

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #168
Monday, September 13, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 3: 10 p.m.
Wood Center 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 2010-11 Faculty Senate

Members Present:

ALLEN, Jane (Video)
ANGER, Andy (Audio)
ARENDDT, Anthony
BAEK, Jungho
BAKER, Carrie
BARBOZA, Perry
BARTLETT, Christa
CAHILL, Cathy
DAVIS, Mike (Audio)
DEHN, Jonathan

Members Present (cont'd):

RENES, Sue
REYNOLDS, Jennifer
ROBERTS, Larry
THOMAS, Amber
VALENTINE, Dave
WEBER, Jane
WILSON, Timothy

Others Present:

Becky Phillips
Linda Hapsmith

Members Absent:

BROCIOUS7fmbeidi

academic programs, but all administrative support services (such as those for research, student services, etc.) are being looked at.

Thus, there is not a lot of flexibility to add new programs that require new infusions of state money. The state has not been that generous to the University system over the last decade in that regard, and it's not going to get better in the current situation. The draft of the budget request from statewide reflects that fact (still needs to be reviewed by the BOR). The operating budget request asks for substantial fixed cost increases to cover salary and benefit increases; however, the three faculty union contracts are expiring soon so some of the actual costs are unknown and not yet specified. And, there is the possible staff bargaining unit to take into consideration. In terms of new operating requests, they're limiting it to \$2.5 million dollars (which is a lot less than in previous years). The UAF portion of that request is just under one million dollars, and includes mainly existing programs or activities that have been funded out of internal reallocation or some other kind of one time funding or grant funding that's expiring. The same applies to other institutions in the system.

In terms of capital funding requests, they're not requesting any new buildings, but they might reassess that if the bond package (with the Life Sciences building) isn't passed by the voters.

Statewide is including \$75 million for deferred maintenance across the system, and \$25 million across the system for Renewal and Repurposing (*R&R*). UAF has more deferred maintenance and would get perhaps \$40 million of that amount. The *R&R* funding would be useful for repurposing buildings on campus, as well. The governor is interested in addressing deferred maintenance and wants to see it funded.

Cecile L. asked if more funding for instructional technology on campus will be requested. Susan didn't recall seeing funding requests for that, but has only had today to review the new budget. Past similar requests have never been funded; the legislature is not generous with equipment requests. The problems are recognized and ways to reallocate within the system are being looked at by administration.

Susan mentioned the 2009-10 summary of promotion and tenure report attached to the agenda. Her main concern has to do with the requests for tenure prior to the mandatory year (PTMY) or requests for promotion to professor after only a few years in the associate professor rank. The question needs to be asked whether only two or three years in the associate rank is enough to have amassed the performance record of sustained excellence required for promotion to professor (as described in the Blue Book). Similarly, questions need to be asked regarding the PTMY promotion to associate professor and tenure applications. She expects further discussions on these issues with the university-wide review committees.

She would also encourage the senate with regard to revising and updating the Blue Book that they consider some of these issues. Should there be a requirement for time in rank for promotion to professor? If it's something that the faculty feel strongly about, it's something that could be included in the criteria (and used to be, in the past).

Jordan Titus asked about the issue concerning PTMY promotion to associate professor and tenure requests. Did it concern new people beginning here, or those coming from outside the university with a prior academic track record? Susan said it was mixed – both cases were true.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Maria Russell

Staff Council's first meeting is on Wednesday. Right now there is a non-retention ruling in the courts locally which will bring into question how the university may release staff from employment. Also, the staff will vote in the months of October and November on whether to unionize. (This doesn't include staff who are supervisors, confidential staff or safety employees.)

Jane W. asked when the vote opens and how long it's open. Maria responded that it's open for 30 days, between Oct. 4 and Nov. 5 (by mail only).

Jordan T. asked about the court case Maria mentioned. The Taylor case was ruled on July 26, and statewide is still discussing their response. It may be hinging on the unionization result as that would be a factor to consider in their response.

B. ASUAF – Nicole Carvajal

Nicole announced the hire of Michele Hebert as the sustainability coordinator, who will work with the student board. They're having biweekly meetings and there is a listserve for interested people. Send an email to either Michele or herself president@asuaf.org. Four students have been hired to work on the recycle bins.

