

## MINUTES

### UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #189

Monday, March 4, 2013

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

109 Butrovich – Board of Regents Conference Room

#### I Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds

##### A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (13)	SHORT, Margaret (13)
ALBERTSON, Leif (14)	VALENTINE, Dave
ALEXEEV, Vladimir (13) - <b>Georgina Gibson</b>	WEBER, Jane (14)
BANDOPADHYAY, Sukumar (13)	YARIE, John (14)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (13) – <b>Brian Rasley</b>	
BROWN, Stephen (13) – <b>Julie Cascio</b>	Members Absent:
CEE, Vincent (14) – <b>Kathy Arndt</b>	CHAMBERS, Izetta (14)
COOK, Christine (14) audio	CHEN, Cheng-fu (14) - Excused
DAVIS, Mike (14) video conference	GEORGE-BETTISWORTH, Retchenda (13)
FALLEN, Chris (13)	WEBLEY, Peter (14)
FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)	WINFREE, Cathy (13)
GUSTAFSON, Karen (13)	WINSOR, Peter (14)
HARDY, Cindy (13)	ZHANG, Xiong (14)
HARDY, Sarah (13)	
HEALY, Joanne (13)	Others Present:
HEATON, John (14)	Chancellor Brian Rogers
HENRY, David (13)	Provost Susan Henrichs
JENSEN, Karen (14)	Paul Layer, Dean, CNSM
JOHNSTON, DUFF (13) audio	Alex Fitts
JOLY, Julie (13)	Dani Sheppard
LARDON, Cecile (13)	Debu Misra
LAWLOR, Orion (13)	Eric Madsen
MARR, Wayne (14) audio	Libby Eddy
MCEACHERN, Diane (13) video conference	Jon Dehn
MEYER, Franz (13)	Linda Hapsmith
NADIN, Elisabeth (13)	Carol Gering
NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)	Carol Murphrey
NG, Chung-Sang (13)	Joy Morrison
RADENBAUGH, Todd (13) video conference	Doug Schrage
REYNOLDS, Jennifer	Elizabeth Allman

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #188

Approval of Minutes #188 was postponed to the April meeting.

C. Adoption of Agenda

Adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to require the student transcript to distinguish between Master's with thesis and Master's with project
2. Motion to require graduate student enrollment in credits within discipline during semester of thesis defense and semester of graduation
3. Motion to approve a new minor in Military Security Studies
4. Motion to amend transfer credit policy
5. Motion to amend the credit by exam policy

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Comments – Jennifer Reynolds

The Faculty Senate highlights for the fall 2012 semester have been distributed via email to all faculty. Their purpose is to more widely communicate with and make faculty aware of what the Senate has done. Only items of wide interest were included. Comments on the effectiveness of this trial effort were invited. Highlights for the spring semester will be sent out later on.

A new ad hoc committee was announced which will address joint appointments. The committee will look at policies concerning faculty evaluation and other related issues to joint appointments. The main reason for doing so is that Faculty Affairs and Unit Criteria Committees are revising the Blue Book which hasn't changed since 2006. There is very little guidance in it now concerning how rules, policies and the Collective Bargaining Agreement apply to evaluating faculty with joint appointments. This committee will be set up during this semester and will continue next fall.

B. President-Elect's Comments – David Valentine

The Interdisciplinary Issues Faculty Committee has chosen Craig Gerlach as Chair. They will identify barriers and hurdles that are in the way of interdisciplinary research, teaching and service. Later on they will take public input, and David will announce when they are ready to do so.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers reported that he had just returned from Juneau where he had the opportunity to meet with 26 legislators or their staff individually. News on the UAF budget is not good. The Governor had approved in his budget request 50% of pay raise money and some of our fixed costs to include the opening of new facilities. The House Finance Subcommittee acted to reduce the university budget by 2.4 million dollars. The bad news is the method by which they did that. They stripped out all the money the Governor had added in except for the pay raise money. The effect of that deleted all the funding to open the Life Sciences Building. Their intent was just an unallocated reduction. But the mechanics by which they did this stripped it out in the process, essentially taking out 2.8 million dollars' worth of items the Governor had given to the university, and then giving us an unallocated increment of \$400,000. The structure of this budget (for the first time in a long time) is a single appropriation which allows the Board of Regents and the President to hypothetically move funds from UAA and UAS to UAF in order to open the facility. This is not a good situation. The Chancellor is speaking to key

members of the full House Finance Committee on how to correct this, suggesting they keep the funds for opening facilities which the voters approved in the budget and instead give a \$2.4 million unallocated reduction, but he anticipates the vote will be close. It has to be fixed in the House rather than the Senate. Otherwise, if the House has taken \$2.4 million out in one place and the Senate takes out \$2.4 million unallocated, then the Conference Committee has the option of saying both reductions will be taken and suddenly the reduction is \$4.8 million. It's a very unfortunate situation that was largely due to the House Finance subcommittee being composed of mainly new members with no one participating from Fairbanks.

On the Senate side, work has not started yet on the operating budget. He wouldn't be surprised to see them come in above the House as they're a little less intent on cutting spending. He was told they should feel good about the \$2.4 million cut because it could have been \$5 million. He is not feeling good about it. It creates a real challenge for us because the University budget is roughly 40% state-funded, 30% federal-funded, 20% student tuition and fees, and 10% other. All three sources (state, federal and tuition/fees) are challenged next year. We're already seeing a slow-down in NSF and other grant awards. The tuition increase next year will be the smallest in over a decade. Together, this really affects the budget for the next fiscal year and they'll be looking for cost savings where ever they can be found.

If the allocation problem is fixed, there is still a reduction in funding to be dealt with by all three campuses. They do plan to try to open the Life Sciences Building, however, which will help with moving some offices back on campus. The two easiest places to try and find cost reductions are through energy conservation and reduced leasing of office space. Economizing in this fashion helps spare programs and staffing from cuts. The Chancellor asked for help in identifying under-utilized space on campus to help reduce the off-campus space leasing. This effort could help save \$1.8 million in leasing costs. An investment of \$6 million has been made in energy conservation programs. Savings made through that investment will pay back those funds, though a portion of that is budget reduction.

There is not much action in the legislature on the capitol budget side, yet. The Chancellor was able to speak about the combined heat and power plant and how it interacts with the legislature's push for gas to Fairbanks. The plant (as currently planned) would reduce annual heat and light costs from about \$10 million to \$5.5 million. If they went with gas, it would increase the costs to \$13-17 million, but there's a capital to operating trade-off. More discussion is expected in the upcoming months.

There is significant support for money to complete the engineering building, or at least to keep work going on it in the next fiscal year. There is enough money to keep work going until this time next year, so there will be an effort made to find funding so they don't slip a year on that building. The focus in the next month or so is to ensure that our budget is as strong as it can be, and that we've identified where else we can find reductions that don't directly impact our instructional and research programs. The Chancellor invited faculty to join the dialog and share their thoughts on budget issues.

Elisabeth N. asked if it's typical, compared with other universities, for tuition income to be 20%. Chancellor Rogers responded in the negative, stating that typically for a university comparable to ours, tuition income is higher and federal and state income is lower. We're at the high end for state support among colleges and universities, and at the low end for tuition support.

#### B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs announced that Dr. Alex Fitts is the new Vice Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer. She noted that the position entails oversight of the Academic Advising Center, Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Activity (URSA), the Honors Program, Testing Services, Upward Bound and Student Support Services.

The Provost reported on the Strategic Direction Initiative (SDI) meeting that occurred the week before last in conjunction with the Board of Regents' meeting. The intent is to move the process toward completion in time for a presentation to the BOR in June. Over the next several weeks documents from this process will be made available for widespread input. One of the big issues is how UAF will assess its progress toward the goals of SDI. Identifying assessment measures is an ongoing and intensive task in the months ahead. The new focus will be on outcome metrics or "products" such as graduates who've obtained employment, patented products, and publications for Alaskans, rather than input metrics such as amounts of grant funding received or student enrollment numbers. They are looking for ways to show the value of the University to Alaskans. The actual implementation of SDI will be an important undertaking in the years to come.

A brief summary of the BOR meeting was provided, which the Provost described as reasonably low key with no surprises. The MAT degree programs in mathematics and physics were eliminated, along with the MS in general science. The CRCO and CTC master plans were approved. The vapor barrier project for the Fine Arts Complex was approved. There was considerable discussion about the SB 241 report on teacher preparation by the University and its progress toward meeting the need for teachers in the state. Much concern remains about the fact that the majority of K-12 teachers are hired from outside Alaska and do not stay very long in the rural school districts. The goal that has been established by the legislature and the Board of Regents is that our Schools of Education will prepare more teachers who are well prepared for and committed to teaching in rural Alaska.

The Provost spoke about the widely distributed memo concerning FY14 and future year budget challenges. Because a variety of questions have followed its distribution, she plans to visit the units and provide opportunities for faculty to ask questions. Faculty should also feel free to email her with their questions. She commented that faculty have asked how they may participate in the dialog concerning what the University does to continue being strong and successful despite the budget challenges. It is partly up to faculty to frame how they would like to give their input to administration, though she hesitated suggesting that Faculty Senate should form another ad hoc committee. The Planning and Budget Committee is the established entity for evaluating budget requests and for making recommendations on budget matters to administration, and it will continue to include faculty representation. (The Chancellor had not yet arrived, so the meeting moved on to Old Business first.)

#### V Old Business

##### A. Call for nominations: Outstanding Senator of the Year Award and Selection Committee (Attachment 189/1)

Jennifer announced that the nomination period for the Outstanding Senator of the Year award is now open. She went over the attached guidelines, noting that nominations should be sent to her or to Jayne Harvie at the Faculty Senate Office by noon on March 22.

##### B. Call for nominations: Faculty Senate President-Elect

Jennifer noted that the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws contain the procedures for president-elect nominations. Nominees should submit a statement of interest by March 20 in order to be included in the next Administrative Committee agenda (though late nominations are accepted). Individuals may nominate themselves. If you nominate someone, please check with them first to be sure they're willing

to serve in that role. If you have questions, contact Jennifer, David Valentine, Dean Paul Layer, or past presidents Jon Dehn or Cathy Cahill. The election is to be held at the next meeting and will be either a vote of affirmation (if there is no more than one nominee) or an election by vote (if several nominees).

