MINUTES - DRAFT

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #201
Monday, October 6, 2014
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Cécile Lardon

A. Roll Call –

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (16)	MCCARTNEY, Leslie (15)
ALLMAN, Elizabeth (16)	MCDONNELL, Andrew (16)
BARNES, Bill (15)	MEYER, Franz (15)
BERGE, Anna (15)	MISRA, Debu (15)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (15)	MOSER, Dennis (16)
CABLE-Young, Jessie (15) **– Jessica Cherry**	NEWBERRY, Rainer (15)
CASCIO, Julie (16) - audio	RADENBAUGH, Todd (15) - audio
COFFMAN, Christine (15)	SHALLCROSS, Leslie (15)
CONDE, Mark (15) – **Ataur Chowdhury**	SKYA, Walter (16)
COOK, Brian (16)	VALENTINE, Dave (16)
DEHN, Jonathan (15)	WEBER, Jane (16)
DISTEFANO, Diana (16)	WILDFEUER, Sandra (16)
DUKE, Rob (15) - audio	WINFREE, Cathy (15)
FALLEN, Chris (15)	
GIBSON, Georgina (16)	Members Absent:
HANKS, Cathy (16) - **Brian Rasley**	PETERSON, Rorik (15)
HARDY, Sarah (15) - audio	RICE, Sunny (16)
HARTMAN, Chris (16)	
HEALY, Joanne (15) – **Phil Patterson**	Others Present:
HORNIG, Joan (16)	Chancellor Rogers
HORSTMANN, Lara (15)	Provost Henrichs
JOHNSON, Galen (15)	Dean Paul Layer
JOLY, Julie (15)	Alex Fitts
LAN, Ping (15)	Libby Eddy
LARDON, Cécile (15)	Cindy Hardy
LAWLOR, Orion (16)	Tim Wilson
LOVECRAFT, Amy (15) - audio	Chris Beks
MAHONEY, Andrew (16)	
MAXWELL, David (16)	

NOTE: There were technical problems with the sound system which were not resolved until approximately 10 minutes into the actual meeting. The audio recording and minutes (below) begin during Chancellor Roger's comments.

B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #200
C. Adoption of Agenda

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions
A. Motions Approved: None
B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – Cécile Lardon
B. President-Elect's Remarks – Debu Misra

1:20 IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

[NOTE: The minutes below start during Chancellor Roger's remarks due to technical problems with the sound system and audio recording which occurred at this meeting.]

The Chancellor remarked on the results of the tobacco-free / smoke-free survey completed by Staff Council last year (389 favored a policy and 389 opposed a policy). He expects that the Board of Regents will make a dispositive decision concerning this issue for the university system.

Due to their concerns over budget issues the Board of Regents have extended their November budget meeting to two days instead of one. On the second day of the meeting, they will discuss a possible merger of the three Schools of Education.

Jane W. asked a question about projected budget figures and potential loss of 16-20 positions at UAF. The Chancellor responded that there is a lot unknown about the potential scenario of having to cut positions because the Alaska legislature has not adopted the university budget yet. If the budget remains flat (no decrease or increase) the university must absorb $14 million in pay and fixed cost increases. If tuition is raised, that might bring in another $1.5 million to UAF, but still leaves $12.5 million to cut out of the budget. The BOR is frustrated because the university can't say what the revenue from a tuition increase actually buys beyond "less reductions" than if the increase didn't happen. The challenge is to make the impact of the budget cuts more clear to the Board.

Ken A. asked Chancellor Rogers to comment regarding the possible political changes to the Board's position with regard to the university system as regent terms end and regents are appointed or re-appointed in the coming year. Chancellor Rogers noted that the terms of four regents go through February 1 of 2015. Whoever is governor in December would make the appointments to replace those four positions. Two of those four regents have indicated they will seek reappointment, and two will not. The tuition increase vote was seven opposed and four in favor. Three of the four who were in favor of the tuition increase are among those whose terms are ending. In order to make a change to the tuition policy, the Board members who voted no would have to change their minds. (Also, the student regent position will come open at the end of the academic year.)

The Chancellor was asked to comment further about the potential impacts to UAF and faculty positions if the Schools of Education were combined, and the possibility of other schools being combined as well.

Chancellor Rogers noted he had tried to lay out a matrix of the issues that would have to be considered, ranging from the effect on already-tenured faculty, to the effect on pre-tenure faculty, to the effect on how we relate to local school districts, to curriculum, and so on. There are 14-15 other criteria that one might consider, as well. The answer depends upon what model might be chosen for us. The Board has mentioned the possibility of combining the Schools of Management.

Provost Henrichs has been meeting with the Deans of the Schools of Education. She commented that no decisions have been made yet. The three Provosts, the three SOE Deans and the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Research will be making a clear statement at the November BOR meeting about the biggest issue facing the Schools of Education right now, which is the NCATE accreditation. They will urge the Board that no changes are made to the organization of the schools until the accreditation issues are resolved, which could take several years.

David V. mentioned that Faculty Alliance has drafted a letter to both Governor Parnell and gubernatorial candidate Bill Walker, to urge them to consider a number of characteristics which Alliance thinks are important to consider in making appointments to the Board of Regents. President Gamble has asked FA to share the draft with university administration so they might possibly endorse it as well. He asked Faculty Senate to think about who might be good regents. There are a number of emeriti faculty, for example, who would be excellent additions to the Board.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

The Planning and Budget Committee is being reconvened from last spring, as the Chancellor had announced at the Convocation. Because of the steep learning curve involved with the UAF budget issues, membership will remain the same except for those unavailable to continue. It will function in the same way as it did last year, but look for ways to find additional savings in order to deal with the possibility of a reduced budget, or one that remains unchanged in the face of rising fixed costs that go unfunded by the legislature.