ASUAF is looking into buying textbooks for core 100- and 200-level courses, to have on reserve in their offices for students to use at that location (not to check out).

ASUAF is interested in having input regarding +/- grading issue. They keep hearing that students are unhappy with the system, particularly the C- issue.

ASUAF will be sending two students and the president to the BOR meeting in Juneau later this month, specifically regarding tuition.

At the ASUAF meeting yesterday, seven seats were filled; however, there are still some vacancies so please send interested students their way.

Jane W. asked about whether paper recycling is being done. Nicole wasn't certain at this time what is being worked out on that issue.

Dave V. asked about the grading issue. Nicole clarified that a grade of C- is causing students to fail some of their classes, and, in general, it's dragging GPA's down. Jon D. commented that Administrative Committee has talked about the issue, and that the Curricular Affairs and Graduate Academic and Advisory committees are also discussing the issue. Amber T. commented that she thinks C- is a passing grade in the Core, but not for courses in a major. Nicole clarified that she meant C- is a failing grade for a course in one's major.

C. UNAC – Jordan Titus

Jordan Titus mentioned that UNAC has just begun negotiating the new collective bargaining agreement. Also, the university had filed a unit clarification request to the Alaska Labor Relations Board. It's gone through procedure, and the post-hearing briefs were submitted at the end of August. They're hoping to have a decision from the Board this fall. The ORP lawsuit is still ongoing.

Jane W. mentioned that UAFT CBA negotiations are still ongoing (and have been for the past month).

VII Guest Speaker

A. Rebecca Phillips, Manager, UAF Bookstore

As of July 21, the campus bookstore is now owned and run by the Follett Corporation. The entire staff (except for one person) was retained. They've hired about 30 temporary and student employees for the semester start-up, and they'll keep about 15 student employees through the semester.

Textbooks are back on campus. They also have a variety of e-books. About 30% of textbooks are now available for rent, with a savings of 55% from the new price for students who take advantage of that. They have a good variety of logo merchandise and are bulking up on the study aids and school supplies. In the coming semesters they'll have more time to audit the textbook shelves.

Jane W. thanked Becky and her staff for the great job they're doing, and is glad to see all the books again.

Becky mentioned the October 1 e-adoption deadline for textbooks. They'll also take any paper adoption forms.

Cecile L. asked if there's a price difference if a book is ordered online. Becky explained that it's not different online than locally any more. The local Follett store personnel see the online order and pull the book for the student here. The student doesn't pay freight charges, unless they want the book mailed to them.

Lara D. asked about the advantage of renting a book vs. buying a used book. Becky explained that renting is cheaper than buying a used book, with a price difference of 25%. The rental option is cheaper for one semester; so, if a book will be used for two semesters the students are encouraged to purchase it so it's cheaper. The bookstore will buy it back if it's in useable condition.

Cecile asked about e-books. Becky reported that the bookstore sold 85 this semester. Clerks talked them up, but buyers were still a little hesitant. Faculty may elect e-books during the adoption process.

If faculty want a textbook to be on the local rental list, they should plan to use that textbook for at least four semesters. Follett also has a national rental book list, which includes some textbooks already in use at UAF. The textbook should not contain a consumable that can't be reused (codes or workbooks, for example).

Dave V. asked how long this bookstore contract is in effect. Becky hasn't seen the contract, but believes it's for five years.

BREAK

VIII New Business

- A. Reaffirm the Resolution for Open Promotion and Tenure Meetings, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 168/2)

Dave V. spoke in opposition to the motion. At SNRAS they want the candidate's letter from the committee to accurately reflect their discussion which is more frank and open with a closed meeting. The letter that results is more informative, better constructed and more defensible in terms of the discussion, than it would be if the candidate were present.

Jennifer R. noted the philosophy behind the resolution is, theoretically, that one wouldn't say anything in the meeting that wouldn't be said directly to the candidate's face. Only legitimate comments should be made about the file at hand. With that in mind, she asked Dave why they feel it's better to hold closed meetings.

Dave responded that there's a potential element of personal acrimony. He agreed that peers should uphold the standard of only speaking to the content of the file and the candidate's record. But he doesn't believe that keeping the meetings open will necessarily accomplish that.

