FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Jayne Harvie, Faculty Senate Office
474-7964 jbharvie@alaska.edu
Zoom Link: https://zoom.us/j/741255415

AGENDA
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #213

Monday, March 7, 2016 – 1:00 - 3:00 PM
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1:00	I	Call to Order – Debu Misra A. Roll Call B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #212 C. Adoption of Agenda	4 Min.
1:04	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions A. Motions Approved: 1. Motion to approve a new MA in Marine Science 2. Motion to approve Unit Criteria for Cross-Cultural Studies 3. Motion to approve a new Minor in Art History 4. Motion to approve a new Minor in Computer Information Technology Specialist B. Motions Pending: *None*	1 Min.
1:05	III	Guest Speaker: Jyotsna Heckman, Chair, UA BOR Discussion Topics: 1.) Strategic Pathways, and 2.) Synergy between BOR and Faculty Senates	30 Min.
1:35	IV	Public Comment	10 Min.
1:45	V	A. President's Remarks – Debu Misra (2 Min.) B. President-Elect's Remarks – Orion Lawlor (2 Min.)	4 Min.
1:49	VI	A. Interim Chancellor's Remarks – Mike Powers (3 Min.) B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs (3 Min.) C. VC for Research – Larry Hinzman (3 Min.) D. Members' Questions/Comments (2 Min.)	11 Min.
2:00	BREAK		
2:05	VII	Governance Reports A. Staff Council – Faye Gallant (2 Min.) B. ASUAF – Mathew Carrick (2 Min.) C. UNAC – Chris Coffman (2 Min.) UAFT – Jane Weber (2 Min.) UNAD – Katie Boylan (2 Min.) D. Athletics – Dani Sheppard (2 Min.)	10 Min.
2:15	VIII	New Business A. Motion to approve Unit Criteria for the Geophysical Institute, submitted by Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 213/1)	10 Min.

B. Motion to agree to discontinuation of the BA and Minor in Russian Studies, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 213/2)

2:25 IX Discussion Items 15 Min.

A. Proposed additions of definitions of faculty in BOR Policy – Mara Bacsujlaky, Chair of Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 213/3, 213/4)

B. Limiting the number "X" courses in GER classification lists – Jennie Carroll, Chair of Curricular Affairs Committee

2:40 X Guest speaker: Mae Marsh 10 Min.

Topic: Title IX Updates; Changes to BOR Policy and UA Regulations

2:50 XI Public Comment 5 Min.

2:55 XII Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements 5 Min.

A. General Comments/Announcements

B. Committee Chair Comments

Curricular Affairs – Jennifer Carroll, Chair (Attachment 213/5)
Faculty Affairs – Chris Fallen, Chair (Attachment 213/6)
Unit Criteria – Mara Bacsujlaky, Chair (Attachment 213/7)
Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 213/8)
Core Review – Andy Seitz, Chair (Attachment 213/9)
Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry, Chair
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Sandra Wildfeuer, Chair (Attachment 213/10)
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair (Attachment 213/11)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair (Attachment 213/12)
Research Advisory Committee – Jessica Cherry, Chair
Information Technology Committee – Julie Cascio, Chair (Attachment 213/13)
Administrative Committee – Orion Lawlor (Attachment 213/14)

3:00 XIII Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 213/1
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for the Geophysical Institute.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The Unit Criteria Committee reviewed the unit criteria which were submitted from the Geophysical Institute. With some revisions, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

****

UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY AND GEOPHYSICAL INSTITUTE (GI) UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND INDICES

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 ADAPTED FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE FACULTY OF THE GEOPHYSICAL INSTITUTE (GI) DEPARTMENT/S. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S/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 Policies, Chapter IV. Exceptions to these requirements for initial placement in academic rank or special academic rank positions shall be submitted to the chancellor or chancellor's designee for approval prior to a final selection decision.

B. Academic Titles.

Academic titles must reflect the discipline in which the faculty are appointed and reside within a specific discipline.

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 positions. These procedures are set by UAF Human Resources and the Campus Diversity and Compliance (AA/EEO) office and shall provide for participation in hiring by faculty and administrators as a unit.

D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank.

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

E. Following the selection process.

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

F. Letter of Appointment.

The initial letter of appointment shall specify the nature of the assignment, the percentage emphasis that is to be placed on each of the parts of the faculty responsibility, mandatory year of tenure review, and any special conditions relating to the appointment.

This letter of appointment establishes the nature of the position and, while the percentage of emphasis for each part may vary with each workload distribution as specified in the annual workload agreement document, the part(s) defining the position may not.

CHAPTER III.

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

THOSE FACULTY OF THE GEOPHYSICAL INSTITUTE WHO HOLD A TENURE-TRACK JOINT APPOINTMENT WITH A UAF COLLEGE OR SCHOOL ARE EVALUATED UNDER THE UNIT CRITERIA OF THE RESPECTIVE COLLEGE OR SCHOOL.

A. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies" Chapter IV, 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.

BIPARTITE FACULTY MEMBERS AT THE GEOPHYSICAL INSTITUTE PREDOMINANTLY FILL POSITIONS PERFORMING IN THE RESEARCH AND SERVICE COMPONENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY'S MISSION, BUT MAY HAVE A TEACHING COMPONENT.

SPECIFIC SCIENCES CRITERIA FOR TEACHING PERFORMANCE:

BIPARTITE FACULTY WHO ENGAGE IN TEACHING AS AN OVERLOAD SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO DO SO AS A CONDITION FOR EVALUATION OR PROMOTION. EVALUATIONS MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH AN INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBER'S REGULAR WORKLOAD AGREEMENT (I.E., NOT OVERLOAD). IF A RESEARCH FACULTY MEMBER HAS AN ASSIGNED TEACHING COMPONENT AS PART OF THEIR REGULAR WORKLOAD (I.E., NOT OVERLOAD), TEACHING SHOULD BE PART OF THE EVALUATION IN THE SAME PROPORTION AS IT IS TO THEIR WHOLE WORKLOAD FOR THE ENTIRE REVIEW PERIOD. ONLY TEACHING ACTIVITIES NOTED ON A FACULTY'S REGULAR (I.E., NOT OVERLOAD) WORKLOADS WILL BE EVALUATED UNDER TEACHING.

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.

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. ***WHEN EVALUATING THE QUALITY OF THE TEACHING, CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE NATURE OF THE COURSE.*** Effective teachers

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

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

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

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

e. demonstrate content mastery, discuss current information and divergent points of view, relate topics to other disciplines, deliver material at the appropriate level;

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

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

h. DEMONSTRATE EFFECTIVE MENTORING OF UNDERGRADUATE AND/OR GRADUATE STUDENTS.

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.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR TEACHING PERFORMANCE:

- ***ASSISTANT PROFESSOR:*** ***EVIDENCE OF TEACHING ABILITY AND A COMMITMENT TO A QUALITY AND CURRENT TEACHING PROGRAM. STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS SHOULD SHOW THAT THE MAJORITY OF STUDENTS RATE COURSES FAVORABLY, AND, IF NOT, THERE SHOULD BE A DEFINITE UPWARD TREND SHOWING IMPROVEMENT OVER TIME. COURSE MATERIALS SUCH AS SYLLABI, EXAMS, PROJECTS AND HOMEWORK SHOULD REFLECT THE COURSE DESCRIPTION AND BE CONTEMPORARY. THE FACULTY MAY PROVIDE EVIDENCE FOR ACTIVE SUPPORT OF STUDENT RESEARCH AT THE UNDERGRADUATE AND/OR GRADUATE LEVEL.***

- ***ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:*** ***THE RECORD MUST SHOW THAT THE TEACHING MATERIAL IS CONTEMPORARY AND RELEVANT AND THAT THE PRESENTATIONS STIMULATE THE LEARNING PROCESS. EVIDENCE OF THE EXPECTED QUALITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE MAY INCLUDE, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO, COURSE AND/OR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, NOVEL APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION, VERSATILITY IN INSTRUCTIONAL ASSIGNMENTS, EFFECTIVE GUIDING AND MENTORING OF INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS, OR HIGH QUALITY STUDENT OR OTHER TEACHING EVALUATIONS (E.G. PEER-EVALUATION). THE RECORD MAY ALSO SHOW ACTIVE AND SUCCESSFUL MENTORSHIP IN RESEARCH AT THE UNDERGRADUATE AND/OR GRADUATE LEVEL. SUCH MENTORSHIP CAN INCLUDE MEMBERSHIP ON GRADUATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.***

- ***PROFESSOR:*** ***SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM ARE EXPECTED. THESE CONTRIBUTIONS MAY INCLUDE MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS IN COURSE AND CURRICULUM OFFERINGS, SECURING FUNDS TO ENHANCE INSTRUCTIONAL AND/OR LABORATORY SETTINGS, LEADERSHIP IN DEPARTMENTAL LEVEL CURRICULUM CORE REVISIONS, STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME ASSESSMENTS, STUDENT ADVISING, AND MENTORING OF GRADUATE STUDENTS TO THE COMPLETION OF THEIR DEGREE. THE FACULTY MUST SHOW A CONSISTENT RECORD OF HIGH-QUALITY 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.