In addition to the regular program review that happens annually, there will be a special program review which will focus on programs with small or decreasing enrollments and with low graduate to enrollment ratios. Unfortunately, the objective of the special review is look for programs to be eliminated if funding is reduced as much as might happen with the legislative action. All the special program review committees have faculty representation on them as does the Planning and Budget Committee. There will also be other opportunities for faculty to provide feedback.

A question was asked about what constitutes low numbers for programs. The Provost said a flowchart may have been made available to Faculty Senate already, but she will re-send it and it can be made available to senators. There were a set of criteria that were agreed to by the Planning and Budget Committee last year.

In response to a question about revenue sources for the university, the Chancellor commented that the three main sources of funding include federal, state and tuition / fees funding. Tuition and fees are the only funding sources over which the university has any control. They've stepped up fundraising efforts and have raised $13 million, but these funds are usually for endowments from which they draw a small percentage annually and which cannot provide funding to cover core programs.

Provost Henrichs added that most of the enrollment growth they have seen in the last several years is from programs being delivered online. It's a competitive area for growth; offering unique and quality programs will be key to being successful at it. She also noted that while the federal environment is very competitive, UAF has some wonderful successes there. She encouraged everyone to strive for what they can get from that source due to the current budget climate.

Andrew Mahoney commented that 50% of his salary is coming from private industry this year. He suggested this sort of funding opportunity could be endorsed and improved upon by the university.

Lara H. asked, given the funding environment, how adding more administration could be justified. She mentioned the new associate dean position at the Graduate School. Provost Henrichs answered that the associate dean position is a temporary augmentation due to an emphasis in Arctic initiatives over the next couple of years. There are opportunities for building collaborative international research, as well as for additional revenues.

Cécile strongly encouraged senators to get involved in the committees this year. As she knows from working on BOG and PBC, the work is not fun, but it's where shared governance makes a difference. Faculty Senate has the responsibility to get involved. And, it's better than sitting on the sidelines and being unhappy with decisions which must be made.

V Guest Speaker

A. Marsha Sousa, Director of the Honors Program
Question and Answer

Marsha noted that the Honors Program was established in 1982 and is similar to many other honors programs at other universities. Students take a body of honors courses and produce a capstone thesis. While a good model, it has become a dated approach. Many baccalaureate programs are now following a capstone approach and are emphasizing research opportunities. Most of the honors courses are core curriculum courses, with few upper division electives. Even when there are many students in one major area (biology, for example) it can be difficult to get all of them together for one upper division course in a given semester. Many honors students work with individual instructors and make a contract to modify an existing course to provide an honors component. The honors capstone requirement may also count toward the major degree capstone, if there is one.

Currently, there are 200+ students in the honors program according to Banner. There are 52 freshman, and 102 seniors. It's difficult to track them in Banner. Most are in STEM fields, with 45 in Biology (95 overall in CNSM), 66 in Engineering, and 24 in CLA. This is very different from what one sees in most honors programs which typically have more honors students in the liberal arts. Marsha referred to a handout that was distributed. The handout is posted online at the Faculty Senate meetings web page: http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/

Marsha is looking at revising the honors curriculum with the goal of bringing honors students together as a cohort to increase retention while also helping them to get to know one another and begin working together. She's observed that they are losing honors students in the upper division level. By focusing more on improving the core and first-year honors courses, she hopes to strengthen the cohort and improve retention. Marsha described her ideas for the freshman- and sophomore-year curriculum. The additional challenge with those plans has been the fact that the university GERs and UAF core curriculum are in the process of being revised.

Marsha is also currently revising how advisory committees are constituted for honors students. They will include other students as well as faculty, which is a national best practice. She described the new mission statement, and student learning objectives which focus on critical thinking, a broad education and independent scholarship by graduation. She also described the current challenges facing the honors program. One of those is the challenge to incentivize faculty to teach honors courses.

Donie B. commented about one of her students who graduated with honors last year. She didn't come in to the university as an honors student in her freshman year, and made that transition later in her college career. Donie urged the door to be kept open for students like this. Marsha noted two options for students to graduate with honors--for those transferring in or those who discover themselves in their junior and even senior year.

Chris C. thanked Marsha for initiating changes to the honors program. She commented that the interdisciplinary aspects being incorporated look very interesting. She expressed a concern for the second-year course in reading that was listed on the handout, encouraging Marsha to talk with humanities faculty to learn of the more current trends in that field.

David V. commented about an idea to look at the graduate interdisciplinary programs, like RAP, and see about the possibility of reaching back to the undergraduate realm from those areas.

Anna B. expressed her excitement about the possibility of interdisciplinary seminars. These would be a good way to foster communication between departments. She and Marsha exchanged some comments concerning student learning outcomes for honors students and majors in general.

David Moser asked Marsha to comment on the service learning aspect. Marsha responded that she and her faculty council are still discussing service learning and are looking into various ways to implement it in a community the size of Fairbanks. They're also talking about enrichment experiences that are not necessarily service-oriented.

