

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Jayne Harvie
474-7964 jbharvie@alaska.edu

For Audioconferencing:

Toll-free #: 1-800-893-8850
Participant PIN: 1109306

A G E N D A

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #170

Monday, November 8, 2010

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1:00	I	Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn	4 Min.
		A. Roll Call	
		B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #169	
		C. Adoption of Agenda	
1:04	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	1 Min.
		A. Motions Approved:	
		1. Motion to Approve an Updated Procedure for the Program Review Process	
		B. Motions Pending: None	
1:05	III	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
1:10	IV	A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn	10 Min.
		B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill	5 Min.
1:25	V	A. Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers	10 Min.
		B. Provost Susan Henrichs	10 Min.
1:45	VI	Governance Reports	5 Min.
		A. Staff Council – Maria Russell	
		B. ASUAF – Nicole Carvajal	
		C. UNAC – Jordan Titus	
		UAFT – Jane Weber	
1:50	VII	Guest Speaker	15 Min.
		A. Peter Lewis, Superintendent of Schools, FNSB School District	
		Topic: Integrating K-12 Education with UAF Programs	
2:05	BREAK		
2:10	VIII	Announcements	5 Min.
		A. Registrar's Office:	
		1. Printed course schedule is going away.	
		2. Enforcement of the grade-posting deadline.	

2:15	IX	New Business	15 Min.
		A. Motion to Amend the Faculty Senate Constitution, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 170/1)	
		B. Motion to Approve the DANSRD Unit Criteria, submitted by Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 170/2)	
		C. Motion to Specify the Minimum Grade for Baccalaureate Core Courses, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 170/3)	
2:30	X	Discussion Items	15 Min.
		A. Update on the Core Revitalization Subcommittee – Curricular Affairs	
		B. Statewide’s request for one-year math placement test expiration date. – Administrative Committee (Attachment 170/4)	
2:45	XI	Committee Reports	10 Min.
		A. Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 170/5)	
		B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair	
		C. Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Ute Kaden	
		D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 170/6)	
		E. Core Review – Latrice Laughlin, Chair (Attachment 170/7)	
		F. Curriculum Review Committee – Rainer Newberry, Chair	
		G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks, Convener	
		H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair (Attachment 170/8)	
		I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee –Ken Abramowicz, Chair	
		J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair	
		K. Research Advisory Committee (ad hoc) – Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen, Co-Chairs	
2:55	XII	Members' Comments/Questions	5 Min.
3:00	XIII	Adjournment	

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, Article IX, section 1, to state that the most current version of Robert's Rules of Order shall be the parliamentary "guidelines" for the Faculty Senate rather than the "authority".

Effective: Immediately

Rationale: Robert's Rules of Order in regard to a governing body serve the function to facilitate the mission of that body such that they:

- Are subordinate to the Constitution and Bylaws of a governing body
- Support majority rule while preserving the rights of the minority
- Are to facilitate collegial debate regarding matters of policy

In fact, past practice of the UAF Faculty Senate has demonstrated the use of Robert's Rules of Order in this manner. The "authority" of the UAF Faculty Senate is derived from its voting majority and its mandate in the University of Alaska Board of Regents and UAF Policy.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

ARTICLE IX - Parliamentary Authority

Sect. 1 The parliamentary **[[authority]]** **GUIDELINES** shall be the most recent version of Robert's Rules of Order

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for the Department of Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development (DANSRD).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria for the Department of Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development. With some revisions, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
REGULATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY
AND
DEPARTMENT OF ALASKA NATIVE STUDIES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(DANSRD)
UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND INDICES

**“OUR MISSION IS TO STRENGTHEN LEADERSHIP CAPACITY FOR RURAL AND
INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES IN ALASKA AND THE CIRCUMPOLAR NORTH
THROUGH
DEGREE PROGRAMS THAT PROMOTE ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE, PERSONAL
DEVELOPMENT, PROFESSIONAL SKILLS, GLOBAL AWARENESS, RESPECT FOR
INDIGENOUS CULTURES AND COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY. WE SEEK TO
INCLUDE A KEEN AWARENESS OF THE SCOPE, RICHNESS, AND VARIETY OF
ALASKA NATIVE CULTURAL HERITAGES, AND A SERIES OF CRITICAL
PERSPECTIVES ON THE HISTORICAL AND THE CONTEMPORARY INDIGENOUS
EXPERIENCE FOR ALL OUR STUDENTS.”**

RURAL DEVELOPMENT (RD) IS AN APPLIED PROGRAM THAT IS MADE AVAILABLE AT BOTH BACCALAUREATE AND GRADUATE LEVELS TO STUDENTS ON THE FAIRBANKS CAMPUS, ACROSS THE STATE, AND BEYOND USING A COMBINATION OF HIGH QUALITY, INNOVATIVE DELIVERY METHODS INCLUDING INTENSIVE SEMINARS, AUDIOCONFERENCING, WEB-BASED TEACHING AND OTHER DISTANCE TECHNOLOGIES.

ALASKA NATIVE STUDIES (ANS) IS AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM AVAILABLE AT THE BACCALAUREATE LEVEL AS BOTH A MAJOR AND A MINOR. STUDENTS TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE SAME DELIVERY METHODS AS RD, AND DANSRD FACULTY

TEACH COURSES IN BOTH PROGRAMS. STUDENTS FROM ANS ARE ENCOURAGED TO TAKE RD COURSES (E.G. AS A MINOR SEQUENCE) AND VICE-VERSA WITH THE RESULT THAT BOTH PROGRAMS PRODUCE WELL ROUNDED GRADUATES.

BOTH PROGRAMS ENCOURAGE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT WITH INDIGENOUS SCHOLARS AND POLITICAL LEADERS. GUESTS FROM INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES OUTSIDE THE STATE DELIVER LECTURES TO STUDENTS IN BOTH PROGRAMS, AND FACULTY MAINTAIN ACTIVE CONNECTIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL COUNTERPARTS. INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS ATTEND BOTH RD AND ANS COURSES.

AS AN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT IS A RAPIDLY EXPANDING FIELD WITH AN INCREASED NUMBER OF UNIVERSITIES OFFERING POST-BACCALAUREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDY. DANSRD OFFERS A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY FOR ALASKA'S STUDENTS TO CONNECT TO PEERS IN THE FIELD AND SHARE NEW IDEAS TO BENEFIT RURAL COMMUNITIES AND ENHANCE THEIR CAREERS.

DANSRD SERVES A LARGE BODY OF NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS AND THEIR COMMUNITIES. THE PROGRAM OFTEN EMPLOYS INNOVATIVE METHODS TO ENSURE THAT THESE STUDENTS GET THE MOST OUT OF THEIR EDUCATION, AND THAT THEIR COMMUNITIES BENEFIT FROM DEPARTMENT RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY. THESE METHODS ARE REFLECTED THROUGHOUT OUR UNIT CRITERIA.

