B.   Approval of Minutes to Meeting #172
The minutes were approved as submitted.

C.   Adoption of Agenda
The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II   Status of Chancellor's Office Actions
   A.   Motions Approved:
      1. Motion to Amend the Mandatory Placement Policy for Math
         Placement Test Expiration Date
      2. Motion to Clarify Grading Policy for Graduate Programs
      3. Motion to Accept Students Transferring to UAF with AA/AS Degrees
         as Satisfying the 100-200 Level Core Curriculum
      4. Motion to Change the Academic Disqualification Policy
   B.   Motions Pending:
      1. Motion to Approve the DANSRD Unit Criteria

III   Public Comments/Questions

Orion mentioned that he brought some comments from a constituent to share later in the program
during discussion of stacked courses.

IV   A.   President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

The systemwide academic council had a joint meeting with the President's Cabinet prior to the last
BOR meeting. A suggestion that such joint meetings take place regularly was accepted. The rough
plan is to have a joint meeting prior to the BOR meetings. This provides faculty a seat at the T*oint at the ACtion l

adding governance citizenship, as well as adding degree programs that focus on the Alaska

colleges off from the MAUs. They will separate the statistical information for the community college degrees out from the university's four-year programs for reporting purposes. Doing so should help alleviate problems with national rankings that were mentioned in the report.

The President is starting a strategic planning exercise at the UA system level, to be completed by the end of the calendar year. She thinks he'll ask them to look at the Fisher Report during this process. He has told Faculty Alliance that faculty will be

IX   New Business
       A.   Motion to Address Faculty Concerns about Electronic Student Evaluations, submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee (Attachment 173/1)

X   Discussion Items
        A.   Course Stacking – Rainer Newberry (Attachment 173/3)

Rainer gave some background about this discussion item and its recent history. He commented on a statement by Debasmita Misra. [This statement has been posted online at the Faculty Senate Meeting web page.] http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#173

Rainer explained why stacked courses came about and the need for them in Master's programs to get enough students in a course. The important issue is how to ensure that there's a difference between the undergraduate and graduate course levels so undergraduate students are not overwhelmed and graduate students are not underwhelmed by the course. The Curriculum Review Committee believes the existing regulations do not sufficiently address this.

Orion L. commented that 600-level courses and 400-level courses are easier to teach as un-stacked. He's unsure about having formalized requirements for teaching stacked courses, and noted Debu Misra is worried that we might make it harder for stacked courses to exist.

Lara D. expressed concern about creating a double standard by requiring new courses to pass more rigorous standards while old ones don't change. Rainer defended the motion, using the example of the syllabus requirements motion that the senate passed years ago. The motion only affects new and changed courses and he suspects over a period of five or six years the process of course changes which happen would update other existing stacked courses.

Cecile L. commented that the point is not whether a master's program can be offered without stacked courses, but whether or not the students are getting taught at the appropriate level for their degree. We shouldn't offer the degree if they can't be taught at the required level.

Amber T. suggested that outcome assessments for programs across campus need to be analyzed to make a determination about whether or not stacked courses are accomplishing their intended purpose. She noted there are lots of teaching styles across campus, and unless we're looking at assessments of these courses, the discussion is too early at this level.

        B.   General Ed Revitalization Committee Update – Dave Valentine (Attachment 173/4)

Dave provided an extensive update about the work of the current and past committees looking at changes that are needed to UAF's core curriculum. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is posted as a PDF at:
            http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2010-2011-meetings/#173

Dave shared about what feedback they have received from various entities across campus and invited faculty to provide their feedback.

There were statements made and general agreement that a lot more in-depth discussion was needed on this topic. Jon promised this topic would be brought up again.

XI   Committee Reports

Comments were very abbreviated due to the meeting running over time.

A. Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair
B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair
C. Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Ute Kaden, Co-Chairs
(Attachment 173/5)
D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair
(Attachment 173/6)
E. Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair

ATTACHMENT 173/1
UAF Faculty Senate #173, March 7, 2011
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate, upon the recommendation of the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee, moves to approve the following actions:

New electronic student evaluations will not be implemented without Faculty Senate approval.

More research on this issue will be done at the administrative level in order to complement the FDAI committee's concerns and recommendations (attached).

