

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #184

Meeting minutes for #184 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Motions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Delete the MAT in Biology Program

Carol has also volunteered to run some usability trials with faculty volunteers here at UAF, also in the spring semester. The trials would involve trying out specific tasks in the various systems. A report on both of these studies would come out later in the spring. David encouraged faculty to consider participating in these trials.

David also reported on a demo of Faculty180 software for electronic annual activity reporting that took place at Provost's Council. He was impressed with the fact that it was a potential time-saver for recordkeeping tasks during the academic year (to compile activities for future reporting). It also has some depth to it, such as the capability of attaching PDFs of publications and course syllabi, for example. He suggests that faculty try it out as the pilot is unrolled. He also cautioned faculty to be mindful not only of the capabilities that they like, but those that might cause them concern in terms of "mission creep" – more information being required for reporting purposes down the road.

D3(oaiyu cu)-4(l)-6(t)-16Tw - otiesple91 -36.05 -1.15 Td [(oaiy55)-2(ha)Td ()Tj [(b(he)4(c)4(a)4(pa)-4(l)-6(e

Chancellor Rogers expressed his thanks again for the

is always an option for the units, but what has tended to happen is that the directors recruit or appoint faculty to serve as the representative. What has happened in the past is that the unit faculty are not making a decision about their representation.

Orion L. commented that he will vote no on this motion because he doesn't want to see the research folks lose representation. He suggested that perhaps the way to fix this would be to use majority appointment as the rule for reapportionment purposes rather than locus of tenure for split appointments.

Debu M. asked how research or term faculty are represented by Faculty Senate, noting the Institute of Northern Engineering as an example for CEM. Jennifer recounted details from the last reapportionment. First, INE had been separated out from CEM in terms of faculty representation. But, then they were kept together because the INE director reports to the CEM dean, not the Provost. Debu responded that the research faculty are being disenfranchised by this.

Joanne H. spoke in support of two representatives because each brings their own perspectives on issues. Having a discussion after meetings and talking about what they will bring back to their units is a valuable process.

Franz M. commented about efforts to increase awareness at GI and IARC about the importance of being represented at Senate to ensure sustained involvement; and, that having two reps will increase likelihood of reporting back to the units.

Georgina G. (alternate for IARC) asked about the ramifications of this motion on IARC. They have two representatives and wish to keep both. Would they be reduced to one? Jennifer clarified that the smallest units (which include IARC and GI) would end up with one representative. Georgina voiced her support for keeping a minimum of two representatives for each unit.

A vote was taken and nays failed the motion, with one abstention.

- B. Motion to amend the Bylaws to increase the target number of elected seats in the Faculty Senate, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/2)

Jennifer explained that this motion had been necessary if the first one passed – to keep the total number of representatives steady at 39. Mike D. moved to table the motion and was seconded. It was unanimously voted to table the motion.

- C. Motion to amend the Bylaws with regard to non-voting members of the Faculty Senate, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/3)

Jennifer noted that this motion is basically a housekeeping motion to clean up the bylaws regarding ex officio members. Ayes passed the motion unanimously.

- D. Motion to conduct reapportionment of representation among the qualifying units at UAF, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 185/4)

Jennifer provided the background for the motion, reiterating that it is a response to the Library unit's request because they would like separate Senate representation now that they are no longer housed under the College of Liberal Arts. They do not have any joint appointments.

The Provost's Office would gather the data and the Faculty Affairs Committee would apply the calculation formula and determine results which would take effect upon spring semester elections. The motion was passed unanimously.

New business was conducted after a short break. The planned photo shoot was cancelled due to Todd Paris being out sick. (Rescheduling will occur for February's face-to-face meeting.)

VI New Business

- A. Motion to amend the Student Probation policy, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 185/5)

[Discussion of this motion occurred after the guest speaker.]

Rainer N. urged Faculty Senate to pass the motion. The motion adds clarification to the policy and how it's applied to the summer term (it does not change current practice). Rainer clarified for Orion that the Wintermester and Maymester are tacked onto the spring semester or summer term. The motion passed by majority with one Nay vote.

VII Discussion Items

- A. Commencement Schedule – Jennifer Reynolds

The May 2013 commencement will occur as scheduled. This discussion is about questions which would affect the May 2014 commencement. A decision needs to be made about it by the Chancellor in a couple of months or so. Faculty input is needed and there are two main questions to consider:

- 1.) Should the ceremony be moved to Saturday?
- 2.) Should there be a separate ceremony for hooding masters' degree recipients?

