

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Jayne Harvie  
314 Signers' Hall  
474-7964 fysenate@uaf.edu

For Audioconferencing:

Toll-free #: 1-800-893-8850  
Participants PIN: 1109306

**A G E N D A**

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #163

Monday, December 7, 2009

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

- |      |       |   |         |
|------|-------|---|---------|
| 1:00 | I     | Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn   | 5 Min.  |
|      | A.    | Roll Call   |         |
|      | B.    | Approval of Minutes to Meeting #162   |         |
|      | C.    | Adoption of Agenda  |         |
| 1:05 | II    | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions   | 5 Min.  |
|      | A.    | Motions Approved:   |         |
|      |       | 1. Motion to Reaffirm the Journalism Department Unit Criteria   |         |
|      | B.    | Motions Pending: none   |         |
| 1:10 | III   | Public Comments/Questions   | 10 Min. |
| 1:20 | IV    | A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn   | 5 Min.  |
|      | B.    | President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill   | 5 Min.  |
| 1:30 | V     | A. Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers   | 5 Min.  |
|      | B.    | Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs   | 5 Min.  |
| 1:40 | VI    | Governance Reports  | 5 Min.  |
|      | A.    | Staff Council – Martin Klein  |         |
|      | B.    | ASUAF – Adrian Triebel  |         |
|      | C.    | UAFT/UNAC   |         |
| 1:45 | VII   | Guest Speaker   | 15 Min. |
|      | A.    | Karl Kowalski, Executive Director, OIT User Services<br>Topic: Current distance/online delivery systems (e.g., Blackboard, eLive) and planned technology changes to distance delivery and other campus systems. |         |
| 2:00 | BREAK |   |         |
| 2:10 | VIII  | New Business  | 10 Min. |
|      | A.    | Motion to Approve a Minor in American Sign Language, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 163/1)   |         |
|      | B.    | Motion to Restrict Core Natural Science Courses to Hands-on Laboratory Experiences, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 163/2)  |         |



ATTACHMENT 163/1  
UAF Faculty Senate #163, December 7, 2009  
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Minor in American Sign Language.

EFFECTIVE:            Fall 2010

RATIONALE:           See the program proposal #23-UNP on file in the Governance Office,  
                             314 Signers' Hall.

Requires completion of 15 credits from the following: ASLG F101, ASLG F202,  
ASLG F203, ASLG F204, ASLG 205, and ASLG F110 (a 1-credit course that may be  
repeated for up to 3 credits).

\*\*\*\*\*

**Minor, American Sign Language**

The objectives of the American Sign Language Department (a part of the TVC academic programs) are to provide a depth and breadth of knowledge of the American Deaf culture and history. Each student will be proficient in their ability to sign clearly, to be understood and to comprehend native signers. Students of ASLG will have a greater understanding of diversity, and empathy for people with differing abilities. Critical thinking skills will be developed while acquiring signing skills in ASL. Students will be required to participate in community events and to fully develop an ethical responsibility to the community in which they live.

**Proposed Catalog Layout:**

1. Complete a minimum of 15 credits from the following classes: \*  
ASLG 101 – American Sign Language I - 3 credits  
ASLG 202 – American Sign Language II - 3 credits  
ASLG 203 – American Sign Language III - 3 credits  
ASLG 204 – American Sign Language IV - 3 credits  
ASLG 205 – American Sign Language V - 3 credits  
ASLG 110 – American Sign Language Practice - 1 credit – Can be repeated for up to 3 credits
  
2. Minimum credits required.....15

\*Student must earn a C grade or better in each course.

Note: Courses designated as humanities that are taken for the minor may also be used to fulfill humanities distribution requirements for the B.A. degree. Courses that are taken for the minor may not be used to fulfill the core Perspectives requirements.

**Program Justification and Impacts:**

Creating a minor for American Sign Language will provide a more complete education for our students. We have students who are taking three or four of these ASLG classes who do not go on to take the final three to six credits as it is not listed as a minor. If students have the opportunity to get a minor by taking one or two more courses, this will provide an opportunity for the instructors to engage the students and for the students to interact with the deaf community, to work on projects within the community and to more fully develop an awareness of the American Deaf community a04 T

ATTACHMENT 163/2  
UAF Faculty Senate #163, December 7, 2009  
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to restrict Core natural science courses to those which possess hands-on laboratory experiences. Courses with virtual labs do not satisfy the requirement.