THE DEPARTMENT OFTEN LOOKS TO TRUSTED PEERS FROM WITHIN THE COMMUNITIES SERVED FOR EXPERT REVIEW AND OBJECTIVE EVALUATION OF ITS WORK. THESE PEERS POSSESS KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERTISE THAT MAY OR MAY NOT BE DIRECTLY TIED TO FORMAL EDUCATION. IN MANY CASES INDIGENOUS LEADERS HAVE EARNED THEIR POSITIONS THROUGH LEARNING FROM A WIDE RANGE OF SOURCES OVER MANY YEARS. THIS KIND OF LEARNING AND OVERSIGHT IS ESSENTIAL TO DANSRD.

DANSRD'S MISSION IDENTIFIES SPECIFIC INDIGENOUS POPULATIONS AT COMMUNITY, REGIONAL AND STATEWIDE LEVELS. WHEN DANSRD PROVIDES PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE TO THESE COMMUNITIES IT IS NOT MERELY A GENERAL PRO-BONO BENEFIT TO SOCIETY AT LARGE. RATHER, IT IS A RESEARCH OR SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY WITHIN THE MANDATE OF THE DANSRD MISSION, AND NOT AN ACT OF SERVICE.

GIVEN THE APPLIED NATURE OF THE PROGRAM, FACULTY MEMBERS MAY FROM TIME TO TIME HAVE GREATER OR LESSER THAN AVERAGE ASSIGNMENTS IN RESEARCH. IN THESE CASES, EXPECTATIONS OF THEM SHOULD BE ADJUSTED ACCORDINGLY, USING THE LEVEL OF ACTIVITY SPECIFIED IN THE ANNUAL WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT AS THE PRIME DETERMINANT.

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND REGENTS' CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE SPECIFICALLY DEVELOPED FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ALASKA NATIVE STUDIES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (DANSRD). ITEMS IN CAPITAL LETTERS ARE THOSE

SPECIFICALLY ADDED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENTAL MISSION. THESE UNIT CRITERIA ARE FOR USE IN ALL EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY.

Chapter I

Purview

The University of Alaska Fairbanks document, “Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” supplements the Board of Regents (BOR) policies and describes the purpose, conditions, eligibility, and other specifications relating to the evaluation of faculty at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). Contained herein are regulations and procedures to guide the evaluation processes and to identify the bodies of review appropriate for the university. The university, through the UAF Faculty Senate, may change or amend these regulations and procedures from time to time and will provide adequate notice in making changes and amendments.

These regulations shall apply to all of the units within the University of Alaska Fairbanks, except in so far as extant collective bargaining agreements apply otherwise.

The provost is responsible for coordination and implementation of matters relating to procedures stated herein.

Chapter II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment

Minimum degree, experience and performance requirements are set forth in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV. Exceptions to these requirements for initial placement in academic rank or special academic rank positions shall be submitted to the chancellor or chancellor’s designee for approval prior to a final selection decision.

B. Academic Titles

Academic titles must reflect the discipline in which the faculty are appointed.

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank

Deans of schools and colleges, and directors when appropriate, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit, shall observe procedures for advertisement, review, and selection of candidates to fill any vacant faculty position. These procedures are set by UAF Human Resources and the Campus Diversity and Compliance (AA/EEO) office and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators as a unit.

D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

Deans and/or directors, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit, shall establish procedures for advertisement, review, and selection of candidates to fill any faculty positions as they become available. Such procedures shall be consistent with the university's stated AA/EEO policies and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators in the unit.

E. Following the Selection Process

The dean or director shall appoint the new faculty member and advise him/her of the conditions, benefits, and obligations of the position. If the appointment is to be at the professor level, the dean/director must first obtain the concurrence of the chancellor or chancellor's designee.

F. Letter of Appointment

The initial letter of appointment shall specify the nature of the assignment, the percentage emphasis that is to be placed on each of the parts of the faculty responsibility, mandatory year of tenure review, and any special conditions relating to the appointment. This letter of appointment establishes the nature of the position and, while the percentage of emphasis for each part may vary with each workload distribution as specified in the annual workload agreement document, the part(s) defining the position may not.

Chapter III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

1. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," Chapter IV, AND DANSRD UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND INDICES, evaluators may consider, but shall not be limited to, whichever of the following are appropriate to the faculty member's professional obligation: mastery of subject matter; effectiveness in teaching; achievement in research, scholarly, and creative activity; effectiveness of public service; effectiveness of university service; demonstration of professional development and quality of total contribution to the university.

For purposes of evaluation at UAF, the total contribution to the university and activity in the areas outlined above will be defined by relevant activity and demonstrated competence from the following areas: 1) effectiveness in teaching; 2) achievement in scholarly activity; and 3) effectiveness of service.

Bipartite Faculty

Bipartite faculty are regular academic rank faculty who fill positions that are designated as performing two of the three parts of the university's tripartite responsibility.

The dean or director of the relevant college/school shall determine which of the criteria defined above apply to these faculty.

Bipartite faculty may voluntarily engage in a tripartite function, but they will not be required to do so as a condition for evaluation, promotion, or tenure.

B. Criteria for Instruction

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities.

Effectiveness in Teaching

Evidence of excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, evidence of the various characteristics that define effective teachers. Effective teachers

a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for students;

b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject;

c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are sensitive to student diversity;

d. emphasize regular feedback to students and reward student learning success;

e. demonstrate content mastery, discuss current information and divergent points of view, relate topics to other disciplines, deliver material at the appropriate level; AND DEMONSTRATE ABILITY TO TEACH EFFECTIVELY THROUGH THE SIMULTANEOUS USE OF MORE THAN ONE DELIVERY METHOD, E.G, COURSES WITH STUDENTS IN THE CLASSROOM AND IN ATTENDANCE VIA OTHER MEANS OF DISTANCE DELIVERY AT THE SAME TIME;

f. regularly develop new courses, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design;

g. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching.

SPECIFIC DANSRD CRITERIA FOR TEACHING FOR APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO:

A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF TEACHING ABILITY AS WELL AS COMMITMENT TOWARD CONTINUAL IMPROVEMENT IN AREAS INVOLVING DISTANCE DELIVERY AND ONLINE LEARNING MUST BE PROVIDED.

B. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: THE RECORD MUST SHOW THAT THE MATERIAL TAUGHT IS CONTEMPORARY AND RELEVANT, AND THAT THE PRESENTATIONS STIMULATE THE LEARNING PROCESS. EVIDENCE OF THE EXPECTED QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION MAY INCLUDE, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO, COURSE AND/OR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION, EFFECTIVE GUIDING AND MENTORING OF STUDENTS, AND EFFECTIVE TEACHING PERFORMANCE IN CLASSROOM SETTINGS AND BY DISTANCE DELIVERY MODALITIES. THERE MUST BE EVIDENCE OF SUPERVISION OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH AS A MAJOR COMMITTEE CHAIR/MEMBER.