Debu commented about undergraduate research opportunities and suggested tapping into those for independent scholarship reasons. He gave the example of one of his students who has gotten a global research fellowship.

[The break was taken at this time.]

VI Discussion Item

A. Draft Motion re Capstone Experience, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 201/1)

Rainer commented on the purpose of the motion, emphasizing that it applies to baccalaureate programs, (not associates degrees), and provided some background on how it was crafted.

He also commented that the preferred model for making changes to the baccalaureate requirements (such as the capstone topic today) is to talk about proposed changes in a meeting, and have senators go back to their constituents for feedback. Voting, or potentially returning a proposal back to Curricular Affairs Committee, would take place at a future meeting.

He requested feedback from senators today with regard to whether or not they see any problems with requiring a capstone experience as part of a baccalaureate program.

David V. asked whether a student could take a capstone in another program (for example, General Studies) if their major didn't have a capstone. Rainer responded that the idea is for students to take a capstone in their major.

Diana D. asked who would decide what constitutes a capstone experience. Rainer responded that it would be the responsibility of each program to create it, in addition to assessing it (as the motion says).

Chris C. suggested adding "qualitative analysis" to quantification in the *Proposed criteria for Capstone Experience* section under the first bullet point.

Further discussion clarified that this capstone is distinctly separate from that of the Honors Program which had been talked about earlier. It was also clarified that adding the requirement of a capstone experience to a major degree program does not necessarily mean adding more courses. Having students produce a portfolio of their work was one example provided. Debu noted it's an integrative experience and can be tailored to each program.

Online discussion via the google discussion group was encouraged.

VII Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Chris Beks

Chris reported that in response to Debu's comments at their meeting regarding the common system calendar, they created an ad hoc committee to provide feedback on how staff would be affected. Generally, it seems staff think that this issue affects students and faculty more than staff. Staff Alliance (SA) will be giving some input on this topic as well. He briefly mentioned the task force that David V. is putting together at Faculty Alliance.

Chris described some suggested language changes to the furlough policy which have been submitted by Staff Alliance to university administration. There is a working group for the regulations which will accompany the policy and it includes SA members, also.

Changes were made to the annual leave cash-in program. UAF had some input into the process, but the other two universities did not. SA has asked the UA Summit Team how they can have feedback into the process of these types of changes which affect all three universities.

B. ASUAF – Mathew Carrick

No report was available.

C. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

No report was available.

D. UNAC – Tim Wilson
UAFT – Jane Weber

Tim reminded UNAC members that the union stands ready to assist with comprehensive fourth-year reviews, promotion and/or tenure reviews, and post-tenure reviews.

Jane reported that UAFT negotiations are still underway. With regard to JHCC news, the next phase of the wellness program will run from November 1 through April 30.

VIII New Business

A. Motion to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Marine Advisory Program, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 201/2)

Chris C. described the very minor changes made to the criteria. They were passed with no objections.

B. Motion to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 201/3)

Chris noted there were some discrepancies with the standard template for unit criteria, but these were resolved. No substantive changes were made to their criteria. The DMS unit criteria were passed with no objections.

C. Resolution endorsing Staff Council's Resolution re FY16 Capital Budget Request for Expanding Child Care (Bunnell House), submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women (Attachment 201/4)

Jane W. described the resolution which piggybacks on a recent Staff Council resolution, and asked for Faculty Senate approval.

Anna B. asked for clarification about the resolution and whether it applied to the early childhood program or the building. The Chancellor explained that the budget request is for a replacement facility that would be licensed to handle twice as many children as the current one. They're still working on the business plan for the childcare center, and part of the goal would be to handle an expanded age range of children as well. The need is there and is recognized.

Rainer asked what the effect of passing this resolution would be. Chancellor Rogers responded that the President has not made his final recommendations yet, and will bring those to the November Board of Regents meeting. The hope is that these endorsements from Staff Council and the Faculty Senate would help get a positive reaction from the President and the Board.

Julie C. asked about the nature of this budget item. The Chancellor explained that this is a line item in the capital budget request. In terms of the early childhood education lab school and increased staffing needs, this would also have an effect on the operations budget. But they would also realize some additional fees coming in from child enrollments in the program. Julie C. asked if the program is self-sustaining, but that wasn't known. The resolution was passed with no objections.

ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEM:

The agenda was amended at the beginning of the meeting to include time to play a video clip from the Faculty Alliance governance report made at the September Board of Regents meeting. It showed David V. making the report and the responses to it by various Board members. To provide context for the video clip, David noted that the FA report he provided to the regents followed other governance group reports, including a powerful and strongly-worded statement made by Monique Musick for Staff Alliance.
A link to the video clip is posted online at:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2014-15-fs-meetings/#201

After the video clip was played, Cécile noted that the President followed up with nine minutes of additional remarks. David briefly summarized those remarks and commented that he appreciated them because President Gamble recognized the commitment of governance groups to move forward, stating his support for the faculty before the BOR.

Cécile added that the President had participated in the many hours of discussion at the FA retreat, and he said this involvement had helped to educate him about the complexities of the issues and tasks. The clip demonstrates the mood at the BOR at this time. While we may have different ideas about shared governance, the truth is that the Board of Regents have the authority to act, even as the Chancellor noted in his remarks earlier. We need to find ways to work with them in this current climate. FA is trying to do that. They can always use help on various committees and tasks.

