



Gerald Plumley, professor with the UAF Institute of Marine Science, and graduate student Tracie Toivanen work to discover the causes and prevention of paralytic shellfish poisoning.

UAF photo by Heather Tipton

STANDARD FOUR

Faculty

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS

4.A. Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare and Development

1. Faculty Characteristics

The diversity of instructional programs and research institutes at UAF has created a philosophically heterogeneous faculty. This variety extends to academic rank faculty, special rank faculty such as research faculty, vocational and developmental educators, and extension faculty [G1]. (See Appendix [A4.1] for a glossary of faculty terms.)

The number of faculty by type and student/faculty ratio for fall 1991 through fall 2000 are given in the table below. (See computation of student/faculty ratio [G6 Table 3.03].)

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Full-time Regular Faculty numbers	526	525	531	513	514	500	441	428	461	478
Part-time and temporary faculty numbers	220	207	216	173	183	203	226	227	236	250
Total	746	732	747	686	697	703	667	655	697	728
% FT Regular	71%	72%	71%	75%	74%	71%	66%	65%	66%	66%
Student/Faculty ratio	N/A	N/A	12.5	13.1	12.3	12.6	13.7	12.1	11.1	10.7

From data provided in "UA in Review" (G6)

Starting in July 1997, the University of Alaska participated in the state's Retirement Incentive Program (R.I.P.) for three consecutive years, reducing the number of full-time faculty (see table on page 2 of this section) to a decade low of 428 in 1998. The distribution among college, schools, and institutes of faculty retiring under this program is shown in the table on page 2 of this section. About half (44 of 86) of the retired faculty positions were funded for replacement during the three years of the R.I.P. During this period, many positions were lost rather than replaced at entry-level rank as initially expected. The low rate of permanent replacement was due to the need for budget cuts and the rules under which the R.I.P. was administered. Some faculty positions (in the College of Rural Alaska (CRA), for example) were left vacant because of overall university funding reductions, not just the R.I.P. [CRA campus notebooks]. In addition to the 44 replacements, some rebuilding of faculty has occurred since fall 2000.

In the last two years, with a change in administration and an increase in legislative funding, the decline has stopped and faculty numbers are recovering [E4.1]. As a result, the fall 2000 ratio of full-time equivalent students per full-time faculty member, 10.7, is lower than the high of 13.7 reached in 1997 [G6 Table 3.03].

For a history of faculty unionization, see Standard 6.

College or School	Number of faculty retiring under RIP	
College of Liberal Arts	19	
College of Rural Alaska	19	Subtotals
		Northwest Campus
		Kuskokwim Campus
		Cooperative Extension
		Fairbanks Campus
		Tanana Valley Campus
Institutes, Museum, and Arctic Region Supercomputing Center	16	Subtotals
		Museum
		Geophysical Institute
		Arctic Region Supercomputing Center
		Institute of Arctic Biology
College of Science, Engineering and Mathematics	14	
School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences	10	
Rasmuson Library	3	
School of Education	2	
School of Agriculture and Land Resources Management	2	
School of Management	1	
Total	86	

Evidence-Based Description

During fall 2000, UAF employed 478 full-time (regular) and 250 part-time faculty. Individual department faculty profiles are included in each department and campus notebook [departmental notebooks].

About half (47 percent) of the 478 full-time faculty are tenured (down from 61 percent in 1996), about a quarter (24 percent) are not tenured, and 28 percent are not eligible for tenure, e.g., part-time faculty, instructors and some research faculty [G6 Table 3.01]. All major programs in the colleges and schools have tenure-line faculty members and many use part-time faculty (4.A.1; see also Standard 2.C and below).

The majority of the faculty (92 percent) are represented by collective bargaining. The table below gives the distribution of faculty by bargaining unit [G6 Table 3.10].

Representation	Number (%) of faculty in fall 2000
Alaska Community College Federation of Teachers (ACCFT)	61 (8%)
United Academics (UNAC)	421 (58%)
United Academics Adjuncts (UNAC Adjuncts)	190 (26%)
Non-Represented faculty	14 (2%)
Non-represented Adjunct faculty	42 (6%)

Collective bargaining agreements are on exhibit [G14; G15; W4.1].

The full-time faculty is predominately Caucasian (86.7 percent) and male (62 percent) [W4.2; W4.3]. Ethnic and gender distribution varies across colleges and schools as described in the following table.

+ Fall 2000 Full-time faculty by college/school/institute, gender and ethnicity

College School	Number of Full-time faculty	Percent Females	Percent Males	Percent Ak.Nat/Ind	Percent Asian	Percent Black	Percent Hispanic	Percent White
CLA	108	42	58	5	2.5	0.5	5	87
CRA	92	51	49	9		1		90
CSEM	77	16	84		13		1	86
SALRM	22	36	64		14			86
SFOS	42	19	81	5	5			90
SME	14		100		64	14		22
SOE	16	63	37	19			6	75
SOM	21	24	76		14			86
Library	11	64	36					100
Museum	5	20	80					100
Institutes*	60	14	86		10			84
ALL UAF	478	38	62	4.4	6.0	1.2	1.7	86.7

+ 3 FT temporary faculty not included

*Institutes include ARSC, IAB, INE, GI, and IARC

Percentages may not add to 100 due to an "other" category and/or rounding of figures.

The distribution of faculty (full- and part-time) by gender, ethnicity and rank is given in UA in Review 2001 [G6 Table 3.09]. The distribution of faculty headcount by rank is 21 percent professor, 17 percent associate, 21 percent assistant, and 41 percent instructor or adjunct. Female faculty members comprise 11 percent of professors, 31 percent of associate professors, 46 percent of assistant professors and 51 percent of instructors and adjuncts. Standard 2.C discusses the instructional role of full- and part-time faculty by college and school.

The faculty are well qualified and functionally diverse [A4.2; A4.3; W4.3]. Of the full-time faculty 65 percent have a doctorate, 23 percent have a master's degree, 3 percent have a bachelor's degree, 1 percent have professional licenses; 8 percent have less than a bachelor's degree or their degree status has not been entered into UAF's database [A4.2]. About three-quarters of the tenure-line faculty (73 percent) at UAF hold doctoral degrees. Most of the exceptions occur in the College of Rural Alaska (4.A.1, 4.A.3), where faculty most often have master's degrees or meet community standards (e.g., experienced certified welders and recognized Native dance instructors). Faculty hired for baccalaureate and graduate programs typically have completed the Ph.D. and many have postdoctoral teaching and/or research experience. In some instances senior-level faculty who have comparatively little academic experience but extensive experience in industry, the professions, or government agencies have been hired. This practice is particularly relevant to professional degree programs such as Engineering, and to undergraduate and graduate degree programs in areas such as Journalism and Broadcasting, and Paralegal Studies. Individual department faculty profiles are included in each department notebook.

Full-time faculty members' terminal degrees and awarding institutions are listed in the Appendix [A4.3]. The vast majority of UAF faculty (97 percent) received their terminal degree at other universities; 15 received terminal degrees from UAF, 8 of whom are tenure-line faculty. In the

case of specialized Arctic or Northern expertise, UAF sometimes hires its own graduates, often after postdoctoral experience at other institutions.

In the fall of 2000, UAF had 250 part-time and temporary faculty members, an increase of 23 percent from 203 in 1996 (see the table above). Most (92 percent) of these faculty members were part-time adjunct lecturers. According to collective bargaining agreements, adjunct faculty can teach no more than fifteen credits a year (4.A.8). Every college and school hires adjunct faculty (see Standard 2 and exhibits [G5]), but the highest proportion was within the College of Rural Alaska, which had 35 percent of student credit hours taught by part-time faculty during fall 2000. The College of Liberal Arts had 23 percent, the School of Management had 21 percent, and the School of Education had 15 percent of student credit hours taught by adjunct faculty. All other colleges and schools had less than 10 percent. (Data are based on course designators; additional analysis is on exhibit [E2.1].)

Required qualifications for adjunct faculty are set by individual academic programs (4.A.8). This is appropriate for the diversity of programs offered. For example, within the sciences the master's degree is the minimum qualification while in the vocational-technical programs certification and appropriate experience (e.g., welding or fire science) are the primary qualifications. In the community campuses, adjunct faculty, except for local interest courses such as Alaska Native dance, are subject to approval of academic departments. Hiring is the responsibility of deans upon recommendation by the department chair, campus director, or a committee (4.A.9). Thus adjunct faculty are qualified, having the appropriate degree for the level of instructional responsibility assigned [departmental notebooks].

Appraisal

Savings from the R.I.P. and recent budget increases have resulted in a partial recovery of faculty positions. Even though the number of full-time faculty in fall 2000 remains about 10 percent below those of 1990-1993 period, the ratio of full-time equivalent students per full-time faculty member (10.7) is at its lowest level in eight years. However, the number and proportion of tenure-line faculty are at their lowest point since 1996.

Retirements during the three years of the R.I.P. were arbitrary with respect to program needs. Only 51 percent of the vacated positions were refilled, and salary savings from the retirements did not devolve directly to the affected college or department. Thus, recovery is uneven and departments that lost several faculty will fully recover only if additional replacements are approved. Currently the provost and higher administrators are not approving R.I.P. replacement searches. Instead, all new faculty hires must be part of a statewide planning, programming, and budgeting initiative process.

UAF has a loyal and qualified group of part-time instructors for some disciplines. However, the Fairbanks area (population 83,000) provides a small pool of part-time faculty in some fields, e.g., the physical sciences. During the last decade the administration dealt with some issues about part-time faculty and is continuing to work on issues such as office space, seniority benefits, retirement benefits, department voting privileges, department meeting participation privileges, professional development, advising responsibilities, office hour responsibilities, and

compensation for certain travel. Many of these issues will be handled through collective bargaining as the union representing part-time faculty, United Academics Adjuncts, completes its organizational structure.