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 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, ***SUPPORT RESEARCH AND/OR CONTRIBUTE TO THE SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS AND RESEARCH FACILITIES, COLLABORATIONS AND CAMPAIGNS,*** 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 ***RESEARCH*** *problems, such as computer programs, and systems for the processing of data,* ***SAMPLE PREPARATION***, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.

m. ***MENTORING STUDENTS IN RESEARCH AND LABORATORY TECHNIQUES.***

n. ***CONDUCTING EXPERIMENTS AND PRODUCING SCIENTIFIC DATA USED IN SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS.***

SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH PERFORMANCE:

- ***ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF THE ABILITY TO ESTABLISH A VIABLE RESEARCH PROGRAM IN THE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION, NORMALLY A SUB-DISCIPLINE OF THE NATURAL SCIENCES (WITH THE OPTION OF RESEARCH IN SCIENCE EDUCATION). THIS SHOULD INCLUDE SEVERAL OF THE FOLLOWING:***
    - ***PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS FROM RESEARCH PERFORMED AT LEAST IN PART DURING THEIR CURRENT APPOINTMENT . PUBLICATIONS IN REFEREED PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS, OR EQUIVALENT, DEMONSTRATING SIGNIFICANT SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS. IT IS IMPORTANT FOR THE FACULTY MEMBER TO CLEARLY DISCUSS THE IMPORTANCE OF THEIR SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE NARRATIVE.***
    - ***PROPOSALS THAT WERE EITHER FUNDED OR RECEIVED FAVORABLE REVIEWS.***
    - ***RECRUITING GRADUATE AND/OR UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS***
    - ***ACQUIRING DATA THAT PROMISES TO RESULT IN PUBLICATIONS***
    - ***ESTABLISHING A PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION THAT DEMONSTRATES VISIBILITY IN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY***
    - ***PRESENTATIONS SUCH AS TALKS OR POSTER PRESENTATIONS AT SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS***

- ***ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: MUST HAVE ESTABLISHED AN APPROPRIATE RESEARCH PROGRAM AND MET THE CRITERIA ABOVE FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR. THE FACULTY MEMBER SHOULD SHOW INDEPENDENCE AND LEADERSHIP BY THE CREATION OF RESEARCH IDEAS THAT TRANSLATE INTO PROJECTS THAT MAY INVOLVE POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWS, GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS. EXAMPLES FOR SUCH A SUCCESSFUL RESEARCH PROGRAM MAY INCLUDE:***
    - ***PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS FROM RESEARCH PERFORMED AT LEAST IN PART DURING THEIR CURRENT APPOINTMENT . PUBLICATIONS IN REFEREED PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS, OR EQUIVALENT, DEMONSTRATING SIGNIFICANT SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS. IT IS IMPORTANT FOR THE FACULTY MEMBER TO CLEARLY DISCUSS THE IMPORTANCE OF THEIR SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE NARRATIVE.***

- ***PUBLICATION OF DISCIPLINE-RELEVANT DATA AND METADATA, CONTRIBUTION TO CYBER INFRASTRUCTURE, OR CONTRIBUTING TO PUBLICLY AVAILABLE COMPUTER MODELS***
- ***PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS***
- ***LEADERSHIP IN PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS***
- ***ACQUISITION OF EXTERNAL RESEARCH FUNDING***
- ***HAVING DEMONSTRATED SUCCESSFUL MENTORING OF GRADUATE AND/OR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN THE FACULTY'S FIELD OF EXPERTISE WHICH CAN BE DEMONSTRATED FOR INSTANCE BY GRADUATING THE STUDENT, STUDENT PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS, STUDENT AWARDS OR GRANT SUCCESS, PROFESSIONAL PLACEMENT OF STUDENTS AFTER GRADUATION.***

- ***<u>PROFESSOR</u>: THE RESEARCH PROGRAM SHOULD HAVE PRODUCED A SUFFICIENT QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF PUBLICATIONS TO DEMONSTRATE THE EXISTENCE OF AN ON-GOING, PROFESSIONAL, INDEPENDENT RESEARCH PROGRAM AND MET THE CRITERIA ABOVE FOR ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR. THERE COULD BE A RECORD OF STUDENT INVOLVEMENT INCLUDING SUCCESSFUL MENTORING OF GRADUATE AND/OR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS. IT IS EXPECTED THAT THE FACULTY MEMBER SHOULD HAVE ATTAINED AN INTERNATIONAL REPUTATION (AS DEMONSTRATED BY PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OR PRESENTATIONS AT MEETINGS AND BY CITATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS OR DOCUMENTED OPINIONS OF OTHER SCIENTISTS IN THE FIELD). EVIDENCE OF QUALITY PUBLICATIONS MAY INCLUDE DATA CONCERNING:***
  - ***EXTERNAL REVIEWS STATING THE PAPERS MADE MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS***
  - ***INVITED TALKS AND BOOK CHAPTERS***
  - ***PROFESSIONAL AWARDS***

WITHIN MANY DISCIPLINES IT IS COMMON FOR THE PRIMARY AUTHOR TO BE LISTED LAST (OFTEN AS THE CORRESPONDING AUTHOR); IT IS ALSO CONSIDERED FAVORABLE FOR STUDENTS TO BE INCLUDED AS COAUTHORS OR FIRST AUTHORS. THEREFORE IN EVALUATING RESEARCH PERFORMANCE IN PUBLICATION THE NUMBER OF FIRST OR SOLE AUTHORSHIPS SHOULD NOT BE GIVEN ADDITIONAL WEIGHT. FURTHERMORE IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE FACULTY MEMBER CLARIFIES IN THEIR NARRATIVE THEIR ROLE AND RESEARCH/CREATIVE/SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTIONS IN ALL COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS, INCLUDING MULTI-AUTHORED PUBLICATIONS.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

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

1. **Public Service**

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

a. Providing information services to adults or youth.

b. Service on or to government or public committees.

c. Service on accrediting bodies.

d. Active participation in professional organizations.

e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

f. Consulting.

g. Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.

h. Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.

i. Training and facilitating.

j. Radio and TV program ***CONTRIBUTIONS, INCLUDING INTERVIEWS***, 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.

l. ***PROVIDING TOURS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC (MAY ALSO BE COUNTED AS UNIVERSITY OR PROFESSIONAL SERVICE DEPENDING ON THE AUDIENCE).***

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, ***RESEARCH GROUP***, or departmental committees or governing bodies.

b. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance for 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.

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

i. Mentoring ***INCLUDING SERVING AS NEW FACULTY MENTORS.***

j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

k. ***SERVING ON COMMITTEES THAT REPRESENT THE UNIVERSITY AT OTHER PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTIONS.***

l. MANAGEMENT AND DIRECTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE THAT MAY INCLUDE DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS, RESEARCH EXPEDITIONS AND RESEARCH AND CAMPAIGNS AND MAINTAINING SCIENTIFIC EQUIPMENT.

m. CURATING SAMPLES AND DATA AND/OR THE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF FORMALLY RECOGNIZED UNIVERSITY COLLECTIONS THAT SERVE AS RESEARCH RESOURCES FOR STUDENTS AND RESEARCHERS AT UNIVERSITY, STATE, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS.

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.

g. SERVING AS A MENTOR/ADVISOR, COMMITTEE MEMBER OR EXTERNAL EXAMINER FOR STUDENTS AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS.

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, ***AND PROFESSIONAL*** 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.

<u>MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICE PERFORMANCE INCLUDE (BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO):</u>

- ***ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EFFORT OF ORGANIZATION TO WHICH SERVICE WAS PROVIDED.***
- ***OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF QUALITY OF SERVICE (E.G., AWARDS, LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION).***
- ***OPINIONS OF CLIENTS SERVED AND/OR COLLEAGUES INVOLVED IN DELIVERY OF SERVICE.***

<u>SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR SERVICE PERFORMANCE:</u>

- ***<u>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR:</u> NONE IN ADDITION TO UAF CRITERIA.***
- ***<u>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:</u> POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH GROUP AND/OR UNIVERSITY MATTERS, EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PUBLIC, AND/OR EFFECTIVE SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION ARE EXPECTED.***
- ***<u>PROFESSOR:</u> EVIDENCE OF LEADERSHIP IN THE SERVICE AREA IS MANDATORY. SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH GROUP L AND/OR UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS ARE EXPECTED, INCLUDING SERVICE TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC AND/OR ALASKAN TEACHERS.***

ATTACHMENT 213/2
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate agrees to discontinuation of the BA and Minor in Russian Studies.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2016

RATIONALE: Following the 2012-2013 program review process, the Chancellor's Cabinet found enrollments and student credit hours had not increased and recommended the program be discontinued.