David V. added that Regent Anderson and he had talked afterward. Regent Anderson reiterated his concern about UAA's resolution which he saw as faculty arrogance which gets in the way of the Board's actions. David responded to him saying that if it comes to a head-butting contest between the faculty who are in charge of the curriculum at the three universities and the Board, then the university loses. They agreed they need to ensure that this doesn't happen.

Cécile asks what FA, and David as its chair, need from the faculty in terms of input and collaboration that would be helpful to the work being accomplished (and not undermine it). David responded that the fundamental rub is that each senate is empowered to act however they see fit. The Faculty Senates can and do communicate independently. However, the clearest way to have the voices of Faculty Senate heard effectively is to work together in concert with the FA. This is a much more powerful statement to the BOR than those made independently. The President has suggested that when individual senates come up with resolutions or ideas, to vet them through others and get some input and idea of how things may play out in terms of BOR support and votes. David also urged senators to be aware of opportunities to show faculty and programmatic successes to the Board and talk up our accomplishments.

Jon D. pointed out that over the years faculty senates have all had their run-ins with the Board. He stressed that the UAF Faculty Senate role should primarily focus on the curriculum at UAF. He does not think individual senates should be firing off resolutions to the Regents – that is the job of Faculty Alliance which is made up of the leaders of each of the senates and the past presidents. We're stronger together than we are apart. Keeping the message positive -- "Yes, but here are the challenges to be overcome…" and pulling together in the same direction -- are both necessary so that things don't get worse.

Anna B. shared her concern that the Board only seems to be concerning themselves with one constituency, the students. The mission of the university is much broader and it consists of multiple constituencies. It's not in the university's best interest to focus solely on one constituency. The focus needs to be on the mission of the whole. Where has our advocacy gone for the university as a whole?

David V. acknowledged Anna's point. He was opaque in his opening remarks to the BOR because he wanted them to know it was understood they were addressing student concerns which have been largely anecdotal and not clearly communicated to the faculty.

Georgina G. asked if there were data presented to support the concerns the Board has expressed. Cécile responded that some data have been presented, but it has changed over the last ten years, as the student body has also changed. Rainer pointed out that it's now at the point where the Board is really angry and

wants the faculty to do as they've been directed to do; it no longer matters whether they're in the right or the wrong.

Provost Henrichs said that over the years they've provided the BOR with data reports on lots of issues, including developmental education, transfer credit, and the number of students taking courses across the system which relates to the calendar alignment. They've seen copious amounts of data. But, they've identified several issues that they believe are extremely important, two of which are the alignment of the GERs, and the common calendar. As Rainer points out, the extent to which those are supported objectively by data probably could be argued about. What's hard to argue with is the constitutional authority of the Board of Regents.

Donie B. commented that she is struck by the fact that the Board seems very far down in the weeds and wanting to control things at a very high level of detail. How can we get them to move their focus?

The Chancellor noted there's a wide variety among systems around the country in terms of the level of detail that the Board is in. There are even legislatures that are mandating things like GERs in other states. They've tried to ensure that the Board stays at the policy level over the years, but members have varying levels of experience with large organizations. Those who have experience in large organizations more readily understand the challenges of a policy board getting down into the weeds. But others do not have that experience and thus it seems easier to tackle smaller issues than to try to address things from the hypothetical 30,000 foot level. He noted the long and detailed board agendas of the last couple of years, some upwards of a thousand pages.

Cécile urged those interested in continuing the discussion to go online to the Senate discussion group. Senators should also feel free to contact her or Debu with comments.

[Email address for the Faculty Senate discussion group is: UAF-FS-Discussions@alaska.edu]

IX Public Comment*

Kari Burrell of the Chancellor's Office shared information about the upcoming Arctic Day on November 13. The event will kick off Wednesday evening, November 12, with Alice Rogoff, publisher of the Alaska Dispatch News. She will speak at 6:30 PM at the Charles Davis Concert Hall. The next day there will be a poster session in the Great Hall, featuring projects that faculty are working on. There will also be a student resource fair with information about activities and classes. A town hall with Vice Chancellor for Research and Chancellor Rogers will be held. Contact Kari with any questions or to get involved with the events.

Note: Information may be found in the online Cornerstone at:
http://uafcornerstone.net/save-date-uaf-host-arctic-day-events-november/

Sine Anahita asked about the status of the department chair policy revision. She urged senators to talk with their constituents and not just department chairs.

David V. announced the search committee for the next Vice President of Academic Affairs and Research (VPAAR) has been constituted. The official job announcement will go public any day now. He has gotten the sense from statewide that an internal hire is preferred and consideration will be given to those who come from faculty ranks. He urged faculty to talk among their colleagues and encourage potential applicants.

The motion to adjourn was made at 3:11 PM.

X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

B. Committee Chair Comments

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 201/5)
Faculty Affairs – Chris Fallen, Chair (Attachment 201/6)
Unit Criteria – Chris Coffman, Chair (Attachment 201/7)
Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair
Core Review Committee – Leah Berman, Chair (Attachment 201/8)
Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair (Attachment 201/9)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair
Research Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair
Information Technology Committee – Rorik Peterson, Convener

XI Adjournment

*Comments from the public are welcomed. Any subsequent assignment of an issue arising from public comment to a Senate committee is made by the Faculty Senate President.

