

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #150
Monday, April 7, 2008
1:00 p.m. – 3:47 p.m.
109 Butrovich Building – BOR Conference Room

I Call to Order – Jon Genetti

Faculty Senate President Jon Genetti called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Allen, Jane
Anahita, Sine
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar
Barboza, Perry
Barrick, Ken
Barry, Ron
Bret-Harte, Marion (Link Olson)
Cascio, Julie
Christie, Anne
Cooper, Christine
Dandekar, Abhijit (Silke Schiewer)
Dehn, Jonathan
Genetti, Jon
Hogan, Maureen
Iken, Katrin (online at Kodiak)
Illingworth, Marjorie
Kingsley, Ilana
Konar, Brenda (Alex Oliveira)
Leonard, Beth
Lowder, Marla (online at Boston)
Lurman, Julie
McEachern, Diane
Newberry, Rainer
Potter, Ben
Reynolds, Jennifer
Roberts, Larry
Rosenberg, Jonathan
Sousa, Marsha
Thomas, Amber
Weber, Jane
Wiechen, Heinz
Zhou, Thomas

Members Absent:

Daku, Michael
Huettmann, Falk
Little, Joe
Zhang, Jing

Others Present:

Castellini, Michael
Dieringer, Deanna
Duffy, Larry
Goering, Douglas
Hamburg, Jake
Hamilton, Mark (Guest Speaker)
Hardy, Cindy
Hapsmith, Linda
Henrichs, Susan
Herman, Susan
Illingworth, Ron
Ivey, Pat
Layral, Sheri
Madsen, Eric
McCrea, Scott
Milke, Diane
Morrison, Joy
Norton, Brody
Patil, Shirish
Redman, Wendy
Ripley, Kate
Sfraga, Mike
Sparks, Juella
Sunwood, Kayt
Sutton, Trent
Thomas, Dana
Titus, Jordan
Vonnahme, Joel
White, Dan
Wiesenburg, Denis
Sun Star Staff

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #149

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II Guest Speaker:

A. President Mark Hamilton

After meeting with Senate leadership, ASUAF and Staff Council, and individuals in Fairbanks,

Ken Barrick asked for clarification about the process beyond the interim appointment. How will the permanent position be handled? President Hamilton says that at this time next year they'll reconvene and see about what they want to do, similar to what he arranged with Anchorage. He'll vet this recommendation back through the governance bodies, and if they're in agreement he'll appoint this person.

Thomas Zhou shared the comments of his colleagues at the School of Management. They are strongly in favor of a national search. The Northwest Accreditation body suggests open search should be used for higher level positions.

Jonathan Rosenberg said that the faculty would appreciate having the open forums. Many of the CLA faculty also want a national search; and if the interim appointee is performing well, they'll certainly be a credible candidate in a national search.

Wendy Redman mentioned that a press release will be going out with the two names shared today.

Ken Barrick asked whether a recommendation from the Senate to start an immediate national search and appoint the interim chancellor for just one year would be considered by President Hamilton. President Hamilton responded that this would only give the person one year which is not long enough. He wants the person to get a budget going and to be in charge to execute it. Ken commented about the importance of considering an appointment that is the very best possible in light of UAF being an international institution. An appointed chancellor becoming permanent in a year's time could possibly limit the chance to hire the very best and brightest person to lead the institution. Ken asked if President Hamilton was concerned about such an opportunity to hire the best person in the world being lost without a search process. President Hamilton responded that it did not worry him that this would happen. From his observations of the skill sets of chancellors selected in national searches, he thinks that it's very difficult for any search committee to take an individual's track record and overlay it on this institution. The chances of figuring out how they will handle the list he's already given would be the luck of the draw. It's a brutally tough job. It takes a long time for them to get started. He has more confidence in the individuals he's put forth. In a year's time they would do very well in the national search process, demonstrating the importance of 'ground troops' for this situation.

Jordan Titus asked the President to comment about his basis of confidence in these two individuals. He commented that it's asymmetric with these two individuals. President Hamilton spoke to Rogers' eight-year term on the Board of Regents. He chaired it for three years. He knows him well. Rogers has done a significant amount of work with the UA system and other institutions in the state. With Davies, he's been here at UAF and has the academic credentials. He doesn't know him well, doesn't know about his abilities to handle all 'the other stuff' with the chancellor position, but he believes he could work with him.