Amber T. asked why this motion was brought forward. Jane W replied that the Committee on the Status of Women feels strongly about the issue and asked for it to be put forward. Cathy C. mentioned it's also the start of the review cycle and unit peer committees are being formed, so it's timely.

Amber T. asked about scope of the resolution, which she thought only extended to the university-wide committees. Is it intended for individual units, also? Cathy noted that the unit peer is more likely to follow the university-wide policy example. Jon stressed this is a resolution and noted that each committee can decide for itself. The committees are forming now, so they want to reaffirm this position now.

Jennifer R. remarked that when this resolution was first drafted several years ago, many committees were holding closed meetings for their own convenience. It was not a considered decision.

Donie B. made a point of clarification about the current policy: it's to make sure people know it's a choice to have an open or closed meeting.

Jordan T. noted that the unions prefer open meetings to ensure that the faculty contracts are being adhered to.

Julie J. asked who chooses whether the meeting is open or closed, the candidate or the committee? The committee chooses whether the meeting is open or closed first, but the candidate can respond and close an open meeting. However, if the committee chooses a closed meeting, the candidate has no choice.

The resolution was moved to question and seconded. The resolution was reaffirmed by a majority vote.

B. Motion to Eliminate the B.S. in Statistics, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 168/3)

Rainer described the motion and its origination in the Mathematics department. Curricular Affairs could find no reason not to pass it. Jon D. noted that none of the statistics courses are going away, just the pathway to this B.S. degree. Lara D. asked what difference it makes to eliminate the program if there is no change to courses or faculty. Rainer observed that they won't have to do outcomes assessment on the program anymore. Lara asked what the difference is between the bachelor's and master's in statistics. Rainer noted that getting a math degree with an emphasis in statistics is nearly the same. From the standpoint of an employer or graduate school, the difference is minimal. There's total of five people taking it right now, but there's nobody new in the program. The department itself has made the choice to eliminate the program.

Susan H. commented about the investment in time required for doing student learning outcomes assessment and program review. Every year Statewide publishes a list of programs with their enrollment numbers. They are questioned every year about smaller programs, so it is to their advantage to consider streamlining and consolidating programs. In this case, Curricular Affairs and the department itself have gone forward with streamlining. The advantages may mostly be bookkeeping ones. Lara asked if, in light of how difficult it will be to get new programs in the future, it wouldn't be better to consider revamping the program to better serve an audience.

Lara commented on the need for biostatisticians for state jobs. A master's isn't needed for that position, but a bachelor's is a good idea. She doesn't see how this fits the plan. Rainer reiterated that the math degree with stats emphasis is nearly the same degree, and asked if we can truly afford to keep both programs with the scrutiny from both the state and university administration.

Amber T. noted that, even in this funding climate, we can still work within the parameters of programs that already exist to create new minors and areas of emphasis or refocus energies with existing resources. The Provost confirmed Amber's statement. Susan also mentioned that no university should just sit on its laurels; it should change with its constituency. New programs starting from scratch will still possibly happen, but it will be a harder process in this time of constrained budgets.

Amber asked if anyone was present from the Math department who could respond to Lara's suggestions about revamping the program rather than eliminating it.

Dana Thomas spoke to the concern raised. He has a professorship in statistics in the mathematics department, and it's still his locus of tenure. Both statistics and math department faculty directed this motion because they think this is the best path to go on. The math degree with an emphasis in statistics is their choice for support.

The motion was called to question and seconded. A vote was taken and the motion carried with no nays or abstentions.

C. Motion to Revise the Core Review Committee Membership in the Faculty Senate Bylaws, submitted by the Core Review Committee (Attachment 168/4)

Latrice Laughlin, chair of Core Review, brought the motion to floor and explained the purpose of the change to that committee's membership bylaws, which is to provide for more support from and representation by individuals working with the Core at different units.

many terms defined and the glossary has been expanded. Draft #28 is at the BOR, after which it will come back to the senates for another look.

Cecile L. asked if there were any sticking points in the plan. Susan said doctoral programs are still an issue. UAA wants free reign to develop all sorts of doctoral programs, while UAF wants to remain the doctoral granting university in the system. The compromise has been to allow UAA (if they wish) to develop a doctorate in Nursing Practice and a doctorate in Education Administration. These are both professional doctorates, as opposed to a research doctorate.