Faculty profiles for gender and ethnicity reflect the characteristics of applicant pools and, as a result, minority numbers do not represent either the state population or the UAF student body. For example, 13.3 percent of the overall faculty are non-Caucasian and only 11 percent of full professors are female [W4.4; W4.5]. Thus, the university must give increased attention to gender and ethnic representation. The high number of Alaska Native students attending UAF (see Standard 3) calls for a greater proportion of Alaska Native faculty to serve as role models and mentors. Clearly, the university will be required to provide enhanced opportunities for Native Alaskans to pursue advanced degrees that would enable them to enter faculty applicant pools. Gender inequity at the full-professor level should be addressed through proactive recruiting.

Projections

UAF will benefit from a systematic review of programs that have a high percentage of part-time instructors. Such a review would determine the degree to which an increase in the number of permanent positions would better serve the needs of these programs. Improved methods for collecting data on the qualifications and contribution of part-time faculty will allow deans to better assess the quality of faculty by program.

In the next decade, UAF will reverse the trend of the 1990s by increasing its number of full-time faculty. Such increases are already identified in initiative proposals for 2003. “Strategic Plan: UAF 2005” [A1.4], developed by faculty and administrators, projects an increase in the number of full-time faculty, especially in science, math, engineering, and education.

2. Faculty Roles

Evidence-Based Description

Faculty roles in governance and the development, review, approval, and implementation of curricula have been well established in faculty governance for many years (see standards 2.A and 6 for more detail) and are revised as needed.

Faculty are involved in academic planning at various levels. Department planning (see short- and long-term goals in department notebooks) contributes to the development of college and school missions and goals. In addition, faculty draft initiative proposals that are part of a statewide planning, programming, and budgeting system [G25] (4.A.2). Although there is need for further integration of budgeting and academic planning, UAF has an Academic Development Plan [A1.6] developed by the provost in consultation with faculty. Faculty members also serve on the Master (facilities) Planning Committee [W8.5].

Faculty have primary responsibility for the development, review, approval and implementation of curricula (see Standard 2.A for a description of the program and course approval process).

During fall semester 2000, full-time faculty delivered 71 percent of the courses and 70 percent of the student credit hours for the associate of arts, baccalaureate and graduate programs and 41 percent and 39 percent respectively for vocational associate and certificate programs (4.A.3) (see Standard 2.C for further detail). However, part-time faculty now offer more courses and SCH than they did in the early 1990s [G5] (4.A.1, 4.A.8).

Most adjunct faculty teach lower division courses and have helped maintain reasonable student/faculty ratios [G6]. Many of these faculty have been associated with a specific department for several years and often play a significant role in those departments (4.A.8). The administration has assessed the role of part-time faculty at various times over the last decade. For example, in the mid-1990s the dean of the College of Science, Engineering and Mathematics reviewed hiring practices and compensation with department heads. Currently, the role of part-time faculty is assessed during the collective bargaining process [W4.1] (4.A.10).

Advising is recognized as part of the faculty workload and is included as part of instruction, not service [G14; G15]. Full-time students are required to have an advisor's signature on a registration form prior to registering for courses each semester (see Standard 3 for more details). Declared majors are generally advised by faculty in their field of study (4.A.2). Non-degree seeking, undeclared, and some associate degree students are advised through a variety of methods depending on their location and needs (see Standard 3). On the Fairbanks campus these students are advised by faculty at the Academic Advising Center or by professional staff in Rural Student Services. The Department of Athletics advises student athletes. Local faculty members or professional staff advise students at community campuses. The chancellor established the Carol Feist Advising Award in the early 1990s for faculty who excelled at advising, and this award has been given annually since then.

Advising often includes helping students find employment. UAF departments or programs that are professionally accredited or certified and vocational-technical programs typically have well developed processes in this area. For example, the School of Management, the School of Education, Engineering programs, and Computer Science have cooperative and intern programs that often lead to jobs [college, department notebooks]. UAF also has internships in Counseling and Social Work. Tanana Valley Campus provides opportunities through the Nursing and Allied Health programs. Individual faculty commonly assist students with job and further education placement [college, department notebooks]. Other departments, such as Anthropology and Biology, have extensive professional relationships with government agencies that employ students in the summers and full time after graduation. In addition, Career Services informs faculty of recruiting opportunities for students in their disciplines. The UAF graduate employment survey conducted by Career Services provides specific information concerning job and further education placement [E4.2] (see Standard 3).

In addition to curriculum development and advising, faculty participate in departmental governance (4.A.2). Each department has an elected departmental chair [G11]. Additionally, each college or school has representation on the Faculty Senate proportional to its number of full-time faculty. Through its curriculum, graduate and core committees, the Faculty Senate has had a major impact on the academic function of UAF [G11]. (Standard 6 describes university governance in detail.)

Appraisal

The role of faculty in planning continues to evolve. Most departments drafted formal short- and long-term goals in 1999-2000 for the first time in many years as part of this self-study [department notebooks]. The implementation of the statewide budget initiative process and the growth of an Academic Development Plan increased faculty involvement in planning as well. This change in faculty involvement was largely due to new leadership at the presidential, chancellor, and provost levels. New leadership, the revised mission and vision statements [A1.1; A1.4], and the new budget initiative process [G25] have generally raised faculty morale. Planning and budgeting processes need refinement (see Standard 1), and the role of faculty should receive continual attention. Rural faculty representation in all aspects of planning—especially master planning—is needed.

Faculty involvement in governance and in the development, review, approval, and implementation of curricula are well established in the Faculty Senate. These roles are important to faculty and are not likely to be revised in a major way any time soon (see also standards 2.A and 6).

Each department has its own method of distributing advising assignments among its faculty, and some differences are evident. In Biology and Wildlife, faculty are assigned a number of undergraduate advisees scaled to the percentage of their appointment in the department. For example, a faculty member with a 50 percent departmental appointment would have about twice as many undergraduate advisees as one with a 25 percent departmental appointment. In Philosophy, the department chair advises seniors and juniors, while junior faculty advise sophomores and freshmen. In Chemistry and Biochemistry, three senior faculty members advise all undergraduate majors. Students in the School of Education are advised by professional staff [department notebooks].

The results of the survey of graduates conducted by Career Services [E4.2] (see Standard 3) suggest that job placement is generally not a problem for UAF graduates. However, there is no evidence that faculty have used specific information from this survey to improve placement. The role of faculty in student placement has never been well defined for the institution as a whole.

A faculty discussion of best practices should be considered in the following areas:

- Models for the distribution of undergraduate student advising among faculty.
- Models for the faculty role in placement, especially for those programs that appear to need attention in the survey of graduates.
- Models for departmental and college/school planning processes.

3. Faculty Workload Types

Evidence-Based Description

UAF has procedures in place to determine faculty workloads (4.A.3). These procedures are contractually based in collective bargaining agreements with the three UAF faculty unions—

Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers, United Academics, and United Academics Adjuncts [G14; G15; W4.1]. Workload is distributed among instruction, research, and service (university, professional, and public). The forms used for developing annual workloads are communicated to faculty via the World Wide Web [W4.6].

These procedures have been continuously reviewed over the last ten years, resulting in standardized workload assignment forms and increased consistency in workload unit values assigned to instruction, research, and service roles within colleges and schools. Faculty workloads (4.A.3) reflect the diversity of mission and vision of UAF [A1.1; A1.4]. Therefore, workload distributions vary greatly among colleges and schools. Such variation occurs in relation to expectations for instruction, externally funded research, university service, cooperative extension service, and mentoring of graduate students. Faculty workload agreements in the College of Rural Alaska (CRA) are influenced by the unique role many CRA faculty hold. In many instances, CRA faculty work in single-member departments or in rural communities with many different expectations [CRA notebooks].

Overall documentation of diversity in faculty workload can be seen in departmental notebooks. Some university faculty, mostly in CRA, have bipartite appointments [G15] in which the workload is composed of four parts teaching and one part service. Bipartite and tripartite workloads are established in writing at the time of recruitment and in the annual workload agreements prepared by the individual faculty member and approved by the department chair and college dean. Bipartite and tripartite faculty are represented by unions, ACCFT and United Academics, respectively [G14; G15]. All workloads must conform to contracts negotiated in collective bargaining agreements (4.A.3).

UAF departments vary considerably in the number and nature of joint appointments. Faculty holding joint appointments have salary and benefits provided by more than one unit. For example, a physics professor may have tenure-line and 50 percent of salary in the Department of Physics, with the other 50 percent from the Geophysical Institute. Joint appointments are commonplace in most of the sciences [department notebooks] but relatively rare in the College of Liberal Arts, the School of Management, the School of Mineral Engineering, and in Mathematics or Statistics programs. In large part because of joint appointments, UAF has wide variation in the research component of workloads (from 0 percent to 80 percent for tenure-track faculty). Those who have joint appointments typically have higher research and graduate mentoring as part of instructional workload than those who do not, and these vary in relation to the percent of the appointment with the institute.

Faculty members without joint appointments are expected to teach four to five courses each academic year, demonstrate scholarly activity, and provide service. Some departments [Biology notebook] assign a lower instructional workload to new and junior faculty. Some units, such as the School of Management, provide reduced course loads for scholarship. Many faculty add to their assigned teaching loads with uncompensated additional independent study courses and unusually heavy student advising and compensated summer teaching. Faculty members include academic planning, curriculum development, outcomes assessment, and advising as part of the instructional workload. In addition to the instructional workload agreements reviewed by department chairs and approved by deans, many faculty members sign separate agreements with

the Center for Distance Education and Independent Learning to serve as graders for independent learning (correspondence) courses.

In general, public, university, and professional service constitutes 5 percent to 10 percent of faculty workloads in all colleges and schools except the College of Rural Alaska and the School of Education. However, faculty represented by ACCFT, mostly in CRA, have service assignments of 20 percent of workload, and extension faculty have a majority of their workload in service. In addition, a few faculty have high service workloads because of partial administrative assignments, such as in faculty development or as assessment coordinators.