Background and Information:

Russian is part of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. There are five languages taught in the department: French, German, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish. The BA in Japanese Studies and the BA in Russian Studies have been separate majors, which incorporate courses from other departments. French, German, and Spanish are majors within the BA in Foreign Languages (or students have the option of focusing on more than one language). With the deletion of the separate Russian Studies major, the Russian language, culture, and literature courses will still be offered and students will be able to major in Russian through the BA in Foreign Languages. There will be some reduction in demand for the elective courses taught in other departments that were required for the Russian Studies degree (Anthropology, Business, Economics, Geography, and History), though the number of Russian Studies majors is so low that the impact will be minimal.

Over the past ten years, enrollments have remained consistently low, from a high of 8 enrolled majors in 2009 to a low of 3 enrolled majors in 2012. The number of graduates has declined from 6 in 2006 to 0 in 2015, with a total of 4 graduates over the past 5 years. During the 2010-2011 Program Review cycle, the program was continued, but the committee stated:

> Upper division SCH for this program have averaged only 64/year for the past five years, albeit with a lot of variation. If five courses a year are offered, there would be an average of four students enrolled in each one. This is only a rough estimate but if there are only 10 majors, which would likewise suggest upper division enrollments of five or less. While in the present relatively favorable budget environment UAF can afford to continue this program, which could change if state financial support decreases. FORL faculty should consider whether there is potential for increasing enrollments, or whether Russian might become an option within the broad FORL BA, reducing the number of courses that need to be taught. Enrollment will be reassessed in two years, and if it falls further, continuation of the program may not be possible.

Following the 2013 Program Review, Chancellor's Cabinet found that enrollments and student credit hours had not increased, and that the degree needed to be folded into the larger and more flexible Foreign Languages BA degree. There is insufficient demand for the stand-alone Russian Studies degree. One of the two full-time faculty members has announced her retirement effective May 2016. The remaining full-time instructor will be able to teach most of the remaining courses with an occasional adjunct. Currently enrolled students will be able to complete their degrees without disruption.

****

Rationale for Proposed Changes/Additions to Definitions of Faculty
(M. Bacsujlaky for UAF Blue Book Revisions Subcommittee - March 2016)

Members of subcommittee: Mara Bacsujlaky (SNRE)(Chair), Bob Bolton (IARC) Jeff Benowitz(GI), Jessica Cherry, (INE), Valerie Gifford (CLA: Dept. of Psychology)

Proposal: To redefine (BOR policy) and define (UAF Blue Book) non-tenure track faculty as academic rank faculty with 1) rights to stand for promotion evaluated by their peers and to participate in conducting promotion processes as members of unit and university-wide peer review committees, 2) a fair and equitable non-retention notification schedule that aligns with/matches that for tenure-track faculty and 3) full participation in shared governance.

Rationale: As in universities and colleges throughout the nation, non-tenure track faculty have substantially increased in numbers at the University of Alaska. At UAF, non-tenure track faculty (excluding adjuncts, who belong to a different union) comprise nearly half of the faculty (approximately 46%). Current BOR policy (UA-wide), UAF Blue Book (UAF-specific) and CBA (UA-wide) define non-tenure track faculty as special academic rank faculty, which in turn affects eligibility for promotion and offers no substantive due process should reduction in force occur. Further, this classification of special rank contributes to the perception that non-tenure track faculty are not of the same caliber as tenure-track/tenured faculty creating a distinct caste system that is dated and groundless.

Currently, the only special academic rank faculty that are eligible for promotion are research and clinical faculty. Extension faculty were stipulated to be eligible for promotion in the last CBA, but the CBA remained silent on how the process was to be developed and enacted. Overall the current approach is ad hoc and does not adequately or fairly address issues that negatively impact a steadily growing number of faculty, many of whom are not "term" in the sense of its current definition, but are instead faculty with continuing appointments, many of whom have built successful careers matching in length that of their tenured colleagues.

Although promotion and the non-retention notification schedule are processes that theoretically can be addressed through policy revisions in UAF's Blue Book, this would impact only UAF faculty. And while a CBA that speaks to promotion process and/or retention process would be UA-wide, it is also a nonpermanent solution, subject to removal/change every three years when a new CBA is negotiated. Further, current definitions in both the UAF Blue Book and the CBA do not align with the definitions in the BOR policy. Were definitions to be changed/developed for non-tenure track faculty within the BOR policy, this would set the foundation for alignment across all of the UA campuses/MAUs and would, in our opinion, make it easier for each of the MAUs to update/revise their Blue Books.

Therefore, we propose that the most effective first step in developing a rigorous, functioning promotion process, ensuring that non-tenure track faculty have equal opportunity to participate in all levels of shared governance, and have an equitable non-retention notification schedule is to classify non-tenure track faculty (including research) as regular academic rank.

"Term" would be retained in its current meaning and remain within the special academic rank category (it is not present as a defined title in the BOR policy).

Proposed Definitions: Attached is a draft of what these proposed definition changes could be (with inclusion of some of the Provost's proposed wording/definers in response to concerns raised and identified below) for purposes of further discussion and refinement, and as a starting point for discussing the idea of how to achieve parity. Upon review the Provost raised several concerns. Chief among these, and shared by this committee, is the potential for confusion that the modifiers "research", "teaching", "service" would apply to tenure-track/tenured faculty, many of whom have workloads similar to the proposed classification system. It might be worth noting that currently there is a "research" modifier (Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Full Professor) and its application has been clearly attributed to those faculty that are term-funded, and not to tenure line faculty; therefore there is precedent for including the other two designators for non-tenure track faculty, which we proposed because of their logical correlation to the tripartite academic system. Additionally, a cautionary note from the Provost is that non-tenure track teaching faculty were intentionally made ineligible for promotion (appointed either as Instructors or Assistant Professors) so that their titles could not be confused with those of tenured faculty. She has provided, as an alternative, three ways to address developing promotion processes for teaching and service non-tenure track faculty (in effect adding them to special academic rank alongside research and clinical) , which are in summary: special rank are never tripartite and are either are mono- or bipartite, are dependent on a funding source that is not expected to be available indefinitely, and meet a need that is not expected to persist indefinitely.

Recently, the chair of this subcommittee began discussions with counterparts at UAA and UAS that are also working on developing promotion processes for non-tenure track faculty. Bi-monthly working group sessions on drafting UAF Blue Book revisions are ongoing.

The purpose now of bringing this item to the Faculty Senate for discussion is to open a dialogue on how best to accomplish the three points laid out in the opening proposal, and what wording/categorization would best accomplish parity and full participation in shared governance for nearly half of faculty employed at UAF (and throughout the UA system).

EXCERPTED DRAFT - FOR DISCUSSION

REGENTS' POLICY

PART IV – HUMAN RESOURCES

Chapter 04.04 - Faculty

P04.04.010. Academic Freedom.

Nothing contained in regents' policy or university regulation will be construed to limit or abridge any person's right to free speech or to infringe the academic freedom of any member of the university community.

(06-20-97)

P04.04.020. Construction.

This chapter and university regulation shall govern the university system and the institutions therein, regulating the matters contained herein as authorized by law. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to restrict the power of the board to periodically alter, amend, revise, or repeal the provisions hereof in whole or in part from time to time.

(07-01-89)

P04.04.022 . **Application**.

This chapter and the university regulation promulgated under it shall apply to the university system and are designed and intended for use with appropriate policies and procedures developed for each university and community college. These policies and procedures may differ from each other in their provisions, but no provision may be contrary to or inconsistent with regents' policy, including Chapter 04.04, or university regulation.

(09-19-14)

P04.04.030. Definitions.

In this chapter, unless otherwise specified or the context requires otherwise,

A. "academic ranks" means the ranks held by persons having the title of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor; which titles denote academic rank exclusively; the title of instructor may also be a title of academic rank at the discretion of the policies and procedures approved for each university; subject to the provisions of E. of this section;

B. "faculty" means those persons who have accepted and hold appointment to academic rank or special academic rank;

C. "non-tenure track ***faculty*** ~~position~~" means a position that is ***a rolling or continuing appointment***[1]***,*** but does not provide a faculty member any rights to consideration for appointment to tenure. ***Non-tenure track appointments are distinguished from tenure track and tenured positions and are defined by the following titles:***

1. ***Research (Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Full Professor): faculty whose appointment is mono- or bipartite, with at least 75% or more in research;***

2. ***Teaching (Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Full Professor, Lecturer, Instructional): faculty whose appointment is mono- or bipartite, with at least 75% or more in teaching;***

3. ***Extension (Service) (Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Full Professor): faculty whose appointment is mono- or bipartite, with at least 75% or more in service;***

~~4.~~ ***Clinical (Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Full Professor): faculty whose appointment is in a special category reserved for practitioners in the health care delivery professions.***

D. "policies and procedures approved for each university" means those policies and procedures designed by each university for its own use "special academic ranks" means those ranks held by persons having a title or a qualification to a title specified in this paragraph; these titles denote special academic rank exclusively:

1. "adjunct" means a person employed to teach one or more courses up to 15 credit hours per year, or other academic assignment at less than 50 percent of a full-time appointment;

2. "affiliate" means a person in voluntary faculty service, not employed by the university;

~~3. "clinical" means a person in a special category reserved for practitioners in the health care delivery professions;~~

4. ~~"instructional" means a person employed to teach and perform other faculty functions as assigned~~;

5. "instructor" means a faculty member employed to teach and perform other faculty functions as assigned;

~~6. "lecturer" is a person employed to teach full- or part-time;~~

~~7. "research" means a person in a position supported primarily by grant funding;~~

[1] This would be a new term with new definition, but is used, along with the term rolling appointment, in other institutions with high numbers of non-tenure track - see for example Michigan Tech.