EFFECTIVE:            Fall 2010

RATIONALE:            Science is like swimming. You have to do it to be able to do it.

ATTACHMENT 163/3  
UAF Faculty Senate #163, December 7, 2009

**Outcome:**

**Notes:**

The calculation is intended to allocate 35 senate seats proportionately across the UAF faculty units.

To determine the number of senators, the result of the calculation is rounded to the nearest integer.

If a unit's score is above 0.50 (and thus rounds up to 1), then the unit qualifies for representation.

The minimum number of faculty to qualify for separate representation works out to 8.8 FTFE.

However, the minimum number of senators is 2, so no qualifying unit receives only 1 senator.

To explore the effect of accounting for split appointments, a separate calculation was conducted using only the adjustment for those faculty with less than 0.75 FTFE appointments. Faculty with split appointments were counted in their academic department. The result was surprisingly similar to that of the much more arduous method of accounting for split appointments, with different results only for IAB and CNSM. In the calculation for split appointments IAB did not qualify for separate representation, whereas in the calculation using split appointments they did qualify. However, GI and IARC qualified for separate representation in both calculations, with the minimum 2 senators each. CNSM retained 6 senators, while in the calculation for split appointments CNSM dropped from 6 to 4 senators. CLA dropped from 8 to 7 senators in both calculations. The total number of senators in this reapportionment was 37.

The simplest method would be to use integer numbers of faculty in each unit, not accounting for either partial FTFE or split appointments. Faculty with split appointments would be counted in their academic department. For AY08 data, the FTFE adjustment did not change the outcome; calculations with and without it resulted in the same Faculty Senate apportionment.

<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>Senate Reps existing AY08</b>	<b>Senate Reps NEW full calculation</b>	<b>Senate Reps WITHOUT Adjustment for Joint Appt</b>	<b>Senate Reps WITHOUT ANY adjustments</b>
CLA	8	7	7	7
CNSM	6	4	6	6
GI	0	2	2	2
IAB	0	2	0	0
IARC	0	2	2	2
Total # elected senators	36	39	37	37

**Issues identified:**

1) The data on the numbers and appointment details of faculty in the different schools, colleges, and institutes were difficult to obtain. The details of faculty appointments are not stored electronically anywhere at UAF, and they change annually with the faculty workloads. For this reapportionment, the Provost's Office compiled the data by hand from faculty appointment letters. The effort required considerable staff time and took three months (November, 2008 to February, 2009). This is a major weakness of the current system and an alternative must be found.



Options: (1) The reapportionment calculation could be simplified, to drop the adjustments for the details of faculty appointments (partial FTFEs, split appointments). The summary above describes the effect of these changes as applied to AY08 data. The Provost's Office (Sarah Lewis) states that they would be able to provide counts of faculty per unit based on electronic records. The counts from those records would still have to be hand-edited to remove duplicate entries (faculty with joint appointments), but the level of staff time required would be greatly reduced.

2) The election procedure is decoupled from the reapportionment procedure. The root of the problem is the way in which split appointments are handled. For reapportionment, the Bylaws specify that faculty with less than 0.75 FTFE appointments and faculty with split appointments are to be counted as fractional FTFE. However, in elections, "A faculty member may vote for Senate representatives in only one unit. That unit must be the unit of primary appointment or, in the case of evenly split appointment, the unit of the faculty member's choice." In other words, faculty are fractional for the purpose of reapportionment, but quantized for the purpose of elections. This throws the concept of proportional representation into disarray. Furthermore, there is no central authority to track which unit a faculty member votes in. Because the units run their own elections, faculty might be invited to vote in all units in which they have appointments.

Short of allowing faculty to cast fractional votes in accordance with their fractional appointments, the Faculty Affairs Committee did not see any way to conduct apportionment with split appointments and still maintain proportional representation on the Senate. FAC discussed possibilities for handling fractional votes, and ultimately decided that the process would be unreasonably complex.

Options: (1) Follow the current Bylaws as written, and concede that representation on the Faculty Senate is not proportional to the number of faculty in each unit. Under this option, the Faculty Senate would conduct complex reapportionment using data on split appointments, yet those faculty would vote in only one of the units in which they hold appointments. (2) Reconcile the reapportionment and election procedures by returning to apportionment in which faculty are counted in only one unit, i.e., the unit in which they have the largest appointment. In the case of evenly split appointments, the faculty could be counted in the tenure-granting unit. If instead the faculty with evenly split appointments choose which unit to vote in, someone will have to keep track of the choices and ensure that these choices are applied to both reapportionment (managed by the Faculty Senate) and elections (managed by the units).