Appraisal

Wide variation in workload distribution among UAF faculty poses the following challenges:

- It is difficult to evaluate individuals for promotion and tenure in the context of individual workload agreements.
- Faculty with high teaching and service components in their workload sometimes have difficulty achieving their personal aspirations for scholarly accomplishments. This occasionally results in morale issues.
- Departments with faculty who have a high percentage teaching and service assignment find it difficult to develop and maintain graduate programs.
- Departments with faculty who have a high percentage research assignment sometimes find it difficult to meet instructional demands.

In all colleges, but most notably the College of Liberal Arts, some departmental notebooks report that faculty have no incentive in their workloads to increase productivity in research and scholarly activity (see also Standard 4.B). Even though workload assignments may be changed during an academic year, discussions with deans indicate that few faculty members, department chairs, and deans complete and submit revised workload agreements.

Faculty members teaching correspondence courses often have heavier instructional workloads than those represented on the workload forms reviewed by the department chairs and approved by deans. Separate agreements between individual faculty members and the Center for Distance Education and Independent Learning are used for assignments to teach correspondence classes. Even though initial department chair approval for such assignments is required, this approval is not part of the workload assignment process, and the process does not require informing the dean. Department chairs may change every two years, so new chairs may not be aware of such continuing assignments. This makes it difficult for department chairs and deans to accurately mentor these faculty toward promotion and tenure.

The service component of workloads appears appropriate in most instances. While there is little comment in department notebooks, university faculty across UAF complain about too many university related committee assignments. Some faculty, in particular women and minorities in CLA, have asserted that they feel “serviced to death.” This is indicative that service is not well distributed and is worthy of investigation.

Even though the UAF research enterprise has grown during the last decade (see Standard 4.B), faculty often comment that the research component of workload seems to be losing ground to teaching and service. The following contributing factors are commonly mentioned in this regard:

- A lack of staff support in the preparation and administration of grants for some units forces faculty in these units to invest their time in obtaining extramural funding and assume primary responsibility for grant writing.
- There is a need for independent study courses to be offered for students to complete their degree programs in a timely manner. This is a problem within the College of Rural Alaska and smaller programs in the College of Liberal Arts where these courses are often offered on an alternate-year cycle. However, there is no institutional data on how significant or widespread this issue is.
- A formalized process of review of faculty (annual, comprehensive retention review, tenure-promotion, and post-tenure) has increased the time spent in preparing files for these purposes.
- Most internally funded equipment is now distributed based upon competitive proposals rather than in budgets allocated to individual departments. Examples include Technology Advisory Board funding and the Provost's Instructional Equipment Fund. This results in additional faculty time spent on writing such proposals.
- The retirement of senior faculty through the Retirement Incentive Program reduced the number of faculty to whom service is assigned.

Projections

Over the next ten years, UAF will continue to work on a model incorporating the different values of a research university, a liberal arts college, and a community college. Faculty workloads will continue to evolve to meet the external demands placed on the university.

The provost has mandated that outcomes assessment be included in 2001-2002 faculty workloads. However, a broader discussion of workload is needed to deal with the following issues:

- Instructional workload related to individual study courses.
- Faculty involvement in correspondence courses.
- Workload recognition for grant preparation, particularly for units lacking sufficient staff support.
- Recognition of workload associated with internal proposal writing for equipment.
- Extensive service role of some faculty, especially women and minorities.

4. Faculty Compensation and Recruitment

The 1995 Interim Report for Reaffirmation of Accreditation [G23] reported that average salaries at all ranks except instructors were lower than those reported in the Oklahoma State University Faculty Salary Survey for all institutions and for group one institutions (Pacific Northwest). In addition, the 1995 report indicated that average salaries for all ranks were lower in 1995 than those reported in the 1989-1990 self-study [G24], and the range of salaries for each rank was narrower.

Because of the budget decline in the early 1990s, The Board of Regents on August 20, 1993 [G4 Minutes], suspended indefinitely all provisions of its policies concerning annual in-range adjustments, cost-of-living increases, and protection of real income. The board then began discussions with the UA Faculty Alliance to revise its compensation policy for faculty not represented in unions. Before any conclusion was reached in these discussions, further unionization efforts began. During the 1997-1998 academic year the United Academics collective bargaining agreement was signed. Compensation issues are now part of the respective collective bargaining agreements (United Academics, Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers, and United Academics Adjuncts).

There has been little change in the overall process of faculty recruitment in the last decade. The most notable change has been the increased visibility of the role of the Equal Employment Office and the university's effort to increase faculty diversity.

Evidence-Based Description

Compensation

Salaries and salary adjustments are outlined in UAF faculty policies [E4.3] and union collective bargaining agreements [G14; G15; W4.1]. These agreements also describe compensation for special assignments such as serving as department chair. The College of Liberal Arts section at the end of Standard 2 discusses compensation issues pertinent to CLA faculty.

Since the implementation of the first United Academics collective bargaining agreement in the 1997-1998 academic year, continuing faculty have received raises averaging 2.4 percent each year (4.A.4). In succeeding years these raises have alternated between performance-based adjustments that have averaged 2.4 percent (within a possible range of 0 percent to 8 percent), and across-the-board increases. Under United Academics and Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers contracts, raises are capped at 10 percent during any year including any salary adjustment based on promotion.

Current United Academics (UNAC) and Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers (ACCFT) collective bargaining agreements stipulate across-the-board raises of 2.6 percent at the start of each fiscal year (July 1, 2001, 2002, and 2003) [G14; G15].

Starting salaries (9-month contract period) for incoming faculty have risen only slightly—from about \$38,000 to about \$44,000 in the sciences and mathematics, \$50,000 to \$55,000 in engineering, and from \$36,000 to \$44,000 in liberal arts—in the past few years for a faculty member with no academic experience beyond the Ph.D.

Average salaries by year for full-time faculty in UNAC and ACCFT are compared to the 2000-2001 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) [E4.4] and the Oklahoma State University Faculty Salary Survey [E4.5] in the following table.

	UNAC 9-month average salaries by year (fall semester data)				Oklahoma Salary Survey Average Salary "other" category	AAUP median Category I (Doctoral-Level)
Rank Table 4.1	1997	1998	1999	2000	2000-01	2000-01
Professor	64,836	66,556	67,194	67,838	75,473	84,731
Associate Professor	50,336	52,214	52,038	52,722	57,210	61,219
Assistant Professor	41,690	42,285	43,758	44,910	47,187	52,001
Instructor	35,955	38,616	37,617	40,255	33,862	38,467
	ACCFT 9-month average salaries by year (fall semester data)				Oklahoma Salary Survey Average Salary "other" category	AAUP median Category III (Two-year Colleges)
Rank Table 4.1	1997	1998	1999	2000	2000-01	2000-01
Professor	59,833	61,831	67,973	69,741	75,473	54,827
Associate Professor	59,173	59,178	57,251	57,939	57,210	46,150
Assistant Professor	47,280	49,586	47,433	45,825	47,187	39,681
Instructor	43,732	44,064	43,081	44,777	33,862	34,479

A more detailed study compared faculty represented by United Academics by rank and discipline for the 2000-2001 year with the research/doctoral institutions' 2000 salary study conducted by Oklahoma State University (OSUSS). This comparison eliminates many disciplines that do not occur at UAF and therefore provides a more appropriate comparison of salaries. A faculty member from the UAF School of Management conducted this study as part of this self-study [E4.6]. The analysis found that UAF average salaries lag 11.5 percent behind peer institutions across all ranks and disciplines, and this difference is statistically significant. Assistant and associate professor salaries are 6.5 percent below average, and full professors are 19.5 percent below average. These deviations are also statistically significant. While the salary deviation from peer institutions varies across UAF colleges and schools, non-aggregated data indicate that the salary deviation found at the institution-wide level also exists within each college/school. Controlling for rank, salary deviations from peer institutions were not statistically significant across gender.

In the early 1990s UAF average faculty salaries by rank were in the first or second quintile (20 percent) of faculty nationwide. The March-April 2001 issue of *Academe* [E4.7] indicates that among doctoral-granting institutions UAF salaries are now in the bottom 20 percent for full, associate and assistant professors and in the 40-60 percent group for instructors. Few faculty members at UAF are at the top of the salary scale as specified for their academic rank in the collective bargaining agreements, so maximums set in the contract are not an issue in general for colleges and schools at this time. Some exceptions occur in the School of Management.

Though UAF is the only institution in the University of Alaska system classified as a research/doctoral institution, its average salaries differ by less than \$1,000 from other institutions in the system [G6 Table 3.02]. The other institutions in the system are classified as comprehensive universities.

Salaries paid to part-time instructors are quite low (around \$2,300 per course in the College of Liberal Arts). This makes it difficult to recruit and retain well-qualified instructors to fill the needs of departments that are short-handed due to the Retirement Incentive Program or faculty on leave. Although the United Academics Adjunct collective bargaining agreement does not specify salary maximums, many departments pay the minimum salary because of limited faculty pool budgets and instructional demand.

Recruitment

UAF's standard orderly process for recruiting for open positions and creating new adjunct and full-time faculty positions is similar to that at other universities (4.A.6). Departments request replacement or new positions based on their needs. The dean reviews the request and, based on the individual college's mission, budget and strategic plan, either approves or disapproves the request. If additional funding is needed, as in the case for a new faculty line, the dean forwards the request to the provost, whose decision is based on UAF's priorities and budget [A1.4].

UAF takes recruitment of new faculty seriously. In several instances, departments have declared a failed search rather than offer a position to an applicant who may not achieve tenure and promotion [e.g. Biology and Wildlife notebook]. Applicants for adjunct faculty openings are recruited throughout the year, as needed to meet instructional demands.

Procedures for the recruitment and selection of new faculty members are laid out in Board of Regents policy and regulations [G2 P04.03; G3 R04.03] and these procedures are followed at UAF. A faculty search committee, appointed by the dean with input from the departmental chair and, when applicable, an institute director, develops a position description, proposed rank, and workload category (tripartite or bipartite). The EEO office reviews the position description, advertisements, and screening forms for compliance with university hiring procedures and suggests advertising strategies to help recruit a diverse pool of applicants. Recruitment is normally done through national publications applicable to the field and posting on university and department web pages.