C. Motion to agree to the Discontinuation of Ph.D. in Mathematics (Attachment 189/2, and Attachment 189/3, Department Update)

Jennifer called attention to the attachments which included the tabled motion and a statement from the department faculty who wish to revitalize the degree program. The statement lays out what they've done since the December meeting, what the current status is with their efforts and what they hope to accomplish by the end of the semester. Based upon this memo, the Administrative Committee recommends the motion be tabled again until the May meeting. There's been concrete progress and goals have been laid out for the next two months.

A motion was made to table the motion until the May meeting and was seconded. The vote to table the motion was unanimous.

D. Results of faculty survey on posting syllabi or alternative course description (Handout)

Jennifer called attention to the report available as a handout and posted online at the Faculty Senate Meetings web page. The first page of the report provides an overall summary. Overall, there is widespread support for creating some sort of central repository for course descriptions. The survey responses will help guide how we move forward on this project.

Question 1 of the survey was, "Do you favor creating a central online repository of course information?" Results indicated that 71% were in favor of an online repository and 22% were not, while 6% had no opinion.

The next question concerned whether the repository should be publicly accessible or restricted to the UA community, i.e., people with a UA login. Results indicated that 55% preferred UA login access only and 37% preferred public access. Quite a few comments were submitted about this question which should help sort it out. The survey answers and comments indicate there would be much broader support from faculty and less resistance if access is restricted.

The next questions concerned whether individual faculty would prefer to post syllabi or expanded course descriptions on a restricted access site. 74% would be willing to post syllabi, and 26% would not. 83% would be willing to post expanded course descriptions and 17% would not. Comments by those who said no indicated that there may be some adjustments to the plan that could make it more acceptable to them.

The last question was about what the central repository should contain. The margins of difference in the answers were much smaller, with the answer "instructor's choice" being the most popular at 49%. It could also be interpreted as the default answer because faculty would always like to have a choice. There were survey comments about the advantages and disadvantages of posting syllabi or course descriptions, and these will be examined along with the numbers.

The next steps are to answer two questions:

1. Where would the online repository be created or hosted? Options mentioned included UAOnline; Blackboard; and CourseLeaf. They will talk with OIT about those options.
2. What would the information look like? A template will be created to show concrete examples and illustrate how much work might be involved.

There will be more information presented at the next Faculty Senate meeting. No voting will be done about this topic until the template is shared and there's a chance for everyone to examine it.

Todd R. asked if the poll was representative of the faculty and what percentage of faculty responded. Jennifer responded that there were 180 responses, including 40 from adjunct faculty. It's hard to say what percentage that is because responses were invited from adjuncts as well as tenure-track, research and term faculty, and we don't have an accurate count of how many adjuncts there are. She compared the response distribution by rank and unit and this seemed to indicate the responses were representative of the faculty. Overall, the results appear to be representative, but this question cannot be answered in a rigorous way.

Brian R. asked if the response level around 20% was normal for this kind of survey, from the point of view of a social scientist. Cecile L. said yes, for social science surveys without follow up this was a significant response. You would not do better without a whole lot more effort. Jennifer added that it's probably fair to assume that faculty who care most about the topic responded, or at least were over-represented in the results of the survey. She thinks that negative responses were probably overrepresented.

Margaret S. wanted to know if identifying information about the instructor will be stripped out of what is posted to help prevent students from instructor shopping. She thinks faculty would feel better about it if this were done. She feels it's important to make it clear that examples of the courses are being posted. Jennifer said that is one of the main reasons behind posting expanded course descriptions instead of syllabi. The template they have right now does not include instructor names, assignments, or grading policy. It does include the course description, the course goals and learning outcomes, and prerequisites.

David V. addressed part of Margaret's comment, noting the schedule identifies faculty each semester. He asked her if she would object to the instructor's name being posted if the course was only taught by one person. Margaret noted that she's been the only instructor of one course for quite some time and pointed out that she changes the course content from semester to semester because she's had difficulty finding a textbook for it.

Debu M. asked if there will be extensive discussion when there's something more to show them, and Jennifer assured him that would occur.

## VI New Business

### A. Motion to approve the Library Science Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 189/4)

Karen J. noted there were only a few changes from the last version of the criteria. Brief statements were added about the faculty workloads in Library Science, and criteria were added for promotion to the rank of full professor.

A vote was taken, and the motion to approve the Library Science unit criteria was unanimously passed.

### B. Motion to amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws pertaining to membership of the Unit Criteria Committee, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 189/5)

Karen J. explained the changes which update the units listed in the bylaws and add representation for research units and the Library (now its own separate unit).

A vote was taken, and the motion to amend the bylaws for the Unit Criteria Committee carried unanimously.

C. Motion to amend the grading policy for C- (1.7) as minimum acceptable grade for baccalaureate major / minor degree requirements and prerequisites, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 189/6)

Rainer N. noted this change will again align the UAF grading policy for C- (1.7) with Board of Regents' policy which accepts all forms of "C" including C+ and C- as indicating a satisfactory level of acquired knowledge and performance in completion of course requirements. A few years back when Faculty Senate went to plus/minus grading and kept the minimum acceptable grade at C (2.0), they did not realize they were contradicting BOR policy. The easiest way to fix this problem would be to use a time machine, but, the second easiest way is by means of this motion.

Linda H. summarized the grading implications for prerequisites and core courses. Julie J. asked to confirm that this policy change is not retroactive. Rainer explained that like other catalog changes, they are in effect for the individuals who graduate under that catalog. He also noted that it does not affect the requirement that a student's overall GPA and GPA in the major must be a minimum of 2.0.

Chung-Sang N. asked if the 2.0 minimum overall GPA will have to change down the road. He asked about the hypothetical case of a student who passed all their courses with C-. Rainer said the scenario is conceivable, but we'll just have to cross that bridge when we actually come to it. Provost Henrichs commented that the possibility of it was quite slim because anyone below 2.0 would be placed on academic probation, and anyone with a 2.0 or lower GPA for two successive semesters would be subject to dismissal.

Orion L. commented what a sweeping change this is, particularly in terms of the Catalog. He mentioned that the credit / no credit option is affected by this change, whereby credit for an elective course is awarded if performance is at the 2.0 grade or higher.

Debu M. asked Rainer if the idea of eliminating C- / D+ by just stopping at the C (2.0) grade, then going to D, had been considered. Rainer responded that it had not been considered. Mike D. commented in support of Debu's idea.

David V. commented that some instructors have elected to only give C grades, and not the C- grade. If the idea were adopted, then instructors wouldn't feel compelled to fudge grades to avoid having a student in their class again because of a C- grade. Rainer acknowledged hearing similar statements from various faculty to this same effect. Elisabeth N. noted that, conversely, some instructors might give a D grade so the student must take the course again.

Ken A. commented about departments potentially creating programs with a straight C minimum requirement. Can Faculty Senate override this? Rainer responded that to his knowledge no department has deliberately done that for a major and a minor. However, there's no reason they couldn't do that.

Susan H. commented that departments can set more rigorous standards for grades if they choose to do so. Most just default to the baccalaureate degree requirements set forth in the Catalog. If there are any programs that specify a 2.0 minimum, that is acceptable and Faculty Senate is not overriding them. She also commented in support of the motion because the current system of what is acceptable and what isn't in terms of the C grade and how it's applied is extremely confusing for everyone.

Cindy H. noted that SADAC discussed this motion. They voted on it, and were 8 to 1 in favor of the motion. It regularizes the grade level for students, and students still have to do 2.0 for good standing and in the degree program.

Christine C. asked to verify for the School of Education that their higher rigor courses would still hold. Jennifer assured her that Faculty Senate action would not override those standards set by the program.

Elisabeth N. asked what it would take to change Board of Regents' policy. Susan H. responded that it would require the agreement of all three campuses, but UAS would probably not go for it. It was asked what the consequences could be for remaining out of compliance with existing BOR policy. Susan noted that there was some potential for legal problems by staying out of compliance with BOR. Jennifer noted that the confusion factor is also a serious issue.

Cecile commented that if we graded on a full grading scale, this wouldn't be an issue. If there were an objective standard for C and C- there wouldn't be a problem. But, there isn't such a standard; grades are still determined by individual faculty.

A vote was taken. The ayes carried the motion, with three abstentions.

## BREAK

### VI New Business Continued

- D. Motion to revise the grade appeals policy to clarify the time period within which grade appeals will be reviewed (Section III: Procedures, Article B, Subsection 5), submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 189/7)

Cecile said there was vigorous debate and good email exchange after the last Senate meeting. The committee discussed the motion again, taking into account the feedback, but in the end they did not find any real solution for addressing the time period in between regular semesters. For example, every grade appeals committee requires a student to be represented on the committee, and while faculty would still be on contract over the winter break, students would be scarce during that time. So, after considering the pros and cons, the committee returned to its earlier position. If there is a committee available during the summer or winter break, there is nothing to prohibit them from meeting; but, a student should not expect that a committee can be put together outside of regular semesters.

There was no further discussion on the motion. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

- E. Motion to amend FS Bylaws regarding special elections to fill vacant senator positions, submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 189/8)

Cecile described the background for this motion. This was brought by a unit that has had difficulties in getting enough candidates on the ballot during regular elections, but find faculty later on who would fill seats if there were an opportunity to add them. There is not much said in the FS Constitution or the Bylaws on the matter. Faculty Affairs Committee discussed this extensively and recommends that there only be a special election if a regular senator resigns and there is no alternate available to fill the seat. In that case, the unit can have a special election within 30 days of the senator resigning, so that they can be represented. The committee also added that elections are to be held in the spring, as is current practice, since time frame is not specified in the Bylaws right now.



Joanne H. asked why elections should be held in the spring rather than the fall, when people know what they're doing. Cecile noted that for administrative reasons the Senate has to elect its new members in the spring, plus faculty workloads are set during the spring semester for the next academic year, so that's the time when faculty discuss what they're going to be doing in the fall.

Georgina G. asked if an alternate fills a vacancy, if a department then can hold an election for the vacated alternate seat. Cecile responded no, the alternate is the "safety net."