ATTACHMENT 201/1
UAF Faculty Senate #201, October 6, 2014
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

DRAFT MOTION regarding the proposed Capstone Requirement Effective Fall 2016

The Curricular Affairs Committee moves that the Faculty Senate make the following changes to the UAF baccalaureate requirements:

Each student must complete a capstone experience in the student's major or program, as described below. It will be the responsibility of each Department, Program, and (or) College/School to create, deliver, evaluate, and assess their capstone experience. Each Dean's office will have a copy of the capstone requirements for all programs in the school/college on file.

Rationale: This change is proposed in support of satisfying UAF's Learning outcome #4: *"Integrate and apply learning, including synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies, adapting them to new settings, questions, and responsibilities, and forming a foundation for lifelong learning. Preparation will be demonstrated through production of a creative or scholarly project that requires broad knowledge, appropriate technical proficiency, information collection, synthesis, interpretation, presentation, and reflection*."

Many UAF Departments and Programs currently have baccalaureate capstone experience requirements; the purpose of this change is to create a UAF-wide requirement. Hence, we envision this proposed change as not adding a significant burden to UAF faculty and students.

Proposed criteria for Capstone Experience

The Capstone experience will demonstrate students' ability to integrate a wide range of learning. Students will make connections among ideas, skills, and bodies of knowledge, and will synthesize and transfer their learning to new, complex areas of inquiry, products, or situations within or beyond conventional coursework. Specifically, the Capstone will:

- Require that students demonstrate the appropriate skill levels in communication and (as appropriate) quantification.
- Integrate learning from major requirements.
- Guide students through a project or experience relevant to their educational goals
- Provide a basis for evaluating student performance
- Be suitable as a potential means for assessing the major requirements

Proposed Instructional Objectives

The student will integrate and apply learning from multiple disciplines and skill sets.
The student will demonstrate an ability to contribute to existing bodies of knowledge, work in professional settings, and (or) create products relevant to the student's further educational, career and life goals.
The experience will demonstrate the student possesses intellectual and practical capabilities at a level expected of one receiving a baccalaureate degree from a major university.
Each student will complete a body of work as the culmination of the student's baccalaureate education

Course examples

NORS 484 W/O Seminar in Northern Studies: An interdisciplinary seminar focusing on topics relating to the North with emphasis on the physical sciences, the peoples, and the socioeconomic and political aspects of the area. Specialists in the various fields will assign readings and conduct discussions. Prerequisites: ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213X; junior standing; or permission of instructor. (3+0)

PS F499 W Senior Thesis: Thesis will draw from the literature in at least two sub-fields of political science (U.S. government/politics, political theory, public law, comparative politics, international relations) in its analysis. Prerequisites: ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213X; PS F101; PS F222; senior standing; permission of instructor. (1.5+0+7.5)

Non-course examples

Portfolio internship performance /exhibition participation in competition professional publication student teaching

ATTACHMENT 201/2
UAF Faculty Senate #201, October 6, 2014
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Marine Advisory Program.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The Unit Criteria Committee reviewed the unit criteria which were submitted by the Marine Advisory Program. The unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

****

UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY AND *MARINE ADVISORY PROGRAM* 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 MARINE ADVISORY PROGRAM (MAP). 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 Appointment and Evaluation Policies", Chapter IV. Exceptions to these requirements for initial placement in academic rank or special academic rank positions shall be submitted to the chancellor or chancellor's designee for approval prior to a final selection decision.

B. Academic Titles

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

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank

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

In accordance with the BOR policy on promotion and tenure, MAP agents and specialists typically have bipartite appointments. Bipartite responsibilities are to be clearly stated at the time of hire and can be any combination of two of the three tripartite missions, i.e., teaching, research, or service. A MAP faculty member can request a tripartite appointment in their employment contract if such a status is consistent with the goals of the Marine Advisory Program.

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.

MAP faculty members are designated at the time of hiring as either agents or specialists. An agent is a generalist that does not require concentration of their workload to a specific academic, research, or service discipline. Specialists concentrate their workload toward a specific academic, research, or service discipline as designated in their letter of appointment (examples are: Business Specialist and Fisheries Specialist). Workloads and evaluations are to be based on which of those two assignments the individual holds. A MAP faculty member may be granted a change of assignment based on his/her request and the needs of the program.

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

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

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

Bipartite Faculty

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

The dean or director of the relevant college/school, ***in consultation with the MAP leader,*** shall determine which of the criteria defined above apply to these faculty.

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

B. Criteria for Instruction

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

and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities.

MAP faculty may participate in formal teaching when the opportunity arises; however, standard academic teaching is not a common form of informational delivery in the Marine Advisory Program. Instruction often includes contact with clientele through distance delivery methods, workshops, seminars, training, public presentation events, and classroom teaching. A 10% (4 unit) teaching load in MAP is considered 45 to 50 hours of instructional activities.

Development and preparation of instructional materials such as workshop outlines, training syllabuses or lesson plans, handouts, slide presentations, displays, lecture materials etc. are also components of MAP instructional activities. Educational videos and/or other media produced for public education are also included.

Marine Advisory Program agents usually function as generalists by contributing breadth and diversity in their teaching efforts. Rurally located agents usually respond to requests to develop and/or teach discrete sessions, workshops, or short-term courses on subjects not typically available to rural Alaskans.

Specialists have a depth of topical knowledge and primarily focus on teaching technical information in their specialty area to clientele.

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.

   Teaching in the context of a MAP activity is generally defined as proactively planned and delivered instruction. MAP education activities are designed to deliver information relevant to specific clientele and public needs. Clientele may range from kindergarten to adults, and the general public to professionals.