UAF typically makes a special effort to recruit women and minorities by advertising in publications used for this purpose and contacting institutions with high minority populations. However, few women and minority candidates apply for many faculty positions. Occasionally, programs have made direct hires or conducted abbreviated or internal searches to hire a candidate from an under-represented group who is recognized as exceptionally well qualified.

When the application period closes, a screening committee of faculty members and, in many units, students, evaluates the applications. Finalists' names are forwarded to the dean for consideration prior to final interviews, which are normally held during a campus visit. Interviews usually include a formal presentation before faculty and students. The dean receives final approval from Equal Employment Office and the provost prior to making an official offer of employment.

In summary, while the dean is the final hiring authority, some deans (for example in the College of Liberal Arts) empower department search committee heads to make the arrangements for candidates. The practicality is that the search chair is in the best position to know the candidate

and committee schedules. The dean's office pays for the hiring process, and the dean meets with the department chair to discuss potential ranges for acceptable offers. Some faculty have been critical of the lack of participation in carrying out aspects of the search process [CLA notebooks].

Appraisal

The UAF compensation policy is well defined in union contracts and recruitment processes are well defined in policy. The administration follows these policies in practice. Faculty are engaged in discussions on compensations through collective bargaining and participate fully in recruitment.

While salary data on the department/discipline level remain to be fully analyzed, national survey data clearly indicate that UAF faculty salaries have fallen behind peer institutions. Salaries for United Academics represented full, associate, and assistant professor are lower than national averages using either AAUP or Oklahoma State University Faculty Salary Survey figures. Given the reduction in the number of full professors with many years in rank because of the R.I.P., one would have expected a drop in salaries for full professors. However, that did not occur. The picture is not as clear for ACCFT-represented faculty because salaries for some faculty in this group should be compared to those for two-year colleges while others should be compared to comprehensive university salaries. The diversity of programs represented by ACCFT faculty makes salary analysis difficult. Furthermore, the attempt to recruit at market salary levels in order to maintain the high quality of faculty has led to salary compression between grades because raises for continuing faculty have not kept pace with increases in market levels. In some fields (see Engineering department notebooks), UAF has been unable to offer market-based compensation (4.A.1, 4.A.4). Overall, the impression from reviewing departmental notebooks is that the majority of faculty would like market-based salaries. In contrast, most faculty consider their benefits to be adequate or very good.

The benefits package and research university environment have helped to attract qualified replacement faculty. However, without a significant adjustment in both the salaries offered to new hires and the salaries of existing faculty, UAF is likely to face difficulties in faculty recruitment and retention. The salary comparison did not adjust for the higher-than-average cost of living in Fairbanks, and therefore a more detailed analysis is needed to determine its impact.

A major challenge for UAF is to appropriately compensate the diversity of the faculty. Two issues contribute significantly to this challenge:

- As a research/doctoral institution UAF needs appropriate salaries to attract and retain qualified faculty in research programs. However, salaries for faculty in disciplines where there is no graduate program and research is not a major priority should more appropriately follow standards set for comprehensive universities or community colleges.
- Board of Regents policy and collective bargaining units focus on UA system compensation scales and do not recognize UAF's distinct compensation needs as a research/doctoral university.

In some departments the lack of competitive starting salaries and inadequate travel budgets or start-up funds have negatively impacted recruiting.

Projections

Faculty concern over compensation appears to be growing. However, the current United Academics and Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers agreements are in place through June 2003, and the United Academics Adjuncts agreement is in place through December 2001. Thus, changes in salary are not expected prior to the end of these agreements. Current leadership in faculty unions and the UA and UAF administrations appear committed to working together to improve faculty salaries and working conditions, depending upon the economic status of the state.

No changes are anticipated in the recruiting process in the near future.

5. Faculty Review and Evaluation

Prior to United Academics unionization of faculty, the Faculty Senate had been involved in policy development and revision concerning the evaluation of faculty not represented by unions (see Standard 6 for a history of UAF faculty unions). Now the vast majority of faculty are represented by unions and faculty evaluation procedures are a component of collective bargaining agreements.

Evidence-Based Description

UAF has procedures in place to evaluate faculty (4.A.5) [department notebooks]. These procedures are contractually based in the three faculty collective bargaining units—Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers, United Academics, and United Academics Adjuncts [G14; G15; W4.1]. The schedule, forms used, and guidelines for faculty evaluation are communicated to faculty via the Internet [W4.7].

Student evaluations of courses and instructors based on the Instructional Assessment System of the University of Washington are conducted for every course for each faculty member (full- and part-time) (Policy 4.1 c.1) [E4.8]. This information is used in subsequent faculty evaluation procedures. In addition, some departments (e.g., English) mentor teaching graduate assistants via one-credit courses in teaching methods and have tenure-line faculty periodically observe teaching assistants and part-time instructors (4.A.5).

Evaluation procedures were developed and are assessed continuously by administration and the Faculty Senate (4.A.5, Policy 4.1.a) and modified as appropriate [G11 Minutes]. A recent example of this has been an extensive process for post-tenure review starting in 1999. In cooperation with the unions and the Faculty Senate, the administration created a post-tenure review procedure similar to regular tenure review [W4.7]. This review occurs every three years.

Even though there are some differences in the collective bargaining agreements, all faculty are reviewed in a three-year period and all untenured faculty (both tenure-track and term) are

reviewed annually. Moreover, all faculty have undergone a comprehensive review over the past three years. Faculty are evaluated on how well their efforts conform to the distribution of their individual workload agreements in the areas of instruction, research, and service (Policy 4.1.c). Department notebooks report the date of last review and type for individual faculty members. Department chairs are evaluated in the same way as all other faculty.

The review processes for the collective bargaining units are described by bargaining unit as follows:

- **Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers (ACCFT) [G15].** Untenured faculty are reviewed annually by the dean. Tenured faculty are reviewed every three years by the dean. Faculty submit annual activities reports to the executive dean (in the case of rural campus faculty via the campus director). The collective bargaining agreement specifies a post-tenure review period of "not less than every five years." However, these reviews are conducted on UAF's three-year cycle of evaluation.
- **United Academics (UNAC) [G14].** Untenured faculty are reviewed annually by the dean based upon an annual activities report submitted by the faculty member. Untenured faculty have a 4th year comprehensive retention review by a peer-review committee, the department chair upon the dean's request, and the dean. Tenured faculty are reviewed every three years, alternating a review by the dean and a comprehensive review by a peer review unit, dean, and provost. The agreement clearly indicates that the post-tenure review process is focused upon faculty development (Policy 4.1.d). In addition, tenured faculty submit an annual evaluation report to the dean. In the case of joint appointments, the institute director is involved in the review process.
- **United Academics Adjuncts (UNAC Adjuncts) [W4.1].** Adjunct faculty are reviewed annually in the context of the decision to hire if needed in future years.

As a matter of new UAF policy, each department chair formally assigns one or two faculty mentors to tenure-track assistant professors. These mentors work with the faculty members on an ad hoc basis to guide them toward successful promotion and tenure. Although some discussion concerning the role of faculty mentors has occurred, no standard has been established.

When a faculty member is a candidate for promotion or tenure, the comprehensive review process is used [W4.7]. This process includes review first by that faculty member's unit peer committee (at least five senior faculty members) (Policy 4.1.b), academic dean, and then by a university-wide faculty evaluation committee, the provost, and the chancellor. When departments have temporary shortages of senior professors, faculty from related disciplines augment unit peer committees. Also, under the United Academics collective bargaining agreement [G14], the dean can request input from the department chairs. Each level of review provides a written evaluation addressing teaching, service, and research or creative activity, as applicable, based on a file submitted by the candidate. The candidate has an opportunity to submit a written response at each level. Most faculty have applied for tenure and promotion to associate professor before the mandatory (seventh) year in rank [G11 Minutes, September 2000], and this phenomenon appears to be accelerating.

Each union has an appeal process and a grievance procedure to address denial of reappointment, promotion, or tenure. The Faculty Senate, unions, and administration (including the Equal

Employment Office) pursue faculty grievances in a serious and thorough way. Fairly elaborate procedures are in place, and in particular United Academics has a special appeals committee [G14 Article 7; E4.3].

Ten departments have unit criteria approved by the Faculty Senate and UAF administration intended to provide a program-specific framework for evaluation of faculty [E4.3]. For example, the Department of Mathematical Sciences' unit criteria include a peer review of teaching and suggest that results of this process be recognized as more significant than Instructional Assessment Summaries (student reviews), which are often low for required math courses. Three departments have formally stated they prefer the more general UAF criteria [E4.9]. All other departments operate under the general UAF criteria, although they have never formally stated that preference.

An e-mail survey of department and unit chairs during the 2000-2001 academic year revealed that, in general, department chairs provide orientation to part-time faculty to acquaint them with the unit's expectations [E4.10]. Furthermore, part-time faculty are evaluated in the same way as full-time faculty through the Instructional Assessment Survey. Some departments are more extensive in their evaluations, observing classes, reviewing syllabi, and holding meetings with the part-time faculty as a group.

Appraisal

In the context of mentorship, deans are expected to provide evaluation and feedback to faculty about the quality of their work and their progress toward satisfactory promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. Department notebooks show no great dissatisfaction with the deans' reviews. After several years of change, evaluation procedures and paperwork have now stabilized. However, many faculty continue to complain about the amount of work required to prepare annual and comprehensive review paperwork.

Because of the diversity of workload assignments and joint appointments across UAF, there is substantial variation among and within colleges and schools in their weighting of instruction, scholarship/research, and service. The development of unit criteria by some units has reduced inconsistencies noted in the previous NASC review [G23]. Some faculty have expressed discontent with a perceived emphasis on student opinion (as summarized in Instructional Assessment Survey reports) as a major means of evaluation of instruction in the comprehensive review processes. These faculty members question the adequacy and accuracy of this information. However, few departments have adopted unit criteria that include other means of evaluating instruction.