3) The Faculty Senate Bylaws state that reapportionment is to be conducted "in even numbered years or upon two-thirds vote of the Senate." We believe that reapportionment has actually been done at much longer intervals, on the order of 5-10 years. This probably reflects the sense of the Faculty Senate governance that the distribution of faculty at UAF changes on that time scale.

Options: Consider changing the Bylaws to lengthen the interval between scheduled reapportionments to at least 5 years, leaving in place the mechanism to conduct reapportionment at any time upon a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

4) The size of the Faculty Senate is, according to the Bylaws, intended to be "approximately 41 members" with "approximately 35 members" elected by the faculty. However, using calculations specified in the Bylaws, the new reapportionment requires 39 elected members.

Options: (1) Increase the size of the Faculty Senate, or (2) change the Bylaws. Possibilities: change the way split appointments are counted; raise the threshold for a unit to qualify for representation; specify that the smallest units must be combined until the number of elected senators does not exceed 36; and/or remove the stipulation that each unit have a minimum of 2 senators, and allow small units to be represented by 1 senator.

5) A related issue is the election procedure. The Bylaws state that “Election shall be held by the academic units or the Senate office for the research institutes to provide representatives to the Senate...” Having the Senate office run elections for a “conglomerate group” of research institutes seems reasonable. However, once a research institute qualifies for separate representation on the Senate, it will have the same organizational ability to run elections as the academic units have.

Options: (1) Continue to have the Senate office run elections for representatives of the research institutes (GI, IARC, and IAB), regardless of whether they are represented jointly or separately. (2) Change the Bylaws to assign the responsibility of elections to the represented units (not just academic units). The Senate office would run elections only for “conglomerate groups” of small units that must be grouped together for representation. (3) Change the Bylaws to have the Senate office run all elections for Faculty Senate representatives, including the academic units.

#### **Faculty Affairs Committee recommendations, from the meeting minutes of March 11, 2009:**

For AY 2009-10, the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate continue with the current method of apportionment, in which research faculty are represented by 2 senators and any faculty member who has an appointment in a tenure-granting unit must vote with that unit.

However, even with this scheme, the Faculty Senate bylaws must be revised to address issues such as setting up a method for holding elections for research faculty representatives. FAC recommends asking the Provost’s Office to run these elections, and also keep information about faculty workloads and percentages in each unit. (*Note: FAC did not realize that the Bylaws assigned responsibility of running elections for the “Research Institutes” group GI, IARC, and IAB to the Senate office.*)

The method of apportionment based on split appointments raised thorny issues, such as: how to handle research units, given that the minimum Senate representation is 2 senators per unit; raising the number of members of the Senate to allow for the new units represented; and how to determine in which unit a faculty member with a split appointment may vote.

## **Accreditation Themes Discussion**

**Prepared by Dana Thomas, Vice Provost**

The faculty senate passed a collection of accreditation themes on October 12<sup>th</sup>.

On November 9, 2009 the faculty senate voted to accept revisions suggested by the Accreditation Steering Committee revisions below with one exception – the senate approved “Engage: Alaskans via Lifelong Learning, Outreach, and Community and Sustainable Economic Development;” the word sustainable was added.

- Educate: Undergraduate and Graduate Students
- Discover: Through Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity including an Emphasis on the North and its Peoples
- Prepare: Alaska’s Career, Technical, and Professional Workforce
- Connect: Alaska Native, Rural and Urban Communities through Contemporary and Traditional Knowledge
- Engage: Alaskans via Lifelong Learning, Outreach, and Community and Sustainable Economic Development

Given recent feedback from the Chancellor's cabinet, Accreditation Steering Committee and Provost's Council the following specific issues need senate consideration:

1. Should the Discover theme (given below) be partitioned into two themes; one for Research and one for Scholarship and Creative Activity?

Current theme

Discover: Through Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity including an Emphasis on the North and its Peoples

Proposed two new themes

Discover: Through Research including an Emphasis on the North and its Peoples

Explore: Scholarship and Artistic Creation

2. Should the Engage Theme be revised to read as follows:

Engage: Alaskans via Lifelong Learning, Outreach and Community and Economic Development  
This revision drops the word "sustainable" prior to the word "economic".

