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 #181

Monday, March 5, 2012 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1:00	I	Call to A. B. C.	Order – Catherine Cahill Roll Call Approval of Minutes to Meeting #180 Adoption of Agenda	4 Min.
1:04	II		US OF CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE ACTIONS Motions Approved: 1. Motion to Define the Academic Credit Hour Requirements for Laboratory Instruction Motions Pending: None	1 Min.
1:05	Ш	Α.	President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds	5 Min
1:10	IV	A. B. C.	Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs Vice Provost's Remarks – Dana Thomas	15 Min.
1:25	V	New E A. B.	Business Call for Nominations for President-Elect of the Faculty Senate, 201 Motion to Amend the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science Degree Requirements, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/1) Motion to Amend the Educational Effectiveness Policy, submitted Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/2))

- E. Motion to Clarify the Academic Honors Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/4)

 F. Motion to Approve a New (Princeted Ctuck), Category of Registration
- F. Motion to Approve a New "Directed Study" Category of Registration, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 181/5)

Motion to Approve an Updated Procedure for the Program

Review Process, submitted by Administrative Committee

G. Motion to Amend the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee Definition in the Faculty Senate Bylaws, submitted by the Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee (Attachment 181/6)

D.

(Attachment 181/3)

ATTACHMENT 181/1 UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012 Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degree requirements as indicated below:

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: There are many cases in which a course might be required for a major or a minor (example: PSY F101 for a BA in Psychology) but that course also carries a General Education designator (such as "S" for Social Sciences). Strictly interpreted the way it's written, the PSY F101 could not be counted toward the required credits in Social Sciences and Humanities, no matter how many PSY credits were earned (say, 36). This would have the unintended and unfortunate consequence of requiring well over 120 credits for a B.A. degree and well over 130 for a B.S. degree if the language is not altered. This is something that has been broadly misunderstood in the advising community for many years (ever since the inception of the Core, as far as we can tell). This was brought before Curricular Affairs in 2009 and both the Registrar's Office and the Academic Advising Center was under the impression this change had already taken place.

Note that with this change, no credits used toward the major could be used toward GERs until they have gone over 30, or for a minor over 15.

CAPS = additions [[]] = deletions

2011-12 UAF Catalog: Pages 136, Beyond the Core:

Under Bachelor of Arts, first column, paragraph after "Minimum credits required for degree":

Of the above, at least 39 credits must be taken in upper-division (300-level or higher) courses. Courses beyond 30 credits in a major complex and 15 credits in a minor complex [[that are not in the primary discipline of that major or minor]] may be used to fulfill the B.A. degree requirements in humanities, social sciences or mathematics. Courses used to fulfill [[minor degree]] requirements FOR A MINOR may be used at the same time to fill major or general distribution requirements if so designated.

Similarly, under Bachelor of Science, second column:

Of the above, at least 39 credits must be taken in upper-division (300-level or higher) courses. Courses beyond 30 credits in a major complex and 15 credits in a minor complex [[that are not in the primary

discipline of that major or minor]] may be used to fulfill the B.S. degree requirements in mathematics or natural science. Courses used to fulfill [[minor degree]] requirements FOR A MINOR may be used at the same time to fill major or general distribution requirements if so designated.

ATTACHMENT 181/2 UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012 Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness policy as indicated below:

EFFECTIVE: Upon approval by the Chancellor

RATIONALE: UAF institutional and specialized accreditation requires outcomes assessment reporting and assessment is important for the continuing improvement of curricula. To ensure that outcomes assessment information is collected regularly, with no long gaps, each program is asked to prepare a report every two years. This is consistent with the typical two year commitments that department chairs make so each department chair will know a report must be filed during their service. In addition, this change will provide timely information to summarize the implementation and results of assessment practices reported annually to the Board of Regents as required in policy P10.06.020.

CAPS = Additions
[[]] = Deletions

UAF EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS POLICY

In accordance with its mission, the University of Alaska Fairbanks has a continuing responsibility to review and improve performance of its students, faculty, and programs. The UAF therefore establishes the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation to describe the effects of curriculum, instruction, and other institutional programs.