   Effective teachers ***will demonstrate some, but not necessarily all, of the following characteristics in an individual year:***

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

   b. express positive regard for students, ***become familiar with their public***, develop good rapport with students ***and clientele***, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject;

   c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student ***and clientele*** participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are sensitive to student ***and clientele*** 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 ***addressing clientele and public needs*** and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design;

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

2. **Components of Evaluation**
Effectiveness in teaching will be evaluated through information on formal and informal teaching, course and curriculum material, ***instructional publications***, recruiting and advising, training/guiding students, etc., provided by:

a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms, ***and/or classroom evaluations, post-instruction surveys and/or student or clientele testimonials,***

and at least two of the following:

b. narrative self-evaluation,

c. peer/department chair/***other professionals*** classroom observation(s),

d. peer/department chair/***other professionals*** evaluation of course materials.

Systematic university approved student evaluations are not usually available or appropriately designed to evaluate MAP teaching activities. In addition, instruction by MAP faculty is often conducted in rural locations where evaluation by peers or department chair is not available. However, a means of evaluation appropriate to the instructional content should be administered by the principal instructor whenever possible.

Additional indices for documenting effective teaching for MAP faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure to <u>Associate Professor</u> may include:

a. Evidence that teaching addresses client-centered needs, as expressed by requests for courses and by client/student participation in those courses;

b. Evidence that the teaching is meeting specific, quantifiable instructional objectives through student evaluations or follow-up surveys;

c. Demonstration of changes in knowledge, skills and/or attitudes/behavior resulting from MAP information transfer through post instructional evaluations, surveys, and testimonials<u>;</u>

d. Clientele evaluations of both the instructional program and the instructor competence and effectiveness;

e. Testimonials and/or repeated invitations to teach;

f. Documentation of contact hours with clientele as an assessment of response effort;

g. Successful application of distance delivery of educational programming;

h. Evidence of successful teaching by development and application of innovative original teaching methods.

i. Successful mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students and participation, as member, in graduate student committees;

Additional indices for documenting effective teaching for MAP faculty seeking promotion to the rank of <u>Professor</u> include:

a. Clientele/student reviews and/or evaluations that show continued quality performance as a teacher,

and at least one of the following:

b. Development and/or adaptation of new methods and approaches in the discipline, such as:

i. Creative use of media and/or distance- delivery methods of instruction which extends the bounds of the discipline and improves educational outreach;

ii. New curriculum or program development that improves the information transfer in the faculty member's area of expertise;

c. Regional, statewide, national and/or international recognition as an expert as illustrated through invitations to and presentations at conferences, meetings, workshops, and trainings;

d. Receipt of state or national awards in recognition of outstanding teaching;

e. Recognition through invitational teaching opportunities;

f. Significant contribution in mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students and participation, as member, in graduate student committees.

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.

Many MAP faculty have limited opportunities to conduct traditional research and limited or no access to laboratories and graduate students. Additionally, bipartite faculty may or may not have a research obligation. Faculty without research obligation may conduct research in response to public needs, in this case these activities will be evaluated under service.

Marine Advisory faculty with research responsibilities in their bipartite or tripartite appointments are expected to conduct applied research or engage in other scholarly and creative pursuits that help solve issues facing the people of Alaska.

For MAP faculty, research, scholarly, and creative activities may consist of:

a. Applied research designed to address specific client needs;

b. Production of peer reviewed informational media; and

c. Publication of peer reviewed publications.

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, ***with results and impacts disseminated to appropriate academic and community audiences.***

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 ***and be relevant to Alaskan issues.***

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, 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 peers, juries, recognized artists, or critics.

e. Performances in recitals or productions, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.

f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.

g. Citations of research in scholarly publications.

h. Published abstracts of research papers.

i. Reprints or quotations of publications, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline.

j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.

k. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.

l. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.

Additional indices for documenting effective research, scholarly and creative activity for MAP faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure to <u>Associate Professor</u> include:

a. If research composed greater than 60% of a faculty members workload, authorship or co-authorship of a minimum of four (4) refereed publications are expected. These expectations are based on a workload of 60% effort in research and should be interpreted in the context of actual workload and adjusted accordingly,

and at least one of the following:

b. edit or referee articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations and MAP or Sea Grant publications,

c. adapt existing research-based technology or knowledge in order to solve problems relevant to Alaska,

d. participate in extramurally funded research projects.

Additional indices for documenting effective research, scholarly and creative activity for MAP faculty at the rank of Associate Professor and seeking promotion to the rank of <u>Professor</u> include:

a. If research composed greater than 60% of a faculty members workload, authorship or co-authorship of a minimum of eight (8) refereed publications are expected. The candidate must demonstrate sustained performance in research. These expectations are based on a workload of 60% effort in research and should be interpreted in the context of actual workload and adjusted accordingly,

and at least one of the following:

b. authorship, co-authorship, editor or co-editor of a book or major reference in the faculty member's area of scholarly activity,

c. recipient of a regional, national or international research fellowship or award,

d. participate in extramurally funded research projects in a leadership role (e.g. principal investigator or co-principal investigator),

e. introduce new technology, product, or idea which demonstrably improves the quality of life for Alaskans, and is a clear result of a MAP faculty member's activity.

D. Criteria for Public, University, 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."

A significant portion of the workload of MAP faculty will consist of service. In general, this will be higher than that found in traditional UAF faculty workloads and reflect the community or specific client needs approach of Marine Advisory Program educational activities.