C. PROFESSOR: SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM ARE EXPECTED. THESE MAY INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, CONTRIBUTIONS TO MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS IN COURSE AND/OR CURRICULUM OFFERINGS, DEVELOPMENT OF NEW COURSES AND/OR DELIVERY APPROACHES, ABILITY TO MOTIVATE AND/OR INSPIRE STUDENTS, AND EXEMPLARY TRAINING OF GRADUATE STUDENTS. THERE SHOULD BE A RECORD OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF GRADUATE WORK BY HIS OR HER STUDENTS. IT IS EXPECTED THAT ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING BY STUDENTS AND FACULTY WILL DEMONSTRATE CONSISTENTLY HIGH QUALITY PERFORMANCE.

Components of Evaluation

Effectiveness in teaching will be evaluated through information on formal and informal teaching, course and curriculum material, recruiting and advising, training/guiding graduate students, etc., provided by:

a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms,

and at least two of the following:

b. narrative self-evaluation,

c. peer/department chair classroom observation(s), INCLUDING SEMINAR/DISTANCE INSTRUCTION

d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials, AND excellence in development/utilization of course materials,

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline.

CONSIDERING THE DANSRD MISSION AND DISCIPLINE, THEREFORE, THE LOCUS AND AUDIENCE FOR DANSRD RESEARCH EXPANDS TO INCLUDE NATIVE AND RURAL COMMUNITIES AND/OR CONSTITUENCIES. THE KEY TO RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES IS THAT THESE ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE APPLICABLE TO THE MISSION OF THE UNIT AND ALSO THAT THE RESULTS OF THESE ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE DISSEMINATED THROUGH MEDIA ACCESSIBLE TO AND UTILIZED BY THOSE WHOM THEY ARE INTENDED TO BENEFIT. CERTAIN ACTIVITIES AND DEFINITIONS, THEREFORE, HAVE ALSO BEEN EXPANDED TO REFLECT DANSRD'S PARTICULAR MISSION "...TO STRENGTHEN LEADERSHIP CAPACITY FOR RURAL AND INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES IN ALASKA AND THE CIRCUMPOLAR NORTH THROUGH DEGREE PROGRAMS THAT PROMOTE ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE, PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT, PROFESSIONAL SKILLS, GLOBAL AWARENESS, RESPECT FOR INDIGENOUS CULTURES AND COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY." FURTHER, THERE IS OFTEN AN OVERLAP BETWEEN RESEARCH AND PUBLIC SERVICE SUCH THAT THE RESULTS OF DANSRD'S RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES DIRECTLY BENEFIT ALASKA'S NATIVE AND RURAL COMMUNITIES AS MUCH AS THEY DO THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY.

TO KEEP DANSRD TRUE TO ITS MISSION, APPROPRIATE DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS WILL INCLUDE REPORTING TO AND INFORMING COMMUNITY, REGIONAL AND STATE ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATION BOARDS, THE ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, ALASKA NATIVE TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS ORGANIZATIONS. THESE ARE THE ORGANIZATIONS WHERE APPROPRIATE JUDGES FOR DANSRD'S WORK ARE FOUND. ALL OF THESE ENTITIES SUPPORT MEDIA WHICH CAN PUBLISH OR OTHERWISE SHOWCASE THE WORK OF DANSRD FACULTY. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere.

1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Whatever the contribution, research, scholarly or creative activities must have one or more of the following characteristics:

- a. They must occur in a public forum.
- b. They must be evaluated by appropriate peers

- c. They must be evaluated by peers AS DEFINED ON PAGES ONE AND TWO external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.
- d. They must be judged to make a contribution TO THE COMMUNITIES SERVED BY DANSRD AND TO THE UNIVERSITY.

2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Evidence of excellence in research, scholarly, and creative activity may be demonstrated through, but not limited to;

- a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, MANUALS, NEEDS ASSESSMENTS, PROGRAM EVALUATIONS, ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES, TRANSLATIONS AND TRANSCRIPTIONS, proceedings and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses, OR BY LEGAL, INDUSTRY OR GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline OR OTHER APPROPRIATE JUDGES.
- b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.
- c. Presentation of research papers, DVDs, OR INVITED PAPERS before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers OR OTHER APPROPRIATE JUDGES. SUBMISSION OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS AND/OR THE COMPLETION OF CONTRACTED RESEARCH REPORTS TO AGENCIES AND FUNDING SOURCES, FORMAL PRESENTATIONS OF RESEARCH/INFORMATION TO ALASKA NATIVE ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, REGIONAL CORPORATIONS, TRIBAL COUNCILS, RESULTS OF COMMUNITY PLANNING PROCESSES AS REPORTED TO COMMUNITY ENTITIES, DEVELOPMENT OF PLANNING PROCESSES REVIEWED BY COMMUNITY BOARDS, DRAFTING AND SUBMITTING REGULATORY PROPOSALS ON BEHALF OF PARTNER COMMUNITIES, ETC.
- d. Exhibitions of art work at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, critics.
- e. Performances in recitals or productions ESPECIALLY IN THOSE PLAY OR DANCE PRODUCTIONS THAT PRESENT INDIGENOUS MATERIALS INCLUDING THEATER/DRAMA/FESTIVAL OF NATIVE ARTS/CAMA-I, AND OTHER STATEWIDE FESTIVALS, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.
- f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.
- g. Citations of research in scholarly publications AND PUBLICATIONS OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO NATIVE AND RURAL CONSTITUENTS AND/OR CONSTITUENCIES.
- h. Published abstracts of research papers.

i. Reprints or quotations of publications, CATALOGING AND ARCHIVING DATA COLLECTIONS OF DANCE/PERFORMANCE VIDEO AND AUDIO TAPES, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline.

j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.

(“k” IS MISSING FROM THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT)

l. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities INCLUDING AWARDS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF VIDEO TAPES, WEBSITES & CDS WHICH DISSEMINATE INFORMATION ABOUT RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND ALASKA NATIVE STUDIES, or selection FOR SCHOLARSHIPS FOR PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMS OF ADVANCED STUDY OR of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.

m. Development of processes or instruments useful in COMMUNITY PLANNING, THAT WILL BE REVIEWED BY LOCAL RESIDENT BOARDS AS WELL AS THOSE USEFUL IN solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.

N. NON-REFEREED JOURNAL ARTICLES AND MONOGRAPHS INCLUDING AUTHORSHIP OF A BOOK OR MAJOR REFERENCE IN THE FACULTY MEMBER’S AREA OF A SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH PERFORMANCE FOR PROMOTION OR APPOINTMENT TO:

A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF ABILITY TO ESTABLISH A VIABLE RESEARCH PROGRAM IN THE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION MUST BE PROVIDED.

B. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: THE FACULTY MEMBER MUST HAVE ESTABLISHED AN APPROPRIATE RESEARCH PROGRAM THAT PRODUCES SATISFACTORY PUBLICATIONS IN SOME OR ALL OF THE PUBLICATIONS NOTED IN A THROUGH Q IN THE ABOVE SECTION, AND HAVE PRESENTED RESEARCH RESULTS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS AND OTHER PUBLIC FORUMS. SUCH THINGS AS THE SUBMISSION OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS AND ACQUISITION OF EXTERNAL RESEARCH FUNDING, THE COMPLETION OF CONTRACT RESEARCH REPORTS, AND PUBLICATION IN CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS CONSTITUTE SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE THAT THE RESEARCH PROGRAM IS OF HIGH QUALITY. THE FACULTY MEMBER MUST SHOW INDEPENDENCE AND LEADERSHIP BY THE CREATION OF RESEARCH IDEAS THAT INVOLVE STUDENTS.

C. PROFESSOR: THE RESEARCH PROGRAM SHOULD HAVE PRODUCED PUBLICATIONS IN REFEREED PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE AS WELL AS OTHER PUBLICATIONS NOTED IN A THROUGH Q ABOVE, AND THERE SHOULD BE A RECORD OF STUDENT AND/OR JUNIOR FACULTY INVOLVEMENT. THE

PUBLICATIONS SHOULD BE OF SUFFICIENT QUALITY AND QUANTITY TO DEMONSTRATE THE EXISTENCE OF AN ON-GOING, PROFESSIONAL, INDEPENDENT RESEARCH PROGRAM. ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE MUST BE PROVIDED SHOWING THAT RESEARCH HAS BEEN PRESENTED TO ENTITIES SUCH AS INDIGENOUS ORGANIZATIONS AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is a fundamental part of the university's obligation to the people of its state. In this tradition, faculty providing their professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge, is identified as "public service." The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assumes a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service."

1. Public Service

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. It includes all activities which extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing, programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, professional contributions to the community or to one's discipline, or other activities in furtherance of the goals and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- a.** Providing information services to adults or youth.
- b.** Service on or to government or public committees, OR OTHER GOVERNMENTAL BODIES INCLUDING TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS, ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATIONS, HEALTH CORPORATIONS, ETC.
- c.** Service on accrediting bodies.
- d.** Active participation in professional organizations.
- e.** Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- f.** Consulting.
- g.** Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.
- h.** Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.
- i.** Training and facilitating.

j. Radio and TV programs, newspaper articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media.

k. Judging and similar educational assistance at science fairs, state fairs, and speech, drama, literary, and similar competitions.

2. University Service

a. University service includes those activities involving faculty members in the governance, administration, and other internal affairs of the university, its colleges, schools, and institutes. It includes non-instructional work with students and their organizations. Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

b. Service on university, college, school, institute, or departmental committees or governing bodies, APPOINTMENT TO INTERNAL EDITORIAL BOARDS AND SCHOLARSHIP SELECTION COMMITTEES

c. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance for specific projects.

d. Service as department chair or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college/school.

e. Participation in accreditation AND UNIT AND CAMPUS WIDE EVALUATION reviews.

f. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.

g. Service in support of student organizations and activities.

h. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.

i. Mentoring

j. Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.

k. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

3. Professional Service

a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.

b. Active participation in professional organizations.

c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.

e. Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings.

f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee, AND
APPOINTMENT TO PROPOSAL EVALUATION/GRANT SELECTION
COMMITTEES.

Evaluation of Service

Each individual faculty member's proportionate responsibility in service shall be reflected in annual workload agreements. In formulating criteria, standards and indices for evaluation, promotion, and tenure, individual units should include examples of service activities and measures for evaluation appropriate for that unit. Excellence in public and university service may be demonstrated through, e.g., appropriate letters of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

SPECIFIC DANSRD CRITERIA FOR SERVICE PERFORMANCE FOR APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO:

A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: NONE IN ADDITION TO UAF CRITERIA

B. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: POSITIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEPARTMENTAL AND/OR UNIVERSITY MATTERS, EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PUBLIC, AND EFFECTIVE SERVICES TO THE PROFESSION ARE EXPECTED. EXAMPLES WOULD INCLUDE FACILITATION SUPPORT FOR THE ANNUAL FESTIVAL OF NATIVE ARTS, ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND SERVICE ON BOARDS OF NATIVE AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS.

C. PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF LEADERSHIP IN THE SERVICE AREA IS EXPECTED. SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF DEPARTMENTAL AND/OR UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS INCLUDING COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP OR UAF SERVICE COMMITTEES ARE EXPECTED. EFFECTIVE APPLICATION OF SERVICE INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO, REVIEWING PROPOSALS, REFEREEING MANUSCRIPTS, AND EDITING FOR PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OR PUBLICATIONS. A PROFESSOR'S SERVICE MAY INCLUDE THE MENTORING OF JUNIOR FACULTY THAT LEADS IN TURN TO GREATER SERVICE ON THEIR PART.

E. Unit Criteria, Standards and Indices

Unit criteria, standards and indices are recognized values used by a faculty within a specific discipline to elucidate, but not replace, the general faculty criteria established in B, C, D, above, and in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," Chapter IV for evaluation of faculty performance on an ongoing basis and for promotion, tenure, 4th year comprehensive and diagnostic review (United Academics only), and post-tenure review.

Unit criteria, standards and indices may be developed by those units wishing to do so. Units that choose not to develop discipline-specific unit criteria, standards and indices

must file a statement stating so with the Office of the Provost, which shall serve as the official repository for approved unit criteria, standards and indices.

A unit choosing to develop discipline-specific criteria, standards and indices shall have such criteria, standards and indices approved by a majority of the discipline faculty. The unit criteria, standards and indices will be reviewed and approved by the cognizant dean who will forward the unit criteria, standards and indices to the provost. The provost will review for consistency with BOR and UAF policies and will forward these criteria, standards and indices to the Faculty Senate, which shall review and approve all discipline-specific criteria according to a process established by the Faculty Senate.

Unit criteria, standards and indices will be reviewed at least every five (5) years by the faculty of the unit. When reorganization results in a unit's placement in another college/school structure, the cognizant dean, in consultation with the unit faculty shall review unit criteria, standards and indices and revise if warranted. Unit criteria, standards and indices approved by the Faculty Senate prior to a unit's reorganization shall remain in effect until reviewed and revised. Revision of unit criteria, standards and indices must follow the review process established by the Faculty Senate. If the unit criteria, standards and indices are not revised, a statement of reaffirmation of the current unit criteria, standards and indices must be filed with the Office of the Provost, following the review.

Unit criteria, standards and indices, when developed by the faculty and approved by the Faculty Senate, must be used in the review processes by all levels of review. Their use is NOT optional. It shall be the responsibility of the candidate for promotion, tenure, 4th year comprehensive and diagnostic review (United Academics only), and post-tenure review to include these approved unit criteria, standards and indices in the application file.