Franz M. asked for clarification that the special election is only for electing a senator, not an alternate. Cecile and Jennifer confirmed that, noting the language in the motion specifies "senator." The alternate position remains vacant.

A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

F. Motion to change UAF Catalog descriptions of letter grades, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 189/9)

Rainer commented that the fundamental distinction between the old and proposed wording is that the word "average" has been removed and the plus/minus grades have been included with the letter grades. These changes align with the Board of Regents' policy. They also get rid of the notion that probably no one has held in over two decades -- that C is an "average" grade.

Cecile L. made the comment that just because we have grade inflation doesn't mean we have to do away with C being an "average" grade. Just because there's pressure to give better grades is not enough reason to change that definition. She also commented that the nuance of what these grades mean is being lost in the BOR definitions. Higher grades are losing meaning. She likes the original definitions much better.

David V. asked why we should specify what "average" is at all. Different professors have different philosophies about how they wish to grade. Some might grade on a curve with C at the center of that, but others have a very different idea and award As and Bs in a class where everyone does well. Rainer noted that there is nothing in Board of Regents' policy that requires us to define what average is and he sees no reason to pretend that everyone builds their grading around a C average.

Brian Rasley commented that he preferred the old wording for B which includes "outstanding." The new definition is more wishy-washy and implies there is a high level and a low level of knowledge and performance. Describing B as "high level" seems less definite than using the word "outstanding." Grades of A and B require extra effort and are honor grades.

Susan H. commented about what average truly means these days. Ian Olson (Institutional Research) looked at grade distributions a few years ago and found that the average upper division course grade is B (3.0) and the average lower division course grade is C (2.7). The other issue with the word "outstanding" is that it's being used to define the grade of A, so you don't want to use it for B as well.

Franz M. commented that he thinks the new definitions are clearer. In the old definition of A, it reads, "...the satisfactory completion of more work than is regularly required." It doesn't really sound that outstanding. And, for the B, it reads "...outstanding ability above the average level of performance" which is a relative description that doesn't mean "outstanding" as such. He also likes the new definition of the grade of F; the old one just said "indicates failure," which is too generic.

Cindy H. noted SADAC also talked about this twice. The first time they looked at the motion, considering what would happen if they just deleted the word "average" it made some of the other sentences rather awkward and they rejected it; but, when they looked at it in terms of adopting BOR language, they agreed 6 to 1 that the BOR language was clearer. Each of the sentences seems to be a clear parallel to the others so you can see a progression one to the other across the board, and it eliminates the whole question of average.

Linda H. noted she had a quibble on the grade of D in the BOR policy which says it's an acceptable grade for electives. Keep in mind that it is also acceptable for elective and degree requirement courses, but not for other purposes. She described some of the confusion this causes, especially for advisors regarding degree requirement courses that are not required in the major and by the Core. She suggested adding language to specify what D or D- are acceptable for as grades, saying "elective courses or degree requirements."

Rainer acknowledged her point, but said whole lists could be created. Susan H. commented that if language is added for clarity to students, it should say for degree requirements not required by the major or minor – otherwise it will be more confusing.

Ken A. suggested removing language referring to "elective" courses instead. Rainer then suggested changing the word "elective" to "some" instead. Ken felt that was redundant.

Susan H. suggested removing any reference to what the grade may be used for in this list and instead later adding a carefully worded footnote or paragraph to explain what D can count for – but she cautioned not trying to do this sort of word-smithing on the Senate floor.

Franz M. suggested just sticking to an operational definition of the grades and leaving out what they may be used for. Cecile agreed.

The motion was considered with a change to the language for the D grade (removing the language about being acceptable for elective courses).

The amended motion was voted upon, and the ayes carried it, with one nay and one abstention.

## VII DISCUSSION ITEMS

### A. Advisor for students filing grade appeals

Jennifer explained that this issue has come up in background discussions about specific grade appeals over the last year or two. A suggestion has been made and floated both in Provost's Council and among Faculty Senate committee chairs that it would be desirable for students to be able to get advice when they are considering whether or not to submit a grade appeal, and in writing the appeal itself. The question is who should this advisor be. An early suggestion was the academic advisor. Now there has been some discussion with the Academic Advising Center on this topic. Jennifer invited Alex Fitts to summarize that discussion.

Vice Provost Alex Fitts shared that Dean Layer had talked about the need for this at Dean's Council, suggesting the Academic Advising Center would be the best source of advice. The feasibility of housing an advisor for grade appeals at the Advising Center has since been discussed further. It would be feasible for advising the undergraduate students, but not for graduate students, at that location. The question goes back to the faculty, whether this is a desired solution. Jennifer invited discussion.

Julie J. asked if it would be someone at the advising center who would talk to the students, or would it be their own academic advisor in the department. Jennifer responded that the first suggestion by Faculty Senate was the student's own academic advisor, but the topic had also independently moved over to the Advising Center. How do faculty feel about this?

Julie expressed a concern about the potential situation where it was the academic advisor who gave the grade in question. Alex commented that having the student go to an independent person at the Advising Center is a better way to go, particularly if it's a small department and the student would thus feel uncomfortable. Paul Layer agreed and added that it puts the academic advisor in an awkward position if they are advising the student to put in an appeal against one of their colleagues in the department. Being able to take the matter outside the department, to a more independent advisor in the Advising Center, would be advantageous for both the student and the department faculty. The department chair is supposed to mediate the process in the beginning anyway, and if that fails (and a formal appeal is being filed) then maybe we should be moving toward something more removed from the department.

Franz M. asked whether grade appeals happen regularly. Cecile L. reported that she'd asked Don Foley that question and learned it averages about five to ten a year.

John H. asked if students are currently required to go through an advisor, or can they file an appeal on their own. Cecile responded that students can file appeals on their own, but that is part of the problem. They often do not do a very good job on their own. She recently sat on two appeals committees and the students had filed on their own and really did not help themselves when they presented their cases.

John then asked if there will now be a new requirement for students to go through an advisor. Rainer commented that this was the topic under discussion – not that it would be a requirement, necessarily, but how to help make the process work. It can be a big waste of everyone's time when a case is brought without merit. Part of the question is how we arrange this sort of thing so students understand the rationale for making a grade change beyond the fact they didn't like the grade they got, and how we educate them to make an effective case. What he has personally seen is that students act alone and by and large the documentation which is required just isn't there.. Jennifer agreed, commenting that students may ask for help or may get informal help with the process, but there is no formal process to assist them. If a system is set up like this, it would become a formal part of the grade appeals process and the student would be directed to the Advising Center for help. It would be listed in the steps a student should take.

Javier F. commented said there's another element of the situation that should be considered. If a student is not happy with the outcome, they can hire a lawyer. We need to be very careful in the process of advising a student on whether or not there are really grounds for the appeal.

David V. noted that the other side of this, in terms of a student going to a lawyer, is that they did not have adequate direction or advice in the appeals process in the first place. The current procedure is unclear. This change would make sure they have clear advice on someone they can go to as an advocate, and this person knows the grade appeals process and can give guidance on assembling materials and meeting deadlines. This helps instill more confidence in the process and makes it less likely for a student to go to a lawyer.

Franz M. spoke in support of having the Advising Center take the lead, as they would be knowledgeable about the appeals process. Students would be better served. He would also like to see a solid documentation available online about what merits a grade appeal.

John H. asked how early would in the process would students be directed to the Advising Center. Paul Layer said first a student talks to the instructor and the department chair. An appeal is the last stage of the process if it's not resolved earlier, and then the student could be directed to the Advising Center for help with setting up an appeal. The Advising Center would not be in a gatekeeping role, but rather an advisory role. It would be optional for the student to go to the Advising Center.

Alex F. commented that part of the language regarding appeals is that they are the last resort after other options have been exhausted. Part of the role of the Advising Center would be to help the student explore whether or not they've exhausted other options.

Jennifer informed everyone that she has asked Alex to keep Faculty Senate up to date on developments so Senate can be involved in discussing any proposals that come up.

#### B. Next steps for Learning Management System (LMS) evaluation (Attachment 189/10)

David V. provided a brief recap, mentioning that he and Carol Gering had discussed various ways that they could evaluate potential replacements for Blackboard. They discussed how to get faculty input in this process, should a potential replacement be identified. They decided on two ways they would approach this. One way would involve setting up a pilot program in which a number of instructors would offer courses using Blackboard and one of the other LMS packages. They would provide their feedback at the end of the semester. The second idea is to take a faculty focus group and ask them to perform several tasks on various LMS packages and have them compare and report back about their experiences, reactions and preferences.

The pilot program has been running this semester at eLearning. Now they have initiated the second discussion about assembling focus groups to look at various tasks for faculty to try out. The attachment contains some tasks and criteria that might be used by the focus group to evaluate the LMS packages. David asks the Senate members to look at this list and make suggestions about what would be key items that should be added to it.

Julie J. suggested the task of adding or removing students from a course on the LMS. David suggested something to keep track of attendance.

David asked faculty to email him suggestions and he'll get them back to Carol and her course designers. He also asked for volunteers for the focus group. Margaret S. and Cecile L. volunteered.

### VIII Public Comments/Questions

Alex F. announced the regional NACADA advising conference in Anchorage. She will provide \$750 funding per person for up to 25 faculty to attend and she encouraged faculty to apply. There are flyers in back of the room, and the Provost's site has a web form. Linda H. can also answer questions about the conference itself.

### IX Governance Reports

#### A. Staff Council – Juella Sparks

A report was not available.

#### B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag

A report was not available.

- C. UNAC – Debu Misra  
UAFT – Jane Weber

[Unfortunately, a portion of the recording was lost due to the video conference being automatically shut down at 3:00 pm.]

Debu shared handouts from UNAC and JHCC with information about proposed rates and plan changes for health care. (The handouts were also distributed electronically before the meeting and posted on the Faculty Senate meeting web page – see link below.) He discussed these and asked for feedback from faculty

There was discussion of Dr. Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya's letter from UAA. He is on the JHCC along with Leah Berman and Abel Bult-Ito. The alternate plan he has proposed was discussed at length. JHCC is also happy to accept other alternate ideas and feedback. It was mentioned that there may be a newer version of the letter. (A newer version has since been posted on the Faculty Senate web site.)