8. "visiting" means a person employed to perform the faculty functions expected of academic rank for a specific period;

9. "collaborating" means a faculty member employed by one unit of the university in voluntary faculty service with another unit;

10. "joint" means a faculty member employed by two or more units of the university.

E. "tenure" means the status of holding a faculty appointment on a continuing basis following evaluation and award according to the terms of P04.04.040.B;

F. "tenure track position" means a position that may lead to consideration for appointment to tenure as described in the policies and procedures approved for each university; a tenure track position will require the performance of faculty function at least 50% of full- time; for exceptional cases, and when in the judgment of the chancellor the best interests of the university will be served, a faculty member may be appointed to a tenure track position at less than 100% but more than 50% of a full-time appointment;

G. "university" means any one of the three universities within the University of Alaska.

Cross-reference: For other definitions applicable to this chapter, see P04.04.040.
(09-19-14)

P04.04.040. Appointment Categories.

The following categories of appointment shall be used to fully specify the type of appointment and associated rights:

A. Type of Position

1. Tenure track position. Faculty appointed to tenure track positions either hold tenure or may become eligible for consideration for appointment to tenure under the conditions stated in P04.04.045. Time spent in these positions shall be counted towards the maximum time by which a tenure track appointee must be considered for tenure for continuation of employment. Faculty appointed to tenure track positions shall have titles of academic rank.

2. Non-tenure track position. Faculty appointed to non-tenure track positions have no rights to consideration for appointment to tenure, nor does time spent in these positions count toward tenure, except as otherwise agreed to in writing between a faculty member and the hiring authority at the time of hire into a tenure track position. Faculty appointed to these positions shall have titles of ~~special academic rank~~ ***regular academic rank preceded by the term Research, Teaching or Extension (Service).***

B. Tenure Status

A faculty member appointed to a tenure track position may receive tenure only under the conditions of P04.04.045 and 04.04.050.

C. Faculty rank and title.

1. Academic rank. Titles of academic rank shall be the same throughout the university system with the exception of the use of the title "instructor" as set out in C.3. below. Titles designating academic rank exclusively are: assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

2. Special academic rank. Titles of special academic rank shall be the same throughout the university system with the exception of the use of the title "instructor" as set out in C.3. below. Titles designating special academic rank exclusively are: lecturer and titles of academic rank preceded by the terms adjunct, affiliate, visiting, instructional~~, research~~, or clinical.

3. Instructor. The title "instructor" is to be used for those faculty employed to teach and perform other faculty functions as assigned. A university may, in accordance with the policies and procedures approved for that university, use the title of instructor as a title of academic rank or special academic rank, but not both.

ATTACHMENT 213/5
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 20, 2016, 1-2:30 pm at 131 Bunnell Building

Present: Ken Abramowicz, Casey Byrne, Jennie Carroll, Mike Earnest, Alex Fitts, Doug Goering, Catherine Hanks, Cindy Hardy, Eileen Harney, Jayne Harvie, Joan Hornig, Jenny Liu, Rainer Newberry, Patrick Plattet, Holly Sherouse
Absent: Ginny Kinne, Lisa Lunn, Caty Oehring

1. Approval/Amendment of Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

2. Approval of minutes

Minutes for Jan. 11, 2016 were approved as submitted.

3. Old Business
    a. GER Buckets
        i. List of courses for each bucket (attached, but I will send/bring latest update)

The list doesn't need to be brought to the Senate for formal approval, but will be shared informationally with them at either the February or March meeting. The classification guidelines will also be shared at that time.

Whether or not limiting the number of courses to two per subject code (e.g., ANS, ANTH, LING) would be effective was discussed, as well as phasing in more courses per subject code later over time. The committee did not like either approach (limiting to two courses per subject code, phasing courses in year by year). Problems with cross-listed courses with regard to the two-course limit were discussed.

Potential issues with implementing the addition of new courses to the list were discussed. Probably, many students will switch catalogs to the newer one. There will be an adjustment time for the existing courses, especially if enrollments go down as student enrollments are potentially spread over more course options. The need to get a list finalized before registration opens up was reiterated. (Currently, all courses on the list exist and are currently offered.)

The committee agreed to meet next week, possibly inviting the Provost to participate and discuss the reasons for limiting the number of possible courses per subject code. Jennie agreed to email the Provost.

Holly presented some draft catalog language for the GERs. The student learning outcomes (bulleted points at top of page 1) will be updated. The sentences right under the subheading "Baccalaureate General Education Requirements:" (middle of page 1) will be removed or corrected to reflect compliance with university regulation. All courses meeting GERs would be designated by an X (e.g., ANS F161X; JPN F101X).

Catalog language for the Humanities / Foreign Language Substitute Option was discussed in depth. Specifically, the use of a second semester foreign language course to fulfill GERs, and how that might be reflected in the course buckets or catalog language, was discussed. Should two semesters of a foreign language be treated as an exception to the rule about using introductory courses without prerequisites to fulfill the GERs? Does creating such an exception create a fairness issue for other non-language

courses? It was agreed to take this issue to the Administrative Committee for further discussion and input.

Ethics and Library Science will remain under the GER section of the catalog, since University Regulations allow credits in excess of 34 credits. Upper division courses can meet the criteria for GERs, though most will be 100- or 200-level courses. The upper-division writing and oral communication requirements will remain in this section, also, since plans do not go into effect until fall of 2017. OAR will continue to work on a GER brochure for faculty and advisors.

Status of capstone requirement was mentioned. Mike E. was going to work on a list of programs that don't have a capstone yet.

Holly mentioned the AA and AS programs which need time to make changes to their degree requirements that reflect the GER. Mahla and Pete (CRCD) need to be contacted; Jennie to follow up.

ii. Transition issues (Ginny's e-mail)

Topic was not discussed due to time constraints.

iii. Possible ways of going forward with less disruption
    1. Shorten the list?

4. New Business (if time)
    a. Spring meeting dates: February 3 and 17, March 2, 16 (skip spring break?), and 30, and April 13 and 27.

It was agreed to skip spring break week.

    b. Identify issues to be resolved this semester

Status of capstone requirements; changes to AA and AS degree requirements (as mentioned above).

Que será, que será, que será; que será de mi vida, que será; si se mucho o no se nada; ya mañana se verá, y será lo que será.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:20 PM.

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 3, 2016, 1-2:30 pm

Present: Ken Abramowicz, Casey Byrne, Jennie Carroll, Mike Earnest, Alex Fitts (via Zoom), Doug Goering, Catherine Hanks, Cindy Hardy, Eileen Harney, Jayne Harvie, Joan Hornig, Ginny Kinne, Lisa Lunn, Rainer Newberry, Caty Oehring, Patrick Plattet, Holly Sherouse
Absent: Jenny Liu
Guests: Mathew Carrick (ASUAF); Amber Cagwin (Dean of Students Office)

1. Approval/Amendment of Agenda
   The agenda was approved with addition of looking over two new minors.

2. Approval of minutes
    a. Draft Minutes 1/20/16

Minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Old Business
    a. Grade Appeals Policy
        i. Special guests Amber Cagwin, Dean of Students Office, and Mathew Carrick, ASUAF President

ASUAF President Mathew Carrick presented three main questions about the grade appeals policy to the committee.

Questions submitted by Mr. Carrick

i. Why is the student member of the grades appeal committee appointed by the dean, and why is the student nonvoting?

In the case of judicial reviews, Mathew noted that student government appoints the student member. So, he wanted to learn why the dean does so with regard to grade appeals.

ii. Why is the appealing student not allowed an advocate when he or she has the second meeting with the dean and professor?

He pointed out that current policy is out of compliance with Regents' Policy at P09.03.040, which says that an advisor may be present at all times for the student.

iii. Why is the review committee's decision final? Does this mean there's no way to appeal the committee's decision at all?

While the decision being final does not contradict BOR policy, Mathew still wanted to understand why that was the case. Ken A. pointed out that the committee review was the third and final step in the three-step process, so he could understand why it would be considered final.