The process will be useful for curricular and institutional reform and will be consistent with UA Board of Regents Policy and institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

The university shall ensure the academic freedom of the academic community in the development and maintenance of this process.

The data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty. Furthermore, no student shall be denied graduation based solely upon information gathered for the educational effectiveness evaluation process.

Each faculty member's activities in developing and/or implementing programmatic and institutional educational effectiveness efforts may be summarized in the instructional section of annual evaluations and promotion and tenure files.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

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.

ATTACHMENT 181/3
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve an updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regent policy and regulations (10.06).

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The existing program review process (Meeting #102, May 2001) does not fully meet Board of Regents policy and regulations on program review (10.06). The proposed process aligns with the new accreditation cycle, is a more efficient process, i.e., it is less burdensome on programs, and is intended to a yield more consistent quality of review. The process is intended for a program review cycle of 5 years, in accordance with Board of Regents policy.

The new program review process will be completed as follows:

1. An initial brief review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit supplied two-page narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere in UA, and any special circumstances that explain features of the centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary (see attached program review template for more details). The information reviewed meets the requirements set by Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; attached). A single Faculty Program Review Committee comprised of one tenured-faculty member from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus five CRCD representatives will review the materials and make one of the following recommendations:

Continue program

Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting

Continue program but improve other specific areas or

Discontinue program.

The committee will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review.

- 2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and 4 administrative representatives from CRCD will review the recommendations of the Program Review Committee, may request additional information from about the program, and will state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.
- 3. The Provost will review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:
 - a. Program continuation is confirmed until next review cycle
 - b. Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.

c. Recommend to discontinue program. Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, when appropriate admissions may be suspended pending action.

Handouts:

- 1. Program Review Instructions
- 2. Program Review Evaluation Form
- 3. Program Review Example

Handouts are posted online at:

http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#181

ATTACHMENT 181/4 UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012 Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Academic Honors policy as indicated below:

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: The current catalog language is vague enough that some students might expect to be on both lists, when the intention was that they are on one or the other, but not both.

CAPS = additions
[[]] = deletions

Page 49, 2011-12. ys014 T

ATTACHMENT 181/5
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new category of registration, "Directed Study," to allow a student to contract with an instructor to enroll individually in a course that exists in the catalog, outside of the regularly-scheduled sections of the course in a given semester. The difference between "Directed Study" and the current "Individual Study" would be that "Individual Study" would be reserved for contracted 1:1 courses that do not exist in the UAF catalog. Courses taken as Directed Study would be transcripted with the existing subject and course number from the catalog and the suffix (D.S.*).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: The majority of current Individual Study enrollments are actually for courses that exist in the UAF catalog. The student contracts with an instructor to take an individual section of the course outside of the regular course schedule. These are posted to the student's transcript as a -97 course number. It then raises questions about course content for transfer credit to other institutions; does not meet prerequisites in Banner; and does not automatically feed into degree requirements in DegreeWorks. Reserving the -97 "Independent Study" designation only for courses that do not exist in the UAF catalog would minimize these problems for students and advisors.

ATTACHMENT 181/6 UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012 Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E, Permanent Committees.2. This amendment updates terminology in the bylaws and removes redundant language from the committee definition.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

ATTACHMENT 181/7 UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012 Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes for January 25, 2012

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry (chair); Jungho Baek; Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Brian Himelbloom (phone); Diane McEachern (phone); Todd Radenbaugh (phone); Dave Valentine; Jun Watabe.

Voting Members not present: Anthony Arendt; Debra Moses.

Non-voting Members present: Lillian Anderson-Misel; Donald Crocker; Mike Earnest; Libby Eddy; Carol Gering; Linda Hapsmith; Susan Henrichs (for Dana Thomas); Pete Pinney; Michelle Stalder. Not present: Doug Goering.

Taking notes: Jayne Harvie

A. OLD Business

Is this an ok day/time?? If not....suggestions?

This item was not discussed, though mentioned briefly. [Wednesdays from 2-3 p.m. accommodates the most members, based on the Doodle Poll results.]

2. Recent GERK issues and such —comments by Dave

Dave reported that GERC is meeting weekly this semester.