Other areas of concern have mostly had to do with how to avoid areas of nonproductive competition, particularly with engineering, distance ed, health and career programs. How do we decide which institution offers which program or how may we offer programs more collaboratively? How do we divide revenue, credit hours, etc. The AMP only makes an incremental step toward resolving these types of issues.

C. Electronic Student Evaluations – Josef Glowa

Josef Glowa brought the topic forward on behalf of the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee. The issue affects every faculty professionally. The Provost's office would like to move to electronic evaluations for issues of cost efficiency and to replace the current instructional assessment system with a better one, and has sought the input from the Faculty Senate, starting with the FDAI Committee.

The FDAI committee examined available research literature on the topic. The major problem they became aware of is the low response rate of online types of evaluation. There are better response rates with paper versions. There is an average 23% difference in responses rates between paper and electronic evaluations. The problem with a low rate of response is not being able to draw valid conclusions about faculty teaching from them. A 50% to 70% response rate is needed to more accurately do so. Student evaluations are important in the promotion and tenure process. Low response rates become hazardous in that context.

Amber T. suggested that if this electronic system were used, that students must complete them in order to get their grades. She observed that when students do these all together in a classroom, it's a more serious process. By doing it outside of class and making it informal, it may not help the task.

Susan H. noted that many distance courses are evaluated online, and some faculty have elected to use online evaluations. The response rates have been low, as the research Josef mentioned has shown. They recognize there must be incentive to get students to do this task, whether it's linked to Blackboard and access to grades, for example. A clicker system in every classroom would be effective, though it's costly. Another issue prompting them to look at this now is a security issue. The present system is loose and that poses risks. Students collect and courier the forms and have access to them in this process. Steps are currently being taken to address the holes in the process.

Amber T. mentioned her frustration at learning of the loss of all CLA evaluation forms for Spring 2009.

Cecile L. expressed concern that students might use an electronic system to do more venting instead of providing feedback, especially if they're made to do so. She feels the discussion of this topic should be more in-depth, and address how evaluations are being used or should be used.

Susan H. welcomed this type of discussion. She also mentioned that systematic student evaluations of instruction are a requirement of our accreditation, which doesn't mean we are tied to one system or way of doing them. She is leery of using a system where we make up the questions or design our system from scratch. The various national organizations that develop these have done a lot of the basic design work already, considering bias issues, etc.

Rainer asked who, in the end, ultimately makes this decision. Susan expressed hope for mutual agreement on the subject. She's uncomfortable with continuing with the system in use now. She wants the options to be looked at and considered, and seeks alternatives that fix the current situation. The solution doesn't necessarily have to be an electronic one.

Jennifer R. mentioned that the current system does "select" for students who actually come to class, and she hopes that this would be taken into account in choosing a future system.

Jordan T. talked about a national conference she attended where they talked about the issue of low response rates. Incentives could be offered, but there are probably legal problems with making it mandatory.

The Provost said they would have to provide an option in the process of not filling out a form. Susan asked Josef for the report the FDAI committee prepared, and asked everyone to think further about a win-win solution on all fronts for everyone involved. [Note: The report had been posted already with some other related information on the Faculty Senate meeting page for last Spring 2010, as Josef mentioned.]

Jon noted that how we use the results from the system we use is really the key question.

D. Status of Committee/Board Assignments

1. Chancellor's Diversity Action Committee:

Current seats: Jane Weber, Extended 2010; Christa Bartlett, 2011

There's open seat for an at-large faculty member. Let Jane Weber know.

2. Provost's Planning & Budget Committee: Cathy Cahill

3. Research Working Group: Roger Hansen

4. Accreditation Steering Committee: 2 open seats

Interested faculty do not need to be senators. Let Jon or Cathy know if you're interested.

X Committee Reports

Due to time constraints, committee reports were shortened to just mentioning any highlights.

A. Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Convener/Chair Meeting notes provided.

B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair No highlights mentioned.