Members of the committee responded that the grade appeals policy was many decades old (actually predating Faculty Senate and "UAF"), having been in place before anyone present even worked at the university. They agreed the questions had merit, particularly in light of the contradiction with BOR policy concerning advocates. Some of the faculty members had served on appeals committees where the student had been allowed to have an advocate present.

Amber commented that her office has not been allowing advocates because of the current UAF policy, but that the contradiction with BOR policy was also a point she had noted down in order to raise today. What would be the most helpful for students would be guidance about the process before they submit their appeal and a discussion about what kind of documentation they need to put together.

Alex F. noted that an academic appeals advisor position was created a couple of years ago to provide this sort of guidance, and this is mentioned in the catalog. It would be helpful if this were noted in the policy.

Procedural changes that would be helpful were discussed at length. Dean Goering brought up the issue of e-learning and changing modes of instruction, which are raising new issues the policy does not address. Having an academic appeals advisor could be very helpful in this regard, also, to help sort through problems and perhaps prevent unnecessary appeals. Ginny K. commented that since the former advisor who was tasked with the appeals advising duties left UAF employment, the role has not been reassigned. Mathew commented that the role of student peer advisor could also be very helpful to

students, but the policy does not provide an established role for them. The committee expressed support for the roles of appeals advisors (both staff and student).

The committee decided that the issues could be most effectively addressed by creating a subcommittee to look at the issues in depth and to find better ways to advise students about appeals. Joan, Ken, Mathew, Alex, Ginny, Mike and Amber agreed to serve on the subcommittee. The new subcommittee will provide a status report by the first of April, and they will consult with General Counsel to be sure changes are in line with BOR policy. Potentially, there would be time to get any changes to Faculty Senate at the May meeting.

b. GER classification implementation
    i. Foreign Languages
        1. Draft guidelines (attached)

Rainer reported about the discussion at the Administrative Committee concerning allowing the second semester language courses. They were supportive of making languages an exception to the 'no prerequisites' standard. The topic will be brought to the full Faculty Senate as an information item.

The UA Regulations do not address the 3 credits vs. 5 credits language courses. The Foreign Languages department does not wish to have the 3 credit (100A and 100B) courses count toward the GER because they are not the equivalent of the first-year, 5-credit courses. The 3-credit language courses are more like continuing ed courses, or developmental level. The committee debated requiring 3- vs. 5-credit language courses for the GER. The majority felt the decision in that regard should belong to the Foreign Language Department.

Caty O. provided some clarification about how language courses transfer in to UAF with regard to number of credits.

The majority of the committee approved the amended guidelines that included the exception for the second-semester language courses. There was one objection to the language exception.

4. New Business
    a. New Minors

Rainer noted that both minors are essentially zero-cost, utilizing existing courses and faculty.

It was noted that the courses for the Art History minor are taught by one faculty person (term instructor). The approval signatures denote there is commitment to offer the minor at the program and college.

The committee approved sending both minors to the Faculty Senate for a vote.

b. Meeting duration

Cathy commented that meeting business could be accomplished in one hour. Due to time constraints and meeting adjournment, there was no further discussion.

ATTACHMENT 213/6
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes: Wednesday, January 20, 2016
4::00 PM, Conference Room (330), Murie Building, UAF

Present: Andreas Anger, Chris Fallen, Valerie Gifford, Joshua Greenberg, Leslie McCartney, Walter Skya

Absent: Nicole Cundiff, John Eichelberger (Ex-Officio), John Heaton, Julie Maier

Elizabeth Allman is no longer part of the committee.

Meeting called to order at 4:03 PM by Chris Fallen. Room had been double booked, moved to public space on third floor.

Agenda approved.

Minutes from November 25, 2015 approved; motion made by Walter, Josh 2nd, passed.

Old business:
RISE resolution was narrowly defeated by senate.

Chris to follow up at next AdCom meeting with Provost about adjunct faculty benefits/overload issue.

Department Chair policy, two small changes, moved by Walter, 2nd Leslie, passed. Chris to take to AdCom. Group agreed if this comes back again we will not pick it up.

New business:
Valerie volunteer to be on the Blue Book Committee, so moved by Walter, 2nd Leslie, passed.

Other Business:
None.

Next meeting:
Doodle Poll to be sent out to arrange.

ATTACHMENT 213/7
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Unit Criteria Committee Meeting Notes
Monday, December 9, 2015
12:00 – 1:00 PM Chancellor's Conference Room

Unit Committee members present: Chris, Mike Koskey (guest) , Bob, Carie, Mark, Chris Fallen (guest) , Sunny, Jennifer, Mara

A. Approval of minutes - approved
B. Approval of agenda – approved with additions

C. Old Business:

1. Brief update on meeting with Jane Weber, Debu Misra re. promotion criteria for non-tenure track faculty (Bob and Mara)

Full discussion tabled to later; brief overview included in discussion of New Business item: Resolution supporting Amendments to BOR regulations

2. Joint appointment primacy follow-up

Bob will send questions to his director in IARC, and also to Bill Schnable, Director of INE. Still need a couple of people from unit criteria to work on gathering information and crafting recommendations for the joint primacy issue

3. Cross Cultural Studies unit criteria, final review (guests: Mike Koskey and/or Ray Barnhardt)

Mike K present to review the X-cultural studies unit curriculum and answer questions; mission and goals were included because the XCS program is unusual and out of the ordinary; more applied aspects than in some other academic areas. Other minors changes are discussed; agreement is reached to remove goals from unit criteria but retain mission statement. Committee unanimously approved Cross- cultural Studies unit criteria with agreed upon changes; criteria will be brought to the Ad Com meeting at its first meeting of spring semester.

D. New Business:

1. Unit Criteria for review: Geophysical Institute (Christopher Fallen, GI)

Chris Fallen present for presentation of unit criteria. Not all of research faculty are oint-appointed, so the challenge was to come up with criteria that evaluates everyone in GI. Most are bi-partite; research/service. If they teach it is typically an overload, therefore generally not evaluated in their teaching capacity. Discussion on page 10 additions. Carie asked for clarification on percentage of workload/evaluation. Question about promotion paragraph: page 11. Question about 2.n: Is managing a research facility part of research? Research infrastructure is another matter. Does require expertise and knowledge. If GI can re-craft the

management word into being clearer as to what it means – this is probably not the intent of the section to be speaking to management in the sense of building management. IAS scores – difficulty is in specifying score benchmarks. Will remove IAS benchmark statement from unit criteria. GI will revise and resubmit final copy – we will review and finalize at Jan meeting.

2. Unit Criteria committee position on student evaluations as metric in faculty evaluations/promotion/tenure

Short discussion due to time limits: For the interim, as a temporary measure since evaluation metrics are not available for online student evaluations, committee will request/recommend that unit criteria submitted for review not contain criteria tied to IAS and/or online student evaluations. Mark supports retaining student evaluations as part of the process of P & T process as students should be involved in the process. He does not support using peer evaluation if faculty are allowed to select their own peer reviewers. Faculty peer review for teaching could consist of peer faculty selected in conjunction with faculty member and dean/director (as one alternative). Further discussion on this issue was not possible due to time limits.

3. Resolution supporting Amendments to BOR regulations

Following suggestion from Faculty Senate president short discussion on preparing a resolution supporting changes to the BOR policies/regulations to align with needed revisions in Blue Book – particularly, but not limited to, expanding definitions and provisions to formalize promotion processes for non-tenure track, non-research faculty (i.e. those whose workloads are primarily in teaching or service). Mara offered to write a draft resolution to circulate to committee via email in advance of the next Faculty Senate meeting.

ADJOURN – 1:00 PM

Next Meeting: January 20 1:00 – 2:00.

Will set the spring meetings at next meeting.