Rationale:

During extensive discussions in the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee, areas were identified that indicate that some aspects of online surveys of teaching are unreliable. Reasonable arguments can also be made in favor of electronic evaluations, for example, under the following circumstances:

electronic evaluations may be the only practical choice in some distance delivery situations.

security has been an issue at UAF with the paper-based IAS forms; however, switching to electronic evaluations will not necessarily prevent this from ever happening again.

This motion asks for more research on this complex issue that is so crucial to our professional lives as teachers. The motion also seeks to ensure that faculty concerns are addressed before a decision on the implementation of electronic student evaluations is made.

****

Attachment to Motion submitted by the FDAI Committee:

To: Faculty Senate
From: Josef Glowa, FDAI

This is a summary of what has been discussed in our committee regarding the pros and cons of electronic student evaluations. Committee member Melanie Arthur deserves special credit for digging more deeply into this issue, and compiling and summarizing some crucial data (see below). Attached are the two articles that best illustrate the current unreliable state of online surveys of teaching.[1]

The first attached article compares modes of administration (paper vs online), finding a huge difference in response rates for in-class versus online evaluations (70% versus 29%, in the absence of special incentives for online evaluators). They included two additional groups of online evaluations, one in which the instructor provided an in-class demo of the online evaluation website and another in which a "modest" grade incentive was offered for completing the online evaluation. In the extra credit case, the response rates were comparable for paper and online evaluations. It should be noted, though, that no similar incentive was offered to the in-class students. Perhaps they could have gotten a response rate closer to 90% for the in-class evaluations if they had offered extra credit there? This was a single institution study of business classes and has not, to our knowledge, been replicated.
The second attached article is a lengthier review of practices, emphasizing the quality of ratings by different modes of administration, and emphasizing the importance of response rates. It reviews studies that have compared in-person and online and finds a difference in response rates ranging from 37 to <1% lower, with an average difference of 23% (notably in the 1% case the in-person evaluation only had a 33% response and included only distance ed courses). The author describes strategies that have been used to raise response rates, but notes in summary that these have typically NOT been used. In their absence, online surveys can be expected to fall well below the acceptable response rate. (Of course, this does not engage the question of students' ability to effectively evaluate their instructors, which is outside the scope of this discussion)
Acceptable response rates: Survey research methods texts (e.g. Babbie's Practice of Social Research) suggest that an absolute minimum response rate from which to draw valid conclusions is 50%, and

PROPOSAL FOR DISCUSSION

In order to ensure that 400/600 stacked courses TRULY are two different courses taught at the same time that simultaneously do not overtax undergraduates and sufficiently challenge graduate students, we enact the following requirements for such courses:

Each part of the two courses will have a separate syllabus that contains significant differences justifying 400 vs. 600 level. These differences will be apparent on at least a weekly basis and not merely an extra assignment added at the end of the course (e.g., a term paper). Such differences will be such that each of the different versions will have different (a) reading assignments, (b) homework assignments, and (c) exams and each will be graded separately.

Further, these regulations and examples of contrasting types of assignments will appear in the course and degree handbook.

Minutes Unit Criteria Review Committee - 21 February 2011
Perry Barboza, Karen Jensen, Ute Kaden, Julie McIntyre, Tim Wilson

Next Meeting 23 March 2pm.

SFOS Revision

Page 5. Please clarify the intent of the following section. "Additional evidence of teaching ... publications based on student's thesis or dissertation research" We understand that publication indicates the quality of work in a thesis and therefore reflects the quality of the instructor or mentor. However, the convention for promotion and tenure files is to list a product only once as evidence of either teaching or research. This section of the document would make it possible to use the same set of publications to demonstrate both teaching and research performance by the advisor. It seem more appropriate that publications co-authored with a student should only be counted either as scholarly work or as evidence of teaching but not as both. Student publications that are not coauthored by the advisor/ instructor could be used to demonstrate the quality of instruction in a writing class or the editorial guidance of the advisor. How does the unit want to use student publications to evaluate the faculty - only research, only teaching or both research and teaching simultaneously?

Please remove all comments from the margin.
Please add page numbers for ease of reference.
The final documents are distributed as black and white copies. Please convert the red text to bold or underlined font for clear copies.

Music Criteria
The committee would like to discuss revision of this document at the next meeting. We would appreciate the attendance of a representative from the music department to assist with questions about the criteria.

The formatting of this document is difficult to follow and is not consistent with those of other units. Please consult the criteria for the Department of Theater that was approved in May 2010 (http://www.uaf.edu/provost/promotion-tenure/unit-peer-criteria/).