They are hearing about faculty frustration with the lack of writing skills being exhibited by students in upper division courses. Is ENGL F111X enough preparation for upper division courses? The idea of utilizing TAs from the English Department as a resource in writing-intensive courses was discussed. It was noted, however, that English graduate students are working on creative writing, not scientific writing. Rainer suggested bringing the English department into the discussion.

Jun asked if the issue of student plagiarism is being discussed at GERC. Dave indicated it's not been brought up.

Susan Henrichs asked if the frustration with student writing skills is echoed in the arts and humanities and social sciences, as well. The consensus was that that this frustration is shared there, as well.

Pete and Carol mentioned strategies they are using at their units to address reading and writing skills in various courses. Linda asked how such courses might translate to the Core requirements. Dave mentioned that GERC is reviewing several Core models and how learning outcomes will be identified for Core. Susan stressed the need for a Core structure that is identifiable and transferable.

Pete mentioned that Mike Koskey can not serve on GERC and wanted to know what procedure to use to replace him. It was agreed that Miranda Wright will follow up and see that a statement of interest is submitted by a candidate to fill the CRCD seat.

3. 'Stacked' courses -- comments by Tony? [Item postponed. Anthony was traveling.]

B. NEW Business

1. Proposed motion #1

Change this:

One academic credit hour of non-laboratory instruction at UAF will consist of a minimum of 800 minutes of instruction" (FS meeting #3, March 25, 1988). It is understood that an average student will

Comments postponed for next meeting.

3. 'Stacked' courses

Anthony gave a brief report, reporting that results are in from the surveys of faculty and students. He and Lara Horstmann are compiling the results and writing a report.

4. Proposed motion to amend the Educational Effectiveness policy:

(A copy of the motion is included at the end of these minutes.)

Jun asked how the assessment data are used, and if reporting is required or just recommended. Doug G. commented on the fact that assessment is required and why. He noted how ABET accreditation drives the review of their undergraduate programs, vs. the review of their graduate programs which is much looser. Senior capstone courses were mentioned as a means that NWCCU recommends for ongoing assessment because it's easier to tie assessment to those courses.

Rainer commented that the ultimate test is after the student leaves. Doug noted it's harder to document then and that external factors start to drive the results (the job market, for example). Rainer also commented that the work not only involves improving programs, but documenting the effort to do so.

There was agreement that there needs to be faculty buy-in in the process. It seems to be driven by administration, rather than faculty driven. All agree that no one wants to do it if it's not useful to them. Dana commented on its need as a feedback mechanism to faculty to have real knowledge of how well students are doing in their courses and programs. Dave Veazey's name was mentioned as a potential guest to speak to the committee on this topic. In the meantime, Rainer urged that an electronic discussion of the matter be initiated.

The CAC passed the motion and it will move on to the Administrative Committee.

NEW Business:

1. Proposed motion to amend Catalog language to clarify the difference between the Dean's List and the Chancellor's List:

Currently, the catalog states that dean's list is for students with a GPA of >3.5 and chancellor's list for >3.9. Presumably, then, this logic means that a student with >3.9 is on both Dean's List AND Chancellor's List. The intention was that dean's list would be 3.5 to 3.89, and chancellor's list > or = 3.9.

Current catalog language (Under "ACADEMIC HONORS" on page 49)

You will make the chancellor's list with a GPA of 3.9 and the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5 or higher.

CHANGE TO:

You will make the chancellor's list with a GPA of 3.9 or higher, and or the dean's list with a GPA of 3.5 to 3.89.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: The current catalog language is vague enough that some students might expect to be on both lists, when our intention was that they are on one or the other, but not both.

The committee passed this motion and it will move forward to the Administrative Committee.

2. Mike Earnest brought the topic of a new category of registration called Directed Study before the committee. It would be similar to Independent Study courses (numbered -97), except that the course

already exists and would retain its catalog number. A flag in Banner could be used to indicate that the student took the course as Directed Study (as opposed to taking it in a normal class setting).

The data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty. Furthermore, no student shall be denied graduation based solely upon information gathered for the educational effectiveness evaluation process.

Each faculty member's activities in developing and/or implementing programmatic and institutional educational effectiveness efforts may be summarized in the instructional section of annual evaluations and promotion and tenure files.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

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.