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2012-13-fs-meetings/#189>

Debu asked faculty to please contact him with questions and feedback about health care plan changes.

- D. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

Dani announced that fall 2012 GPA results have come in and been examined. Among good things going on with student athletes, the entire women's cross-country ski team, all 10 of them, made the Chancellor's List (GPA of 3.9 and 4.0). Five teams are headed into post season, with three going into nationals and two are undecided at this time.

#### X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

Cindy Hardy briefly reported about the GERC which she is attending as the Faculty Senate liaison. They've divided into subcommittees to talk about different elements of the LEAP group. They've come up with some criteria for core course designations. They are starting to pull together a presentation to share with the Curricular Affairs Committee after spring break. Depending upon input from CAC it may then be brought to the departments.

Mike D. commented on how he hopes the Faculty Senate might talk further about its collective involvement in the university budget process and how the whole budget process is put together. The budget is compromised this year and that appears to be the pattern set for the future. He's interested in having this conversation.

- A. General Comments/Announcements
- B. Committee Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)
  - Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 189/11)
  - Faculty Affairs – Cecile Lardon, Chair (Attachment 189/12)
  - Unit Criteria – Karen Jensen, Chair (Attachment 189/13)
  - Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 189/14)
  - Core Review Committee – Jean Richey, Chair
  - Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
  - Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
  - Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair  
(Attachment 189/15)  
Research Advisory Committee – Jon Dehn, Chair

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 PM.

## OUTSTANDING SENATOR OF THE YEAR AWARD (OSYA)

### PURPOSE:

The Outstanding Senator(s) of the year award is an award to be given by the UAF Faculty Senate for truly outstanding contribution of service for academic quality at the University. The contribution to be recognized would be far beyond that normally made by an individual in the normal performance of his or her job.

### ELIGIBILITY AND CRITERIA:

The recipient should be a serving member of the UAF Faculty Senate or a serving member of a permanent or standing committee of the Faculty Senate who has made a major contribution to the faculty's and students' welfare, to the faculty's ability to carry out its duties more effectively, to the general betterment of the University outside the teaching and research function, and/or has shown wise and courageous leadership (and responsibility) on behalf of the faculty and University. This should be an award for service, not teaching or research, above and beyond that normally expected from an individual.

### NON-ELIGIBILITY:

The President and President-Elect of the Faculty Senate are not eligible to receive this award.

### PROCEDURES:

Any eligible Faculty Senate member may nominate a candidate for the OSYA. The letter of nomination should include a brief list of the Senator's accomplishments and a cover letter that makes the case for the nominee. The nomination should be submitted to the Faculty Senate President by noon on Friday, March 22, 2013.

The Screening Committee will consist of five members. One member will be appointed from the Provost Council by the Provost. The Faculty Senate will select four (4) members one of whom will be the President-Elect, and three others, none of whom is a nominee. This committee will meet prior to the April meeting of the Senate to screen all nominees and select one or two candidates that are recommended to the Senate President.

In the April Faculty Senate meeting, the OSYA selection committee shall move the appropriate resolution(s). After appropriate discussion, the full Senate shall vote by secret ballot on the motions. A simple majority vote of those attending will be necessary for the Senate to confirm an OSYA.

The award is to be presented by the President of the Senate and the form of the award shall be a framed, hand-lettered certificate that contains the resolution passed by the Senate and the signatures of the Faculty Senate President and President-Elect.

## **TABLED MOTION FROM MEETING 186:**

The UAF Faculty Senate agrees to discontinuation of the PhD Degree in Mathematics.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

**RATIONALE:** During the 2010-2011 program review process, the Faculty Program Review Committee recommended that the Ph.D. in Mathematics be continued, but stated “DMS should investigate ways to increase this number [of students] or make clear the reasons for the continuation of this program.” The Administration Program Review Committee and the Chancellor's Cabinet recommended the Ph.D. in Mathematics program be discontinued. The Mathematics Department (which administers this degree) appealed that recommendation, but the appeal was denied by the Chancellor's Cabinet on the grounds that there was no evidence that enrollment would increase or other compelling reasons for continuation.

### **Background and Information:**

There was total of only two Ph.D. in Mathematics graduates during the period from FY06 to present. Enrollment was 7 in FY06, but since then has ranged between 0 and 3 students. As shown below, there has been zero enrollment for a year. Of the students enrolled in 2009-10, two graduated and the other student is not expected to return.

### **Program Review Enrollment Data**

Degree and major sought:	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
PHD					
Mathematics	7	2	3	3	2

### **Enrollment in the Mathematics Ph.D. Program by semester, 2009-present**

Program	Su09	Fa09	Sp10	Su10	Fa10	Sp11	Su11	Fa11	Sp12	Su12	Fa12*
PHD	1	2	1	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	0

\*As of October 25, 2012.

Additional factors are that the faculty member who has served as major professor for all recent Ph.D. students has left UAF, and that the program has persistently had low enrollment and graduates. During the previous program review period the enrollment had increased from zero (Fall 1999) to six (Fall 2004), but there were no doctoral degrees awarded. So, over the last 13 years there has been a total of only two graduates. The Program Review conducted in 2005-06 concluded in part:

“We also support continuing the Ph.D. program for the next review period, but it will be subject to a serious re-evaluation in 2010. Several questions that must be addressed at that time are (1) Has a broader group of faculty, especially including some of the recent hires, begun advising Ph.D. students? (2) Has an enrollment of about 5-10 students been sustained? (3) Have a reasonable fraction of the students admitted before 2007 completed their degrees? (4) Have these students had successful outcomes, e.g., employment in their field, publication in peer-reviewed journals, etc.? Negative answers to most of these questions will probably result in termination of the program, or at least, suspension of admissions until a more favorable climate exists.”



Discontinuation of this program will have little effect on other programs, personnel, students, or budget. The department will be freed from administrative requirements of student learning outcomes assessment and program review. The vacant faculty position can be refilled to focus on other department needs. There are currently no students enrolled in this program, and admissions have been suspended pending Faculty Senate action. Therefore, the program can be discontinued immediately and does not require a teach out period.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 189/3  
UAF Faculty Senate 189, March 4, 2013  
Submitted by the Mathematics and Statistics Department

Update: Revitalization plans for the Ph.D. in Mathematics at UAF

To: Members of the Faculty Senate

From: Department of Mathematics and Statistics

**History:** At the November 2012 Faculty Senate meeting, a motion to discontinue the Ph.D. program in Mathematics was introduced. It was tabled following discussion. An alternative motion drawn up by members of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics (DMS) was considered by the Administrative Committee for introduction at the December 2012 meeting, but through mutual agreement the decision to table the November discontinuation motion until the March Faculty Senate meeting was made. The Administrative Committee, in recommending a delay of a vote on the discontinuation motion, requested that the Department of Mathematics and Statistics draw up a plan for a successful Mathematics Ph.D. program. The Provost and CNSM Dean agreed to work with the department towards this end.

**Progress and events since December 2012:** A core group of DMS faculty has met with the Provost, and the Provost and the CNSM Dean to discuss ingredients of a successful Ph.D. plan. These include:

1. A commitment from a core number of faculty from DMS to mentoring Ph.D. students.
2. An active recruitment plan.
3. A (creative) plan for funding graduate students.
4. A list of benchmarks, by which a UAF Mathematics Ph.D. program can be evaluated for success or failure over the years.

DMS faculty at this meeting added an additional item to this list

5. Revitalize and reconceptualize the program requirements for the Ph.D. program, as the current framework has flaws and seems unworkable, or at least unlikely to be successful in the long term without modification.

**Progress made by DMS towards a Ph.D. revitalization plan:** Weekly meetings of the 'Ph.D. revitalization' committee have taken place Tuesdays at 9:30 to draw up a plan; all members of the Mathematics faculty are meeting to discuss curriculum issues, with a focus on graduate curriculum. In light of the items listed above, DMS can report the following progress:

1. There are 10 mathematics faculty in DMS, and a core of faculty (7/10) are interested in mentoring Ph.D.'s. Six of these seven are actively involved in the revitalization plan. Three (3) members are interested only in mentoring Master's students.
2. The entire Mathematics faculty (10/10) agree that renewed recruitment efforts are needed. Increasing and improving recruitment efforts will be the topic of an upcoming math graduate curriculum meeting.
3. The entire DMS math faculty (and Chair) are looking at creative ways to fund graduate students to increase enrollments. Possible innovative new ideas include the idea of integrating graduate student TAs with the DMS goal of improving success rates and retention in lower level MATH courses.
4. There has been lengthy discussion of reasonable benchmarks for administrative review of a Mathematics Ph.D. program. These discussions have focused on workload, mean annual number of graduate students per faculty member, and comparisons to other Mathematics Ph.D. programs in rural states. Currently, the department is considering that an annual average of 10-20 graduate students (Master's and Ph.D.) might be reasonable. No final consensus has emerged.
5. All (10/10) Mathematics faculty think that the entire graduate curriculum at UAF needs attention. On a related (and very positive) note, the goal of revitalizing the Ph.D. program has resulted in renewed energy and enthusiasm among all math faculty members for improving all graduate math education at UAF, and to find improved recruitment venues and means.

In summary, DMS can report that a core of math faculty are interested in mentoring Ph.D. students and retaining and improving a Mathematics Ph.D. program at UAF; discussions and brainstorming are underway for improved graduate recruitment and financing of graduate education; and that there is renewed energy to examine thoughtfully and improve all aspects math graduate curriculum at UAF. The substantive goal of revamping the Ph.D. (and Master's) program requires thought and discussion, and DMS has been working with the Provost to see that a plan is drafted by the end of the semester. The least amount of progress has been made toward achieving item (4), the benchmarking. This is simply because math faculty want to have concrete graduate program guidelines and recruitment goals in hand, before solidifying ideas on assessment.

ATTACHMENT 189/4  
UAF Faculty Senate 189, March 4, 2013  
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Library Science Unit Criteria

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted for review by Library Science. With some minor revisions, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

\*\*\*\*\*

UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY  
AND **LIBRARY SCIENCE** UNIT CRITERIA STANDARDS AND INDICES

**JANUARY 2013**

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS' CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, PRE-TENURE REVIEW, POST-TENURE REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE SPECIFICALLY DEVELOPED FOR USE IN EVALUATING **LIBRARY SCIENCE** FACULTY. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS.