ATTACHMENT 213/8
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Minutes Friday, 19 Feb 2016, 10-11am, School of Ed Conference Room – Gruening 718

Present: Jane Weber, Diana Di Stefano, Derek Sikes, Alex Fitts, Megan McPhee (via skype), Sine Anahita, Ellen Lopez, Kayt Sunwood

1) **Promotion, Tenure & Career Success Workshop – April 22 (10:00-noon)**. Jayne Harvie will reserve Butrovich 1 month in advance (along with back up room). Derek will emcee. Some invited panelists were not able to accept the invite other names brainstormed **(assignments on who will ask new invitees bolded, also questions about whether someone has agreed are bolded)**

Proposed panelists & status:

- Alex Fitts (Vice Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer) – Agreed!
- Diana Di Stefano (CLA-Tenured, FamilyRole) – Agreed!
- Erin Petitt (Geophysics – Tenured) – Agreed!
- Andrea Greenberg (CLA-Term) – **Sine asked, Andrea declined**
    - Retchenda George Bettisworth (Term, Chair Social Work) – **Sine asked, Retchenda Agreed**
- ? Brenda Norcross **– Megan McPhee will ask?**
- Someone from Library? Karen Jensen – **Mary Erlander, has someone from the library confirmed?**
    - **Maya Salganek – Diana will ask**
    - Anna Liljedahl (Research Assistant Professos, WERC) – Agreed! **Thanks Ellen for asking.**

2) **2016 Luncheon – Sept 20/Cost Analysis Update:** Ellen will ask the Provost about speaking at the 9/20/16 luncheon. CSW Chairs still awaiting meeting with Vice Chancellor Sfraga about cost analysis/funding of luncheon.
3) **Terms for CSW**
    - Diana would like to continue for another term
    - Megan is happy to stay on and also wants to give others a chance. She will talk to a colleague who has expressed interest in serving.
4) **Resolution on use of gender inclusive language update –** Provost is looking into how this new language dovetails with UA language and policies.
5) **Conversation Cafés/Faculty Equity Community –** Thanks to Erin for her organizing and creation of the Faculty Equity Community website https://sites.google.com/a/alaska.edu/faculty-equity-community and the listserv https://lists.alaska.edu/mailman/listinfo/uaf-facultyequitycommunity ! CSW members have editing access to the Google Site. Kayt has added links to the site and done some editing (CSW's Faculty Equity Community and Conversation Cafés are among Kayt's special assignments this Spring, so please contact Kayt if legwork or assistance is needed on Conversation Cafés/Faculty Equity Community). Kayt will send promos about the Conversation Cafés out to the all Faculty list. The flier for March 9th's Convo Café is out, copies will be campus mailed to you if your copies have not yet been delivered.
6) **Spring Meetings: March 25th & April 8th**

ATTACHMENT 213/9
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Core Review Committee

Core Curriculum Review Committee
Meeting Minutes for 4 December 2015
Meeting time: 10:30 to 11:30 am
Meeting location: Kayak Room, 408 Rasmuson Library
Meeting convener: Andy Seitz and Margaret Short

Name	Present
Andy Seitz (co-chair)	X
Margaret Short (co-chair)	X
Bobbi Jensen	X
Brian Kassof	X
Burns Cooper	X
Caty Oehring	X
Gabrielle Russell	X
Ginny Kinne	
Hayley Williams	X
Kathy Arndt	X
Kevin Berry	
Kevin Sager	X
Larry Duffy	X
Marsha Sousa	X
Tony Rickard	X
Yelena Matusevich	

1. Meeting minutes from 20 November 2015 approved.

2. Announcement by committee chair: Five BIOL F397 Independent Study petitions were submitted that are identical to a petition that was approved in the Nov. 20 meeting of the Core Review Committee. Instead of reviewing the additional five petitions, a decision was made to approve them based on the precedent set during the previous meeting.

3. Announcement made by committee member: The HLTH F114 petition that was reviewed and denied during the Nov. 20 meeting of the Core Review Committee was not supposed to be voted on, instead it was only supposed to be presented to the committee for discussion. However, after further discussion, it was decided that the committee would likely not change its mind about the petition, so it was recommended that the petition, which was denied on Nov. 20, be sent to the Provost for waiver of the requirement.

4. Petitions
    a. Withdrawn – Petition to ESK 109 and/or ESK251 to count toward the Perspective on the Human Condition language substitute, in conjunction with ESK 102. It turns out the student had already

taken another ESK language class, therefore meets the PHC language substitute requirement, so the petition was not necessary.

b. Approved :
    i. W designator request for BIOL F497. After reviewing the course syllabus, the committee agreed that the course clearly meets the UAF "W" requirements.
    ii. W,O designators request for ED F486 taken in summer 2015. This request was initially reviewed during the Nov. 20 meeting, but a discrepancy in information prompted the committee to request more information from the course instructor. The course instructor provided more information about the course requirements and grading, vis a vis W and O designators. The committee agreed that the course met the UAF "W" and "O" requirements. It was then mentioned that several other students took the class in summer 2015 and should they receive W and O designators for the class as well? The committee agreed that all students enrolled in ED F486 during summer 2015 should receive W and O designators for the course.

c. Denied:
    i. Request to substitute SPCH 104 taken in 1979 for the COMM F131X or COMM F141X core requirement. After lengthy committee discussion, it was decided that SPCH 104 was not a performance-based class, but rather a class about different methods of oral communication, therefore SPCH 104 should not substitute for COMM F131X or COMM F141X which are both performance-based. However, the committee does not feel the student's degree progress should be slowed by having to take another COMM class and therefore recommended this petition be sent to the Provost for waiver of the requirement.

5. Discussion
    a. This meeting on Dec. 4 is the last meeting of the Core Review Committee for the Fall 2015 semester. The next meeting will be held in Spring 2016, after Jayne finds a time that is suitable for the most people on the committee. Because this is the last meeting of the semester, no more petitions will be reviewed this semester and they will have to wait until Spring 2016, unless there are exceptional circumstances. In cases of exceptional circumstances, petitions will only be reviewed by the committee chairs.
    b. Re-visiting the website.
    c. Anything else?

ATTACHMENT 213/10
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for December 8, 2015

On Faculty Senate site:

Appointed Members:
Cindy Hardy, CRCD/DevEd - SADAC Liaison
to CAC Ben Kuntz, Kuskokwim Campus
Joe Mason, Northwest Campus
Jennifer Tilbury, CTC Developmental Ed - Co-Chair -
absent Sandra Wildfeuer, BBC / IAC - Chair
Stacey Howdeshell, Academic Advising Center
Colleen Angaiak, Rural Student Services

Elected Members:
Jill Faudree, Math/CNSM (17)
Eileen Harney, English/CLA
(16) Bill Howard,
Science/CNSM (17)

Ex officio:
Alex Fitts, Provost's Council Rep -
absent OAR: Mike Earnest

1. The minutes for November were approved with the change of adding Bill Howard's name to the attendance.

2. The agenda for the day was approved.

Joe Mason is retiring after serving on the committee for many years!!!!!

3. Committee definition and General Description of Committee

SADA committee reviewed the most recent version of committee motion passed through the faculty senate. Concerns were raised by SADA members in November about wording in the general committee description section of the motion regarding voting procedures. Changes were made at the Ad Comm meeting in November to clarify that each committee has the prerogative to determine voting procedures, which could be by consensus or majority vote. The concerns raised by SADA were addressed.

> New: F. A quorum consists of at least 50% of the voting members of a committee. Mode of attendance and procedure for voting in a committee meeting shall be the prerogative of each committee.
>
> Before: F. A QUORUM CONSISTS OF AT LEAST 50% OF THE VOTING MEMBERS OF A COMMITTEE. ALL MATTERS WILL BE DECIDED BY A MAJORITY VOTE OF ALL VOTING COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE. MODE OF ATTENDANCE AND PROCEDURE FOR VOTING IN A COMMITTEE MEETING SHALL BE THE PREROGATIVE OF EACH COMMITTEE.

The rest of the definition was shared with the new editing symbols, using bold for new and cross out for delete, rather than capital letters for new and brackets for delete.

Here is the approved definition:

The Student Academic Developmental and Achievement (SADA) Committee considers policies related to student placement, academic advising and student appeals, development, and retention. This committee further functions as a curriculum review committee for all developmental education courses.

SADA includes one faculty representative from each of the following campuses of the College of Rural and Community Development: Bristol Bay, Chukchi, Interior Alaska, Kuskokwim, Northwest, and the Community and Technical College. One or more of these should be from Developmental Education. The committee also includes one representative from the Fairbanks Department of Developmental Education; two representatives from the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics: one from the Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, or Physics), and one from Math; two from the College of Liberal Arts, including one from the English Department; and one each from Rural Student Services, Rural Campus Student Services, and the Academic Advising Center. The committee may also invite a student representative to serve as an ex officio member.

4. We discussed the new committee definition and that there are positions on the committee not filled under the new definition.
   We need a representative from Chukchi Campus. We need a representative from Northwest Campus.
   We need another CLA faculty, and Sine Anahita is interested per Cindy Hardy. We need a rural campus student services representative.
   We can have a student rep.

5. New WRTG 110 course was approved unanimously.
   This course is part of the statewide English alignment. Now it is called DEVE 109. The course description is fixed because it is part of the alignment with the other campuses.
   It serves as elective credit, it is not gen ed or core.

   Statewide alignment for English will go into effect in Fall 2017. For now, UAF plans to use trial DEVE and previous DEVE courses from the present until 2017.

6. Update: Motion to amend Grade Appeals Policy
   The Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) is currently reviewing this policy.

   Update: Motion to amend Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions
   CAC and Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (GAAC) are reviewing this policy.

7. New: Develop a Motion for Dual Major Advising?

   Discussion about Dual Major advising and Dual Degree advising Are students being advised well?
   Degreeworks - does it allow double major and double degree, and graduation, are there issues?
   We need clarification from Debu about the specific issues he is concerned about (issue-advisor signing off on other degree forms)

The registrar can run advisor audit to see who is assigned to students.
Currently in Banner there is a need to TRICK the system to put students in two different colleges. Degreeworks=TRNG
Courseleaf is curriculum management
Requests for data about the number of students at UAF that are impacted.
- How many double majors?
- How many double degrees?
- What departments are impacted?
- What about AAS and AA and Bachelor's?