ATTACHMENT 181/8
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012
Submitted by Unit Criteria Committee

Unit Criteria Committee Meeting Minutes for Friday 3 February 2012

Attending: Cathleen Winfree, Vladmir Alexeev, Stefan Golux, Mark Hermann, Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Debra Jones, Perry Barboza

Minutes prepared by P. Barboza

1. BOR document comments on 04.04

Some redundant passages that could be clarified regarding fractional appointments (P040403. G).

No other comments regarding conflicts with governance and unit criteria

2. SOE criteria

Format CAPS BOLD ITALIC per template

Comments and suggested edits were discussed and added to a word document. Return to SOE for amendment. Committee will consider modified document for vote by e-mail.

3. CES criteria

The document diverges from the established template in length and scope Additions to the preamble must be shortened to only describe how this unit differs from what is already described in general terms for all units.

The unit should review approved criteria for CEM and Fisheries that are posted on the FS site.

Invite a Ban>Tj/TT6 1h Tf.46 0 yat xiOoe by8(/TT hoes fromet and ummitteblishedIishedTc0 Tw()

ATTACHMENT 181/9 UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012 ATTACHMENT 181/10
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee Meeting Minutes for January 31, 2012

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:15 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Julie Joly, Franz Meyer, Channon

Price

Excused: Mike Castellini, Stephen Brown, Joy Morrison, Alexandra Oliveira

III. Report from Joy

Joy was unable to attend as her flight was delayed.

Travel proposals were due January 31 at 5:00 pm. Duff and CP volunteered to assist in evaluating the proposals on February 1 at 3:30 pm.

There is an upcoming seminar on Student Incivility, Bullying, and Aggression on Monday, February 6 from 3:30 – 5:00 pm in the Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom. Dr. Claudia Lampman, UAA Professor of Psychology, will present. This is jointly sponsored by UAF Faculty Senate, UNAC, and the UAFT.

IV. Old Business

1. BOR Review

The BOR review by the Faculty Senate has concluded.

2. Faculty survey

The five question areas that our committee discussed at our last meeting are as follows:

- 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?

We discussed how we can advae F4tt.u8e J8/t? at are the.h008 8.7(o).9(re extr developm)81iafore mrcu4aengpm

ATTACHMENT 181/12
UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012
Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee Meeting Minutes for February 2, 2012

Attending:

Sarah Stanley, Dana Greci, David Maxwell, Cindy Hardy, Amy Barnsley, Sandra Wildfeur, Curt Szuberla, Gabrielle Russell, Nancy Ayagarak

Not attending: Diane Erickson, Deseree Salvador, Erin from Nome, Elizabeth Izaki, David Veazy, John Creed, Alan Morotti

Approval of December minutes: Approved by acclaim.

Motion on Committee Definition

We discussed how to encourage rural faculty to participate in this committee. We decided to list all those who don't attend meetings along with those attending. Cindy will contact specific people to see if they are continuing to represent their campus on the committee.

The motion to revise and update the committee definition was approved.

Learning Commons update

Library is setting up tables with dividers, white boards. They will do that in March.

I deas on support for student success

This is an ongoing item on our agenda. We discussed the Very Early Warning and Freshman Progress Reports. Let's encourage our departments to participate.

Sandra suggested a rural student award as means of encouraging student success. This may already be done through CRCD.

Gabrielle mentioned that there have been changes to the withdrawal process, such as the elimination of the drop/swap. She asked whether these policy changes are getting out to faculty and advisors.

SADA data requests

We continued our discussion of gathering data on student outcomes in entry-level courses. Dana G reports that Developmental Education's NADE data request will be in by Feb 15 from institutional research. David will find out if any data requests have been made for math. Sarah S reported that a request was made for placement data for English. Dana Thomas may have some data reports as well. At the next meeting, we will look at the data that exists and see what further questions we want to address. We would like to have two or three standing requests for yearly data from PAIR so that we can track the success of initiatives such as mandatory placement or advising.