- C. Unit Criteria – Ute Kaden, Convener
No highlights mentioned.
 - D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair
(Attachment 168/5)
Jane W. mentioned the upcoming Women Faculty Luncheon on Tuesday, October 12.
 - E. Core Review – Latrice Laughlin, Chair
Minutes were provided as a hand-out.
 - F. Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
No highlights mentioned.
 - G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks, Convener
No comments available.
 - H Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair
(Attachment 168/6)
Josef mentioned that there will be peer instruction workshops with a noted physicist from Harvard on October 27 and 28.
 - I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee –Ken Abramowicz, Chair
Orion reported on a rejected Maymester lab course, FISH F614, which proposed teaching a graduate level lab course inside of two weeks. The committee examined what would be accomplished in that limited timeframe, and concluded that there was no way feasible to compact a lab course of this level to such a short time. There is another 300-level lab course that has been turned into a Maymester course, and they want to see what the outcomes assessment is for that course.
 - J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Convener
No highlights mentioned.
 - K. Research Advisory Committee (ad hoc) – Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen, Co-Chairs (Attachment 168/7)
Orion was elected chair, and the committee is working on their bylaws.
- XI Members' Comments/Questions
No comments or questions brought to the floor.
- XII Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:05 PM.

The following resolution was passed at Faculty Senate Meeting #146 in Fall 2007, and endorsed by a letter distributed to the UAF community in Fall 2008. The Faculty Affairs and Administrative Committees would like to have the Faculty Senate reaffirm the resolution publicly at Faculty Senate Meeting #168 as the current review cycle gets underway.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the members of Faculty Committees are called upon under the concept of shared governance to provide professional review of other faculty candidates undergoing Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Review (Pre and Post-tenure),

WHEREAS the faculty portion of the review process must be fair and reasonable in order to maintain the reputation of the University, and the integrity of the academic process,

WHEREAS open and transparent Committee deliberations facilitate fair and reasonable review,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly requests that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an “open” meeting, and that “mandatory closed” meetings be avoided, including during the 2007-08 review cycle.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty Committee meetings are “open” at the request of a candidate and are consistent with all other relevant UAF rules and procedures.
2. Open meetings provide strong incentives for fair and reasonable review, including the oversight of the candidate.
3. The Committee can query a candidate for clarification of the file, which will greatly reduce the number of false assumptions and errors during deliberation.
4. Open meetings are educational—candidates who opt to attend their review have the opportunity to learn about academic traditions and practices.
5. Attendance can reduce candidates' anxiety, and make them feel like a part of the process.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the elimination of the B.S. degree in Statistics.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011

RATIONALE: See the program proposal #99-UPCh. on file in the Governance
Office, 314 Signers' Hall.

A proposal to eliminate the B.S. program in Statistics has been submitted because of low enrollments. Changes proposed to make statistics an option in the mathematics major have been approved. Statistics courses are largely service courses for other departments, so little impact is anticipated.

Elimination of Statistics B.S. Program

Over the past five years the number of students enrolled in the Statistics B.S. program has been very small (fewer than 5) and the number of students graduating from the program has never been more than 2 or 3 in a year.

The B.S. program in Mathematics has a statistics option and we have submitted revisions to this program/option to accommodate students interested in statistics. The Statistics baccalaureate program was built upon existing service courses; the existing statistics option in the Mathematics B.S. program will continue to be offered using these courses. Enrollment in statistics courses remains strong at both the undergraduate and graduate level because these courses provide a service to other departments or the Statistics M.S. program. Thus, we anticipate little impact on other programs, the personnel directly involved with the program, or the budget of the department. This change will allow the statistics faculty to dedicate a bit more of their effort to the much stronger M.S. program in Statistics which helps provide

Students currently in the Statistics B.S. program will be allowed to complete their programs under the catalogs they are eligible to use or move to the old or newly proposed statistics option in the Mathematics program. Only one course change is being implemented that may impact such students;

ATTACHMENT 168/4
UAF Faculty Senate #168, September 13, 2010

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Section 3 (Art. V: Committees) at subsection E.6, addressing membership requirements for the Core Review Committee.