Jon R. asked that if the decision is made to retain the interim person as the permanent chancellor, what criteria will be used by the President to decide this, so that the faculty can help track them and weigh in on the decision as well. President Hamilton responded that this would be a very fair thing and a basis of his contract with the interim. He would welcome emails from faculty on their thoughts.

President Hamilton made a statement about the difficulty of finding someone who knows rural Alaska in a national search.

III Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to a Masters of Natural Resource Management and Geography
2. Motion to approve an Associate of Science degree program

B. Motions Pending: none

IV Public Comments/Questions

Jon G. asked how the remote sites were doing with the audio and video. Those at Kodiak and Kuskokwim responded that they were hearing and seeing the meeting just fine.

Abel Bult-Ito commented on the interim chancellor. Likes having two years to evaluate the person and thinks both Davies and Rogers are good candidates. He wants to advocate in favor of John Davies for his academic credentials, and he has a Ph.D. from UAF, and he doesn't have the tight connection with statewide which may be a problem for independent function here at UAF. He knows both of them, and they're highly qualified. When he recalls Brian's role as chair of BOR, in his opinion Brian showed little respect for opinions of faculty. So he leans toward John Davies.

Regarding the Chancellor's Campus Diversity Action Committee matter that was brought to the Faculty Affairs Committee, he feels the FA committee's response was spineless. He's back on

Jonathan R. commented that the textbook issue could be handled by the bookstore who gets the information so early; however, it's unlikely they'd want to participate in reducing their own business. The other possibility is the department offices. ASUAF could gather that information from offices and centralize it for students.

Comment was made about the Bookstore web site which has a menu-driven system to tell what textbooks are on order for each of the classes. Is it accessible to everyone? The issue there is

important factors looking ahead include a looming recession – bottom line is the overall economic climate isn't going to be good for the next 6-12 months. This means an actual further tightening of university appropriations is going to happen. We must be mindful that graduates are going to be operating in a global economy, a flattening world, a global environment. We must be preparing our graduates for more than just a job in Alaska. Must be a bigger scope that includes a global perspective. There's increasing pressure on us to focus on jobs. Right now high schools across the country have a national average of only 69% of 9th graders making it out of HS; and few are ready for work or college. It will get worse, and is worse here in Alaska in terms of HS percentages and their preparation for work and college. One third of our college students need remedial classes in developmental math and English. Another factor needing attention is that when you look at the college-going rate of high school graduates by quartiles of family income, if you're in the upper quartile there's an 80% chance of going to college, and in the second quartile a 70% chance, the third quartile a 60% chance, and if you're in the lowest quartile of family income there's only a 40% chance of going to college if you graduate from high school. Generally our numbers in Alaska lag behind national numbers. We must be accountable for the product we generate here at the university.

Some observations he will make include that UAF has great faculty, staff and students. We have immense comparative location advantages related to our northern vector. Flip side of that is the disadvantages faced with drawing students from elsewhere because of our location and perceived harshness of climate. Think about this context and the factors affecting our future. We're strong in international research. We have pockets of higher potential to exploit. Recommendations he'll make will include: tap those locational advantages, increase student enrollment. The Fall numbers offer a glimmer of hope that we've turned a corner. Enrollment management is critical to our success.

We must grow the research enterprise; it brings in more income along with tuition/credit hours. We can't increase research grants and contracts without facilities to do so, and we've utterly failed to excite and enlighten our legislature in Juneau to that fact. We can't seem to crack that nut. While our message is compelling it's not connecting. BIOS building outlook is near zero in terms of the capital budget in Juneau. There's hope in a general obligation bond, but it doesn't happen often, so he doesn't put a lot of stock in that one. Additional infrastructure is needed to grow the research.

We must more aggressively and completely integrate research with undergraduate education.

We must more aggressively and completely integrate research with undergraduate education.

University of the Arctic to connect to Russia, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Sweden, Iceland, and others in ways we haven't before.

May 5 is his last time to meet with the Faculty Senate. He will offer some additional reflections.

Ken Barrick asked about private donations and the increase over last year which are very impressive. Do those funds enter the budget in a way that affects everyone, or do those funds get earmarked into certain new programs chosen by the donors. Chancellor Jones said that the vast bulk are dedicated to the donor's wishes. As a result it doesn't come in to the university budget and get distributed to everyone. Funds usually go to restricted uses like endowed scholarships or an internship, for example. Provides for things we wouldn't get otherwise.