Rationale: the Chancellor's cabinet, Accreditation Steering Committee and Provost's Council support the division of the Discover theme and the dropping of the word sustainable. The Provost has proposed the wording for the new Explore theme - however, none of the groups has approved the specific wording of a new theme for this purpose. The word sustainable, added by the senate at its last meeting, was viewed by these groups as presumed and makes the theme wording awkward.

Additional information may come from meetings of the Accreditation Steering Committee prior to the Faculty Senate meeting. I will present any such new information.

October 28, 2009

Memo from: Faculty Affairs Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate

To: Administrative Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate

Re: Status of Faculty in the Alaska Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit (ACFWRU)

---

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) has been asked to provide a recommendation on whether the “rights and responsibilities” of the faculty in the Alaska Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit (ACFWRU) should include participation in the UAF Faculty Senate.

The five members of this unit are not UAF employees, but are recognized as faculty by the University under a formal 1999 MOU with federal and state agencies. These faculty are well-regarded and play a valuable role in the University. They have recently raised questions about their “rights and responsibilities” as UAF faculty.

FAC has discussed this issue at three separate meetings, and provides the following unanimous recommendations.

The core of the problem is that the University has recognized ACFWRU members as faculty, but not as a specific, defined type of faculty (i.e., tenure track, research, affiliate, adjunct, term), which would have clarified their status, rights, and responsibilities. ACFWRU frustration with the current ill-defined situation is understandable.

1) FAC recommends that the ACFWRU members be formally designated Affiliate Faculty. This is the status normally held by those with an external employer and a faculty appointment at UAF. Examples are faculty employed by the U.S. Geological Survey, the State of Alaska Division of Geological & Geophysical Surveys, Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and the U.S.D.A Forest Service. Affiliate faculty teach, supervise students, and conduct research, and may have rank designations. FAC states definitively that the ACFWRU faculty should not be identified as tenure-track or research faculty.

2) FAC recommends that the ACFWRU faculty should not participate in the Faculty Senate, because they are not UAF employees. The Faculty Senate is a part of the shared governance of UAF, and only employees should participate in shared governance. The ACFWRU faculty have a materially different relationship to the University than faculty employees.

3) The MOU states that “It is the intention of the Cooperators to review and update this agreement in ten years.” The agreement does not automatically expire, but it went into effect in 1999 and is now ten years old. FAC urges UAF to involve the “home departments” of the ACFWRU faculty (i.e., CNSM Dept. of Biology and Wildlife, IAB, SFOS Fisheries Division) in any revision of the MOU.

**Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC)**  
**Meeting Minutes: 2<sup>nd</sup> November, 2009, 1:15- 2:30 PM**

Members Present: Falk Huettmann (Meeting Facilitator & Co-Chair; note taker), Ken Abramowicz (Co-Chair), Carrie Baker, Debra Moses, Rainer Newberry, Beth Leonard, Christa Bartlett, Seta Bogosyan, Sarah Fowell, Carol Lewis (phone), Beth Leonard (phone)

Visitors: Lillian Misel (UAF Advising Office) and Dana Thomas

Invited Guests: Members of the Core Revitalization Committee (out of 14): John Yarie, Christie Cooper, Ron Illingworth, Charlie Meyer

Quorum: YES

1:15  
Welcome

1:16  
Approval of Minutes

1:17 – 2: 24  
The four visiting members of the Core Revitalization Committee were introduced, and each member gave his/her view of the process, goals and the document. It was emphasized in these presentations that CORE/LEAP is designed for dealing with the future, and that big picture thinking matters. The revitalization efforts were needed because the student body widely changed from 20 years ago, and so did the demands and the overall (global) framework. It was outlined that the starting, and current, situation differs on the UAF campus vs. the Rural Campus. Distance Education was discussed. So far, 4 out of 50 states adopted LEAP as their model. Re. 'winners and losers' in this adaptation process, it was emphasized that the students would be the winners because of their improved education system they gain. Problem items to be improved were repeatedly identified as the need for having appropriate skills in Math, Chemistry and the Sciences. Most of the discussion was centered around undergraduate teaching; graduate student & teaching impacts were not addressed. Another discussion item was centered around how to achieve flexibility without vagueness; both goals matter equally for the CORE/LEAP. Reduction of credit requirements was further discussed. A discussion emphasize was placed on majors vs. core classes, and how a traditional specialization and general degrees would look like. The question of the administrative assessment burden was addressed by Dana, who explained that this burden will be decline the brahincreasing. This is achieved through representative, but reliable, sampling (instead of a complete assessment).