A possible solution is a special training for advisors about double majors and double degrees, to make sure all are informed.

8. Subcommittee Report: Student Resiliency Project
   The committee has shared relevant articles. There was an illness and the committee will refresh in January.

9. Next meeting: A doodle poll will be sent to set up a time for the next meeting. Expect to meet in January, February, March and April.

Adjourn

ATTACHMENT 213/11
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 9, 2016

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 10:03 am.

II. Roll call

Present: Mike Castellini, Bernie Coakley, Candi Dierenfield, Diana DiStefano, Cindy Fabbri, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Steve Hunt, Duff Johnston, Chris Lott, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Channon Price
Excused: Gerri Brightwell, Brian Himelbloom

III. News on Electronic Course Assessment Implementation Committee (ECAI)

Andrea reported that the ECAI Committee met in January to discuss results of the fall survey and noted that the overall response rate was 41.3%. He stated that it was "less than we would hope but more than we thought" and added that the average response rate for first-time implementation of an electronic survey is 50% with about a 20% drop from the previous survey method.

The ECAI Committee worked on a letter drafted by Andrea to report the overall results of the electronic survey to faculty and address a few faculty concerns. While some faculty members found the process very effective, others felt that they received harsher comments from their students than before. Kelly wondered if faculty explained to their students that comments are only read by the respective faculty member and to remind their students to share what aspects of the class were particularly helpful. Andrea explained that the letter from the ECAI Committee also prompted faculty to remind their students to fill out their surveys online. Duff wondered if faculty might pass out small cards to their students with the web address and reminder to fill out their online surveys as it would help make the process more visible.

Andrea reported that Marketing and Communication has been working on a website for electronic evaluations that will go public in the next week or so. It includes the main portal for the survey, survey administrator contact information, historical evaluation reports for 1991 to the present, FAQs – one for faculty and one for students – and testimonials from faculty and students on how surveys have helped shape and improve instruction at UAF.

The ECAI Committee will continue to look at response rates, work on publicizing the website and add notes in the future on how to interpret survey results. There was some discussion on faculty perceptions of which students are filling out the online surveys (i.e. only highly satisfied students or disgruntled students). Andrea noted that the committee will look into sharing the distribution of responses so that faculty and deans may get a clearer picture of the overall results.

Steve mentioned that several faculty members would like more time for students to have access to the surveys since they occur during a busy time of the semester for students. Andrea noted that last fall's survey was only available for ten days due to some technical glitches within the system but in future they will be available for a full two weeks.

IV. Upcoming activities of the UAF Office of Faculty Development (report from Joy)

Joy reported that she has been meeting one-on-one with all new faculty members since returning on February 1. She has set up the faculty development training calendar for the spring semester and it is available on the website. Upcoming is a presentation on bullying within departments called "Responding to Toxic Behavior" and will feature Libby Roderick from UAA. Due to results from a satisfaction survey indicating faculty concerns over academic bullying, UAA has created a video on the subject. The video will be shown and discussed on Tuesday, February 23 at 12:30 – 2:30 pm (Rasmuson 340) and again from 3-5 pm (Murie Auditorium). Joy is hoping that this presentation with get a dialog going at UAF.

Joy informed us that the Office of the Registrar and the Dean of Students will give a talk for faculty on February 16. Several registration issues will be discussed.

Joy explained that there may is not enough money remaining in the budget this year to do much; and travel next fall to the POD Conference is limited, so she most likely will not be able to attend and take faculty members.

V. Upcoming activities by UAF eLearning & Distance Education

Chris passed out a list of upcoming faculty development opportunities at eLearning and Distance Education which will include iTeach Spring (March 25, 28, 30 and April 1) as well as various iTeach+ Workshops occurring throughout the spring semester. He informed us that faculty participating in iTeach will have access to one-on-one help from eLearning's Instructional Designers after completing the course. In addition eLearning offers various times for "Open Lab" for all faculty members needing assistance with teaching or developing their eLearning classes.

Coming in late February or early March there will be a workshop (or two) regarding the new Quality Matters Rubric for reviewing electronic courses. Chris explained that more information on this will be forthcoming.

There was some discussion regarding eLearning's collaboration the other two MAUs. Chris explained that UAF is the only one to have a centralized eLearning office. He noted that while there is some collaboration, UAA and UAS are just getting started on the process of centralization that UAF has had for years.

VI. Discussion on Status of the Faculty Mentoring program

Franz started the discussion by saying that in the current economic climate where there are fewer people doing more work, mentoring can fall by the wayside. Our committee has been charged with coming up with ideas regarding incentivization: is it needed, and if so, what is the best way to do it?

Franz noted four components to mentoring programs: 1) pairing mentors and mentees – which is mainly done by assignment through directors or deans; 2) training for both mentors and mentees – how much is being offered at UAF needs to be determined; 3) tracking mentoring activities – should tracking be recommended? If so, care should be taken to not put a burden on the mentoring process; and 4) Incentivizing mentors, mentees, and (potentially) Deans – what incentives are most effective?

Joy explained that she ensures that every new faculty member has a mentor. She conducts an initial introduction to mentors and mentees including training in the main components of UAF's mentoring program. She also revisits mentees in their second semester to hear how the mentoring process is

working. She suggested surveying third- and fourth-year faculty to find out what they think about their mentoring experience. After some discussion it was agreed upon and Joy volunteered to draft a survey on the status of the mentoring program for FDAI to consider.

It was noted and discussed that ultimately deans and directors must buy in to mentoring and support it if it is to be successful. Franz explained that Dean Layer says he chooses the best faculty to be mentors and they already have overloaded workloads, therefore offering one workload credit for mentors may not always be an effective incentive.

Tracking mentoring activity was discussed at some length with Franz reiterating that if we are to suggest it, it must not be a burden to mentors or their mentees. Joy wondered if it would be possible to add a section in Faculty 180 where faculty could address their mentoring activities.

Mike noted that the third year in a faculty member's career is when the doubts start to creep in and faculty request mentoring help, so it might be effective to target this group as well as new faculty. He also suggested that deans request help in pairing mentors with their mentees by asking people in their departments to suggest possible pairings.

VII. Other Business

a. Introduction to the Quality Matters program and UAF's involvement (please take a look at https://www.qualitymatters.org/higher-education-program in preparation)

This was tabled due to lack of time. Franz requested that we all read through the notes on mentoring that he emailed to the committee and provide comments and suggestions.

VIII. Upcoming events

a. Next FDAI meeting: Tuesday, 03/08/16, 10-11 am in Bunnell 222
(also: Tuesday, 04/05/16 and Tuesday, 05/03/16, same time/place)
b. Next admin committee meeting: 02/26/16
c. Next Faculty Senate meeting: 03/07/16

IX. Adjourned at 11:05 am. (Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.)

ATTACHMENT 213/12
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 27, 2016

Attending: John Yarie, Daryl Farmer, Don Hampton, Mitch Reed, Mike Daku, Laura Bender, Amanda Loibl, Jayne Harvie, Mike Castelline, Donie Bret-Harte

I. Minutes from our meeting of January 13, 2016 were passed.

II. Updates from the Graduate School. Mike Castellini indicated that representatives of the graduate school will address the full faculty senate regarding graduate student health insurance at the next meeting, February 8, 2016. He indicated that there is still uncertainty regarding interpretation of the IRS regulations, but that several other institutions (University of Kentucky, University of Alabama) have stopped providing health insurance for graduate students, and believe that they are compliant. At the present time, the Provost is not contemplating changes for next year, because the situation after the next US Presidential election may be quite different. Mitch asked whether there was a student option under healthcare.gov. Laura thought that there was not. No one knew whether Medicaid expansion has gone into effect in Alaska, yet, although the governor approved it.

Mike Castellini also commented that it is not clear yet what the UA President's memo on "strategic pathways" means for UAF. The Provost has received plans from all the schools for how to deal with the budget decrease that was forecast earlier. At this point, those may be minimum decreases, though much is still unknown. For the graduate school, the proposal is to decrease staffing by 1.5 FTE and implement a 25% reduction in thesis completion fellowships. Because student hires have not been subject to the hiring freeze, a student will help out for the time being. Over the longer term, the graduate school would hope to hire back 0.5 FTE. Other updates include that there is no system to automatically generate letters for graduate students who are not in good standing, as is done for undergraduates. Facing staff reductions, the graduate school would like to implement a system of automated letters for graduate students (this may result in less flexibility for graduate students). They haven't done this so far, because not all graduate courses count toward a program, so determinations are made by hand. In other news, the graduate school is getting ready for commencement already. All three commencements have been scheduled for the same day, and it is possible that UAF's commencement will be moved to Saturday so that President Johnson can attend. If that happens, there will be no commencement rehearsal.