6. Academic Freedom

Evidence-Based Description

UAF protects academic freedom (4.A.7) for faculty through faculty governance (see Standard 6 and Standard 9), union contracts [G14; G15; W4.1], and through Board of Regents Policy [G2 P04.04.010]. Only one formal action of the Faculty Senate related to academic freedom occurred

during the past decade. A resolution signed in 1991 reaffirmed Board of Regents Policy and cited the Academic Freedom and Tenure, 1940 Statement of Principles and Interpretive Comments of the American Association of University Professors, that address the faculty member's responsibility to academic freedom [G11 Minutes]. This senate action was taken to support academic freedom in response to public pressure over comments made by one faculty member.

UA President Mark Hamilton spoke out publicly about the protection of freedom of speech at the university during spring 2001 [E9.3]. UAF Chancellor Marshall Lind further supported the president's position by sending a message to all faculty, administrators, and staff [E9.4].

Intellectual property guidelines are included in contract language with United Academics [G14]. Article 14.c of the United Academics contract states the university has rights to a proportion of any revenue received for any university supported work. This includes material assisted or delivered by computer. No specific language concerning ownership of instructional materials is contained in the Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers or United Academics Adjuncts contracts [G15]. Prior to unionization the Faculty Senate maintained an ad hoc Intellectual Properties Committee.

Boards of Regents Policy and University Regulations [G2 P02.07; G3 R02.07] govern access to and responsibility for university information resources. Under this policy, First Amendment rights, privacy, and academic freedom are protected while maintaining the integrity of the university system against theft of intellectual properties, liability, tampering, and misallocation of resources.

Appraisal

The development of the intellectual property policy is a good example of cooperation between the Faculty Senate and the administration in the best interests of faculty. Faculty and statewide staff worked together to present a policy to the Board of Regents.

Projections

The administration, the unions, and interested faculty will work together on issues as they arise. All of these entities will continue to support academic freedom.

Distance delivery of courses will be an area where intellectual property and academic freedom may be tested in the next decade.

7. Faculty Development

Faculty development has been under-funded and un-staffed for some periods during the past decade. However, faculty development continued to be informally carried out by departments as budgets allowed. As a result, the Faculty Senate passed resolutions in 1991, 1992, and 1995 supporting faculty development [G11 Minutes]. In 1995 the staff of the Office of Faculty Development was eliminated as a cost savings measure, but the provost continued to fund individual development projects, and new faculty orientation continued.

In 2000 the Provost's Office of Faculty Development was revitalized. Currently, a faculty member serves part-time as the provost's faculty associate for development to coordinate the activities of this office.

The Women's Studies Program pioneered a voluntary mentoring program for new female faculty in the mid-1990s, which still continues.

Evidence-Based Description

The Office of Faculty Development organizes orientation for new faculty and holds workshops, panel discussions, and seminars throughout the year [E4.11]. Unless the workshops require hands-on participation, activities are available by audio-conference to faculty at community campuses. This office provides professional development opportunities for faculty in the areas of teaching, learning, and scholarship (4.A.3). Assistance with travel, mentoring, promotion and tenure, and instructional technology (through the Faculty Technology Resource Center) are also offered. In addition, the Office of Faculty Development maintains a collection of resource materials for faculty at the Rasmuson Library, and it has implemented a new "mentoring program."

In the fall of 2000, the provost organized the first UAF Academic Leadership Institute, consisting of nine half-day meetings (one Saturday morning each month) in which a group of ten UAF faculty and staff, along with facilitators, explored the concept of leadership in an academic setting. The course consisted of a required reading list on the subject of leadership and higher education. Each meeting contained a presentation by an invited speaker/leader, a question-and-answer session on that month's topic, and group work on a case study. The ten faculty and staff "enrolled" in the institute were selected on a first-come-first-served basis following an invitation sent to deans, directors, and the Faculty Senate at the end of August [E4.12] (4.A.3). The impetus for this institute came partially from the provost's observation that UAF offered little or no preparation for formal academic leadership. It also is derived in part from the provost's belief that academic leadership comes in many different forms from people in many different positions within academia. This institute explored ways to develop thinking about and preparing for academic leadership. Despite the concerns about internal hires and parochialism, the institute engages senior faculty in ongoing education and career development.

Beginning in fall 2000, the provost also organized a department chair workshop each semester. To date these workshops have included presentations and discussions on the role of department chairs, programmatic assessment, the hiring process, case studies, and the self-study process. The provost informally surveyed the chairs for topics of interest for future workshops.

Sabbatical leave allows for academic and professional development and renewal [G14; G15; department notebooks]. Usually, ad hoc or formal college and school level faculty committees review sabbatical applications and make recommendations. Funding for adjuncts or visiting faculty to teach the courses of each faculty member who is on sabbatical leave is the sole responsibility of that faculty member's department chair. The final approval is by the provost.

During the last four years UAF received fifty-six sabbatical leave applications from faculty distributed among the colleges and schools as indicated in the table below.

Sabbatical Leave Summary Table

College/School	Number of sabbatical leave applications (number approved if different)			
	Academic Year during which the Sabbatical leave will be taken; application received the previous year			
	1998-1999	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002
CLA	7 (1 canceled)	4	4	6
CSEM	2	3	4 (3)	7 (6)
SALRM	0	1	1	2 (1 postponed)
SFOS	3	1	0	2
SME	0	0	0	1
CRA	0	0	1	1
SOE	2	0	0	0
SOM	0	1	2	1 (1 withdrew)
Total	14	10	12 (11)	20 (18)

Fifty-three applications were approved but not all were taken for various reasons. Sabbatical leaves were granted to faculty applying from all colleges and schools. CLA and CSEM, the largest colleges in terms of numbers of faculty, had the largest number of sabbatical leaves granted. Colleges and schools with smaller numbers of faculty, for example SME, SOE, and SOM, had the fewest sabbatical leaves during this period. CSEM is the only college that has denied sabbatical leaves during the past four years.

Appraisal

The revival of the faculty development program (especially the travel grant program), the leadership institute and the department chair workshops have had a positive impact on faculty morale. However, more attention to faculty development is needed.

Currently, there is no link between faculty evaluations and the new faculty development program. This could mean that faculty who really need mentoring are not obligated to take training. Faculty have expressed a desire for more access to and training on educational technologies such as smart classrooms, web-based courses, and distance delivery. These have been the focus of professional development programs run by the Office of the Provost the past few years.

Sufficient time for growth and renewal is a concern expressed in some departmental notebooks. Items faculty commonly identify for their own professional growth and development are 1) support for travel, 2) purchase of teaching and research equipment, and 3) support for seminars by visitors in areas of professional interest. In the last two years, the administration has begun to address these issues (see Projections). The unions are contributing money for travel. An improved faculty orientation program has also been started to introduce new faculty to the UAF culture.

Sabbatical leave applications from qualified faculty are generally approved at UAF. Given the reduction in the number of senior faculty resulting from the R.I.P., sabbatical leave is clearly used, as it is intended, for renewal and growth.

Projections

A new faculty handbook has been proposed by the Faculty Senate, and initial meetings have been held to discuss content. A primary function of governance will be to monitor issues of faculty development and academic freedom. As the Faculty Senate reemphasizes scholarly activity and research, more faculty should become interested in governance.

The new Office of Faculty Development will benefit the renewal and growth of all UAF faculty. The expansion of UAF's effort in faculty development and a new leadership academy will provide quality mid-level administrators and the necessary mentoring of new faculty.

4.B. Scholarship, Research, and Artistic Creation

Evidence-Based Description

Mission and goals

As Alaska's Land, Sea, and Space Grant and only doctoral-granting institution, UAF is the center for scholarship, research, and artistic expression in the state. Therefore, these activities are an integral part of the institutional mission and goals (4.B.1). UAF's geographic position, its expertise, and the reputation of its faculty have provided it with a well-earned reputation as the major research university for Arctic and Northern studies in the United States.

At UAF, scholarship, research, and creative activities are conducted within departments of colleges and schools and at research institutes and centers. Research institutes and centers range widely in the sizes of their faculties, staffs and support infrastructures, sources and amounts of external funding, and connections with the academic programs of the university. In part, these differences are based on the nature of the activities emphasized and the longevity or maturity of the unit. Although funded research occurs within each college and school at UAF, the vast majority occurs within centers and research institutes at the Fairbanks campus and at remote research sites throughout the state.

The emphasis of scholarship, research and artistic creation in UAF's mission and goals is carried throughout the institution. All college and school mission and goals statements include these activities. The faculty collective bargaining agreements identify research and creative activity as requirements for tripartite faculty. Department and division chairs, deans, institute and center directors, and faculty peer review and campus committees expect tripartite faculty to be engaged in scholarship, research, or creative activities for promotion and tenure. UAF informs its constituents about its activities through a variety of means including public presentations, web pages, newsletters, advisory councils, publications, and advertisements.

Through research and creative activity—including many collaborations between faculty and students—UAF has made lasting contributions to understanding of the North, and has helped solve many problems for Alaska and other northern regions. Examples of faculty scholarship, research, and creative activities are included in the Appendix to illustrate the consistency of this work with UAF's mission and goals [A4.5] (4.B.1).

Policies and Procedures

UA Board of Regents Policy and University Regulations [G2 P10.07; G3 R10.07] on the role of research, scholarship, and creative activity address the following major areas (4.B.2):

- Academic freedom and professional ethics.
- Classified or proprietary research.
- Security clearances.
- Interaction between university and private sector research interests.
- Inventions, patents, copyrights, trademarks and other intellectual properties.
- Misconduct in research, scholarly work and creative activity in the university.
- Rights and welfare of human subjects or the infliction of pain or injury on animals.

These policies and regulations were last revised in 1996 and 1997. The UA Faculty Alliance, with UAF representation, reviewed and commented on the revisions. In addition, the UAF Faculty Senate was informed of the revision process and its input was requested. Thus, faculty have a role in the development of research policies (4.B.3).

A few research institutes and centers have their own policies and procedures. The Geophysical Institute provides a Staff Manual [E4.13] and a faculty council provides an advisory role to the director in research planning and policy development. The Museum has an Institutional Code of Ethics [E9.5], which it distributes to faculty and staff. The Arctic Region Supercomputing Center provides computer services for sensitive U.S. Department of Defense computing needs, which introduces a requirement for a National Agency Check.