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 advice to government or public committees.

c. ***Collaborations and partnerships with agencies, regional advisory boards, task forces, focus groups or public special interest groups to identify relevant issues and regional concerns.***

d. ***Active participation in constituency organizations.***

e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

f. ***Consulting in the faculty member's area of expertise and the discipline consistent with the obligation for public service.***

g. Prizes and awards, for excellence in public service.

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

i. Training and facilitating, ***at public fora, group meetings and public events.***

j. Radio and TV programs, newspaper articles and columns, ***MAP*** publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media ***including website designed and/or managed by faculty.***

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

l. ***Participation in K-12 educational programs.***

m. ***Assessing and/or responding to research needs of clientele and communicating those needs to the research community.***

n. ***Conducting research in response to public needs.***

o. ***Developing and managing effective community and agency partnerships, which extend MAP resources and/ or develop leadership skills.***

p. ***Representing and answering questions at public events.***

q. ***Site visits for problem solving and consultation.***

r. ***Rapidly responding to urgent client needs in a timely, flexible, and appropriate manner.***

s. ***Other service activities consistent with the School of Fisheries and Oceans Sciences to contribute to Alaska's coastal economy.***

2. University Service

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

a. Service on university, college, school, institute, or departmental committees or governing bodies.

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

c. Service as ***program leader or director***, department chair or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college/school, ***or program.***

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.

j. Prize and awards for excellence in university service.

k. Representing the University and/or MAP at public events including education displays, tradeshows, booths and exhibits.

l. ***Act as an outreach consultant on research projects conducted by other University faculty.***

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 ***regional, statewide,*** national or international review panel or committee.

4. **Evaluation of Service**

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

Additional indices for documenting effective service activity for MAP faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure to <u>Associate Professor</u> includes:

a. ***If service composed greater than 60% of a faculty members workload, creation or co-creation of at least twelve (12) individual service activities, including outreach publications, workshops, conferences, trainings, website development or other service activities. These expectations are based on a workload of 60% effort in service and should be interpreted in the context of actual workload and adjusted accordingly,***

and at least two of the following:

b. ***Presentation of applied research results to user groups such as public agencies, governmental bodies, private businesses, constituent groups, and lay public, both in published and oral forms.***

c. ***Quality and distribution of media presentations and public interviews, e.g., TV, radio, film, newspapers and videotapes.***

d. ***Evidence of response to new knowledge and developments in the discipline by rapidly raising public understanding and awareness through available educational media and methods.***

e. ***Results of individual consultations.***

f. ***Role and effort involved in the development and planning of conferences and workshops.***

g. ***Writing and distribution of MAP, School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, and Sea Grant publications.***

h. ***Documentation of service activities conducted on a continuing basis.***

i. ***Testimonials and letters demonstrating outcomes and/or effectiveness of service activities or other documentation which demonstrates the impacts of MAP faculty service activities.***

j. ***Documentation of public needs and response.***

k. ***Appropriateness of the response effort toward urgent clientele issues.***

l. ***Development and maintenance of partnership relationships.***

m. ***Appointments to public, university, and professional committees and any leadership role in committee assignments.***

n. ***Evidence of support provided to university faculty in their teaching, research, and/or service activities.***

o. ***Evidence of application of ~~applied research or~~ project results by the public.***

Additional indices for documenting effective service activity for MAP faculty at the rank of Associate Professor and seeking promotion to the rank of <u>Professor</u> includes:

a. ***If service composed greater than 60% of a faculty members workload, creation or co-creation of at least twenty-four (24) individual service activities, including outreach publications, workshops, conferences, trainings, website development or other service activities. The candidate must demonstrate sustained performance in service. These expectations are based on a workload of 60% effort in service and should be interpreted in the context of actual workload and adjusted accordingly,***

and at least two of the following:

b. Invitation to serve on national or international boards, review committees, award commissions or scholarship commissions.

c. Appointment or election to a leadership position on local, state, national, and international public service committees or organizations.

d. Engaged in profession and scholarly service activities on statewide, national or international level.

e. National leadership in a professional organization.

f. Recognition through invitational speaking engagements on topics that constitute public service.

g. Evidence of effective application of professional expertise to professional or public processes and organizations.

h. Service as committee chair. Session organizer, or officer of professional organizations.

i. Evidence of important contributions to the development of school, departmental, and/or university programs.

j. Recognition through receipt of public service awards, or awards for service to the university.

k. Receipt of a national association, government, or professional society service award.

l. Participation in a voluntary mentoring relationship with junior faculty to facilitate their progress toward promotion and tenure.

Revised April 10, 2014

ATTACHMENT 201/3
UAF Faculty Senate #201, October 6, 2014
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor's Approval

RATIONALE: The Unit Criteria Committee reviewed the unit criteria which were submitted by the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. With minor revisions, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

****

UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY AND *DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS* 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 ***DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS (DMS).*** ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS. ***THE DOCUMENT GOVERNS EVALUATION OF ALL UAF FACULTY WITH A PRIMARY LOCUS OF RESPONSIBILITIES IN DMS. IT IS NOTED THAT THESE CRITERIA MAY DIFFER FROM THOSE FOUND IN THE NATURAL SCIENCES UNIT CRITERIA. REGULATIONS IN THE NATURAL SCIENCES UNIT CRITERIA DO NOT APPLY TO DMS.***

CHAPTER I

Purview

The University of Alaska Fairbanks document, "Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," supplements the Board of Regents (BOR) policies and describes the purpose, conditions, eligibility, and other specifications relating to the evaluation of faculty at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF). Contained herein are regulations and procedures to guide the evaluation processes and to identify the bodies of review appropriate for the university.