F. Annual Evaluation of Non-tenured Faculty with Academic Rank

1. Process of Evaluation

There will be annual evaluations of all untenured faculty members holding academic rank. Each faculty member shall submit a professional activities report to the campus director or college/school dean according to a schedule announced by the provost. The annual professional activities report will be accompanied by a current curriculum vita.

The evaluations performed by the campus director or college/school dean shall include explicit statements on progress toward meeting criteria for tenure and promotion in their written evaluations. The dean's/director's evaluation shall reference the faculty member's workload agreement in commenting on progress. The director or dean shall provide a copy of a written evaluation to the faculty member.

In the case of a faculty member having a joint appointment, the dean will coordinate the review and recommendation with the DEAN/director as appropriate.

G. Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Members

1. Frequency of Evaluation

All tenured faculty at UAF shall be evaluated once every three years according to a schedule and process announced by the provost.

For tenured faculty with joint appointments, the cognizant dean will arrange a review that assures that all appropriate administrators provide a written evaluation of the faculty member. The dean will inform the faculty member of these arrangements.

2. Annual Activities Report

All tenured faculty shall prepare a professional activities report annually and submit it to the dean or director according to a schedule announced by the provost.

H. Evaluation of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

Special academic rank faculty are appointed for a specified period of time. They are to provide evidence of effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities during the term of their appointment when requested by their college/school dean or institute director according to the process set forth by the provost.

1. Process of Evaluation

The college/school dean or institute director shall require an annual activities report of a faculty member who has an appointment renewed beyond the initial year of appointment. The review process outlined above for academic rank faculty shall apply. The optional process for the development and approval of the unit criteria, standards and indices as outlined above in Chapter III, E, shall also apply to the definition and evaluation of faculty in special academic rank positions.

The appointment to special academic rank shall terminate on the date specified in the letter of appointment, and implies no expectation of a subsequent appointment.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to specify that students must earn a minimum grade of 'C-' (1.7) in all baccalaureate core ('X') classes in order to satisfy core requirements. However, there may be additional constraints on the grade, e.g., minimum of C (2.0) if to be used as a prerequisite for another course.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011

RATIONALE: A grade of D+, D, and especially D- means that a student has learned very little from a class. A grade higher than the minimum needed to pass is required for core classes. Under the proposed system, a student who receives a grade less than C- in a core class receives course credit, but not core credit. This will also align UA internal course transfers better with transfers of credit from outside of the UA system. Currently, a course from outside the UA system will only transfer to the UA system if a grade of C- or higher is received.

See next page for suggested UAF Catalog revisions:

Suggested revised page for catalog (page 47)

Grade	Definition and academic implications	Grade Points
A+	Superior performance: awarded to a small fraction of students in any class	4.0
A	Excellent: indicates originality and independent work & a thorough mastery of subject	4.0
A-	Very Good: nearly complete mastery of subject	3.7
B+	Good to very good: considerable competence in the subject matter	3.3
B	Good: ability above the average level of performance	3.0
B-	Good to Fair: some—but incomplete—mastery of the subject matter	2.7
C+	Satisfactory to Fair: satisfactory level of performance, with some mastery of material	2.3
C	Average: satisfactory level of performance and level of competency in the subject. A minimum grade of C (2.0) is required for all prerequisite and major courses.	2.0
C-	Barely satisfactory: <u>Minimum</u> grade required for all Core (X) Courses. A grade of C- (1.7) in a class which is a prerequisite for another class or in a class required for a student's major will result in the student being required to re-take the class. A C- may affect athletic eligibility and academic standing, as a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0 is required.	1.7
D+	Fair to poor level of competency in the subject matter. A grade of D+ in a core (X) class will automatically require the student to re-take the class to receive core credit.	1.3
D	Below Average: poor level of competency in the subject matter. Receiving this grade will automatically require the student to re-take the class to receive core credit.	1.0
D-	Far below average: the lowest passing grade and one for which core classes will need to be re-taken.	0.7
F	Failure: insufficient mastery of the subject matter. Grade will be counted in the student's GPA calculation but no course credit is received.	0.0

Computing your GPA

Course	Credits	Grade	Credits x Grade points per credit	= Grade points
BIOL F111X	4	A-	4 cr x 3.7 pts	14.8
COMM F131X	3	C	3 cr x 2.0 pts	6.0
ENGL F111X	3	C-	3 cr x 1.7 pts	5.1
MATH F107X	4	B	4 cr x 3 pts	12.0
HIST F131	3	F	3 cr x 0 pts	0.0
Total	16			37.9
			37.9 grade pts / 16 credits =	2.37 GPA

Course	Credits	Grade	Credits x Grade points per credit	= Grade points
BIOL F111X	4	C-	4 cr x 1.7 pts	6.8
COMM F131X	3	C	3 cr x 2.0 pts	6.0
ENGL F111X	3	C	3 cr x 2.0 pts	6.0
MATH F107X	4	C-	4 cr x 1.7 pts	6.8
HIST F131	3	C	3 cr x 2.0 pts	6.0
Total	16			31.6
			31.6 grade pts / 16 credits =	1.98 GPA

Note the effect of the C- grades in the second example. The cumulative GPA is now 1.98 which is below "good standing" and will affect athletic eligibility. The student will be placed on probation if their cumulative GPA is now also below 2.0. In addition, because MATH F107X and BIOL F111X are prerequisites for other courses, the C- grades (1.7) are considered not passing and the student must repeat these courses.

The following motion was passed by Faculty Senate at its March 2010 meeting, and is included here for reference.

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to **AMEND THE 2010-11 CATALOG TO REFLECT** a two year placement test expiration and revise the following UAF catalog statement under the Mandatory Placement heading on page 32, as indicated:

Effective: Fall 2010

Rationale: Placement test expiration periods are inconsistent across the UA system. Students attending different institutions within the system are confused by the differences. A common message is requested.

Furthermore, it is the hope of the SADA committee and the Developmental Math and Math faculty that this motion lead to Banner enforcement of prerequisites for math placement.

CAPS and **Bolded** - Addition

[[]] – Deletion

Mandatory Placement

Students who do not meet basic skills standards in reading, writing and mathematics must complete appropriate Developmental Education courses. Such students may not enroll in 100-level or above courses that depend on these skills until they have satisfactorily met the exit criteria of the appropriate Developmental Education course(s).

Students without appropriate standardized test scores (such as ACT, SAT, ASSET or ACCUPLACER), advanced placement credits, transfer credits or prerequisite coursework must have UAF-approved placement test scores prior to registering for classes their first semester at UAF. **PLACEMENT EXAMS MUST BE TAKEN WITHIN TWO CALENDAR YEARS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE COURSE.** Students may not enroll in classes unless they meet the placement requirements. Placement into appropriate developmental or core classes must be done with the help of an academic advisor. Placement tests are available at every UAF rural campus as well as Testing Services, Academic Advising Center, Rural Student Services, Center for Distance Education and Northern Military Programs at Fort Wainwright, Eielson Air Force Base and Delta Career Advancement Center.

