

MINUTES  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #164  
Monday, February 1, 2010  
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

Members Present (cont'd):

WEBER, Jane

WILSON, Timothy

**Correction 3/10/2010:**

Others Present:

Rich Collins (guest speaker)

Colleen Angaiak

Cindy Hardy

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #163

The minutes were approved as distributed.

for the senate membership, and the Academic Master Plan. There is a mediation workshop taking place next door, in which Jon is participating. Jon recommends faculty involvement in the mediation training, if possible – it provides lots of tools.

#### B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

Cathy C. was online, calling from the Anchorage airport. Phone line feedback made it extremely difficult to capture her comments. The gist of her comments had to do with the Follett bookstore which provided books for core and developmental classes on campus at the start of this semester. Generally, feedback on that being done was very positive. Any feedback is invited to help suggest more improvements.

Follett has been approached to talk about a contract for a brick-and-mortar bookstore. Faculty volunteers are invited to help look over the possibilities. [Jane Weber and Ken Abramowicz have stepped forward to participate in those bookstore talks. Cecile L. asked if Jane and Ken would be handling problems, and Jane asked her to send word to Robert Holden. He'll bring problems to the group which is still being formed.]

Three faculty volunteers are being sought by the Provost's Office, to serve on the Planning and Budget Committee, each representing the areas of teaching, research and outreach. They will meet at least every other week.

Reapportionment will be discussed today. The Administrative Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee have been talking about changes to the Senate bylaws needed to streamline reapportionment. They've talked about coordinating this effort more regularly with the accreditation cycle. Every seven years the faculty numbers would be looked at in terms of reapportionment, since the numbers are being developed for the accreditation cycle already and the efforts would dovetail. If large number changes occurred in a particular unit before that, they could be looked at individually on an as needed basis.

Jon has offered to extend his term as president, which will be a discussion item later today. It's allowed for in the bylaws, though it hasn't taken place in recent history of the Senate. In order to extend his term as president, a two-thirds majority vote of the senate would be needed to approve it.

Jon also summarized Cathy's comments at the end of her time, as she was on audio with a very bad phone connection from the Anchorage airport.

#### V A. Chancellor's Comments – Brian Rogers

Brian R. mentioned that any bookstore problems should be mentioned to Robert Holden, while the effort continues to find a business model that works for the UAF Bookstore. Faculty advice and input is sought.

The BOR meets here in Fairbanks in two weeks, on Feb. 17-18. For those who were planning to speak to the Board, on the 17th, Wednesday, they'll be in executive session the

entire day. Public comment will only be taken on Thursday. Wednesday will be spent on only the presidential search. Primary UAF action items will primarily include reviewing the UAF master plan for facilities in the future. Please share your ideas, as the master plan is still being built. Drafts of the plan will be presented at this February meeting and again in April, with action likely taking place at the June BOR meeting. They'll be looking at schematics for the Life Sciences building and the Energy Technology facility.

The Legislature (House Finance Committee) meets with the university chancellors to discuss funding for the buildings, particularly financing for the Life Sciences Building, and the bill that would not only fund the planning efforts for engineering facilities in Fairbanks and Anchorage, but also the construction. Anchorage legislators are concerned that their sports arena is not in the Governor's budget. But the BOR is supporting the learning facilities at this time. It will take some effort to the Life Sciences building through the legislative process.

The Governor's Performance Scholarship (GPS) Bill is not looking good in the legislative process right now, which is unfortunate because the experience of other states which have this shows that these programs motivate students to complete high school and to seek a college education for which they're better prepared. He's hopeful that merit-based and need-based portions can be combined in a way to pass the legislature. This will be a challenge for

Amber T. asked about the carryforward money and if something's changed at the state level to make it less feasible for the un

May 19 is Staff Appreciation Day – please mark your calendars. If you want to do a presentation to staff about your research or try out a new class, please send in your ideas. An ultimate Frisbee challenge was made to the faculty by staff. It's time to form teams. They would welcome help with the BBQ.

The 2010 Staff Makes Students Count Award is open for nominations. Faculty are encouraged to nominate staff they see helping students. The prize is \$1,000 and two domestic airline tickets. Nominees receive a certificate. March 19 is the nomination deadline.

#### B. ASUAF – Todd Vorisek for Adrian Triebel

Todd Vorisek is the new president as Adrian has taken an internship in Senator Begich's office.

#### C. UAFT/UNAC

Jane W. reported that UAFT and the university have finalized their contract effective for six months (through December 31, 2010). This puts all the union contracts on the same schedule with each other for the faculty.

#### VII Guest Speaker: Rich Collins, Chair, CIRTS Topic: CIRTS Report Update

Rich provided some background on the formation and charge of the Committee on the Integration of Research and Teaching in the Sciences (CIRTS). They just completed a one-year program assessment effort to inform Chancellor Brian Rogers of how their faculty colleagues in CNSM, GI, IAB and IARC are succeeding in research and teaching based on a peer-assessment. The 156-page report just finished has not been officially released as of this date, but is due out shortly. (The committee, almost one year old, has now disbanded as their work is completed.)