The Geophysical Institute recently requested that UAF once again allow military classified research for a particular class of rocket test flights from the Poker Flat Research Range. The provost has established specific limiting conditions if approved by the administration [E4.14]. This was discussed at the deans' and directors' level and within the Faculty Senate. The incoming president of the Faculty Senate has written and submitted for publication a scholarly paper [E4.15] on ethical considerations associated with this request, which he opposes.

UAF's Office of Sponsored Programs coordinates the activities of the Institutional Review Board, which is composed of faculty, staff, and local experts. An Institutional Review Board Manual, prepared forms and draft cover letters are made available to faculty online [W4.8]. This board reviews studies related to human subjects, especially indigenous peoples, and studies related to the ethical treatment of animals (4.B.3).

The vice-provost for research and director of sponsored programs coordinates compliance and policies related to sponsored research. Because external funding is commonly involved, the vice-provost closely coordinates efforts with the director of grants and contracts. The Provost's Research Working Group, which is composed of deans, institute and center directors, and faculty, advises the administration on the planning and implementation of research activities and on policy and procedure development and revision.

Institutional Resources

Financial Resources

UAF views research and other scholarly and creative endeavors as an investment in Alaska and the future of the university. Therefore, it provides financial support, facilities and research centers, and administrative and information resources for these endeavors (4.B.4).

In FY00, UAF expended \$76 million on research [G9]. Based on \$13 million allocated to research from the state's general fund (4.B.4), the remainder of the research expenditures were derived from federal, state, and private extramural support, thereby increasing the state's investment by 380 percent. State funding and resulting returns are reinvested in the institution's faculty, staff, and infrastructure to ensure a competitive stance for further development. Further detail concerning sponsored research is provided in the following section. A broader discussion of finance is included in Standard 7.

The vice provost for research and director of sponsored programs administers a matching fund for research equipment. During the 2000-01 academic year, \$300,000 was distributed from this equipment fund. In addition, the Provost's Office and the Office of Sponsored Programs collaborate in a competitive awards program to stimulate the involvement of undergraduate students with faculty mentors. This program began in 1998 and has supported about twenty student awards per year. The undergraduate research awards program has encouraged student and faculty participation in the sciences, engineering, music, sociology, political science, and other disciplines.

The Graduate School provides graduate fellowships and assistantships (forty students receive these awards each year) that also include tuition and student fee waivers. Awards provided by the Graduate School include graduate fellowships, dissertation completion awards, and graduate student travel awards (see Standard 2 for more detail).

The UAF and the Fairbanks communities are strong advocates of a lively university environment, and they enthusiastically support the visual and performing arts financially through paid attendance at events. Some departments assert that this enthusiasm is less fully supported financially within UAF in terms of needed faculty and facilities. They further assert that in contrast to "income" from grants and contracts in the sciences, income from creative performances is not credited to departments [department notebooks].

Physical Resources

Faculty and undergraduate and graduate students are engaged in scholarship, research, and creative activity within facilities located at UAF campuses and at research facilities and field stations located across the state (4.B.4). (See Standard 8 on facilities and equipment.)

The performing and visual arts on the Fairbanks campus are wholly contained within the Fine Arts Complex. The complex comprises a theater, concert hall, and art studios. This building was constructed in 1973 and substantial upgrades have recently been funded (see Standard 8) to renovate existing space. Because of the limited space, individual faculty members have their own off-campus studios [Art notebook].

Research labs on the Fairbanks campus are located within the Natural Science Facility, the O'Neill Building, the Irving Building, the Duckering Building, the International Arctic Research Center, the Arctic Health Building, the UA Museum, and the Elvey Building. The Fairbanks campus is also home to research greenhouses and the Arctic Region Supercomputing Center. Libraries and information resources are described in Standard 5.

Brief descriptions of a few of the off-campus research facilities are provided in the Appendix [A4.6] to illustrate UAF's commitment to research.

Individual department and institute notebooks list the equipment available for scholarship, research, and creative activities.

Faculty Involvement and Role

Scholarship, research, and creative activity summaries for individual faculty members are included in department, institute, and campus notebooks on exhibit.

As in most U.S. research universities, faculty may be tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure-track faculty. Although tenure-track and tenured tripartite UAF faculty are involved in research, the phrase "research faculty" is officially defined in Board of Regents Policy [G2 P04.04.030] as having "special academic rank" for which promotion is possible but tenure is not available. These "research faculty" are predominately funded by external grants. Tenured and tenure-track faculty have appointments in academic departments and may conduct their research within departments or with the support of an institute or a center. In the case of tenured and tenure-track faculty within the College of Science, Engineering, and Mathematics, for example, joint appointments are commonly held with institutes. Research faculty typically work solely under the auspices of an institute or center but may have some affiliation with a college or school as lecturers or in adjunct positions. Students of UAF and those enrolled from other institutions are academically affiliated with departments, not institutes.

Sixty-eight percent of the faculty associated with research institutes and centers are tenured or tenure-track and have appointments within one of UAF's colleges or schools. The majority of these faculty have appointments within the College of Science, Engineering and Mathematics (51 percent), the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences (26 percent), the School of Agriculture and Land Resources Management (14 percent), or the School of Mineral Engineering (9 percent). Seventy-one percent of these faculty are senior faculty (47 percent full professor, 24 percent associate professor) and 29 percent are at the assistant professor rank. About 30 percent of UAF's faculty associated with research institutes and centers hold positions as research professors (assistant, associate, or full). They are based solely in the research institutes and centers. There have been significant numbers of new hires within the past three years: Geophysical Institute (25 percent), Institute of Northern Engineering (32 percent), and Institute of Arctic Biology (30 percent). The Arctic Region Supercomputing Center and International Arctic Research Center are relatively new organizations that are evolving rapidly; most of their researchers have been hired within the past three years. Senior faculty members (four of nine for ARSC and three of six for IARC) were included among those new hires.

Faculty with appointments in the schools or colleges document their contracted workload related to research to vary from 0 percent to 80 percent. Research workloads as a portion of total assignment vary widely within and among the research institutes and centers and, of course, dramatically between tenure- and research-track faculty within a given institute or center. For example, the average annual percentages of workload for research per tenure-track faculty member are 57 percent (GI), 55 percent (SFOS), 47 percent (SALRM), 30 percent (ARSC), 37 percent (IAB), and 39 percent (INE) (4.B.4; 4.B.5). Research faculty nearly all report their workload for research in excess of 90 percent, with a small portion directed to service. Many of the research faculties also teach on an ad hoc or continuing basis and mentor graduate students under conditions established by departmental faculty.

The Emil Usibelli Distinguished Research Award has been presented annually to a faculty member since 1992. This \$10,000 award goes to an individual who displays extraordinary excellence in research.

There are no constraints on faculty academic freedom in the pursuit of scholarship, research and research funding, and creative activities consistent with UAF's mission and goals. In general, the university gives wide latitude to faculty, subject to the normal limitations of resources (4.B.6; 4.B.7).

Sponsored Research

Programs funded by grants and contracts are consistent with UAF's mission and goals (4.B.6). For example, Psychology Department faculty have received grants from the National Institute of Health to identify protective and resilience factors that allow Native people to live sober, healthy, and alcohol abuse-free lives. The National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, and the National Park Service have funded grants to the Alaska Native Language Center for work on indigenous languages. External funding for Music faculty is most commonly for travel for performances. External funding to the School of Management relates to tourism, property rights, and resource economics of whaling and fishing. School of Education external support includes funds for increasing the number of rural educators, developing instructional materials based on Alaska Native elder knowledge, and demonstration projects. Similarly, the vast majority of grants and contracts in the sciences and engineering relate specifically to high-latitude issues such as cold-weather engineering, Arctic biology, the Aurora Borealis, local agriculture and forestry issues, local geology such as volcanoes and earthquakes, and Alaskan oceans and fisheries.

Although each college and school at UAF receives external funding for research, most external-funded research is carried out through research institutes and centers, which are referred to collectively as the Organized Research Units (ORUs). ORUs expedite logistical and administrative aspects of funded research. The origins, evolutionary histories, and mandates of these various ORUs are unique, and therefore a brief description of each is provided in the Appendix [A4.7]. A brief chronology of the development of the organized research units (ORUs) is also given in the introduction. As the University of Alaska developed, these units operated separately and in parallel with academic departments. In recent years, the pattern has been changing with the majority of the science and engineering faculty performing sponsored research

in one or another of the ORUs while also holding joint academic appointments within a college or school. Detailed information may be found in the ORU notebooks.

Apart from their explicit titles, organized research units considered “institutes” and “centers” and their expenditures in FY00 are listed in the following table:

Organized Research Unit	FY 2000 Expenditures (thousands)	% of Research Expenditures
“Institutes”		
Geophysical Institute (GI)	\$26,929	35.4%
School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences (SFOS) (Including Institute of Marine Science)	13,979	18.4%
Institute of Arctic Biology (IAB)	6,751	8.9%
School of Agriculture and Land Resources Management (SALRM) (Including Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station)	5,835	7.7%
Institute of Northern Engineering (INE)	3,380	4.4%
Mineral Industry Research Laboratory * (MIRL)	1,073	1.4%
Petroleum Development Laboratory * (PDL)	584	0.8%
“Centers”		
Arctic Region Supercomputing Center * (ARSC)	8,929	11.7%
International Arctic Research Center (IARC)	3,556	4.7%
University of Alaska Museum * (includes Alaska Quaternary Center (AQC))	1,155	1.5%
Center for Global Change (CGC) and Arctic System Research (ASR)	570	0.7%
Alaska Native Language Center (ANLC)	563	0.7%
“Other”		
College of Rural Alaska (CRA)	489	0.6%
Center for Cross Cultural Studies	443	0.6%
School of Management (SOM)	262	0.3%
Other (excludes CGC/ASR)	1,597	2.2%
Total expenditures	\$76,096	100%

* See text for clarification.