FOR PLACEMENT INTO ENGLISH F111X OR ANY DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH COURSE, STUDENTS MUST ALSO HAVE A SCORED WRITING SAMPLE SUCH AS AN SAT OR ACT WRITING SAMPLE, OR A UAF-GENERATED WRITING SAMPLE

GIVEN ALONG WITH ASSET, COMPASS, ACCUPLACER OR OTHER PLACEMENT TESTS.

Students who enroll in a **DEVELOPMENTAL OR CORE** course without meeting the requirements [[will]] **MAY** be withdrawn from the course through the faculty-initiated withdrawal process. Prerequisite courses [[and/or placement exams]] must be taken within [[one calendar year]] **TWO CALENDAR YEARS** prior to the commencement of **DEVELOPMENTAL AND LOWER-DIVISION CORE MATH COURSES** [[the course]]. Students may not enroll in Perspectives on the Human Condition courses unless they meet the placement requirements for English F111X (including reading). Students may not enroll in Core science classes unless they have placement at DEVM F105 or above and placement into English F111X.

Curricular Affairs Committee 10/5/2010 Meeting Minutes

Present: Anita Hughes, Dave Valentine, Rainer Newberry, Carrie Baker, Libby Eddy (phone), Carol Lewis, Dana Thomas, Rajive Ganguli, Anthony Arendt, Donald Crocker, Linda Hapsmith, Jungho Baek, Jayne Harvie (phone)

1. Request for someone else to take minutes of the meetings.

Libby E. volunteered for the next meeting. Rainer and Jayne will attempt to do so today.

2. Revisions & Approval of previous meeting minutes: Minutes from 9/21 meeting were approved as amended. Amendments: added Rajive Ganguli to the list of those present, and removed Mike Earnest who was not present.

3. Discussion of the re-re-revised suggested membership for the new-and-improved core revision committee.

The pros and cons of proposed representation were discussed at length. But, it was agreed that all schools and colleges should be represented on the subcommittee because the Baccalaureate Core affects all of them, as well as all students. As a result, some changes were made to the list on the proposal hand-out. Revised version is as follows:

1. Dave Valentine, **SNRAS** + Curricular Affairs
2. Carrie Baker, **CLA** (Arts) + Curricular Affairs
3. CLA (English) + Core Review
4. CLA (Communications) – could be Core Review
5. SOM rep with particular regards to social sciences as well as *SOM per se*
6. CNSM (Math) – (Latrice Laughlin? (Core Review experience) or Jill Faudree? (ditto)
7. CNSM (Science) (Mike Harris? **Or Diane Wagner?**) **Was on core revitalization is CNSM curric review representative**
8. Student representative
9. CEM – suggest RAJIVE GANGULI
10. SOE (School of Education) possibly current member of curric review committee
11. SFOS—current member of curric review committee? --
12. CRCD (AA/AS + 2 bacc) presumably a member of SADA [Diane Erickson, per Cindy Hardy, SADA chair]

Dana Thomas – ex officio

Linda Hapsmith – ~~ex officio~~ VOTING MEMBER

Mike Earnest – ex officio

TOTAL: 13 voting members

We agreed that this proposal would be reviewed with Jon Dehn and Cathy Cahill. To finalize membership on the subcommittee, letters will be sent to each of the deans, providing names (as reflected above, in some cases) along with criteria for selection.

The charge to the subcommittee needs to be written, which includes soliciting input on proposing new intended learning outcomes for a revised Core. Their second charge will be crafting the actual revised Core.

Goal over the next two weeks is to finalize the membership list.

4. Report from the “2.0 = C” Grading Policy subcommittee:

Dave V. reported on the subcommittee’s meeting yesterday afternoon. Anita Hughes, Nicole Carvajal (student), Rainer Newberry and he were present at the meeting.

Students and faculty need to be educated on what the use of +/- grades mean with regard to C grades in one’s major, for the degree overall, and for Core courses. One means is to include a clear statement in the Syllabus Requirements list (by motion to the Senate). Another means is to have deans provide the information to all faculty in their units. Students could be provided written notification of the grading policy in all their classes. Rainer creatively suggested use of the electronic T&T sign at the main campus entrance, clearly a popular idea until the possibility of creating traffic jams (and hence, office of safety intervening) killed it.

Page 47 of the UAF Catalog needs revision, so that the GPA calculation example (Table 10) includes \pm grades. Also, in the table of Grade Points per Credit, the “C-“ should be explained.

Another suggested motion is to request the Board of Regents give more points’ weight to the grade of A+ than an A grade, since use of \pm grades brings down the overall GPA calculation. Someone asked if Banner allows this calculation. Anita said she would ‘look into it’.

A motion is needed to standardize transfer credit, including the bringing in of \pm grades from outside Alaska. One possibility is that D- counts toward the total number of credits toward a baccalaureate degree, but not toward a major, or for passing a Core course. Dana expressed concern relative to accreditation. Standardizing across the MAU’s also needs to be addressed. (hahahah). An alternative to ‘lowering the bar’ for credit transfers outside of UA is to internally ‘raise the bar’. In particular, change the situation so that a minimum grade of C- is required for any core (‘X’) class.

Rainer was volunteered to craft motions for the next CAC meeting, with the goal of taking these before the Faculty Senate in November. Anita has sent a request to PAIR to find out how the change to \pm grading has affected GPAs overall since the policy change.

5. New business: (referred to CAC from the Curriculum Review committee.)

Background of issue: A UAF trial course was proposed that is meant primarily for high school students. Several others are in the works. The question: should such a course be given a 100-level course number? (That is, should we essentially admit that 100-level UAF courses are high school level?) Based on email conversations with Dana Thomas, Rainer crafted the following:

‘UAF courses that are designed primarily for high school students can receive a 1xx course number if the course prerequisites include HS GPA > 2.5 and completion of > 3/4 of high school core curriculum (the AHEAD admission criteria).’

Libby shared other examples of courses being taught for local high school students were shared, and asked who would be checking the high school GPA and class records. It was also asked how this would tie into Banner. Currently, any high school student (and any person, period) may enroll in a 100-level course that does not require college prerequisites.

Further discussion is needed. Dana suggested a Tech Prep person (Pete Pinny) be invited to the discussion.

Curricular Affairs Committee

10/19/2010 Approved Meeting Minutes

Present: Anita Hughes, Dave Valentine, Rainer Newberry, Carrie Baker, Libby Eddy, Carol Lewis, Anthony Arendt, Diane McEachern, Christa Bartlett, Carol Lewis, Donald Crocker, Jungho Baek, Ginny Kinne, Jayne Harvie, Mike Earnest, Pete Pinney (guest), Michele Mussman (Tech Prep guest).