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. **A MASTER’S DEGREE IN LIBRARY SCIENCE (MLS) OR EQUIVALENT FROM AN AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION (ALA) ACCREDITED PROGRAM IS THE RECOGNIZED QUALIFICATION FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS. IN SOME CIRCUMSTANCES A MASTER’S OR DOCTORAL DEGREE IN A SPECIFIED FIELD MAY SERVE AS AN ALTERNATIVE.** 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.

**LIBRARY SCIENCE FACULTY FREQUENTLY HAVE WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTIONS OF 80 PERCENT SERVICE, 10 PERCENT RESEARCH AND 10 PERCENT TEACHING. SERVICE IS DESCRIBED IN CHAPTER III SECTION D2G.**

## CHAPTER III

### Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

#### A. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV, **AND LIBRARY SCIENCE UNIT CRITERIA 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.

**TEACHING WORKLOADS FOR LIBRARY SCIENCE FACULTY VARY, USUALLY FROM A BASE OF 1-2 UNITS PER YEAR. INSTRUCTION MAY ALSO INCLUDE CONTACT WITH STUDENTS OR OTHER AUDIENCES THROUGH DISTANCE DELIVERY, WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS, TRAINING AND PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS.**

#### 1. 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 **AND OTHER AUDIENCES**;
- b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students **AND OTHER AUDIENCES AND** show interest/enthusiasm for the subject;
- c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student **AND OTHER AUDIENCES** participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are sensitive to student **AND OTHER AUDIENCES** 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;
- f. regularly **REVISE CURRICULUM AND** develop new courses, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design. **IN ADDITION TO TEACHING CREDIT COURSES, LIBRARY SCIENCE FACULTY MAY ALSO CONDUCT LECTURES, WORKSHOPS, AND SEMINARS FOR DISCIPLINE-BASED COURSES OR NON-CREDIT PROGRAMS AT ANY LEVEL. THEY MAY ALSO ORGANIZE TEACHING WORKSHOPS OR PREPARE COURSE MODULES FOR BROAD DISTRIBUTION.**
- g. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching.

## 2. 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),
- d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials,

**AND OPTIONALLY:**

e. **STUDENT OPINION SUMMARY FORMS DESIGNED BY LIBRARY SCIENCE FACULTY FOR THE EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS, OR GUEST INSTRUCTION SECTIONS,**

**f. TESTIMONIALS FROM STUDENTS AND OTHER AUDIENCES.**

**TEACHING CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF FULL PROFESSOR MAY INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:**

- 1. DEVELOPMENT AND/OR ADAPTATION OF NEW METHODS AND APPROACHES IN THE DISCIPLINE;**
- 2. RECEIPT OF UNIVERSITY, STATE OR NATIONAL AWARDS;**
- 3. STUDENT/ OTHER AUDIENCE REVIEWS AND TEACHING EVALUATIONS THAT ARE CONSISTENTLY ABOVE AVERAGE;**
- 4. INVITED TEACHING.**

**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. 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.

**RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY ARE A SMALL PORTION OF THE NORMAL LIBRARY SCIENCE FACULTY WORKLOAD, USUALLY FROM A BASE OF ABOUT 1-2 UNITS PER YEAR.**

**LIBRARY SCIENCE RESEARCH MAY INCLUDE SCHOLARSHIP OF DISCOVERY AND INTEGRATION INVOLVING THE DEVELOPMENT, EVALUATION AND INCORPORATION OF NEW IDEAS INTO EXISTING SYSTEMS OF KNOWLEDGE; SCHOLARSHIP OF INSTRUCTIONAL THEORY, METHODOLOGIES AND RESULTS; SCHOLARSHIP OF APPLICATION ESPECIALLY ADDRESSING SPECIFIC LIBRARY, ARCHIVAL OR CURATORIAL PRACTICES AND THEIR RESULTS.**

**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 external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.
- d. They must be judged to make a contribution.

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, proceedings, **CASE STUDIES, TRANSLATIONS, BOOK CHAPTERS, ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES, PRESENTATIONS AND POSTERS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS**, and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline.
- 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 before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.
- d. Exhibitions of art work at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics.
- e. Performances in recitals or productions, 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.
- h. Published abstracts of research papers.
- i. Reprints or quotations of publications, 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. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.
- l. Development of processes or instruments 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. **PEER-REVIEWED ADAPTATIONS OF NEW TECHNOLOGY INCLUDING SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT RELEVANT TO INFORMATION ACCESS AND/OR DELIVERY OF LIBRARY SERVICES.**
- m. **PEER-REVIEWED EXHIBIT CURATION.**

**RESEARCH CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF FULL PROFESSOR MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:**



- 1. DEVELOPMENT AND/OR ADAPTATION OF NEW METHODS AND APPROACHES IN THEIR AREA OF EXPERTISE;**
- 2. RECEIPT OF UNIVERSITY, STATE OR NATIONAL AWARDS;**
- 3. ONGOING CONTRIBUTIONS TO PUBLISHED RESEARCH; SCHOLARLY, CREATIVE, OR PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT;**
- 4. INVITED PRESENTATIONS AT THE STATE, NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL LEVEL.**

**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."

**UNIVERSITY SERVICE IS USUALLY THE LARGEST PORTION OF THE LIBRARY SCIENCE WORKLOAD.**

**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.
- c. Service on accrediting bodies.
- d. Active participation in professional organizations.
- e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- f. Consulting **IN THE FACULTY MEMBER'S AREA OF EXPERTISE.**
- 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
- 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:
- a. Service on university, college, school, institute, or departmental committees or governing bodies.
  - b. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance or specific projects.
  - c. Service as department chair or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college/school.
  - d. Participation in accreditation reviews.
  - e. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.
  - f. Service in support of student organizations and activities.
  - g. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.

**ACTIVITIES RELATING TO THE NORMAL AND NECESSARY FUNCTIONING OF THE UAF LIBRARY AND PERFORMED ON A REGULAR BASIS ARE CONSIDERED TO BE COMPONENTS OF UNIVERSITY SERVICE. FOR MOST LIBRARY FACULTY THIS COMPRISES THE BULK OF THEIR UNIVERSITY SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES. SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:**

**REFERENCE:**

**REFERENCE SERVICES PROVIDE A LINK BETWEEN LIBRARY PATRONS AND INFORMATION SOURCES. THEY USUALLY INCLUDE PERSONAL ASSISTANCE IN IDENTIFYING, LOCATING, AND USING APPROPRIATE RESOURCE MATERIALS.**

**COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT:**

**COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IS THE PROCESS BY WHICH LIBRARIANS DETERMINE THE BOOKS, JOURNALS, NON-PRINT MEDIA, ON-LINE DATABASES AND OTHER ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE LIBRARY'S HOLDINGS. THIS PROCESS INCLUDES: ASSESSMENT OF USAGE DATA; LIAISON RELATIONSHIPS WITH ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT; CO-**

**INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATIVE PURCHASES, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF LONG-TERM CONSORTIAL AGREEMENTS.**

**MANAGEMENT OR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES:  
RESPONSIBILITIES MAY INCLUDE: BUDGETING; SUPERVISING AND EVALUATING STAFF; STRATEGIC AND OTHER LONG-TERM PLANNING; DEVELOPMENT OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES; DATA ANALYSIS, AND REPORT WRITING RELATED TO THE FUNCTIONING OF THE LIBRARY.**

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY:  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVOLVES ASSESSMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRENT TECHNOLOGIES PERTAINING TO THE LIBRARY'S INFRASTRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS. THIS INCLUDES THE PLANNING, CREATION, INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE OF SOFTWARE SYSTEMS; DESIGN OF WEBSITE ARCHITECTURE; AND DEVELOPMENT OF OPERATIONAL POLICIES.**

**ARCHIVES:  
ARCHIVAL ACTIVITIES INVOLVE THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC ACCESS AND RESEARCH SERVICES TO HISTORICAL COLLECTIONS OF PAPERS, PHOTOGRAPHS, MANUSCRIPTS AND OTHER UNIQUE AND UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS. INCLUDED ARE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF DONOR RELATIONSHIPS; GRANT ADMINISTRATION AND OTHER FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES THAT EXTEND NORMAL LIBRARY BUDGETING; APPRAISAL OF COLLECTIONS TO DETERMINE ADMINISTRATIVE OR HISTORICAL VALUE; ARRANGEMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF COLLECTIONS; PRESERVATION OF FRAGILE MATERIALS AND/OR OBSOLETE MEDIA; DEVELOPMENT OF OUTREACH PROGRAMS, AND THE ORGANIZATION AND PRESERVATION OF DIGITAL DATA.**

**CURATION:**

**CURATION AT THE UAF LIBRARY TYPICALLY INVOLVES THE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF A FORMALLY RECOGNIZED COLLECTION THAT SERVES STUDENTS AND RESEARCHERS AT UNIVERSITY, STATE, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS.**

**EXAMPLES OF CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:**

**i. MAINTAINING, ENHANCING AND ENLARGING THE COLLECTION (INCLUDES COMPUTERIZATION AND DATABASE DEVELOPMENT; ARCHIVAL UPGRADES; CONSERVATION AND IDENTIFICATION, AND ADDING OBJECTS TO THE EXISTING COLLECTION);**

**ii. INTERACTING WITH STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES AND WITH THE PUBLIC ON COLLECTIONS-RELATED ISSUES;**

**iii. PROMOTING USE OF THE COLLECTIONS THROUGH LOANS, EXCHANGES, AND VISITING RESEARCH ACTIVITIES;**

**iv. DIRECTING COLLECTIONS MANAGERS, STUDENT EMPLOYEES,  
AND VOLUNTEERS;**

**v. CREATING EXHIBITS AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS  
APPROPRIATE TO THE COLLECTION;**

**vi. PURSUING FUNDING FOR COLLECTIONS GROWTH AND  
MAINTENANCE;**

**vii. PRODUCING CURATORIAL OR COLLECTIONS-RELATED  
PUBLICATIONS, REPORTS, AND/OR MANUALS.**

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

i. Mentoring.

j. 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.