Page 3. Please distinguish between "local" and "surrounding community"

Page 3 **PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION DOCUMENT SUMMARY OF UNIT CRITERIA DESIGNATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS**

This summary is very difficult to follow in this format. Please follow the format used by other units by including the expectations for teaching (B), research (C) and service (D) in the appropriate sections. Define expectations for Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and full Professor that are specific to the unit and additional to the established criteria for UAF. This document will be used to evaluate faculty for tenure and promotion. Criteria for evaluation of non-tenured faculty should be removed from the document to avoid confusion.

Page 4. Statement of Purpose for the unit should be placed at the beginning of the document before Chapter 1. Please confine comments to the specifics of your department.

Page 7 and following: Please integrate the description and evaluation of each activity in the existing format for Scholarly Work (7-10) and Service (14-16)

Page 8. Please remove italics or clarify the need for the different font.

Page 10: 1. "Achievement in research. 1.c. They must be evaluated by peers ...

1.c.1. and 1.c.2. Music criteria .." Please combine the criteria into one statement. Use 1.c.i. to avoid confusion with the main category.

Page 7. Please clarify the following statement "**MAY ALSO BE MEASURED BY WHATEVER METHODS FOR EVALUATION ARE IN PLACE FOR A PARTICULAR EVENT.**"

Page 10. A better definition of "knowledgeable persons" as peer reviewers would be helpful.

Committee on the Status of Women,
Meeting Minutes for Fri, Feb 18, 2011; 1 2 pm,
Library, Kayak Room (408)

Members Present: Derek Sikes, Jenny Liu, Kayt Sunwood, Stefanie Ickert
Bond, Jessica Larsen, Melanie Arthur, Nicole Cundiff, (online   Shawn
Russell), Nilima Hullavarad, Dan White
Members absent: Jane Weber

1. Cecile Lardon presentation on Women in STEM Disciplines project. co PI
Joy Morrison
see PDF of presentation ppt.

Some of the Statistically significant findings: More women than expected in term / soft money

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes February 16, 2011

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:10 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Mike Castellini, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Channon Price, Larry Roberts
Excused: Julie Joly, Alexandra Oliveira

III. Report from Diane

There was a good response to and turnout for Eugenie Scott's visit. Around 25-30 faculty members attended. Diane is working on getting information out to faculty on upcoming events. Statewide is taking care of advertising Neil Howe's Millenials presentation. Faculty are already signing up! Larry reminded us that Neil Howe will also be part of the upcoming Lilly Arctic Institute.

Diane mentioned that she is getting requests for travel funding but that there is no longer any money available. UNAC used their extra funding to pay for Neil Howe's visit. CP noted that the number of requests (and value, if known) should be sent along to the Provost.

People are indicating an interest in calling in for Don Foley's upcoming talk on working with challenging students.

IV. Old Business

Josef informed us of the Faculty Senate's reaction to our motion regarding electronic student evaluations, namely that the Senate felt the wording was not strong enough. It was suggested that we change the word "input" to "approval". After some discussion our committee tentatively decided on splitting the motion into two main bullet points: a) electronic student evaluations will not be implemented (mandated) without Faculty Senate approval; and b) more research will be done at the administrative level. Josef will update the motion based on our discussion and email the new version to committee members for more input.

V. New Business

Lilly Arctic Institute: Larry informed us that the registration fee for the Lilly Arctic Institute (March 3-5) will be waived for FDAI committee members, and while we are free to come and go as it fits our schedules, please register for the sessions you will be attending so as to keep track of the number of faculty expected.

Sub-Committees: After some discussion, it was decided we would not form sub-committees for electronic student evaluations and the upcoming Faculty Forums. We decided on a plan of action for

GAAC Meeting Minutes
February 14, 2011

the 600-level. Rainer noted the need for more truth in advertising for both levels of a stacked course.

Amber Thomas commented that more input should be gathered from department chairs first. Lara Dehn asked for more concrete examples of what is good or bad in terms of course submissions and syllabi for stacking. She also noted that financial cost was a factor for students who take stacked courses, noting some may not be able to afford the graduate tuition. She asked about obtaining student feedback on stacked courses.

Orion noted that stacked courses are often a means of providing graduate level electives by different programs.