Jake Hamburg asked the Chancellor to comment on the enrollment numbers for next year. Chancellor Jones doesn't have the numbers on the tip of his tongue, but he recounted Paul Reichardt's statements over the years – that it's a long time before the numbers take on greater confidence in terms of what we can expect in the fall. But the number of applications and admits are running way ahead of last year to date. But it's still early to count on it right now.

B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

The Provost gave an update on the FY10 budget process. She'll be sending an email to all deans and directors and dept. chairs, asking them to comment on their most-needed items for the FY10 budget request. Each school and college will be asked to forward 1-2 requests. The reason is that SW has come up with a different budget process than was used in years past, which was an open process and allowed for identifying needs from the bottom up; but this time they will focus planning around six areas: engineering, health, teacher preparation, research, workforce development, and student success. Planning groups will include deans and other involved individuals in those six areas and they'll prepare the detailed parts of the budget request. Each of these areas will be planned by a representative group of all three universities in the system. They'll be interfacing UAF needs with other MAUs. The advantage is it'll lead to a coherent, integrated budget request to present to the BOR and to the legislature and the public. They hope that in doing so they'll develop strong support for the universities' needs. The disadvantage is if schools or colleges don't tie in clearly and directly to one of the six areas, it'll be difficult for them to get attention on their need. We do have one to two million dollars identified as undesignated requests from our university. But the way to get a critical need into the budget process is to think about how your need ties into one of the six areas. Think broadly about how your needs fit into the identified areas of budget planning. Of the six million dollar budget increment, only two goes to UAF. It's pretty modest overall in terms of what we can get. The Planning and Budget committee will meet to sift through the needs and incorporate the most critical ones into FY10 process.

The Fisheries BA program and the Fisheries Minor come before the Senate this afternoon. She wants to say these programs have received thorough review from Curricular Affairs. She thinks it's a well thought out and sound program proposal. She wants to point out the broader ramifications of the Senate's decision about this today, which is more than just approving or not approving a degree program. This program is receiving a substantial grant from the Rasmuson Foundation, and one of the conditions for this grant is that the BA and Minor are approved by the BOR by the end of this academic year. If it's not approved at this meeting, we won't be in compliance for the grant. The Provost wants quality to be looked at, but editing small issues at

this point, the consequences could derail this degree program. Changes can be done over time. Another concern about this program is that of committing university to a match of five million dollars. There is an operating budget increment request of one million dollars in the operating budget and everyone's hopeful it will be funded. It's a serious commitment by the university not to be taken lightly. This grant was looked at extremely closely by the Chancellor's Cabinet and the UA system administration. The need for this Fisheries program is great for the state which faces competition from aquaculture and other programs.

Ken asked about the increment of one million dollars and Susan clarified the terms of the match – it's a continuation budget item. Abel asked about what happens if the legislature doesn't come through with the one million dollars; and Susan said it looks good. But it's promised to be an increment in next year's budget if need be -- strategy B. In a worst case scenario the money could possibly be reallocated from some central source; or the grant could be re-negotiated with the Foundation and spreading out the match requirement. It's hard to say how we'd react and there are a lot of "ifs" at this point with that scenario. Ron Barry asked about in five years when the program is over, how much of this money is committed – how much will we have to find? The one million dollars is continuation money to cover the new faculty costs. The rest of the Rasmuson money is for one-time costs for start-up. The Chancellor commented that some of this has already been matched with work going on at O'Neill. CDQs and producing and processing industries may also help with the match. We're not restricted with matching from state dollars.

Jon G. asked if SFOS Dean Denis Wiesenburg CDQh w'eC / Wmie-1(nis faftr the n]TJ0.0007 Tc -0.0007 Tw T

Note: Please refer to the Agenda for this meeting for additional attachments to this motion. The

Heinz commented that he agrees that Fisheries is an important program. But he has a problem

Note: Please refer to the Agenda for this meeting for additional attachments to this motion. The full packet is available for review at the UAF Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

D. Motion to approve a Minor in Fisheries, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Ilana brought to the floor. Jon G. noted that the costs of the Minor are rolled into the BA itself, and the existing program. The motion was called to question and a vote was taken. Ayes passed the motion unanimously. No abstentions.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Minor in Fisheries.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2008 and/or
Upon Board of Regents Approval

RATIONALE: See the full program proposal #55 from the Fall 2007 review cycle on file in the governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The Outstanding Senator of the Year Award Screening Committee has carefully reviewed the 2008 nomination of Rainer Newberry. The committee has concluded that Professor Newberry is a well-deserving candidate for this award. Procedure stipulates that a simple majority vote of the Senate shall confirm the nomination, and a formal resolution shall be prepared for presentation to the recipient at the May meeting of the Senate.