Each research institute has a disciplinary focus, and all usually enjoy significant autonomy, varying in the degree of connection to an academic unit. The Mineral Industry Research Laboratory and the Petroleum Development Laboratory have institute-like organizations with substantial instrumentation assets and research infrastructure, but continued low levels of external support have caused them to behave more as departmental research elements.

Though centers range widely in size and capacity, their principal purpose is to stimulate and coordinate research activities between two or more research units. The Arctic Region Supercomputing Center and the UA Museum serve center-like capacities. Both offer unique research resources that attract and support tenured and tenure-track faculty, research faculty, and

students from the various UAF institutes. As an example, impact assessments are carried out jointly with IAB and IARC working with SALRM, SFOS, and INE. The centers and their expenditures in FY00 are listed as the middle part of the above table. Financially, the AQC appears within the UA Museum, and the CGC/ASR was within the “Other” category for the reporting year.

As shown in the above table of expenditures, the total research expenditures for UAF for FY00 were \$76,096,000, with the ORUs (institutes, centers, and laboratories) representing 96.3 percent of the total organized research activity. This represents faculty-motivated research as well as research stimulated at the administrative level within UAF and the institutes.

A great deal of self-motivated individual and collaborative research and scholarly and creative activities occur within the colleges and schools at the department level (4.B.7). While smaller in terms of external support (representing about 5 percent of UAF’s annual external support total), this aspect of externally funded research contributes significantly to the mix of creative endeavors at UAF and provides rich educational opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students.

Faculty associated with ORUs have been productive in terms of research publications in refereed journals, presentations at national and international meetings, and in writing proposals for funding, as illustrated in the following table:

ORU faculty research productivity for 1998-99 and 1999-2000

	Faculty	Proposals	Awards	Publication	Professional Presentation	Undergrad Publication	Grad Publication
GI	60	173	115	109	126	2	47
SFOS	48	301	104	94	112	2	32
IAB	66	107	61	117	74	4	18
SALRM	20	38	20	28	12	0	1
INE	31	117	69	82	78	11	43
IARC	5	5	2	4	6	0	1
PDL	9	21	6	1	5	0	4
MIRL	9	27	12	10	14	0	14
UAM	5	18	22	21	18	3	2
ARSC	9	11	6	8	8	0	1

Covers the two-year period 1998-1999 except for GI and IAB, which includes 2000. SFOS is a mixture.

There is a significant potential of double counting between this section and college and school summaries given at the end of Standard 2 and the college/school self-study notebooks on exhibit. Sixty-eight percent of the faculty in organized research units have joint appointments in the colleges and schools.

Though documentation of the inclusion of students and their level of involvement in research efforts varies significantly among the ORUs, many have included undergraduates as co-authors on scientific publications. All the ORUs include graduate students as authors or co-authors on scientific publications [institute and center notebooks].

While considerable variation exists among ORUs with regard to the involvement of undergraduate and graduate students within an institute (see table below), it is clear that most of the faculty are currently involved in research projects and are seeking to increase student involvement in those projects. Faculty research has a significant impact on graduate student instruction within the colleges (especially CSEM) and schools. Many graduate students are supported through fellowships and research assistantships, many of which are funded by external grants or contracts. Students choose a field of study directly tied to research programs, and often an important part of faculty instruction workload involves mentoring graduate students. The following table illustrates graduate student funding and the average number of annual degree recipients associated with ORUs.

ORU	Students funded by ORU AY 2000	Mean number of Master's degrees/yr	Mean number of Ph.D. degrees/yr
GI	60	7.3	8.5
IAB	83	13.0	5.3
SFOS	46	13.8	4.0
SALRM	15	5.8	1.0
ARSC	1	0	0
INE	23	16.5	2.5
IARC	3	0	0
SME	ND	8	0.3

Note: Both ARSC and IARC are so new that they would not yet be expected to have supported students through to graduation.

Research and involvement in academic creative endeavors are important determinants in ensuring that the most up-to-date material is taught to students. Undergraduate participation in research and scholarly endeavors is an important component of UAF's instructional programs. For example, payroll records document that 147 undergraduate students were paid from research project accounts in FY98, and a report from CSEM indicates 108 undergraduates were engaged in research and research-like projects in spring semester of 1998 [IAB notebook]. UAF uses research labs to teach upper-division and graduate courses, allowing the faculty to expose students to current methodologies. Classroom and laboratory opportunities such as the National Science Foundation's Research Experiences for Undergraduates program [GI notebook] are often determining factors in the enthusiasm of undergraduates for their major discipline, their academic success, and their decision to pursue graduate school. On the negative side, the use of research-grade instrumentation and facilities for such instruction increases wear and shortens lifetime. It is a tradeoff arising in part from low funding for instructional equipment. Many departmental notebooks state that research at the departmental level is not provided with adequate instrumentation and materials.

As is obvious from the highlights in the Appendix [A4.7], the ORUs vary significantly in their longevity or maturity as well as the diversity of research undertaken and the disciplines that they embrace. What may not be immediately obvious is the diversity in mission, culture, and expectations for seeking external support (4.B.6). The Geophysical Institute, Institute of Marine Science, and Institute of Arctic Biology receive part of their basic operating funds in the general appropriation to the University of Alaska system from the State of Alaska. However, three to five times that amount in external funding is required to maintain the organizations (including

salary and infrastructure) at their present level of activity. Those organizations have created and maintained a culture emphasizing competitive success in obtaining funding from federal and state agencies. Such emphasis has increased the number of proposals submitted and the amount of funding requested over the past four years (see the table below). In contrast, the International Arctic Research Center (two years old) and the Arctic Region Supercomputing Center (effectively four years old) are both new and are provided with substantial support by the federal “block” funding. Researchers in those organizations have focused most of their attention on organizational issues rather than in writing competitive proposals to secure external funding. There is less short-term pressure on those investigators to apply for external support as in-house funding provides for their research needs.

Indices of annual productivity based on the average of four years data.

	FY 97 proposals	FY 97 request \$M	FY 98 Proposals	FY 98 request \$M	FY 99 proposals	FY 99 request \$M	FY 00 proposals	FY00 request \$M
GI	196	53.3	177	137.5	178	52.1	193	68.1
SFOS	210	41.5	232	36.2	244	58.1	225	64.2
IAB	119	11.0	109	23.5	122	32.8	120	52.4
INE	94	14.1	75	22.3	54	16.6	90	30.2
AFES	73	57.0	76	10.8	79	9.1	41	8.2
UAM	39	2.2	44	2.7	48	5.6	52	4.8
IARC	NA	NA	NA	NA	11	16.5	113	10.4
ARSC	3	0.1	1	.02	1	.02	4	3.3
MIRL	16	0.8	12	3.7	14	3.2	12	0.8
PDL	11	0.9	13	18.9	4	0.9	9	1.8
TOTAL	780	183.4	767	257.8	763	196.2	778	245.7

For UAF as a whole, there has been relative stability in grant applications for external support since 1997; the number of submittals averaged 772 each year. In comparison, from 1986 through 1990 (data given in the last self-study [G24]), UAF submitted an average of only 450 proposals per year. Thus, average annual proposal activity in 1997-2000 was 72 percent higher than in 1986-1990.

Appraisal

Mission, goals, policies and procedures

UAF faculty are actively engaged in scholarship, research, and creative activities, and these activities are consistent with UAF’s mission and the goals (4.B.1). Undergraduate and graduate students are involved in these activities and are commonly supported by external funding, especially within the sciences. Policies and procedures are in place, are followed, and are revised in a collegial manner. The large number of undergraduate students involved in research is particularly noteworthy.

A great deal of attention is given to externally funded research at UAF, particularly within the sciences. This area receives direct support from the vice provost for research and director of sponsored programs and direction from the Provost’s Research Working Group. College and school deans direct planning and oversight of scholarship, research, and creative activities not associated with organized research units. A broader institutional view of scholarship, research, and creative activity is needed for the purposes of planning and institutional assessment.

Institutional Support

The university supports scholarship, research, and creative activities by giving broad discretion to professors' choices, assigning a proportion of workload to these areas in faculty workloads, and providing opportunities for sabbatical leaves and instructional release time. Colleges and schools without joint appointments with research institutes and centers generally have less support for these activities than those with joint appointments.

Significant faculty-driven grant, research, and creative activities in the College of Liberal Arts are ongoing, and new funding opportunities are emerging rapidly. However, the college considers itself inadequately funded for research infrastructure. The following areas of needed support have been identified:

- Staff support for preparing proposals. Currently, the college's fiscal officer provides all of this support in addition to being responsible for all other financial processes for the college.
- Staff support, equipment, and supplies for operating and maintaining fine arts facilities.
- Seed money to develop proposals. Much of the research in CLA involves human subjects, requiring complex negotiations with communities to receive permission to do the research. Such funds would allow faculty to travel to rural Alaska to do the necessary preparation and planning to write large proposals.
- Some department self-study notebooks report the absence of institutional incentive for grant proposal writing due in part to large teaching loads.

Facilities

Modern and renovated facilities, state-of-the-art research instrumentation and analytical tools have provided unique and important assets to attract external support and undertake successful scholarship, research, and creative activities (4.B.4). These tools have also provided exposure and training for undergraduate and graduate students in computational techniques, remote sensing, environmental issues, and analytical technologies. Such expertise has substantially improved the educational experience for students and enhanced their preparation for employment after graduation.

This self-study identified the following facility challenges related to scholarship, research and creative activities:

- Faculty and students located at the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences program in Juneau currently have inadequate research facilities (see Standard 8).
- The Rasmuson Library needs additional space for collections related to research (see Standard 5).
- Animal research facilities are inadequate and are being addressed in the planning of a new biosciences facility (see Standard 8).
- Art studio space is inadequate (see Standard 8)
- Lab space for researchers needs to be reviewed and a plan developed. This is cited in the self-study notebooks of the School of Agriculture and Land Resources Management, the School of Fisheries and Ocean Science, and some engineering departments. Space for Biology and Wildlife laboratories has been detailed in a budget proposal.
- Visual and performing arts equipment and facilities are used not only for university creative activity and education, but also for community events. The faculty in these

programs consider current support for renovation, replacement, and upkeep to be inadequate. The College of Liberal Arts self-study notebook discusses this issue more fully.