Prep Courses

We looked over a list of "Prep" courses at Mike Earnest's request, and, in general, all of the courses listed are preparatory or developmental. We discussed how some courses with different designators (ABUS, ECE, TTCH) relate to other content courses such as DEVM or DEVE courses. We raised the question of how "Prep" is defined on this list. We noted that some of the courses listed are required math courses for specific certificate and associates degrees, not "preparatory" for those degrees. We discussed how this request links with discussions of pass rates. Dana G suggested that this fits with our discussion of how to study D/F/Ws. We could limit it to two variables: those not doing well because of trouble learning the material and those not doing well because of external factors.

UAA Questions

We discussed a list of questions UAA faculty sent to UAF DEVE faculty in preparation for meeting to discuss aligning assessment in our programs.

David noted that, in the past, Math and DEVM faculty enforced prerequisites by manually checking student prerequisites in UA online. Mandatory placement has not improved their pass rates, but has eliminated this process and students' need to change classes early in the semester.

Curt said he teaches upper level Physics classes, so placement isn't really an issue. He does teach some 200 level classes, but he can talk with individual students to help with placement issues. He does not want to block a student who wants to try a class, though it may take three times before they successfully complete the class.

In response to the notion of state-wide standardized placement, Sarah recommends a more rounded look at each student in deciding placement through advising. We discussed the benefits of a locally designed placement test and of student self-directed placement.

We noted the advantages of Accuplacer, as well: no need to argue over placement, better reflection of current knowledge than HS transcripts (which may be out of date or mean varying things).

To further address placement issues, we will invite Linda Hapsmith to the next meeting. We will also invite Dana Thomas to the April meeting, once we have looked the data on hand and can formulate further questions.

Next meetings: Those in attendance agreed to 3:30 to 5:00, the first Thursday of the month. Semester meeting dates will be March 1, April 5, and May 3.

ATTACHMENT 181/13 UAF Faculty Senate #181, March 5, 2012 Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

Research Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes - January 25th 2011

Attending: Orion Lawlor (co-chair), Peter Webley (chair), Joanne Healy and John Heaton

Unable to attend: Kris Hundertmark, Sarah Hardy and Roger Hansen

Visitor: Flora Grabowska (Gl Librarian)

Location: IARC 417

Started at 10:02 am

1. Open Access policy at UAF

Flora came to present to the committee on the Open Access for journals. Flora had presented to the Faculty Senate in the public comments at the October 2011 Faculty Senate meeting and it was felt that Flora should come to talk to the Research Advisory Committee.

Flora provided a detailed overview of what Open Access is and that every year there is Open Access week in October. Flora pointed out that if a paper is open access then there will be more citations than if it was kept in a 'Toll Access' journal.

The questions is how do we allot those in UAF to have open access papers? John Heaton made the point that researchers should get to determine their journal of choice and what is this is always open access. Peter Webley spoke about that he submits to journals that offer open access but only at a cost of up to \$2000 per journal.

Flora pointed out that she was only advocating that UAF faculty, staff, students whom do submit to journals to be encouraged to make them open access papers. this will not only help the citation index of the paper but will help promote UAF research

Peter Webley stated that it might be institute, department, college level advisement to researchers to aim to include papers for open access rather than a faculty senate statement or policy decision. Might those with grants to write aim to include additional 'publication fees' only with those for printing color pages to manuscripts associated to that grant directly to also cover open access fees so that the paper can then be open?

Flora pointed out to all on the committee that the GI now is able to assist researchers in getting their manuscripts as open access.

2. Discussion on Policy and Regulations request from Admin Services Committee

Discussion on the requested sections of the UAF Regents Policy and Regulations documents from the UAF faculty Senate Administrative services committee. Orion Lawlor showed his edits and queries to several of the items and these were discussed by committee members attending. Orion will send his

version to all members and they will send edits to Peter Webley, Chair, by Friday am so that the edits can get the Administrative services committee.

3. Timing of monthly meeting

Request to have monthly meeting at similar time of the month. February meeting aimed to be 15th. Flora has offered GI Library conference room. Peter Webley, chair, will get response from full committee to get a time on February 15th.

The aim is for following meetings is 2nd to 3rd Wednesday of each month, Location: GI Library conference room

Ended at 11:17 am