III. GAAC passed the following course and program proposals and changes:

30-GNC: New Course: **DVM F711 - Foundations of Veterinary Medicine IV**, pending some small corrections.

Several other proposals were discussed, and it was noted that revisions are needed. GAAC members will contact the proposers. New assignments were made.

IV. Our next meeting will be on February 17, 2016, at 1:15 pm

---

Minutes continued next page.

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes of February 17, 2016

Attending: Don Hampton, Daryl Farmer, Sean McGee, Mike Daku, Amanda Loibl, John Yarie, Donie Bret-Harte, Mike Castellinie, Laura Bender (by phone)

I. Minutes of our meeting on 1/27/16 were passed.

II. Updates from the graduate school. Mike Castellini expressed thanks for the opportunity to address the Faculty Senate. He noted that there were few questions, but one was "what was the action?" The action is that the graduate health insurance program will be kept for next year (unless there is a catastrophic budget scenario). The graduate school will keep us updated; negotiations for next year's health insurance begin soon.

There was continued discussion on the possibility of electronic signatures for theses. The graduate school has offered a draft form, which is a fillable, secure pdf. Laura Bender indicated that this form alleviates issues of being unable to find advisors, pages getting lost or folded, etc. It will still be an option to have a physical page. The graduate school will probably have people sign this form, even if physical pages are desired, as then they are consistent in requiring the electronic from everyone. GAAC agreed that this is OK.

With respect to the comprehensive exam, it turns out that there is no consistent policy across the university with regard to how many tries a student can make before they have to stop. The graduate school has just polled many departments across campus (however, only a few have responded so far). The maximum number of times student can try are two (five programs), three (three programs), and unknown (one program). They haven't heard back from many departments. It seems wise to put a ceiling on the number of times a student can try across the university; if individual departments want to have a stricter standard, they can. The graduate school is working on the wording with the Provost. The policy will have to be approved by GAAC, since it involves a catalog change. Some departments have both oral and written comprehensive exams, while others do not. GAAC advised that it would be good to cover what happens in both cases. Currently there are 48 Master's programs and 17 Ph.D. programs. It is not clear yet whether all programs have comprehensive exams.

III. GAAC briefly discussed the Academic Appeals policy, which was forwarded to us by the SADA committee. GAAC members will look at it for next time, and Daryl agreed to lead the discussion. Mike Castellini had some experience with appeals when he was with SFOS, and Laura Bender has had experience with some through the graduate school. They both feel that the process works fine. Mike Daku commented that the main issue is that there be a process in place for the student to appeal decisions. Overall, the existing basic structure seems fine, though it may be desirable to tweak some details.

IV. GAAC discussed a variety of course and program proposals and changes, most of which still need work. GAAC passed:
31-GNC: New Course: **DVM F744 - Theriogenology**

V. Our next meeting will be Wednesday February 24, at 1:15 pm

ATTACHMENT 213/13
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Information Technology Committee

Information Technology Committee
February 17, 2016 at 10 a.m. via Adobe Connect.

The meeting of the Information Technology Committee via Adobe Connect was convened at 10:03 a.m.

Roll Call
Attendees: Julie Cascio, Joanne Healy, Rorik Peterson, Ruth Prato, Siri Tuttle, Chris Lott ex officio, Debra Kouda ex officio, Fred Schlutt ex officio
Not present: Falk Huettmann, Eric Collins, Bill Barnes, Martha Mason ex officio

Adobe Connect – Chris Lott shared information on setting this up and that eLearnning is using it as it works for some Online teachers. Thoughts noted include:
There is a cost... $19/mo for a room that contains up to 25 users.
People should probably mute the mic when they aren't talking. Switch to single speaker mode can help.

Use of Blackboard Collaborate Feedback – One comment indicated that learning to use multiple mics in the meeting was helpful. Using Blackboard Collaborate as a class seemed to work better than for a meeting some thought. The effect was described like an old-fashioned teleconference, except with diminished sound quality at times.

Maintaining student records from online book sources – Rorik Peterson looked into assignments turned in via McGraw Hill or other book to keep for a long enough time period. One is an automatic score that gets aggregated into the Blackboard. Grades were not being populated. He could not get information so will report next meeting.

eLearning's efforts to bring Quality Matters to UAF– Chris shared the design on this rubric used for faculty development to look at quality. He asked for interest, and who else would be interested in learning about this. Some comments included interested in applying this rubric to courses and that would like to take a copy of this rubric to my next department meeting. Having an account with QM to get a look at the rubric is interested.
Overall scores are sent to the teacher being looked at. Chris shared information that can be shared with Faculty Senate. Attached is the text of a Teaching Tip about Quality Matters and the one-page summary of the Rubric QM uses for peer reviews. This is available by signing up to the free account

Explorance Blue – Chris reported that Andrea sent letter via this on what has happened now. Paper evaluation was 60% in past. Decline is not as steep as expected. Online is lower which was to be expected in this first year being used. The website created will be going online soon to promote using these. Inspire us! Is the theme and is designed to help students understand how important this is. Chris will connect to see why Siri did not see her student responses yet. He said there may have not been enough responses or got caught in SPAM. Joanne shared that she allowed in class time for responses but students responses were minimal and incomplete. Another comment was that some are voluminous responses!

OIT faculty engagement - Debra connected via a mobile phone, which made this connection more difficult to hear. Debra said work on the Lecture capture is in progress. Working with Faculty

engagement has not started yet.

Page Up - Julie reported that she called two universities that were listed on the ppt about this program. Kansas State University reported it was used only for employee recruitment. University of Alabama was also called. Neither used it for faculty evaluation.

Next Meeting –
March 23, 2016, 10 am CANVAS. Falk will facilitate using this platform
April 20, 2016, 10 am Platform suggestions

The meeting adjourned at 10:56 am
Chair, Julie Cascio

ADDITIONAL HANDOUT INFORMATION POSTED ON COMMITTEE'S WEB SITE:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/15-16-itc/
"The Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric" (PDF, 650KB)
Quality Matters at UAF (PDF, 160KB)

ATTACHMENT 213/14
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

UAF FACULTY SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes for Friday, February 26, 2016 – 1:00 - 3:00 PM - Chancellor's Conference Room

Present: Mara Bacsujlaky; Jennie Carroll; Julie Cascio (via Zoom); Chris Fallen; Alex Fitts (ex offcio); Orion Lawlor (Chair); Debu Misra; Rainer Newberry; Andy Seitz; Sandra Wildfeuer
Absent: Donie Bret-Harte; Franz Meyer; Jessica Cherry; Provost Henrichs; Jane Weber;

COMMENTS
President's Comments – Debu Misra:

Debu reported that there are 10 candidates for the Chancellor position. Search committee members are flying to Seattle today for interviews. Meeting in Seattle for interviews was a cost-saving compromise.

President-Elect's Comments – Orion Lawlor:

Alex F. had some information to share about the current status of the university budget. The House Finance Subcommittee added $12 million back in, bring the budget moved forward to $300 million. There is some hope that the Senate will add some funding back.

The university needs a bottom line of at least $320 million, but that figure would still require broad cuts across the board. This is still below the contingency budgets the vice chancellors had prepared ($325 million), and further contingency budgets are being prepared. PBC meets on Monday. There will be task groups to work on parts of the budget.

Orion noted the difficulty prospect of trying to support Research with no funding in the state's plan.

Possible means of implementing Strategic Pathways initiatives were discussed at length. Alex will talk to the Provost about preparing a one-page communication to share with Faculty Senate. There will be consultation with UNAC and UAFT.

Debu will also draft a communication and will send it out early next week with the goal of adding it to the Faculty Senate agenda by Thursday morning.

Provost's Comments
Provost Henrichs could not attend today due to an out-of-town meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

- Motion to approve Unit Criteria for the Geophysical Institute, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee – passed by the Administrative Committee

- Motion to agree to discontinuation of the BA and Minor in Russian Studies, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee – passed by the Administrative Committee

DISCUSSION / INFORMATION ITEMS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

- Proposed additions of definitions of faculty in BOR Policy
  Mara shared an excerpt from BOR Policy containing definitions of faculty and her suggested

additions. This item will be brought to the Faculty Senate meeting as a discussion item. There was support for the goal of preparing a related motion for the April meeting.

- GER and Alaska Native requirement
  Jennie shared the letter to the BOR by the Alaska Native Studies Council, and the two student governance resolutions from UAA and UAS. Supporting this effort might be a way in which the GER discussion at the system level could be revived. Suggestions for implementation were discussed. There was general support for the proposed addition. This item will be brought to the Faculty Senate meeting as a discussion item.
- Limiting the number of "X" courses per program
  In an effort to keep course offerings from becoming too lop-sided in certain areas, limiting courses to four per subject code is proposed. The CAC GER subcommittee is preparing a guide on how to propose courses for the "X" designation. Additional courses that carry more specific attributes (such as for Alaska Native subject matter, or civics, etc.) could be proposed. There was agreement that imposing a limit makes sense.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 3:00 PM.