### **4. 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.

**EFFECTIVENESS IN SERVICE MAY BE EVALUATED BY ANY OF THE  
FOLLOWING METHODS:**

**a. LIBRARY ACTIVITIES PERFORMED ON A REGULAR AND CONTINUAL  
BASIS ARE EVALUATED BY THE ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS AND MAY BE**

**SUPPLEMENTED BY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FROM PEERS INSIDE OR OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY;**

**b. DOCUMENTATION DEMONSTRATING SUCCESSFUL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS, POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS;**

**c. LETTERS SUPPLIED BY COLLEAGUES WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY EVALUATING PERFORMANCE, CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LIBRARY AND ASSISTANCE TO INDIVIDUALS AND/OR GROUPS;**

**d. TESTIMONIALS DEMONSTRATING OUTCOMES AND/OR EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES;**

**e. HONORS AND AWARDS FOR PERFORMANCE EXCELLENCE WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY, INCLUDING LIBRARY AND PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS.**

**SERVICE CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF FULL PROFESSOR MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:**

- 1. RECORD OF ACTIVE LEADERSHIP AND MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION IN INSTITUTIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES;**
- 2. RECEIPT OF UNIVERSITY, STATE OR NATIONAL AWARDS;**
- 3. INVITED CONSULTATIONS AT THE STATE, NATIONAL, OR INTERNATIONAL LEVEL;**
- 4. EVIDENCE OF CONTINUING GROWTH AND MAINTAINING CURRENCY IN THE FIELD.**

ATTACHMENT 189/5  
UAF Faculty Senate 189, March 4, 2013  
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the Unit Criteria Committee, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E3, (page 17). This amendment updates the list of units and adds representation from the research institutes and the library. The amendment also allows for more flexibility in the final composition of the committee, while maintaining wide representation.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The list of units is out of date and it does not include the research institutes, or the library.

\*\*\*\*\*

**BOLD CAPS** = Addition  
[[ ]] = Deletion

E. The standing and permanent committees of the Senate are:

STANDING

3. The Unit Criteria Committee will review proposed unit criteria for evaluation of faculty submitted by the various peer-review units of UAF, and [[to]] **WILL** work with the heads of those units (or their designees) to ensure that their criteria are consistent with criteria defined in the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations "Blue Book". The committee will also review proposed changes to the "Blue Book."

To ensure that perspectives from across UAF are represented, membership will consist of [[faculty senators, with]] **AT LEAST FIVE SENATORS, ONE EACH FROM THE FOLLOWING FIVE schools/colleges: CLA, [[CRA]] CRCD, [[CES]], [[CSEM]] CNSM, SFOS, [[Engineering]] and CEM; and AT LEAST one from CES, SNRAS, [[SoEd,]] SOE, SOM, OR LIB; AND AT LEAST ONE SENATOR WHO HAS AN APPOINTMENT WITH A RESEARCH INSTITUTE.**

**FINAL COMPOSITION OF THE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE WILL BE APPROVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE.**

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend grading policy concerning the grade of C, such that C- (1.7) shall be the minimum acceptable grade that baccalaureate students may receive for courses to count toward the major or minor degree requirements, or as a prerequisite for another course.

EFFECTIVE:      Fall 2013

**RATIONALE:**

1. Consistency with the past. Before +/- grades, a 'C-' was acceptable because a 'C-' was simply a version of C
2. Consistency with faculty who do not use +/- grades. A student who receives a 'C-' from a faculty member who does not use + is ok because that grade gets recorded as a 'C'. Same course, different teacher, this one does use + and the grade is not acceptable.
3. Consistency with BOR policies. BOR defines a C as an acceptable grade. Clearly a 'C-', which is a version of C, also should be acceptable.
4. Consistency with transfer policies: a course with a grade of C- transfers. However, currently it only transfers as 'credit' for a course in one's major or minor. In order to satisfy the requirement for the major or minor the course would need to be re-taken and a grade of C or higher received.
5. A grade of C- is the minimum acceptable for a 'core' course. This is confusing for students, who recognize that sometimes a C- is good enough, and sometimes not.

Note that the proposed change wouldn't change the fact that a student's overall GPA and GPA in the major must be a minimum of 2.0.

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the Grade Appeals Policy of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section III: Procedures, Article B, Subsection 5. This revision clarifies the time period within which grade appeals will be reviewed.

EFFECTIVE: January 2013

RATIONALE: As currently stated the policy makes it possible for a grade appeal to be received during the summer when many faculty are off contract. Depending on the department and program it may be difficult to find enough faculty to serve on a grade appeal committee during those summer months. The proposed revisions allow for a more flexible time period for processing grade appeals submitted during the summer.

\*\*\*\*\*

**BOLD CAPS** = Addition  
[[ ]] = Deletion

Sect. III (Article B: Procedures)

**III. Procedures**

B. If no such error occurred, the remaining option is by review for alleged arbitrary and capricious grading, or for instances where the course instructor is unavailable and satisfaction is not forthcoming from the appropriate department chair.

1. This review is initiated by the student through a signed, written request to the department chair with a copy to the dean of the college or school in which the course was offered.

a. The student's request for review may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and available at the Registrar's Office.

b. By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the review of the grade, and that the university's administration can not influence or affect the outcome of the review.

c. The request for a review must be received **ON OR BEFORE THE 30TH DAY OF INSTRUCTION OF** ~~[[WITHIN 30 CLASS DAYS AFTER THE BEGINNING OF]]~~ the next regular semester (i.e., fall semester for grade issued at the end of the previous spring semester or summer session; spring semester for grade issued at the end of the previous fall



semester **OR WINTERMESTER**) or within 5 days of receipt of notification of the process by the dean/director of the college or school in which the course was offered.

...

5. The committee must schedule, **WITHIN 10 DAYS OF INSTRUCTION FROM RECEIPT OF THE STUDENT'S REQUEST**, a mutually agreeable date, time and location for the appeal hearing [[within 10 working days of receipt of the student's request]]. **IF THE REQUEST FOR APPEAL IS RECEIVED ANY TIME OTHER THAN DURING A REGULAR SEMESTER, THEN THE HEARING MUST BE SCHEDULED ON OR BEFORE THE 10TH DAY OF INSTRUCTION OF THE NEXT REGULAR SEMESTER.**

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the Faculty Senate Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, Sect. 1, Article III: Membership, Sections C and D. This revision adds a statement specifying that elections are held in the spring. It also adds a subsection allowing a special election to be held if, and only if, a senator cannot complete his/her term and no alternate is available to represent the affected unit.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately.

RATIONALE: The bylaws currently do not state when elections are to be held – only when terms begin. There is also no bylaw regulating situations where no alternate is available to replace a senator who can no longer serve.

\*\*\*\*\*

**BOLD CAPS** = Addition  
[[ ]] = Deletion

Senate Bylaws:

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

C. Election Procedure

1. Election shall be conducted by the represented units, or by the Senate office for any conglomerate groups to provide representatives to the Senate according to Article III of the Senate Constitution. Elections **ARE TO BE HELD DURING THE SPRING SEMESTER** and election procedures are the responsibility of the units, subject to the following:

D. Vacancies

1. In the case of death, resignation, transfer, or other reason why an elected representative can no longer represent the unit, an alternate shall immediately become the representative. The president of the Senate will appoint a replacement from among the unit's elected alternates with the concurrence of the affected constituency and the consent of the Administrative Committee.

**2. IF NO ALTERNATE IS AVAILABLE TO REPLACE THE DEPARTING SENATOR THE AFFECTED UNIT MAY HOLD A SPECIAL ELECTION TO REPLACE THAT SENATOR. THIS SPECIAL ELECTION MUST BE HELD WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE LAST DAY THE DEPARTING SENATOR SERVED. ALL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING REGULAR SENATE ELECTIONS APPLY TO THESE SPECIAL ELECTIONS.**

## MOTION

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to change UAF Catalog descriptions of letter grades as indicated below.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2013

RATIONALE: These revised descriptions of letter grades more closely match those found in University Regulation R10.04.090, Section C., "Grade Definitions." The changes eliminate use of the term 'average' in the descriptions and clarify under what circumstances 'D' is an acceptable grade.

\*\*\*\*\*

**BOLD CAPS** = Addition

**[ [ ] ]** = Deletion

**Grading System and Grade Point Average Computation** [as currently in the *UAF Catalog*, page 48]

...

Grades appearing on academic records are:

**[ [A An honor grade, indicates originality and independent work, a thorough mastery of the subject and the satisfactory completion of more work than is regularly required.] ]**

**"A" (INCLUDING A+ AND A-) INDICATES A THOROUGH MASTERY OF COURSE CONTENT AND OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE IN COMPLETION OF COURSE REQUIREMENTS.**

**[ [B Indicates outstanding ability above the average level of performance.] ]**

**"B" (INCLUDING B+ AND B-) INDICATES A HIGH LEVEL OF ACQUIRED KNOWLEDGE AND PERFORMANCE IN COMPLETION OF COURSE REQUIREMENTS.**

**[ [C Indicates a satisfactory or average level of performance.] ]**

**"C" (INCLUDING C+ AND C-) INDICATES A SATISFACTORY LEVEL OF ACQUIRED KNOWLEDGE AND PERFORMANCE IN COMPLETION OF COURSE REQUIREMENTS.**

**[ [D The lowest passing grade, indicates work of below-average quality and performance.] ]**

**"D" (INCLUDING D+ AND D-) INDICATES A MINIMAL LEVEL OF ACQUIRED KNOWLEDGE AND MINIMAL PERFORMANCE IN COMPLETION OF COURSE REQUIREMENTS. THIS GRADE [ [IS ACCEPTABLE FOR ELECTIVE COURSES, BUT] ]**

**DOES NOT SATISFY REQUIREMENTS FOR COURSES IN THE MAJOR, MINOR, CORE, OR GRADUATE PROGRAMS.**

[[F Indicates failure.]]