F. President-Elect Election

Jon G. gave some time to the candidates to say why they're doing this, and the candidates made their comments before the Senate. (Their published personal statements are included in the Agenda for this meeting.)

Sukumar mentioned his service on the Senate for over 10 years and now is the time to pay back and do his turn. He wants to keep his promise to do more.

Jon Dehn said that it's an honor to be nominated and it's great to have a choice. He's relatively new here and has been at UAF ten years. He comes from the research arm, though he does teach. Brings an outside of the box vision to Faculty Senate. UAF has a good base to build from, though there's a long way to go serve the needs of faculty and students.

RESOLUTION:

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate ratifies the election of President-elect on the basis of the following ballot.

BALLOT
PRESIDENT-ELECT

Please vote for ONE individual to serve as the President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate for 2008-2009.

_____	Sukumar Bandopadhyay
<u> X </u>	Jonathan Dehn

IX Discussion Item:

10 Min.

A. UAF Interim Chancellor

Jon started the discussion, mentioning he heard President Hamilton say a few things he hadn't heard. Jonathan Dehn asked about the two names and how John Davies' name came up. Jon G. mentioned that they had heard the name about ten days ago when he, Marsha and Juella of Staff Council were invited to talk to the President. Davies' name had come up but it sounded like he was out of the running. The following Friday the names were discussed at the Senate Administrative Committee meeting. Jim Johnson withdrew his name around that time.

Jon G. asked if there were any ideas about the forums. Rainer pointed out that with the President making the decision, does it really matter? Marsha responded that there is the invitation to provide feedback from Governance groups and that it's worthwhile to see if we have useful feedback.

Ken B. shared that he's troubled by the increasing unwillingness for national searches to be done. He's optimistic that someone from a larger pool coming to Alaska could catch on pretty quick, issues like rural Alaska included. He wants to see a broader participatory process for this position. Have these two people apply and see how they stand up with the competition. Our role ought to be to encourage him to do what most universities do, which is find a full range of possible candidates to choose from.

Rainer disagreed with Ken's statement; the job of chancellor takes commitment, which is what has lacked with national candidates. The position needs someone who isn't here for a temporary job and moves on in five years. The job needs commitment. A local person who knows the state and can come into the job and do it from day one is a wonderful idea.

Heinz disagreed with Rainer. International searches are held for all faculty positions. For a position of chancellor why would we just look around in Fairbanks? Rainer interjected that nobody evaluates the university based on who the chancellor is, but rather on who the faculty are. If UAF picked only from its graduates for faculty positions, that would be dumb. But the chancellor is a management position. Jon Dehn added that the chancellor is a manager who represents the university at the legislature. These two candidates that have been put forth have vast amounts of experience with the legislature and that's what we need right now. Earlier statements from Chancellor Jones were not very positive about the budget. Here in the state right now we have a 1.6 billion dollar-surplus and UAA through the same mechanism used here at UAF is doing very well with the legislature and they are succeeding in part because of that. This is our chance to the same. He's very positive about the two local candidates.

Jon R. urges the idea of a national search. It's not a hard job to fill, but it's a hard job to do well. If we're trying to replicate what UAA did, that was a unique situation. That person was in the legislature eight years and clearly had the reputation and experience to make that part of the job work very well; but the absence of the academic background however, may be telling somewhere on down the line. Looking at what we just went through today approving the new Fisheries program and five new faculty, we're all very concerned about the zero sum nature of budgeting at this point, but we supported a good program that was thoughtfully put together, with the hope that top management will manage the costs over the long run so that it won't come out of everyone else's pocket. That's why we need some outside expertise, experience in top academic management. The argument that we're so unique that only a local person can manage us strikes him as pretzel logic; some of our uniqueness is not necessarily some of the characteristics of the institution that we want to preserve forever. Maybe we have things to learn about the way it's done

elsewhere. Rainer commented that is the advantag

- There aren't other similar programs out there...is this because it's a unique program or their isn't a demand for it.
 - The program may attract students from rural areas or outside to come to UAF.
 - The school has already received a few calls regarding the program.
- **Funding:** This is a Rasmuson Foundation Grant, matched by the university. It's a 6 year period. The hope is for continued funding from the state. The committee was interested in knowing the contingencies for funding if not going to base.
- **Faculty:** 5 new tenure track faculty will be hired with the money from the grant.