1. Approval of minutes from previous meeting
Discussion-comment from Dana Thomas regarding D- grades. The language was toned down. Item 4. Nicole Carvajal should be referred to as ASUAF President (remove 'student') Approve minutes as amended
2. Old Business
 - A. Renewed discussion: how to ensure that 100-level courses designed primarily for high school students really are '100 level'? Pete Pinney (the 'tech prep rep') has been invited to share his experiences.

Discussion regarding Tech Prep courses (dual credit) and sponsored courses (faculty in charge of determining equivalency. Not sure that this really addresses our issue of high school courses delivered for high school students at the high school. The question posed: will the high schools do the pre-req checking for us? Rainer has several people looking into this. As of 1 Nov, the chances look good for such.

B. Progress report on the new and improved Core Revitalization Committee
Rainer to send letter to Deans
This committee needs a charge. Tied to learning outcomes? Once Learning outcomes are finalized then a new charge would come. Carrie will present a charge at our next meeting.

C. Motion to faculty Senate:
Request Board of Regents to change policy and award a 4.3 (or 4.2 or 4.1) to students earning the grade of 'A+'.
A+ does not recognize the extra work put in by the student
Does this penalize students who are in courses where the faculty member doesn't use the plus/minus system? Yes. But there's no way to ensure that all faculty use +/- or even that they grade fairly and impartially.
This motion makes the A consistent with B, C and D.
Recommend 4.3 for A+
Additional thought: how are honors students recognized at graduation?
Do other schools use the A+ system?
Propose passing the motion with the caveat that if the Provost objects-then we re-consider.
No objections-motion passed. Carol suggests running by provost council as well.
Note: Provost did not object...motion was passed on to AdComm

D. Motion to faculty Senate: (effective Fall 2011)
Students must earn a minimum grade of 'C-' in all core ('X') classes in order to satisfy core requirements. [Note: there may be additional constraints on the grade, e.g. minimum of C if to be used as a prerequisite for another course.]
Continue to allow D- to transfer within UA system (student would get general credit) but would have to repeat the course in order to be used as core. This can be set up in DegreeWorks.

Clarify if C- is an acceptable grade for transfer coursework? Yes, C-'s are currently accepted in transfer. Current practice is to post as C- as a C. Change would be to post a C- as a C-. This change would begin with students transferring to UAF in the Fall 2011 semester.
D- would count for general education . Everyone agrees with Carrie! Rationale should state that currently a D counts for UA system only. But that transfers will come in as C-.
Forward to administrative committee. Approved.

E. Motion to faculty Senate: (effective spring 2011)

Course instructors must add to their syllabus or otherwise publicize to students on the first day of class UAF regulations with regards to the grade of 'C-'. These include: a minimum grade of 'C' (not C-) is required for any course used as a prerequisite for another. A minimum grade of 'C' (not C-) is required for all courses in the student's major. A grade of C- will potentially cause a student's GPA to fall below 2.0.

Move to send to administrative committee

Course instructors must add new language to their syllabus or otherwise publicize

Clarification-undergraduate course syllabi

Include that C- is now the minimum required grade for all courses

"C- will satisfy a core requirement but will not satisfy pre-requisites

Rainer to re-work this motion and re-submit

Provide cut and paste option for faculty to include in new syllabi easily

Add to faculty development website

3. Any new Business?? Don't we have enough on our plate as it is????

Mike Earnest notified the group that the last 'printed' UAF schedule will be produced in Spring 2011. Usually have approx 1000 changes once the schedule is printed. Will meet with AAC to get info out to students, staff and faculty.

Will produce a Fall 2011 'registration bulletin'. This will have academic calendar, registration info etc. Survey to be sent to university community.

All Fall 2010 web grading will be turned off beginning December 22, 2010. Rosters will be printed and any student who does not have a grade posted will receive a grade of 'NS' (not submitted). Lack of grades being turned in on time impacts students-can't get transcripts sent-Dean and Chancellors lists cannot be sent. **Currently only 40% of grades are turned in on time.**

Question from the group-previous mention of students only being able to apply for graduation once a year. Response from Mike-this was proposed, but this will not be adopted at this time. Deadlines will remain Oct 15 and Feb 15.

Next meeting:

Charge to core revitalization-student learning outcomes

Adjourn at 3:03

**Committee on the Status of Women,
Meeting Minutes Tues, Nov 04, 2010; 1-2 pm, Gruening 718**

Members Present: Jane Weber, Dan White, Derek Sikes, Jenny Liu, Kayt Sunwood

Members absent: Janet McClellan, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen, Melanie Arthur, Nicole Cundiff, Shawn Russell

1. Luncheon (Oct 12) comments. 96 people + distance attendees. Great turn out and feedback from attendees. CD made of Carol Diebel's talk. One of the best keynotes so far.

2. Brown Bag lunch 1-2 tomorrow (Nov 5th). Fliers up around campus. Committee: Shawn, Melanie & Kayt. Topic: "Transitions" - graduate student through full professor. Topics for next semester needed - perhaps 'work life balance'. Or presentation & discussion of P/T statistics for nonretention that Dan will acquire.

3. Women and Gender Studies Panel, Dec 7th 1-2pm. Panel: "Where are the women?" In need of panelists. Goal is to examine UAF practices related to employment, retention and promotion of women faculty, lecturers, and instructors.

4. Examination of P/T stats and nonretentions update. (Is there is a gender bias? Categorized by reason for leaving). Dan has asked for statistics from Provost's office for 10 years worth of statistics. Request is in & expected by first week of December.

5. Commencement & Honorary Degree recipients. Do we want to try for a CSW member to be a representative on the committee that decides the list of possible commencement speakers and honorary degree recipients? Since 2002, 25 men 3 women honorary degree recipients. Jane will ask Susan Henrichs if this is a possibility.

6. Discussion of CSW committee & membership. Issues of motivation, energy, goals, attendance were discussed. Janet McClellan's slot will open in Dec. Should we assign tasks to members rather than solicit volunteers?

Next meetings: Tues. December 14; location will be 514C Gruening (SES Conf. Rm.).

Meeting was adjourned at 1:50; Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes

CORE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Minutes for the Meeting of Monday October 19, 2010

Present: Chandra Meek, David Henry, Diane Ruess, Rainer Newberry, Burns Cooper, Christine Coffman, Jean Richey, Latrice Laughlin (members) Faith Fleagle, Linda Hapsmith, Anita Hughes, Donald Crocker, John Craven, Caty Oehring, Mike Earnst (guests)

Latrice calls the meeting to order

I. Petitions

[For purposes of confidentiality, identifying information has been removed. jbh]

1. Petition #1:

Latrice moved to approve the substitution of 2.5 English elective credits for Comm 131X.