**“F” INDICATES FAILURE TO MEET A MINIMAL LEVEL OF UNDERSTANDING OF COURSE CONTENT AND (OR) PERFORMANCE IN COMPLETION OF COURSE REQUIREMENTS.** All F grades, including those earned in pass/fail courses, are included in the GPA calculations.

...

ATTACHMENT 189/10  
UAF Faculty Senate 189, March 4, 2013  
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

From Carol Gering, eLearning Director:

For this initial, small-scale stage of the eLearning LMS Pilot, focus groups will examine the following core LMS functions on at least two of the three LMS systems under consideration (Canvas, Moodle, Blackboard). Due to the small scale of the initial pilot and expected response to call for focus group participants, the evaluation topics are limited and individual participants may choose to focus on a single functional area:

## Content/Materials ##

1. Adding new content, including standard formatting (paragraphs, bold, italic, lists, etc.)
2. Adding media: images, hosted video, etc
3. Linking

## Organization ##

1. Creation of organizational structure: visual, module/folder
2. Move and edit organizational structure
3. Use of date-based organization (appearance or function)

## Gradebook ##

1. Individual grading and response, including file exchange
2. Mass/group grading
3. Views, Hiding/Showing, Grouping
4. Gradebook backup

## Communication/Collaboration ##

1. Announcements
2. Email
3. Discussion forums or equivalent
4. Other group communication (blogs, etc.)

## Assessment ##

1. Quiz/Survey creation (interface)
2. Question types and capabilities
3. Question pools or equivalent
4. Presentation options (individual Qs, timed, backtracking, etc)

**Curricular Affairs Committee MINUTES** 14 January 2013 9-10 am Reichardt 301

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry, Chair; Ken Abramowicz; Retchenda George-Bettisworth (phone); Karen Gustafson (phone); Cindy Hardy (phone); Sarah Hardy; David Henry; Diane McEachern (phone); Todd Radenbaugh (phone).

Non-voting members present: Caty Oehring; Libby Eddy; Lillian Misel-Anderson; Carol Gering; Jayne Harvie (taking notes). Not present: Doug Goering; Alex Fitts.

**1. Approved minutes of last meeting**

**2. No Report from J Rosenberg (GERC) discussed the conference in Anchorage**

**3. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. (submitted by Lillian Misel, Registrar's Office)**

Any student who has completed an associate of arts or an associate of science degree from a regionally accredited 2-year or 4-year institution (other than UAF) will be considered as having satisfied the 100- and 200-level UAF general education (core) requirements. ***\*\*If an AA or AS degree is used to waive UAF's core requirements, it cannot also be used to substitute for a minor in a bachelor's degree. \*\**** We agreed that this was in reference to 'hybrid' Associate degrees, which still need to be sorted out.

**B. Grades & how they're described in the catalog**

**Suggested motion: \*\*\*minimum grades for major and minor requirements and for prerequisites WILL be changed from "C (2.0)" to "C- (1.7)" throughout the UAF Catalog\*\*\***  
**This was discussed, but not approved. More discussion to follow.**

**Grading System and Grade Point Average Computation --current**

"All course grades are letter grades unless otherwise specified in the class schedule. The method of grading (letter or pass/fail) is an integral part of the course structure and is included in the course description. Instructors are expected to state their grading policies in writing at the beginning of each course. Grades appearing on academic records are:

A An honor grade, indicates originality and independent work, a thorough mastery of the subject and the satisfactory completion of more work than is regularly required.

B Indicates outstanding ability above the average level of performance.

C Indicates a satisfactory or average level of performance.

D The lowest passing grade, indicates work of below-average quality and performance.

F Indicates failure. All F grades, including those earned in pass/fail courses, are included in the GPA calculations."

*This is not entirely consistent with the fact that a C- does not count toward a major but does count towards Core requirements (See the table on p. 49 and text on p. 136). Also doesn't say anything about counting to fulfill a prerequisite.*

SAC is considering a change to Regulation that would cause the C- to not transfer. If that is enacted (the President would need to approve) catalog sections on transfer would need to be changed.

If SAC disallows credit transfer for C-, that would have the interesting result that a course could count for the UAF Core and general ed requirement, and if the student completes the UAF Core then that general education completion counts at UAA and UAS even though the grade itself would not transfer

A suggestion (made by the Provost):

**C or C+ Indicates a satisfactory or average level of performance.**

**C- or D The lowest passing grades, indicate work of below-average quality and performance.**

This or a similar rewording would help students to understand that a C- is not the same as a "C". This is similar to the rewording now proposed for University Regulation.

**And while at it, make this change?**

***B Indicates outstanding work and subject mastery, above the average level of performance***

**But perhaps this is an opportunity to get rid of the whole 'average' business???**

#### **4. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. MOTION: A student who has completed a baccalaureate degree at any U.S. or Foreign regionally accredited institution is considered to have completed UAF's core requirements.**

**This was not accepted. Might try again. Might not.**

**B. SHOULD WE TELL GERC: 'WE DON'T THINK 'DESIGNATORS' IS A GREAT IDEA'??**

**They apparently got the word: See J. Rosenberg's report of 26 Jan.**

**C. Core class transferability issues --came up at inter-MAU meeting in Anch Jan 2013**

**BOR POLICY " P10.04.062. General Education Coursework Transfer.**

A. The general education requirements for each university and community college will include a common core of course work constructed in part to facilitate transfer of general education credit among the universities and community colleges.

B. A student who has completed the general education requirements at one university system university or community college and transfers to another system university or community college will be considered to have completed the general education requirements at all University of Alaska universities and community colleges

C. A student who has completed some of the general education requirements at one university system university or community college will have those credits count toward fulfillment of the same categories of general education requirements outlined in the common core at all University of Alaska universities and community colleges. This applies even if there is no directly matching coursework at the institution to which the student transfers."

**I think** the above means 'when you transfer we'll bend over backward to accommodate you but once you're at your new MAU you'll play by the new MAU's rules'. But a real lawyer would probably have a field day with it. Potential application by UAF student: take UAA's Geography 101 by distance delivery. Since it counts for their version of 'perspectives on the human condition' at UAA and since such person took it from UAA, that person automatically gets it to count towards perspectives at UAF. .... I PROPOSE TO CLARIFY THIS.

**Motion: \*\*A UAF student cannot use a class taken at another MAU while at UAF to count towards the UAF core requirements unless that course is directly equivalent to the UAF required core course.\*\***

**Subsequent discussions with Dana Thomas indicate such would violate BOR regulations....oh, well...**

#### **D. Semi-related: 'The push to more E Learning'**

'Seventy-three percent of UAF's credit hours delivered through CDE are to students who live in the Fairbanks area.' (from the recent report to the BOR). Students at UAF can take E-courses from UAS and UAA. UAS and UAA can take UAF e-courses. Is there need to get excited about this topic?

There are lots of classes that UAF students can take from UAA and UAS that will count towards the UAF core. Are we excited/annoyed/happy about this??? Uncertain.

**This time everyone DID RUN OUT SCREAMING....**

-----

PRESENT: Rainer Newberry (Chair); David Henry; Carol Gering; Ken Abramowicz; Todd Radenbaugh (phone); Sarah Hardy (phone); Cindy Hardy (phone); Retchenda George-Bettisworth (phone); Karen Gustafson (phone).

Ex officio members present: Alex Fitts (phone); Libby Eddy (phone); Lillian Misel (phone).

Jayne Harvie also present (taking notes).

Absent: Diane McEachern; Doug Goering.

### **1. minutes of 14 Jan approved as amended**

### **2. Report from J Rosenberg (GERC):**

"GERC will not meet as a committee for the next two weeks. Instead the working groups will meet with the goal of having sets of recommendations for how to satisfy and assess the new learning outcomes. The working groups are: Civic Engagement Alaska/Arctic Intercultural/Diversity Writing/Oral Communication Quantitative skills

It was also determined at the last GERC meeting that course designators for each of these areas, while not impossible, are probably unnecessary. The goal of the working groups is define what characteristics/content courses should have to meet the objectives in each area and discuss how that could be assessed. The next step will be to get it all written up and take it to the faculty for feedback, firebombs and suggestions on specific courses."

### **3. Cindy Hardy agreed to serve as the CAC representative to GERC**

### **4. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **A. Grades & how they're described in the catalog**

**After long and heated arguing.....**

**We agreed (a) to not mess with +/- grades at this time**

**(b) to try an informal poll of faculty, dept heads & deans about making C- acceptable**

#### **B. Core class transferability issues --came up at inter-MAU meeting in Anch Jan 2013**

**Do we simply bite the bullet??? And accept that UAF doesn't REALLY have a core curriculum???**

**However, a version of this motion will come before the Fac Senate in a week:**

"This senate supports the formation of a Faculty Alliance GE Learning Outcomes UA Coordination Subcommittee, to include equal representation from each MAU and to work on the general charge of identifying a common set of General Education learning outcomes to recommend to the faculty senates at each MAU in late 2013. "

**We agreed to NOT OPPOSE this**

**Everyone ran off screaming..**



**Faculty Senate - Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Minutes from January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013 meeting**

Voting members present: Cécile Lardon (Chair), Leif Albertson, Margaret Short, Duff Johnston, Chris Fallen

1. **Blue Book:** Karen & Cécile had a joint meeting with members of the unit criteria and faculty affairs committees to review drafts of the revised Blue Book. The sections reviewed were faculty evaluation, faculty dismissal, and sabbatical leave. The meeting resulted in a set of questions for the administrative committee. The drafts and questions were then presented and discussed at the admin meeting. The next step is to complete the remaining section on hiring, merge the sections into a whole document, incorporate feedback from the members of the two participating committees and the admin committee and then present that full draft to the Senate.
2. Policy about **earning degrees/certificates by staff/faculty in the same unit:** Duff, Leif, & Cécile generated a list of department/program chairs, campus directors and deans to interview about this issue. They had a first interview before the winter break and plan on having a few more over the next 2 weeks. The input from these people will inform any policy recommendations.
3. No progress report on the **non-regular faculty project**.
4. **Election of alternate senators after the senate election:** There is nothing in the Faculty Senate constitution or by-laws saying when elections should be held. The by-laws address when terms begin and what should happen when a senator cannot complete his/her term. The committee decided to add language on when elections are held to an existing section and to add a section about a special election that can only be held if an exiting senator cannot be replaced by an alternate. Cécile will draft the motion and send to the committee for review.
5. **Possibility of promotion for term-funded instructional faculty:** The committee realized that providing a path to promotion for term-funded instructional faculty is beyond the charge of the FAC as it involves changes in BOR policies and regulations, UAF faculty policies and procedures (i.e., the Blue Book), the collective bargaining agreement(s), and other units at UAF.
6. **Committee meeting time:** The FAC will continue to meet every other Monday from 1 – 2. The meetings will be held in the IAB library (Irving 311b)

The next meeting will be on February 11th at 1:00 in the IAB library.