Committee concerns/discussions are below:

- Math requirements. Need to verify if calc is required. If so, it shouldn't be for a BA.
- What does industry think of a BA vs. BS degree? In the case of NRM, they want to hire folks with a BS.
- The proposal could be strengthened by:
 - Clarification of the math requirements
 - Industry support letters—documents in the proposal that indicate that industry is looking to hire people with this specific degree.
- There is a low enrollment rate—so where is the demand coming from?

Next meeting is March 24th, 9am, Rasmuson Library Joint Conference Room.

B. Faculty Affairs - Jon Dehn

Jon is trying to arrange for a couple more meetings of the committee before the next Senate meeting. Notes from the last meeting were available as a handout at the back table.

The following report was available as a hand-out at the meeting:

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Rasmussen 341 15:15 Wednesday March 26th.

Dehn, Christie, Hogan, Barrick, Wiesenburg, Reynolds

* Report on from Barrick on adjunct faculty. A series of guidelines were suggested, but no data on the actual conditions at UAF yet gathered. The Provost's office has been requested for this data, we hop to have that in a few weeks. A draft report to the senate will be sent out before the next committee meeting for committee comments.

* Nomination of faculty by the Senate to the Chancellor's committees. Lively discussion again on this topic. In consultation with the Administrative committee, the course of action recommended is to draft a motion requesting the Chancellor in the future give an explanation if the nominee is not appointed. It was not felt by the majority in committees (though we didn't have a quorum in both cases, and there was one strongly opposed to the majority) that further efforts to seek explanation in the case that triggered this would yield meaningful results.

* Automated annual activities reports. Draft of report to the Senate is in preparation, the point most agreed upon is that gathering metrics to represent university achievement and a personal document for each faculty member to guide their careers may be related, but are two separate

functions. Much duplication of current databases exists in the current, yet changing form of the automated annual activities report. We would like to suggest a variant of the automated scheme that provides a measure of the professional output of the faculty members, but does not include any sensitive information, or information already in the Banner System. In addition, following the guidelines laid down for these reports, be easy and efficient for faculty members to fill out. The current form is quite onerous and could require it to be included in the next CBA. Finally, in order to get "faculty buy-in" on the system, we'd like to request more involvement than has

Pg 7: Eliminate first two sentences of the paragraph after m. They are redundant and empty. They don't add anything. The workload should be taken into account and this doesn't need to be pointed out here.

Pg 7: The two sentences starting "The primary evidence of high research quality...." Should go

- Will be on 18April and fliers were handed out to all to publicize the event. The panel will be Paul Layer, Carol Gold, Diane Wagner and Roxy Dinstell. They will each speak 5-10 minutes on what they feel are key aspects of the process that would benefit the audience.
- There was a discussion on how to ensure that the campus wide committee be open. It was decided that since the decision is left up to each P&T committee, then once the committee is decided they should be lobbied to keep the meetings open unless requested otherwise by the applicant.
- There was some discussion/question on how one gets on the campus wide committee. It seemed that each college deals with it in a different way.
- Carol and other suggested that we encourage the campus wide to be split into several committees, each dealing with only part of the promotion/tenure applicants. Then it may be more appealing to serve to a wider number of faculty.

2) Childcare issue

- The GCC has proposed a task force on childcare. We as the CSW nominate Diane Wagner to represent CSW (as well as Bunnell house) on this task force. Having adequate day care is critical to retain and to hire new/young faculty, as Brenda mentioned since she has just been involved in several searches.
- Uma asked if Bunnell house can take over the newly to be vacant Play n Learn building? It is not campus, but it would help while the new building idea is moving forward.

3) Our next meeting will be April 29th 1-2. Each member of this committee should email Jane and Sine 1-2 ideas of what she would like the committee to address next year.

5) The 'Now You Know Project' will bring Martha West to UAF April 21-25. She is giving her talk at 7PM on Tuesday April 22 in Carol Brown Ballroom in the Union. The CSW would like to have dinner with her at 6PM on the 23rd at the Pumphouse. Sine will be confirming attendance by email before reservations are made. Each pays their own way.

