cyndee requested that our committee provide a list of topics to include on the survey. We discussed the issue of restricting the survey to UAF faculty only and including UAFT faculty as well. Mike reminded us that we need to include all UAF faculty, not just those that are present in Fairbanks. As the future UNAC VP, Melanie Arthur will be helpful in creating the survey. She has a lot of experience developing surveys, and she has a lot of experience with our committee as a former member.

We discussed including the following topics on the survey:

1. What kinds of sessions do faculty want?
2. What kind of feedback is there on recent sessions?
3. How are faculty meeting their development needs?
4. Sessions on globalization – what do international faculty members need, and how can we be more aware of these needs and therefore more helpful?
5. What are the needs of more experienced faculty?

The FDAI committee also discussed whether Joy can have a ranking system based on need since junior faculty have the greatest need and can no longer be given preference for funding based on their newness.

ATTACHMENT 180/9
UAF Faculty Senate #180, February 6, 2012
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate
2011-12-06 Meeting Minutes**

Voting Members: Orion Lawlor, Sue Renes, Donie Bret-Harte, Elisabeth Nadin
Guest: Lillian Misel

We continue to work our way through our curriculum list.

FISH 645, 670, and 672 (2-4 GNC) are approved.

16-GPCh is approved.

The counseling internship III and IV courses 29-GNC and 30-GNC are approved, even without an instructor assigned yet.

Discuss policies for post-baccalaureate certificates: are these under the purview of the graduate school? There are currently only three such programs, in [Construction Management](#), [Statistics](#), and [Education](#).

Pro: students already apply to the graduate admissions process, pay graduate tuition, get graduate financial aid, and are taking 600-level courses. If they weren't under the graduate school, where would they go?

Con: students don't file advancement to candidacy like more typical Master's degrees, and some may not even have Bachelor's degrees yet.

The graduate school added a new requirement for an exit survey, asking graduating graduate students their opinions on UAF. Some have wondered how an anonymous survey can be required for graduation; the way this works is students print the end-of-survey page and turn it in to the graduate college.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Jan 24 at 3pm.

**GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate
2011-11-22 Meeting Minutes**

Voting Members: Orion Lawlor, Vincent Cee, Chung-Sang Ng, Sue Renes, Donie Bret-Harte, Elisabeth Nadin, Xiong Zhang
Ex officio: Timothy Bartholomaeus, Anita Hughes, Karen Jensen, Larry Duffy
Guest: Lillian Misel

We worked our way through all the courses ready for approval on [our curriculum list](#).

Approved this meeting:

8-GNC: New GEOS 436/636 – Programming and Automation for Geoscientists, a 2 credit pass/fail course on using matlab and shell scripts for automated data analysis.

10-GCDR: Drop GEOS 434/634 – Remote sensing of Cryosphere, an elective that was rarely

21-GNC: New GEOS 431/631 Foundations of Geophysics, a single-course replacement for 620 and 602 proposed by those courses' instructors.

23-GNC: New GEOG 6xx: Sustainable Livelihoods and Community Well-Being, a new elective on sustainability.

GAAC approved the mouldy course drops from ED, CEM, Biology, Chemistry, and Wildlife, all listed at the [bottom of the GAAC curriculum page](#).

President Gamble has asked the faculty senates to review the [UA Policy & Regulations](#) for readability, relevance, and consistency with the law and our [collective bargaining agreement](#). GAAC has been assigned [Chapter 09.05. Employment of Students](#), and (once the Provost's office has reviewed it) [Chapter 10.02. Academic Administrative Organization](#). Step one is to flag anything we think may need changing by mid January; by the middle of spring semester we should be finished with our review, at which point we'll trade sections with UAA's faculty senate.

CNSM Dean Layer would like to adjust the Annual Report of Advisory Committee requirements, to make them every year (not just the second year) and always include a plan (not just those within two years of the graduation limit). Many departments do file these every year already; probably a majority of students already do these. Some departments have vociferously opposed the more frequent reporting in the past. It might be difficult for a first-year PhD students to produce a plan; or for overworked advisors to produce more reports. Nonetheless, GAAC recommends accepting Dean Layer's plan.

Discuss policies for post-baccalaureate certificates: are these under the purview of the graduate school? There are currently only three such programs, in [Construction Management](#), [Statistics](#), and [Education](#). Discussion will continue online.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Dec 6 at 3pm.