Effective: Immediately

Rationale: Allowing membership of the college representatives who are already tasked with assessing core courses will improve communication between the Core Review Committee and the colleges regarding substantive changes and additions to baccalaureate core courses.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Section 3 (ART V: Committees), subsection E.6, paragraph two:

The committee shall be composed of one faculty member from each of the core component areas:

ATTACHMENT 168/5
UAF Faculty Senate #168, September 13, 2010

Committee on the Status of Women, Minutes
Monday, August 30, 2010; 1-2 pm
Gruening 718

Members Present: Melanie Arthur, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Shawn Russell, Jane Weber

6th Annual Faculty Women Luncheon: Tuesday, October 12, 2010, 12:30-2:30, Wood Center Ballroom; Audioconferenced and webstreamed. Melanie and Jane will work on setup – need more volunteers. Steffi will work on invitations with Senate Office.

Honorary Degree Recipients and Commencement Speaker: Need CSW member on committee – no volunteers yet

Topics for year:

- 1) Examine P/T stats
- 2) Annual “survey” tied to Annual Activities Report
- 3) Examine mentoring at UAF
- 4) 2017 Vision
- 5) Brown Bag Luncheon Committee

Future meetings: Tuesday, October 5, 1-2
Thursday, November 4, 1-2.

ATTACHMENT 168/6
UAF Faculty Senate #168, September 13, 2010

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes
August 25, 2010

Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Julie Lurman Joly, Joy Morrison, Channon Price

Excused: Alexandra Oliveira, Larry Roberts

We discussed committee membership and noted the following changes: 1) Dana Greci is on a year-long sabbatical; 2) James Huesmann, Marianne Kerr, Alexandra Oliveira, and Xiyu (Thomas) Zhou have resigned from the committee (but Josef will email Alex and ask her to reconsider as input from rural-site faculty is very important to our committee); 3) Diane McEachern is on the committee but we have not been able to connect with her yet; 4) we need to request that the Provost appoint a replacement for James Huesmann to the committee; and 5) Joy will be on a six-month sabbatical starting in January so we will need to continue on with whomever is hired to direct the Office of Faculty Development during Joy's absence.

Meeting day/time for the fall semester will be the second Tuesday of the month from 3:00 – 4:00 pm, with our next two meetings set for Tuesday, September 14, 2010, 3:00 – 4:00 pm, and Tuesday, October 12, 2010, 3:00 – 4:00 pm in Bunnell 222.

2011 Lilly Arctic Conference on Adult Learning is scheduled for Fairbanks in March. Joy suggests that it might be held every two years instead and new speakers should be brought in.

The New Faculty Orientation went very well and had good attendance. Many social activities have been planned to help welcome our new faculty to the community.

Eric Mazur, Harvard Physics professor, is scheduled to come to Fairbanks October 27 – 29 to give presentations and workshops on peer instruction. He is the key speaker for this semester. Joy requests that we look him up online and come up with suggestions on what we might have him do while he is here.

Next year's key speaker will be Ron Burk who specializes in using humor in the classroom (coming in late August 2011).

This year's agenda will be focused on continuing our investigation into electronic student evaluations. Sarah Lewis has resigned her position in order to pursue her education, and Sarah Lundemo has been tasked with administrative support of the IAS process. Josef sent a memo to the Administrative Committee with our recommendations last year, and he will check with Jayne Harvey to insure that it is put on the agenda for Faculty Senate. Joy will ask Dan Julius, Vice President for Academic Affairs about possible plans for electronic evaluations statewide.

Joy asked that we brainstorm ideas on how to better collaborate with UAA so we can share our guest speakers via video conferencing and spread the benefits of their expertise even further.

We will also work on finalizing the Faculty Forum for spring 2011, using Kennedy's book again as a springboard.

Joy mentioned that there will be four weekend workshops in Distance Education offered this year: two this fall and two in the spring. The workshops, which have a competitive application process as announced in the August 23 email to all faculty, will cover a variety of topics including Elive, Second Life, blogs, and Wikis

ATTACHMENT 168/7
UAF Faculty Senate #168, September 13, 2010

Research Advisory Committee (Ad hoc)
Sept. 9, 2010 Meeting Notes

Actions taken at meeting:

1. Orion Lawlor was elected committee chair, and Roger Hansen co-chair.
2. The committee's name is now the Research Advisory Committee (RAC) from ARC.
- 3.