E. Core Review - Michael Harris
No report available.

F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry
No report available.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Tom Clausen
No report available.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement

Larry spoke about the two faculty forums, with attendance of 40 total at both. Interest in the forums is high.

The following report was included in the agenda:

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement Committee Meeting Minutes for March 19, 2008

Participants: Marji Illingworth, Julie Lurman, Michael Daku, Channon Price, Susan Herman, Dana Greci, Link Olson

1. Lily Conference

The conference was dynamic. The presenters were great. We plan to get a few more new presenters for next year. Local attendance was low. Partly that is because it's hard for people to get away for in-town conferences. But the committee hopes to do some work on how to get the word out better next year.

2. Faculty Forums

The forums are coming up on Wednesday, April 2nd and Friday April 4th. Both forums will be held from noon to 2 p.m. Wednesday's will be located at TVC room 442, and Friday's will be located at Copper Lane House. Ron Illingworth and Charlie Dexter will present on Wednesday at TVC; Marji Illingworth will moderate. Susan Herman, Dani Sheppard, and Beth Kersey will present on Friday at Copper Lane House; Mike Daku will moderate. Marji will set up the audio-conferencing for TVC; Joy will set it up for Copper Lane.

The committee decided to focus the forum discussions on the following two questions:

- 1) At the beginning of the course, what specifically do you do to engage students and get them inspired about learning?
- 2) Mid-semester, how do you keep them motivated, excited, encouraged, engaged?

Discussions can focus both on what works and what doesn't work.

It was decided, in a vote with 4 yeses, 1 no, and 2 abstains, that three students will be included in each forum discussion. Students who are not highly motivated will be included. Students who study with those hosting the forum will be excluded. Mike will get two students for Copper Lane; Link will get one. Marji will get students for TVC.

The committee will encourage the Provost and Deans to publicize the forums and encourage faculty to attend. Susan Herman will speak with Susan Henrichs. Marji will talk to Rick Caulfield, Dana to Bernice Joseph, Channon to Joan Braddock, Link to Denis Wiesenburg, Mike to Ron Davis, and Susan to Mark Herrmann. We will encourage faculty in our departments to attend. Mike will call Eric Madsen to encourage Education faculty to attend.

3. Upcoming Meetings

Special meeting with Susan Henrichs is Tuesday, April 8, at 8:30 a.m.

After that, we meet April 16, from 8:15-9:15 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dana Greci, Recorder

agreed that a writing sample is an important component of a placement test, which can be addressed through ASSET or Companion. Ron noted that NADE recommends that teachers take a placement test to be familiar with what incoming students are being tested on.

ACT re-norming—Reading: Linda Hapsmith reported on the ACT re-norming report she has received in the Advising Center. The report shows the mean ACT test scores of students who have successfully passed various core classes. While the Math and Writing levels needed are in line with current placement levels, the reading levels needed to be successful in 100-level core classes vary widely. For example, for students to be successful in Perspectives on the Human Condition, they need reading scores in the 17-19 range, but for History 100 and Econ 100, students need reading scores of 20. In the sciences, the reading level varies, as well, but, again

remain low, even on rural campuses, where placement is more direct. While reading is mentioned in the original mandatory placement motion, it's only mentioned in one place. The motion does not detail how to implement reading placement. We discussed waiting to flesh this out until after math and writing placement are implemented, but those in attendance feel that starting reading placement in tandem with math and writing placement would be better. However, we need to gather together empirical evidence from the ACT report and from studies done by Ian Olsen to look further at what impact reading scores have on grades for 100-level classes. We will take this up at the next meeting.

Department and program updates: Cindy reported that the Developmental Education Department curriculum committee has been meeting frequently, discussing CDE correspondence classes in developmental math and English. During this process, they have drafted a list of standards for teaching developmental classes. This has yet to be officially adopted by the department, but they are using these standards as a rubric to evaluate the effectiveness of CDE correspondence courses.

Next meeting(s):

Friday, April 11, 2-3:30

Possible meeting or lunch during CRCD face-to-face, May 15-16.

XI Members' Comments/Questions

Jane asked about what the plans are after the next (last) Senate meeting in May. Will there be any plans since it's a face to face meeting. Jon indicated there will be something planned for after the meeting. To be discussed and details released later.

XII Adjournment at 3:47 PM.

Submitted by Jayne Harvie, Faculty Senate Secretary