Jennifer summarized the pros and cons which will also be posted online for a more extensive Google discussion. There are two considerations for moving commencement from Sunday to Saturday. One is not to reduce faculty participation in the event, but rather increase it, if possible. Another main factor behind this proposal is that there is a heavy staff presence at commencement, and many are involved in working on the event the whole weekend. Travel is another factor, with a change to Saturday allowing travelers to return home on Sunday.

Regarding a separate ceremony for awarding master's degrees, the goal is to give master's students more recognition for their degrees rather than just keeping them on par with undergraduate degrees. A number of ideas were discussed last year, but the current one is to hold a separate hooding ceremony earlier on Saturday, and then have the master's and Ph.D. degree recipients also march in the main ceremony. All the events associated with commencement would fit into one Saturday. Because UAF is a research university, the involvement of graduate degree recipients with the main (larger) commencement ceremony would be maintained. Recognizing graduate degree recipients in a separate

smaller ceremony would be a compromise to keep from lengthening the larger commencement ceremony.

Cecile noted there is no perfect solution and asked about when and how this would be done. Jennifer made a comment in response that the disincentives may be so large that this idea is not pursued in the end. [Unfortunately, Cecile's comments were almost completely obscured because an online caller put their phone on hold and the resulting "hold music" overpowered the audio recording during this section of the meeting.]

Julie J. asked for discussion to be broadened to look into other options. Jennifer responded that it was fine to submit more ideas in the online discussion.

David V. commented that faculty participation is central to this matter. He'd like feedback from the units about holding two ceremonies and whether or not faculty would attend both. The goal may be a noble one, but if the end result is a diluted faculty presence at commencement, that's not a positive outcome. Jennifer encouraged faculty to poll their graduate students, as well as their colleagues. She mentioned the option of keeping the hooding of Ph.D. students in the main ceremony, while the hooding of the master's students would take place separately. This would encourage the faculty to attend both ceremonies.

Debu M. commented about the exam schedule and the fact that exams may occur on Saturday. The schedule will need to be shifted to allow for both students and faculty to participate in a Saturday commencement. David H. commented that holding to the current length of the commencement ceremony is important for both faculty and student participation. He's found that the length of the ceremony is already a deterrent to student participation.

Lillian Misel, assistant registrar for graduation and curriculum, mentioned that there are students who work on Saturday and are glad that commencement occurs on Sunday. She also mentioned that staff have had many discussions about the fact they work on the weekend to help with commencement, and they are used to it and accept that fact. One idea they would like to see considered is to hold a separate graduation for the CTC graduates instead. It would be preferable to keep the master's and Ph.D. ceremony with the baccalaureate graduation to inspire the undergraduates who may be thinking about continuing on to Graduate School.

B. Update on General Education Revitalization – David Valentine

David commented about the GERC information sessions held this month. He noted that GERC members have also met at some of the colleges and departments to hear about concerns and ideas. He noted common concern about any kinds of changes to the allocation of resources.

GERC has only two of its original members from several years ago, so there is a certain amount of revisiting issues because of this. A survey poll is targeted to go out on or near October 15. He encouraged all faculty to fill it out. Alex Fitts also encouraged faculty to take the poll and publicize it. The poll has fields for comments and Alex urged faculty to include their comments.

C. Posting course syllabi online in a central repository

[This discussion item was not covered due to time constraints. An online discussion will be started and it will be carried over to the November meeting agenda.]

VIII Public Comments/Questions

Dani Sheppard of the Psychology Department introduced herself as the faculty athletics representative, a position which is required by the NCAA and appointed by the chancellor. NCAA tasks this position with three priorities, which include ensuring academic integrity within the Athletics program by making sure that policies and procedures allow for academic integrity to remain a priority in the athletics program; maintaining compliance with NCAA regulations as a member institution; and, looking out for the wellbeing of student athletes in the program to ensure they do not become tangled up in the politics surrounding athletics.

ATTACHMENT 185/1
UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

ATTACHMENT 185/2

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsections A and B (pages 13-14). This amendment increases the target number of elected seats in the Faculty Senate.