This session clarified many of the questions the committee had, and it was suggested to focus next on the Departmental impacts, and thus, receive over the months feedback from the Deans, as well as from Alaskan employers. In addition, it was suggested to check the High-Impact Practices (appendix 2), and how they match up with the university situation. These are next steps for the Curricular Affairs committee to take. Other unresolved questions deal with details of the implementation phase for instance. It was agreed that the coming Curricular Affairs session will deal specifically with contrasting the Learn th Outcomes CORE/LEAP (A ppendix 1). An email discussion on any of these topics is encouraged in the meantime.

2:25-2:30  
Other business  
None

2:30  
Adjourn

-----  
**Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC)**  
**Meeting Minutes: 16<sup>th</sup> November, 2009, 1:15- 2:30 PM**

Members Present: Falk Huettmann (Meeting Facilitator & Co-Chair; note taker), Ken Abramowicz (Co-Chair), Carrie Baker, Rainer Newberry, Beth Leonard, Sarah Fowell, Seta Bogosyan, Debra Moss (phone)

Visitors: Lillian Misel (UAF Advising Office) and Dana Thomas

Quorum: YES

1:15  
Welcome

1:16  
Approval of Minutes from Nov 2<sup>nd</sup>.

1:17 – 2: 24  
This meeting was specifically devoted to evaluate Appendix 1 (UAF's 2008-09 Baccalaureate Core Curriculum vs. The AACU Essential Learning Outcomes) and Appendix 2 (Connecting Essential Learning Outcomes with High-Impact Practices).

Most time was spent in basic but crucial discussions on the meaning and relevance of the underlying concepts, and specifically, the wording and purpose of each paragraph. The Committee contrasted each of the seven paragraphs in Appendix 1, and app. 10 minutes got devoted to each item. It was decided to find coherent schemes in each of the two (UAF's 2008-09 Baccalaureate Core Curriculum vs. The AACU Essential Learning Outcomes). The committee decided upon improved wording; tasks got assigned to specific committee members for finalizing specific paragraphs (details are with the Note Taker and available on request).

The discussion and word-smithing of these tasks is on-going and proposals are to be submitted by email towards an agreed and final version until the next meeting (Dec 14<sup>th</sup>; because the Dec 7<sup>th</sup> session is overlapping with the Administrative Committee session, and not all members are present for a valid and meaningful discussion). Final versions will be presented then.

Despite great progress made, it became clear from this exercise that a thorough review, discussion and update of these crucial goals is critical, and will occupy us for at least another session.

2:25-2:30  
Other business: None  
2:30 - Adjourn



ATTACHMENT 163/8  
UAF Faculty Senate #163, December 7, 2009

**Committee on the Status of Women, Minutes  
Meeting Minutes for Tuesday, 24 Nov 2009**

10-11AM  
Gruening 514C

Members Present: Alexandra Fitts, Jenny Liu, Derek Sikes, Diane Wagner, Jane Weber

Members absent: Elizabeth Allman, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen, Janet McClellan, Kayt Sunwood, Elizabeth Allman, Kayt Sunwood

Short discussion of last brown bag lunch on topic: "What is a family friendly campus more family friendly?" Discussions focused on child care, leave share policy that includes childbirth and childcare, more flexibility in part time work, etc. From D. Wagner - Ideas from the committee that should be possible to enact first - a worklife coordinator to oversee changes, website with links to resources. Money is tight so larger projects like a new childcare center, although ideas exist and planning has begun, are still far off. The need for broader representation of faculty, staff and students on the chancellor's Family Friendly Taskforce was discussed.

Leave-share issue - cannot currently donate leave for maternal care, childbirth (except C-section), elder care. Leave share is a "catastrophic" health problems. Members support broadening eligibility for leave share to include childbirth and perhaps other conditions, such as bereavement. Jane will take this to an administrative meeting. Resolution to send forward needed that Alex will prepare with help from Diane. Discussion on extent of changes to propose - Alex pointed out that if one is teaching, maternal leave for 6 weeks is a bad idea because it interrupts teaching. The entire semester should be given as leave. Draft will be sent to CSW members for review.

Jane - Promotion & tenure workshop in the spring, Jane will reserve the Butrovich Building room. January CSW meeting on the 19th, 2pm.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:38

Respectfully Submitted,  
Derek Sikes