Rainer Newberry seconded the motion

Unanimous approval: Motion Passes

2. Petition #2:

Latrice moved to table the petition until more information could be found and presented.

Chris Coffman seconded the motion

Unanimous approval: Motion passes

3. Petition #3:

Latrice moved to approve the substitution of a 200 level ethics course from Edison State college for Philosophy 322X (but not granting the upper division credit)

David Henry seconded the motion

Unanimous approval: Motion passes

4. Petition #4:

Latrice moved to approve the substitution of Eskimo 330 and Eskimo 140 for the language portion of Perspectives.

Burns Cooper seconded the motion

Unanimous approval: Motion passes

5. Petition #5:

Chris Coffman moves to deny the substitution of TTCH 131 for Math 103

David Henry seconded the motion

Unanimous approval: Motion passes

6. Petition #6:

David Henry moved to approve the substitution of Math 243 from South Oregon University for Stat 200X.

John Craven seconded the motion

Unanimous approval: Motion passes

II. New Core Courses

1. **Phil 322X Course Compression Format Change for Wintermester/Maymester**

The philosophy department is proposing a compressed version of their core ethics course. Latrice stated that the syllabus provided does not specify meeting times. Both she and Rainer had attempted to contact the professor that submitted the proposal but were unsuccessful in reaching her. John Craven pointed out that there is a distinctive difference in the efforts being asked in the proposed syllabus and what was currently being asked in the semester long class. Chris Coffman requested to find out more about the professor's pedagogical stance.

Latrice moved to table the proposal in order to find out more information about the class and professor.

David Henry seconded.

Unanimous approval: Motion passes.

2. **Two new courses added to Perspectives on the Human Condition: Honr 241 and Honr 242.**

The honor's department has submitted two courses to be added to the list of classes that can be taken for the Perspectives on the Human Condition. John Craven asked who was planning to teach the course. Chris Coffman explained that she had been approached to teach the course but had not agreed to do so. She claimed that the class took away from the idea of the core by relegating it to a strictly honors class. Rainer stated that even though Honors is not part of CLA it needs to be sent to CLA because the content and required texts of the proposed classes are consistent with what is taught in several liberal arts classes.

Latrice moved to send the proposal to the CLA curricular review as a Core Course

Chandra Meeks seconded the motion

Unanimous approval: Motion passes

III. Next meeting November 1, 3:30-4:30. Rasmuson Rm 341.

Report for the Senate minutes: The committee met on October 18th with eight members present. The committee approved four core petitions and denied one petition. The committee reviewed a course compression format change for Phil 322X and tabled the petition till more information could be found. The committee also reviewed two new course proposals from Honors to be added to Perspectives on the Human condition. Honors 241 and 242 were sent to be reviewed by the CLA Curricular review committee as a core course because of the large amount of overlap the Honors courses had with CLA core courses. The next meeting is on November 1 at 3:30 in Rasmuson Rm 341.

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for October 12, 2010**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 3:08 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Joy Morrison, Alexandra Oliveira, Channon Price, Larry Roberts

Absent: Julie Lurman Joly, Eric Madsen

III. Report from Joy

Joy distributed posters for the committee to take and put up that detail Eric Mazur's upcoming visit. Both the Thursday and Friday lunchtime presentations will be videoconferenced throughout the state.

Other upcoming speakers include Dr. Eugenie Scott, director of the National Center for Science Education which advocates for teaching evolution and Creation science in public schools. She will present a talk on Wednesday, January 26, 2011 for UAF faculty and then will present Thursday evening, January 27, at UAA.

Coming up in November, Libby Roderick will present a talk on the book "Start Talking: A Handbook for Engaging Difficult Dialogs in Higher Education." Chancellor Rogers is very interested in this book and would like UAF faculty to be familiar with it. CP says it is available for free on the UAA CAFÉ web site. Libby's talk is scheduled for lunchtime on Friday, November 19 in the Wood Center.

This Thursday, October 14 Joy is showing Classroom Management 102: Working with Difficult Students as a "brown bag lunch," and next Tuesday, October 19 is the luncheon for new faculty and their mentors. Although she has asked department chairs to not schedule meetings during the Tuesday 1 – 2 PM time slot, there have been some scheduling conflicts for new faculty.

November 3 – 7, Joy will be attending the 35th annual POD (Professional and Organizational Development Network) Conference in St. Louis, MO. Please let Joy know if you are interested in attending next year's conference as there may be some funding available. While she is traveling, Joy requested a facilitator for the "iPads, Nooks and eReaders" webinar on November 3. CP volunteered readily.

IV. Old Business

1. Update on Eric Mazur's presentations and workshops on peer instruction, October 27 – 29.

(see above)

2. More on electronic student evaluations

Melanie asked where we are on this issue. Josef recapped that he re-sent our summary from last May along with other notes and comments to Provost Henrichs and Jon Dehn. Now it is a matter of getting it on the Faculty Senate agenda. It was suggested that Josef contact President-elect Cathy Cahill. We also discussed ways Josef might broach the subject, such as, “What is being done with the information provided by the FDAI committee?” and, “What action is being taken on our recommendations?”

Melanie pointed out that security has been an issue at UAF with the paper-based IAS forms, and we had some discussion over the tampering of IAS forms by a former UAF faculty member who has since left the university. CP stated that switching to electronic evaluations will not necessarily prevent this from ever happening again.

V. New Business

1. Introduction of Diane Erickson, who will be replacing Joy during her sabbatical.

Diane comes to us from UAA where she worked with CAFÉ and has a background in adult higher education. She has been hired to teach reading in the Department of Developmental Education. She will be taking over some of Joy’s duties in January while Joy is on her spring sabbatical. We welcome Diane and look forward to working with her.

2. Faculty Forum for Spring 2011:

- choosing a theme from Kennedy’s book “Academic Duty” and inviting a guest speaker to join in/facilitate the discussion

Although chapter 9 “To Reach Beyond the Walls” was suggested at our last meeting, we discovered that it was not about community outreach as we thought, but instead discussed the ethics of outside work and monetary gain. Josef mentioned that he felt balancing teaching, service and scholarship was not clearly defined. Joy brought up that each faculty member can negotiate their workload agreement each year with their chair and dean, but we all agreed that that is not necessarily the practice at UAF.

Melanie suggested we look at chapter 3 “To Teach” as a follow up to Dr. Scott’s presentation in January. Her talk could be a strong catalyst for an interesting discussion. Possible facilitators discussed were Provost Henrichs, Eduardo Wilmer, and Jordan Titus. We are tentatively scheduling the Faculty Forum for Tuesday, February 15, 2011 from 1 – 2 PM. We need to find an appropriate room that is about halfway between West Ridge and Lower Campus.

3. Another template for improving teaching strategies?

We did not have time to discuss this.

VI. Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 16, 2010, 3:00 – 4:00 pm in Bunnell 222.

VII. Adjourned at 4:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.