EFFECTIVE: November 2012

RATIONALE: The Bylaws specify a target number of 35 elected senators, to be apportioned among the units according to the number of qualifying faculty in each unit. In practice, because of the “minimum 2 senators” rule that is addressed by a separate motion the UAF Faculty Senate has had 37 senators for approximately a decade until reapportionment in Fall 2010. This reapportionment added two small units and increased the size of the Faculty Senate to 39 elected members. That is the current size.

The Faculty Senate functions well with 39 elected senators, and it is easier to fully staff the Standing and Permanent Committees with this larger number of senators. If the Faculty Senate removes the rule that all units have a minimum of 2 senators without making other changes to the Bylaws, the number of senators will drop to the Bylaws’ target level of 35 senators. This amendment would enable the Faculty Senate to remain at its present size if the “minimum 2 senators” rule is removed. All seats would be distributed proportionately, according to the number of faculty in each unit.

This change would go into effect with the next reapportionment and would affect the first elections

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection A (page 13). This amendment modifies the bylaws regarding non-voting members of the Faculty Senate to conform with recent and current practice.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately.

RATIONALE: The Bylaws provide for nine non-voting members of the UAF Faculty Senate. These bylaws have not been followed in recent years. The following amendments to the bylaws change the number of non-voting members to seven and adopt recent practices as official Faculty Senate policy.

CAPS = Addition

[] = Deletion

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

- A. The membership of the Faculty Senate, hereinafter referred to as "Senate," ... **FOUR** **[Six]** non-voting members will be selected by and from other university constituencies as follows: one **[non-graduate student and one graduate]** student selected by the ASUAF; one **DEAN OR DIRECTOR SELECTED BY THE PROVOST** **[professional school dean and one college dean selected by the Deans' Council]**; one staff representative from the registrar's office; and one additional staff member selected by the Staff Council. **[If the staff representative from the registrar's office is APT, the se**

ATTACHMENT 185/4
UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to conduct reapportionment of representation among the qualifying units at UAF.

EFFECTIVE: November 2012.

ATTACHMENT 185/5
UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

ATTACHMENT 185/6
UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes for 10 Sept. 2012 (with attachments)

Voting Members present: Ken Abramowicz; Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy; David Henry; Rainer Newberry (convener); Todd Radenbaugh (audio).

Voting Members absent: Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Diane McEachern.

Non-voting members present: Donald Crocker; Libby Eddy; Doug Goering; Linda Hapsmith; Lillian Misel; Andrea Schmidt from Advising.

Non-voting members absent: Carol Gering; Ginnie Kinne. Jayne Harvie present to take notes.

1. Elect a chairperson

Rainer Newberry noted that earlier in the year he had emailed the membership, asking if anyone would be willing to chair so he could take on the chairship of the General Ed Revitalization subcommittee of CAC. No one has stepped forward. He offered another opportunity, but no takers. Rainer was unanimously approved to chair the committee, much to everyone's relief.

2. Approve Rainer Newberry as CAC representative to (and chair of) Curriculum Review Committee

Rainer explained that Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) is another subcommittee of CAC, and its

opportunities to contribute to general education changes by means of campus-wide discussions, along with discussions at the department level.

Rainer noted that GERC needs a CAC member to attend its meetings and report back to CAC. This would also serve to provide Faculty Senate representation on the committee. Cindy H. requested to have a member of the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee on the GERC. Rainer concurred that this was a good suggestion and would be acted upon.

Rainer reported that the action plan had been examined and approved by Faculty Senate leadership, Dean's Council, and the Chancellor. The Chancellor will mention the project in his convocation tomorrow.

With regard to the position of Dean of University Studies mentioned in the action plan, Cindy asked if this position would replace the existing dean of general studies. Rainer provided some history on general studies (which concerns students who have not yet declared majors) and noted that the new position of dean would preside over "university studies": the baccalaureate core and all related requirements for graduation (i.e., "W" and "O" courses). The long-term position would not be a vice provost. Alex Fitts, now interim vice provost (and former GERC chair), has general studies along with university studies as part of her assignment, but without the accreditation piece.