Ten town hall meetings with the faculty were held on West Ridge last year, and then a survey developed. The survey was run in November, with the results being used to write the report. Rich summarized the survey results utilizing PowerPoint slides. The survey had a 70% response rate (96 responses from a diverse and representative group of faculty across the target units). All data was distilled through the committee, including narrative responses made by individuals (there's no raw data in the report).

The 96 faculty were diverse and representative in terms of which research institutes they were from, how many months of their salary they had to bring in on grants, their longevity on campus, and the number of graduate and undergraduate students they're advising. The results showed strong agreement that new research directions must enhance our academic curricula. People are committed to the integration of teaching and research on campus. But, how this is happening reveals significant tension among the faculty. Questions about salary recovery and how they support assistantships in the sciences revealed that faculty feel the

requirement to generate portions of their salary conflicts with their ability to support students. There was disagreement with the survey statement that people receive appropriate workload credit for the number of graduate students they mentor. The ability to support graduate students is seen as critical if UAF is to succeed in teaching and research. Success for undergraduate research depends upon good support in place for the graduate students.

of administration and clearly identify tangible opportunities at the faculty level where integration of teaching and research actually.

Thanks were extended to many individuals who assisted with the survey, with data gathering, and with reviewing the initial drafts of the report.

Rainer N. commented about summarizing the results of the survey to mean that there is no faculty consensus about anything except that teaching and research are both important. Rich disagreed with the phrasing of that sound bite, saying that while there's a huge diversity of opinion and in the aggregate of the 90 faculty there is no simple consensus, the report has extensively parsed the data more specifically in terms of how long faculty have been here, and how many students they support, etc. This allows more strategic choices to be made based upon how faculty are operating in certain ways.

Cecile L. asked the Chancellor why social scientists/researchers weren't included in the survey. Brian R. responded that the initial genesis was the desire to look at alternate plans for how we deal with the biomedical sciences on campus. The committee took a broader look and the info they gathered is useful for some other issues such as workload flexibility, how indirect cost recoveries are allocated, as well as the need for support of graduate students and programs. He also noted that with major structural changes, we lose momentum. There is not enough of an advantage to justify restructuring units.

Cecile commented on the perception now furthered by this latest effort, that West Ridge research and researchers are more special than those working in the liberal arts and social sciences, in spite of the facts. The Chancellor agreed that there is a perception like that, but



Cindy Hardy, SADAC chair, gave the background of the motion, and described the changes being made. Statewide had brought up the issue of differing policies across the system and requested that the expiration dates for placement tests be consistent with UAA and UAS. SADAC also incorporated the writing sample language that was voted upon last spring in the Faculty Senate. The Curricular Affairs Committee has accepted her committee's changes. Dana T. mentioned the difference in expiration dates for prerequisite courses (one year for math and developmental) vs. placement tests (two years).

Rainer N. further clarified the language change two years ago by the Senate regarding lower division and developmental math prerequisites being taken within a calendar year of the required courses (at the request of Math faculty); however, the language "developmental" and "lower division" was never incorporated into the policy back then – leading to confusion. So, this updated motion fixes that problem.

Jane W. asked a question about the differing expiration dates and Cindy answered it, giving the example of a student who takes a placement test in the junior year of high school. By the time they get into college, they're already near the expiration deadline.

Dana T. said he had brought this issue forward at statewide's request, to standardize policy across the system. Jane talked about the one year and the two year deadlines which can be confusing. Cindy said her Math colleagues felt two years for math was too long.

Mike Ernest, Admissions director, mentioned that one of the benefits of regularizing the deadlines and scores across campus is that statewide can write a program in Banner that can flag scores as expired or delete them altogether for advising purposes. This brings consistent score results across all three campuses, benefitting students who transfer across the system.

Linda H. said the Advising Center is behind this motion. They prefer the two-year date for developmental and lower level math, but they will go with the motion as is, if it remains one year. The policy is consistent with other universities that are comparable to UAF. Cindy H. commented that the policy ensures that math students at the development and core level will learn it in a particular way--math students will be advised with some extra attention with the way this is now written.

Mike D. stated that he wanted to bring a proposed amendment of the motion to the floor for consideration, which was to change both expiration deadlines to two years. Jane A. supported the proposed amendment on the floor. Rainer commented that for full involvement of the math folks, it would make sense to send it back to committee for more discussion. He commented that the one year deadline makes more sense with needs of students (especially those in developmental courses), which is a higher priority than consistency with other campuses.

Cindy H. reiterated that instructors always have the discretion of letting students into their classes or not. There are ways to work around the policy if it's a problem for students.

Mike D. mentioned his motion to amend was brought to the floor, but he hadn't heard it seconded. Jane A. seconded it. A vote was taken. There were six votes in support of

amending the motion as discussed on the floor. There were 18 votes for not amending it as