Unit Criteria Meeting – Feb 11<sup>th</sup> – Present: Karen Jensen (Chair), Christine Cook, Cathy Winfree, Jun Watabe, Georgina Gibson (for Vladimir Alexeev)  
Minutes by: Christine Cook and Karen Jensen

1. Library Science Unit Criteria revisions. Discussed revisions, passed with 5 voting in favor, no nays or abstentions.
2. Motion to amend Unit Criteria Committee Bylaws. Discussed whether or not research “representation” needs to be separate from colleges and schools. Not all units are represented on Unit Criteria anyway; only one from CES, SNRAS, SOE, SOM or LIB for example. As long as someone is from research end or has a joint appointment, that point of view will be represented. Passed with 5 voting in favor, no nays or abstentions.
3. Fisheries Unit Criteria comments and suggestions, below, will go back to unit for further revision.

## Chapter II

Add a paragraph regarding the typical workload so that evaluators will understand what the criteria is when evaluating faculty – possibly after section F – Letter of Appointment.

## Chapter III – Section B – 1

EFFECTIVE TEACHERS: -

Why are sections a through e not expected of effective teachers every year?

Section h – SUCCESSFULLY MENTOR GRADUATE STUDENTS - vague; what does “successful” mentoring mean? Why is it in the teaching section?

Section i - MAY WRITE TEXT BOOKS, TEXTBOOK CHAPTERS, OR ARTICLES ON TEACHING METHODS, DEVELOP CASE STUDIES, ORGANIZE TEACHING WORKSHOPS, OR PREPARE COURSE MODULES FOR BROAD DISTRIBUTION. Why is it in the teaching section? It may need to go in the research section...

## Chapter III – Section B – 2 - Components of Evaluation

FISHERIES FACULTY WITH SPLIT (JOINT) APPOINTMENTS WITH THE MARINE ADVISORY PROGRAM OR THE MUSEUM (FISH CURATION) WHO ARE CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR SHOULD BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY AT LEAST FOUR SUCCESSFUL GRADUATE STUDENTS (UNDER THEIR SUPERVISION/ ADVISORSHIP).

Concern with the amount of content in this paragraph; would be good to separate out the elements to make it more clear; also separate out the differences for Joint, associate professor, etc.; how do you define “successful” graduate student? Possibly add a Preamble to section B defining what they mean by quality teaching, then elaborate on the specific components further down. In other words, separate the “philosophical” statements from the specific requirements; list requirements in sequence with the rest of the document.

## C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Paragraph after section I (under Section C, number 2, I) – there is much redundancy; look at it and take out overlapping sections.

Possibly add a Preamble to section C defining what they mean by quality research, then elaborate on the specific components further down. Again eliminate the wordiness so that readers can get the overall picture in a paragraph, and specific criteria in a list.

#### **D. Criteria for Public and University Service: Section 5 - Evaluation of Service**

HOWEVER, EXCEPT FOR FACULTY ON SABBATICAL LEAVE, THE GUIDELINE EXPECTATION IS THAT EVERY FACULTY MEMBER WILL SPEND AT LEAST ONE MONTH OF TIME ANNUALLY ON SERVICE RELATED ACTIVITIES REGARDLESS OF THEIR LEVEL OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING.

Recommend deleting the sabbatical section; the workload aspects would be moved to the initial section

FOR FACULTY PROVIDING CURATION SERVICES, THE APPLICATION FOR PROMOTION SHOULD INCLUDE A LETTER PREPARED BY A COMMITTEE OF TENURED CURATORS AT THE MUSEUM. Seems limiting to say that it is only a letter from peers at this one museum; possibly outside areas as well; more a letter of support – those does not even mention a positive letter; what is the weight of this letter compared to other components, such as the unit peers?

Once again, the committee had concerns about specific numbers of graduate students, specific numbers of journal articles, etc. What if a grad student plagiarizes their thesis, and the faculty member is relying on that student as one of their “successful” graduate students? (This has happened elsewhere...) Specifying exact numbers using the current language seems risky both for faculty and because of overreliance on them by committees.

ATTACHMENT 189/14  
UAF Faculty Senate 189, March 4, 2013  
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

**Committee on the Status of Women, Minutes Friday, February 1, 2013**

10:30-11:30 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Diana Di Stefano, Jenny Liu, Shawn Russell, Nilima Hullavarad, Ellen Lopez

Members absent: Jane Weber, Megan McPhee

**1. Funding secured for future Women Faculty Luncheons**

Mike Sfraga has committed to line item in the university budget (for food part of the luncheon). Thanks to Jane Weber and Carol Gold.

**2. April 26<sup>th</sup> Promotion and Tenure Workshop 10:00 am to 12:00 noon– need 5-6 panelists. Possibilities:**

\* Roxie Dinstel (Jane will ask)

\* Sine Anahita: She is happy to do that, if it about strategically planning for promotion and tenure, she doesn't want to do the file prep part of it.

\* Paul Layer, Dean of College of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Kayt will ask Paul.

\* Ellen Lopez: She is in the middle of her fourth year review. She is willing to participate.

\* Nilima Hullavarad: She would like to wait until she has tenure. We'll ask her next year.

Who are our women, full professors? Topics that would be addresses: funded vs unfunded research, Positioning within departments, peer unit level is really important. What women need to know about strategy for the peer unit level. Ideas: Nicole Mulder. Can we get a list of the women, full professor? Kayt will email this list to us. We can communicate via email. Joan Braddock: Amy will ask. If Joan can't we keep looking at the list. Maybe find one more, so we are at 6 panelists. Try for well-rounded panel: colleges, unions, tripartite, bipartite.

**3. Conversation Cafes**

Potential discussion topic: the pressure/ discord/ surviving within peer units, and how this disproportionately affects women faculty. Mary suggested we explore mentoring. Potential times: Friday, February 15, 10:30 to 11:30: Mentoring. Thursday, February 28, 3:45-4:45: Peer Unit.

Brainstorm idea for these further conversation cafés:

Future dates: March 21 3:45-4:45pm, March 29 10:30 to 11:30

April 12 10:30- 11:30 am, April 18 3:45-4:45pm

**4. Women's Center Advisory Board**

Meets today.

**5. Fall 2013 Luncheon speaker**

Ideas: Anita Hartman suggested a new woman who is headed up research who is new faculty at UAF. Kayt will get her name and send it out. Ellen suggested somebody who could talk to the establishment and promotion of women's center, or women's issue. In particular, a women in Maine- who has a great women's center. Diana suggested in the introduction to the speaker we could present an overview of the resources available to women faculty.

6. Rational for a part-time faculty/ administrative position focusing on the issues of women faculty  
This is postponed until next time.

Future meetings: February 22 and March 22/10:30-11:30/Gruening 718

Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/>

ATTACHMENT 189/15

UAF Faculty Senate 189, March 4, 2013

Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes for January 23, 2013**

Attending: Donie Bret-Harte, Jayne Harvie, Cheng fu Chen, Laura Bender, John Yarie, Lillian Misel, Libby Eddy, Chung-san Ng, Elisabeth Nadin, Mike Daku

GAAC Agenda 1/23/13

- I. Approval of minutes from last meeting (11/12/12)
- II. Update on motions submitted to Faculty Senate Administrative committee
  - a. Motion on Master's degree with thesis or project
  - b. Resolution on archival of Master's projects
  - c. Motion on catalog wording to require 3 credits in last semester of degree
- III. 698 vs 699 credits (request from registrar's office)
- IV. Request to add checkboxes for safety training, hazmat shipping, and importation of international soil samples to Graduate Study Plan (request from Provost's office)
- V. Progress on course approvals
- VI. New assignments

Minutes:

Minutes from the last meeting were approved.

An update was given on motions.

- I. Revised Motion on distinguishing Master's degrees with thesis vs project was passed.
- II. The issue of requiring maintaining enrollment in three credits in last semester was discussed. It was agreed that requiring only one credit in the last semester if the thesis has already been defended might be more reasonable. It was pointed out that in the Construction management program, most classes are only 1 credit. UAF don't require this enrollment for undergrads, and UAA doesn't require it either. Graduate tuition of \$783/credit non-resident, \$383/credit resident, can be a lot if graduate students don't have funding. It was pointed out that requiring at least one credit would ensure that they show up as a student on the books, which is important for statistics. Further, requiring one credit would provide an incentive to finish, but be less punitive than before

The modified motion was passed.

III we discussed the 698 vs 699 designation in Banner. The Office of the Registrar and Admissions would like to change the designation in Banner. This will not affect any policies.

Lily explained the problem – approximately 25 students file for advancement to candidacy with 698 instead of 699 credits; have to file petitions to change

Currently 698 listed as research

Proposal: change 698 instead to non-thesis research/project in Banner and course registration screens to match what is in the catalog

Laura Bender – 698 should never be used by Ph.D. students, but a faculty member would like to be able to grade thesis credits (699); could propose a 697 class

GAAC supports the change in course title for 698 to non-thesis research/project. Present to Admin Committee; Donie will present to Admin Committee at their next meeting

- IV. Hazardous materials and soil shipping, and a requirement for safety training. Provost suggest that this should be on the Graduate Study Plan.

Discussion:

Could be addressed in the graduate orientation.

Concern was expressed that the form will be too long

Seems that responsibility lies with faculty to educate their students

50-50; could we modify existing IRB form?

Would it be appropriate for a memo to come from Provost to faculty to inform their students, rather than adding to a burgeoning form? No decisions were taken; this will be discussed at a future meeting.