Sponsored Research

Faculty in all of UAF's colleges and schools have been successful in pursuing and receiving external funding in the form of grants and contracts. However, organized research units receive the vast majority of external funds. UAF should expand its view of research, scholarship, and creative activities and further support proposal writing outside the research institutes and centers to increase external funding and graduate program development.

UAF's Organized Research Units provide an enriched environment for graduate and undergraduate students through mentoring and opportunities for participation in diverse field- and laboratory-based research projects. The colleges and schools also help provide access to modern field and campus-based laboratories and other research facilities. In addition, they fund research in the form of assistantships for graduate students and organized programs for undergraduate student research efforts. Funding from private sources encourages undergraduate and graduate participation in research. Examples of funding opportunities include the UAF/NASA Space Grant program, the NSF Research Experience for Undergraduates program, and various university internships such as those available in art. These programs have been successful in attracting qualified students.

There has been significant variation in the number of proposals submitted from the Organized Research Units and college/school departmental efforts. In part, that variation reflects the differences in administrative support that the various research units provide in-house. Though there have been important changes in number of support personnel and their level of expertise over recent years, the Geophysical Institute, the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, and the Institute of Arctic Biology respectively have provided the highest levels of support for proposal preparation (4.B.4). The GI has historically provided the highest level of administrative support for any organization at UAF. This support includes word processing (from draft documents), library support including full-text editing and proofing, budget preparation, formatting to fit agency guidelines and forms, and mailing.

In response, UAF has recently adopted a comprehensive program to provide proposal support. The Office of Arctic Research and its Proposal Office have added staff positions and have been renamed the Office of Sponsored Programs. The purposes of this reorganization are to improve service, to integrate and standardize operations across the campus, and to address issues of research compliance [E4.16]. As in most U.S. universities, faculty determine the appropriateness of their research proposals with some encouragement and oversight of compliance by directors, department chairs, and deans. Final compliance and budget certification is provided by the Office of Sponsored Programs. The vice provost for research (also the director of the Office of Sponsored Programs) provides the institutional signature.

A recent Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) evaluation of UAF's research administration [E4.16] characterized UAF as having an undesirable separation between the research institutes and the academic mission of the campus. The evaluation also recognized a "major absence" of graduate students for a university of UAF's size. The EPSCoR

team recommended closer integration of some of the colleges with some of the institutes; it viewed the models of (1) IMS and SFOS and (2) IAB and Biology/Wildlife as prototypes that should be extended to other units.

Projections

Though capital improvements to existing facilities continue, office and laboratory space presents significant problems for future program and research development. While a portion of this difficulty will be resolved within the next year as renovation projects are finished (e.g., the Duckering Building), the amount and quality of space associated with scholarship, research, and creative activities will continue to be problematic. Efforts have begun through the Provost's Office to evaluate the use of existing space with a view to consolidation and reallocation, and longer-term plans for the construction of additional office and laboratory space exist (see Standard 8) [W8.5]. The highest priorities for new construction related to research are the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences facility at Lena Point near Juneau, a biosciences building, and a computational science building on the Fairbanks campus. A detailed budget proposal has been worked out for the biosciences building. UAF will continue to seek funding for the Lena Point facility and will begin planning for a computational science building.

After several years of effort, Alaska has qualified for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR). The EPSCoR review team for research administration recommended emphasizing "foci of excellence" rather than supporting all programs evenly throughout the university. The Alaska EPSCoR Program, centered at UAF, the state's research institution, will serve to stimulate research and education in four areas proposed by a broad-based UA faculty (at UAA, UAF, and UAS) that are appropriate to the university's expertise and the state's needs. These include High Latitude Contaminants Consortium, Cold Regions Engineering, Integrative Approach to Environmental Physiology, and Alaska Genomic Diversity Initiative. In addition to these research focus areas, additional "foci of excellence" were recommended [E4.16] for expansion to areas of new opportunity such as computer science, nano technology, materials science, logistics, biomedical environmental health, mental health, and substance abuse.

The EPSCoR program will continue to bring significant change to UAF through infrastructure development, including new faculty lines and relevant instrumentation and facility improvement. In addition to eighteen new graduate positions supported within the above research programs, EPSCoR includes two undergraduate educational programs: The Alaska Undergraduate Research Access and The Alaska Rural Research Partnership.

Several new programs at UAF provide substantial promise for faculty and institutional infrastructure development [E4.17; E4.18; E4.19; E4.20; GI notebook]. One such program is the National Institutes of Health's Special Neuroscience Research Program, which provides, with institutional matches, more than \$7 million over five years. Its goal is to establish three young investigators in their careers and to acquire substantial new scientific instrumentation.

The development of UAF's Office of Sponsored Programs is consistent with the EPSCoR review recommendation [E4.16] to further develop research administration infrastructure to monitor

more closely expenditures and performance on grants and to enable faculty to better identify and respond to grant opportunities.

Budgetary and staff support and facilities maintenance and planning for artistic and creative activities need attention. The CLA faculty is poised to assume a leadership role in the creative arts through conferences and projects that are directly in line with the mission and goals to interact with the Pacific and circumpolar regions including Russia. Attention is needed to the topic of support for community-based arts programs and their use of UAF facilities as stated in the mission and goals.

Standard 4 Documents List

Appendices

- A1.1 UA and UAF Mission Statements (extracts from UA Regents Policies)
- A1.4 UAF Strategic Plan 2005
- A1.6 UAF Academic Development Plan
- A4.1 Faculty Definitions
- A4.2 Table #1, Institutional Faculty Profile
- A4.3 Table #2, Number and Source of Terminal Degrees of Faculty
- A4.4 Full time Faculty with Highest Degree by Rank and Tenure
- A4.5 Examples of Scholarship, Research and Creative Activities
- A4.6 Descriptions of Research Stations
- A4.7 Summary of UAF's Institutes, Centers, and Laboratories

Exhibits

- G1 UAF Catalog (<http://www.uaf.edu/catalog/>)
- G2 Regents' Policy (<http://www.alaska.edu/bor/>)
- G3 University Regulation (<http://www.alaska.edu/bor/>)
- G4 Board of Regents' Home Page (<http://www.alaska.edu/bor/>)
- G5 UAF Fact Book (<http://www.uaf.edu/pair/factbook.html>)
- G6 UA in Review (<http://www.alaska.edu/oir/Review/index.html>)
- G9 Yellow Book (<http://www.alaska.edu/swbudget/yellowindex.htm>)
- G11 Faculty Senate Home Page (<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/index.html>)
- G14 Collective Bargaining Agreement: United Academics – AAUP/AFT (UNAC) (<http://www.alaska.edu/labor/current/united/table2001.html>)
- G15 Collective Bargaining Agreement: Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers (ACCFT) (<http://www.alaska.edu/labor/current/accft/Contract/table.html>)
- G23 1995 UAF Interim Accreditation Self-Study Report
- G24 1990 UAF Accreditation Self-Study Report
- G25 Initiative Planning & Budgeting Process (<http://www.alaska.edu/swacad/planning.html>)

- E2.1 Memo from Executive Dean Gabrielli to CDE&IL on assessment of Core Curriculum courses
- E4.1 Fairbanks Daily News Miner, September 22, 2000
- E4.2 Career Services Employment Surveys
- E4.3 Senate Blue Book
- E4.4 AAUP Salary Study
- E4.5 OSU Salary Study 2000
- E4.6 Pippenger Salary Study
- E4.7 March-April 2000 *Academe*
- E4.8 Student Opinion of Instruction Information (IAS System)\
- E4.9 Provost Memo on Unit Criteria
- E4.10 Email Survey of Department Heads
- E4.11 2000-2001 List of Faculty Development Activities
- E4.12 Invitation to UAF Academic Leadership Institute
- E4.13 Geophysical Staff Manual

- E4.14 Provost's Memo on Classified Research
- E4.15 Swazo Paper on Classified Research
- E4.16 Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) Documentation
- E4.17 Infrastructure and Systems for Cold Regions
- E4.18 High Latitude Contaminants Consortium
- E4.19 Alaska Genome Diversity Initiative
- E4.20 Integrative Approaches to Environmental Physiology
- E9.3 Memo from President Hamilton on Freedom of Speech
- E9.4 Memo from Chancellor Lind on Freedom of Speech
- E9.5 Code of Ethics for Museums of the American Association of Museums

Additional Web Sites

- W4.1 Collective Bargaining Agreement: United Academic-Adjuncts-AAUP/AFT (UNAC) AFL-CIO (<http://www.alaska.edu/labor/current/adjuncts/table.html>)
- W4.2 Faculty by College/FT-PT Status/Gender, Fall 1999 (<http://www.uaf.edu/pair/00faculty.html>.)
- W4.3 Faculty Headcount by Academic Organization/Ethnicity, Fall 1995-1999 (<http://www.uaf.edu/pair/9599facu.html>)
- W4.4 Fairbanks Campus Faculty by Rank/Ethnicity, Fall 1995-1999 (<http://www.uaf.edu/pair/9600fcfacrank.html>)
- W4.5 Fairbanks Campus Faculty by Rank/Gender, Fall 1995-1999 (<http://www.uaf.edu/pair/9600fcfacgen.html>)
- W4.6 Workload Forms (<http://www.uaf.edu/provost/workload/>)
- W4.7 Promotion and Tenure Information (<http://www.uaf.edu/provost/PromotionandTenure/promotiontenure.html>)
- W4.8 UAF Institutional Review Board Manual (<http://www.uaf.edu/irb/main.html>)
- W8.5 Master Planning Website (<http://www.uaf.edu/mastplan/>)

Notebooks of Interest

- College of Rural Alaska campus notebooks
- Academic department notebooks
- Biology and Wildlife notebook
- Engineering notebooks
- Art notebook
- Institute and center notebooks
- Institute of Arctic Biology notebook
- Geophysical Institute notebook