Ken A. expressed concerns over just rubberstamping the action plan. He noted possible K (the A) 1 (a) M (u) P <@MCN)

It was clarified that the changed wording of the policy means that probation can occur because of one term with a semester GPA below 2.0, or an overall (cumulative) GPA below 2.0. But disqualification would only be determined on fall/spring or spring/fall semesters. Donald asked about a scenario where the GPA is below 2.0 in spring, OK in summer, and then below 2.0 in fall. The result would be probation (not disqualification). Disqualification occurs on the basis of two semester below 2.0 and an overall GPA below 2.0. A student might be on probation for two semesters, but with a GPA above 2.0 they would not be disqualified.

A discussion occurred about this change being a correction to the existing Catalog because of a “cut and paste” error made last year that shows in the printed Catalog. The online addendum is correct and in line with current practice.

Donald asked about how financial aid is affected for summer. Libby will check on that.

The need for academic advising in the summer session was noted. Dean Goering noted seeing some bad examples resulting from students not being advised about the summer courses. Everyone seemed to agree the ramifications of this change needs to be addressed by further discussion, and that the Summer Sessions Office should be included (as far as it affects degree-seeking students).

Rainer proposed carrying on this discussion to the next meeting and that financial aid and other ramifications (e.g., being put on probation at the end of the summer; advising and registration issues) be looked into further between now and the next meeting. Libby will look into the financial aid issues.

5. Calendar revision for AY 2013-2014

Proposed change: grades required by TUESDAY NOON Dec 24 instead of the Usual Weds noon (Dec 25). This would give the AR folks a bit of a holiday...

Rainer described the need to amend the 2013-14 academic calendar because the due date for grades would fall on a holiday or the day after a holiday if left unchanged. The problem affects both faculty and staff. He suggested the committee approve a change to that semester so that the due date would be December 24. The committee agreed that the due date should not be delayed because it adversely affects students, as well as faculty and staff.

Libby E. brought up the problem of Wintermester dates during AY14. There is not enough time to hold Wintermester between Jan. 2 and the first day of spring semester classes. The problem was acknowledged by Rainer, but more time is needed to resolve it. A subcommittee will be specifically examining it. Mid-October would be optimistic for having this problem resolved. Libby will let Marketing know they need to wait on this one before they can publish the calendar.

Ken A. noted problems with Maymester in the past and with when spring semester starts (before or after Alaska Civil Rights Day). This problem is different in that it affects the period of hard closure. Cindy

instructor may drop you. You are responsible for conferring with your instructor concerning absences and the possibility of making up missed work.

New suggested wording: Students are expected to adhere to the attendance policies set by their instructors. Students must have prior written approval to miss the first class meeting; otherwise, they may be dropped. Students are responsible for conferring with their instructors in advance concerning absences and the possibility of arranging alternate ways of learning the missed course material.

Further discussion on this item was postponed until the next meeting.

7. Proposed modification of absence notification (Catalog, pg. 49)

Current: You must notify your instructor(s) of all scheduled UAF-required absences for the semester (e.g., travel to athletic events) during the first week of classes.

Suggested modification: You must notify your instructor(s) of all scheduled UAF-required absences for the semester (e.g., travel to athletic events) by the end of the second week of classes (the deadline for late registration).

Note: the above is apparently what happens now, in violation of the catalog. But should it be further changed????? (Reference the copy of Sine Anahita's memo which was attached to the agenda).

Ken A. asked the committee to strongly consider not changing the notification by the student to the instructor to the second week of classes, but instead it should remain notification to the instructor on the first day of class. The second week can bring students too close the drop date and create more problems for both students and instructors. Rainer stressed the need for the committee members to look this over for the next meeting.

Karen G. noted that the first day of class for individual courses can vary.

Rainer requested the committee members have at least one sleepless night considering the issues at hand and come prepared for more discussion. He also suggested that online discussion could occur on these issues. He will try to get Athletics involved in the discussion with the committee.

8. OLD business that will be rearing its ugly Head.....Wintermester and etc.

(This item was rolled into the academic calendar discussion earlier in the meeting.)

Meeting was adjourned shortly after 10:00 AM.