There was not a consensus about stacked course requirements in the group, but requiring a syllabus for each level of the 400/600 course was not opposed. Rainer was encouraged to have the Curricular Review Committee study this issue further before taking any action.

7. Preliminary discussion of review process for the 53 new courses proposed by Civil and Environmental Engineering

Ken commented that this group of courses appeared to be focused on providing continuing professional education, and this is the very definition of 500-level courses. The consensus of the committee was that these courses did not meet the requirements of 600-level courses. Ken will talk to Bob Perkins about the matter. Laura suggested using them for an undergraduate certificate. Orion suggested creating a Special Topics course at the 600-level for the graduate certificate program instead. It was questioned, however, whether the majority of a program should be comprised of Special Topics courses. The committee did not want to approve these as 600-level courses.

8. As the scheduled end of the meeting neared, it was noted that a March 1 deadline for catalog submissions has been established by the Office of the Registrar. Thus, the GAAC members agreed to hold another meeting on February 21 to maximize the number of proposals that could be approved before the catalog deadline.

9. Before the meeting was adjourned, a brief review of previously discussed courses was held.

• 18-GCCh_ ATM F613 was approved.

• 36-GCCh_EE F614 was not approved because requested syllabus revisions were not made.

• 19-GNC_ATM F666 was discussed, but questions about the syllabus remained.

• 25-GNC_ATM F678 were discussed, but questions about the syllabus remained.

19-GNC, 25-GNC and the remaining proposals on the agenda that were not discussed will be placed on the agenda for the next GAAC meeting on February 21.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 10:00.

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
February 21, 2011 GAAC Meeting
9:00-10:00 a.m.
341 Rasmuson Library

Voting members present: Ken A. (Chair), Sue Renes, Lara Dehn (phone), Amber Thomas
(phone), Jen Schmidt (phone), Orion Lawlor, Anupma Prakash
Ex officio members present: Larry Duffy, Laura Bender, Anita Hughes
Guest: Jayne H. (Notes)

1. Discussion/modification/approval of agenda
98-GCCh _ GEOG F612 - Geography of Climate and Environmental Change, listed under item 4
of the agenda, has become a trial course submission (#II-Trial).

2. Minutes from 2-14-2011 meeting were approved.

3. GAAC proposals approved (review leader is listed first, followed by the secondary
reviewers).
• 41-GPCh_ Ph.D. - Fisheries Modify Admission Requirements (Amber, Lara, Jen)
While it was noted that the changes raised the bar to get into the program, this was seen as
positive by the majority of the committee. It was noted that a student without any published papers,
can still be admitted to the program with faculty endorsements. Larry mentioned that the number one
predictor of success in Ph.D. programs is undergraduate research. The proposal was unanimously
approved by GAAC.
• 42-GPCh_M.S. Fisheries - Expand elective course requirements (Amber, Lara, Jen)
Amber noted this one consisted of straightforward changes to electives. Lara provided some
background to the changes. The unit is adding a human dimension component to the electives as
they have some Rasmuson Foundation funding. The proposal was unanimously approved by GAAC.
• 43-GNC FISH F680 - Marine Sustainability Internship (Amber, Lara, Jen)
While there was a question about the summer and fall parts of the course, Lara resolved
this issue and the proposal was unanimously approved by GAAC.

4. GAAC proposals discussed, but not yet approved.
• 19-GNC ATM F666 - Atmospheric Remote Sensing (Donie, Jen, Xiong)
The course syllabus needs modifications (e.g., goals and outcomes, determination of
points in course). Jen will email the instructor.
• 25-GNC_ATM F678 - Mesoscale Dynamics (Xiong, Jen, Sue)
The syllabus needs modifications (e.g., concern about tone of the syllabus, lack of
alignment between the grading table and the projects that are listed). Ken will follow up on this
course.
• 38-GNC_EE F646 Wireless Sensor Networks (Orion, Donie, Lara)
While the instructor is working on a revised syllabus, there was agreement that this
proposal can not go forward until more detail is added to the syllabus.
• 39-GNC EE F668 Radar Systems (Orion, Donie, Lara)
The course syllabus needs modifications. While the course is similar to an existing
Geoscience course, the material is a subset of that course. If changes aren't received, it may be
best to ask the instructor to re-submit this course as a new proposal after the required changes are
made.

- 40-GNC_EE F675 Robot Modeling and Control (Orion, Donie, Lara)