ATTACHMENT 185/8
UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Faculty Senate –

professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge,* is identified as "public service." The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assumes a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service." – clarify with the chancellor regarding the term "free of charge" as this implies there will be no charges to the participant

* CES FACULTY WORK IS COUNTED AS PUBLIC SERVICE EVEN THOUGH THE UNIVERSITY MAY CHARGE A FEE FOR SOME ACTIVITIES. THESE FEES ARE NECESSARY TO RECOVER COSTS SUCH AS THOSE FOR ROOM RENT, PRINTED MATERIALS PROVIDED TO PARTICIPANTS, EQUIPMENT, AND OTHERS AND ARE NOT PAYMENT FOR FACULTY TIME NOR ARE THE FEES EVER RETAINED BY INDIVIDUAL FACULTY. – differentiates between faculty being paid on top of their original salary versus charges to the participant; do not feel this paragraph is necessary unless there is a specific reason for inclusion; clarification needed

Page 8: 1 (Public Service)

b. Service on or to government or public committees, COLLABORATIONS & PARTNERSHIPS ESTABLISHED WITH AGENCIES AND GROUPS AND UTILIZATION OF DISTRICT OR REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARDS, TASK FORCES, FOCUS GROUPS OR PUBLIC SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS TO IDENTIFY RELEVANT ISSUES AND PROBLEMS. – very wordy; might be beneficial to combine section b with l as there does not seem to be the necessity for both l. ENGAGE THE PUBLIC IN ASSESSING RESEARCH NEEDS – AND COMMUNICATE THOSE NEEDS TO THE APPROPRIATE RESEARCH UNITS.)

Page 8: 1 (Public Service)

f. Consulting INCLUDING FACE TO FACE IN THE OFFICE OR OFF

provide to the Faculty Senate for the October 8th meeting

Blue Book Review

Need to review the Blue Book to make sure it is in line with the Collective Bargaining Agreement; the Unit Criteria Committee is to meet with the Provost after 3pm on October 10 or sometime on October 11th to discuss what to address in the Blue Book; members reviewed their scheduled and decided on October 8th. Karen was to determine a specific time and send the meeting information out to the committee.

Karen will also send the link to the Collective Bargaining Agreement so all committee members can be familiar with that document.

Committee Meeting Schedule

ATTACHMENT 185/9
UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

pedagogy despite requesting the session. After some discussion it was discovered that several issues came into play: 1) there was some confusion regarding communication of scheduling; 2) SOE faculty wanted a higher-level presentation than the basic level; and 3) the 3-hour block of time is too long for most teaching faculty. Joy noted that she is willing to present on Saturdays, but there is concern that faculty may not show up. Franz noted that there should be some encouragement in the form of a reminder to faculty that these development sessions are a part of their tenure process. Izetta mentioned that rural campus faculty members find it difficult to join in the faculty development opportunities. Joy pointed out that audio conferences are easy to set up if faculty from the rural campuses request it, while video conferencing – which is sometimes necessary for visual-intense presentations – is more difficult due to the limited number of available video conferencing rooms.

V. Discussion of including postdocs in the FDAI activities

Mike noted that he will be meeting with John Eichelberger next week and will talk with him about unifying postdocs. He will report back to our committee after their discussion. Mike mentioned that he recently attended two national-level postdoc meetings and can share the latest information. Andrea
(nc)4()-4(n)-4(17.96)2(i)-2(vi)-2(t)-2(i)-2(e)4(15)]TJ 23.417.96

ATTACHMENT 185/10

ATTACHMENT 185/11

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 20, 2012**

Attending:

Sarah Stanley , Cindy Hardy, Allan Morotti, David Maxwell, Gabrielle Russell, Joe Mason, Sandra Wildfeuer, Curt Szuberla, Linda Hapsmith, Andrea Schmidt

Not attending: Nancy Ayagarak, Diane Erickson, Dana Greci, Amy Barnsley

Approval of May minutes: Approved

Election of chair and co-chair: Cindy Hardy was re-elected as chair; Sandra Wildfeuer as co-chair.

Review of committee membership definition: Jennifer Reynolds, current Faculty Senate President, has been looking over committee definitions and membership and asked that we review how members are selected for SADA among other committees. We discussed the history of the committee, originating as a Developmental Studies committee and broadening its definition after the formation of the Department of Developmental Education. Currently the committee membership definition allows for sixteen members, including one from each rural campus, plus several “members” who attend meetings out of interest but have not gone through any selection process, and others who are elected or appointed by their colleges or departments. We considered the possibility of voting and ex-officio membership, perhaps moving those not in the committee definition or those in staff or administrative roles to ex-

data at our next meeting.

Brown bag student/faculty discussions: We will take this up at the next meeting. We are gathering ideas for this.

Celebration of Writing: Sarah S. announced the Celebration of Writing to be held Oct. 20 (National Day of writing). It will be similar to a science fair, but about writing. She invited committee members to attend a planning session on Friday at 4pm.

Other discussion items:

Sandra W. noted that IAC is implementing E-live math tutoring for all math students in IAC classes. They are also hiring full-time math and English tutoring and faculty support positions as part of a 2-3 year Title III grant.

Linda H. raised the issue of student movement between DEVM 105, DEVM 106, and Math 107. The CRCD Academic Council approved a change in prerequisites from a C or better to B or better in order to move to the next class. She asked that there be an alert to advisors when such a change takes place. She noted that this has caused a difficulty for students who registered for a class before the prerequisites have changed. We discussed drafting a motion requiring an alert to advisors and departments when a prerequisite changes after the catalog is complete. Linda agreed to draft a motion for the next meeting.

Next meeting: Those attending agreed that Tuesday or Thursday afternoons work best. Cindy and Sandra will collaborate on times they are both available and will send out a Doodle poll for the best time. Cindy will work with Jayne to set future meetings.

ATTACHMENT 185/12

UAF Faculty Senate #185, October 8, 2012

Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

Research Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes – Sept. 17, 2012

Rather than formal minutes a summary in the form of an outline is given, because the meetings are not strictly according to Robert's Rules. All are encouraged to correct or edit the summary before we submit it formally to the senate. Any motions we make will be posted here as drafts for consideration as well. The current meeting only will be on this page, past meetings will be linked at the bottom.

September 17, 2012 14:00-15:00

Present were: Dehn, Healy, Heaton, Hundertmark, Koch, Lawlor, Webley

An informal agenda was adopted:

- > 1. Nomination and election of a chair
- > 2. Past business updates, review of last years actions
- > 3. Accounting of F&A, and re framing the impression of what the research engine does for UAF
- > 4. Role of the RAC and VCR office, how we can be helpful
- > 5. Research Foundation at UAF, what sort of needs would the research community have

1. Jon Dehn was nominated and elected as Chair of the RAC for this academic year

2. Past business was discussed, led by Webley

a.) the FAQ for researchers at UAF, is a living document, Lawlor forwarded the document. We will host it here and suggested a home for it at the VCR's website. We should make sure the document stays current. I suggest it be on the agenda regularly for the RAC. Next meeting when all have access to it, we'll take a closer look. (<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1u4-DvbjNefwKURNTLGyZzIEAWqEWqAS6-HdhdWkK1iw/edit>)

b. URSA, and how to have it work better for the research enterprise at UAF. Many ideas were suggested, including having undergrad research mentored by graduate students as well as faculty, and having more faculty involved in the courses URSA offers. Dehn will invite and engage Barbara Taylor and our new Grad School Dean, John Eichelberger.

- a.) a positive tone to show how research supports a lot of other things at UAF, to help us get the credit we deserve
 - b.) large scale most of this is known (<http://www.uaf.edu/osp/policies-and-procedures/facilities-administrative/>)
 - c.) but what about how each institute, center, college or school handles it (posed by Winsor via email), we'll formulate a request for next meeting to circulate
6. Followup on policy review at UAF
- a.) the committee looked at Regent's policy as one of many groups tasked to look for inconsistencies with funding agency policies, laws and practices at UAF
 - b.) a list of these was produced, the question rose as to what has or will be done
 - c.) the impression is that some of these will be acted upon at Regent's level, some not, we may not hear to much about it anymore
7. RACs role to serve as an arbiter for disputes with IACUC (<http://www.uaf.edu/iacuc/>) and IRB (<http://www.uaf.edu/irb/>) idea posed by Hundertmark
- a.) currently there is little recourse if one runs afoul of either of these bodies
 - b.) we should research the potential impacts of this on RAC, is it a large workload?
 - c.) there used to be a mediation group at UAF, Dehn was an active member with training, perhaps that body is a good place, or we should have trained mediators on RAC?
8. Future meeting schedule and communication
- a.) monthly may be sufficient, be prepared for more often as warranted
 - b.) try to keep meetings focused an efficient
 - c.) judicious use of online media, spawned this Google Site at UAF for RAC, please make avail of it and add info and tidbits!