The university, through the UAF Faculty Senate, may change or amend these regulations and procedures from time to time and will provide adequate notice in making changes and amendments.

These regulations shall apply to all of the units within the University of Alaska Fairbanks, except in so far as extant collective bargaining agreements apply otherwise.
The provost is responsible for coordination and implementation of matters relating to procedures stated herein.

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment

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

B. Academic Titles

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

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank

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

D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

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

E. Following the Selection Process

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

F. Letter of Appointment

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

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

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," Chapter IV, **AND DMS UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND INDICES** evaluators may consider, but shall not be limited to, whichever of the following are appropriate to the faculty member's professional obligation: mastery of subject matter; effectiveness in teaching; achievement in research, scholarly, and creative activity; effectiveness of public service; effectiveness of university service; demonstration of professional development and quality of total contribution to the university. **THE DMS RECOGNIZES THE VALUE OF ACADEMIC AND SCHOLASTIC DIVERSITY. AS SUCH, THE UNIT DOES NOT REQUIRE EACH CANDIDATE DEMONSTRATE EQUAL STRENGTH IN EACH AREA OF TRIPARTITE RESPONSIBILITY. CANDIDATES WILL BE RANKED IN EACH AREA BY THE DMS PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC). THE PRC CONSISTS OF ALL TENURED MEMBERS OF THE DMS. MEMBERS OF THE PRC WHO ARE ON SABBATICAL OR OFF CAMPUS FOR EXTENDED PERIODS HAVE THE OPTION OF PARTICIPATING, BUT THIS IS NOT REQUIRED. MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE MAY ABSTAIN FROM VOTING, BUT ONLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH DMS OPERATING PROCEDURES. CANDIDATES WILL BE RANKED IN EACH CATEGORY OF RESPONSIBILITY ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING SCALE: OUTSTANDING, SUPERIOR, SATISFACTORY, NEEDS IMPROVEMENT AND UNACCEPTABLE.**

THESE CORRELATE WITH CATEGORIES SOMETIMES USED BY THE UNIVERSITY WIDE COMMITTEE AS OUTLINED BELOW.

DMS		**UNIVERSITY WIDE**
OUTSTANDING	**=**	**EXCELLENT**
SUPERIOR	**=**	**VERY GOOD**
SATISFACTORY	**=**	**GOOD**
NEEDS	**=**	**SATISFACTORY**
UNACCEPTABLE	**=**	**UNSATISFACTORY**

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.

1. **TENURE. A CANDIDATE FOR TENURE WILL BE JUDGED ON THE BASIS OF PERFORMANCE AND INDICATIONS OF POTENTIAL IN ALL APPLICABLE AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY, WITH EMPHASIS PLACED ON THE INTERVAL SINCE THE LAST PROMOTION OR HIRE, WHICHEVER IS MOST RECENT. A CANDIDATE NEED NOT DEMONSTRATE EQUAL PERFORMANCE IN ALL THREE AREAS. IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR TENURE, A FACULTY MEMBER SHOULD HAVE DEMONSTRATED A SUSTAINED PERFORMANCE IN ALL THEIR AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY. WHILE THERE IS NO OBJECTIVE DEFINITION OF "SUSTAINED" NOR IS THERE ANY REQUIREMENT FOR ANY LENGTH OF TIME AT ANY PARTICULAR RANK, A TYPICAL CANDIDATE FOR TENURE SHOULD NORMALLY HAVE SERVED AT LEAST FIVE YEARS AT THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AT UAF OR ELSEWHERE. UNTENURED FACULTY SHOULD REFER TO THEIR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT AND INITIAL APPOINTMENT LETTER REGARDING MANDATORY YEAR OF TENURE REVIEW. A SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATE SHOULD ATTAIN AT LEAST A SATISFACTORY RATING IN TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE AND AT LEAST SUPERIOR IN TEACHING OR RESEARCH IN THE VOTE BY THE PRC AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION FOR TENURE.**

2. **ASSISTANT PROFESSOR. A FACULTY MEMBER AT THE ASSISTANT PROFESSOR LEVEL MUST HAVE AN EARNED DOCTORATE OR DEMONSTRATED EQUIVALENT. DEMONSTRATED EQUIVALENCE WILL BE DECIDED ON AN AD HOC BASIS BY THE PRC. THOSE WORKING AT THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR SHOULD DEMONSTRATE A COMMITMENT TO TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE.**

3. **ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR. IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR THIS RANK, A RECORD OF QUALITY INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH IS IMPORTANT. THOSE WORKING AT THIS RANK ARE EXPECTED TO DEMONSTRATE A CONTINUING DEDICATION TO RESEARCH, TEACHING AND SERVICE.**

4. **PROFESSOR. THIS IS THE GREATEST SINGLE HONOR THAT THE UNIVERSITY CAN BESTOW UPON A MEMBER OF ITS FACULTY. THE HONOR MUST THEREFOR BE MADE UPON CAREFUL CONSIDERATION OF THE CANDIDATE'S TOTAL DEMONSTRATED CONTRIBUTION TO THE UNIVERSITY AND THE MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES. THE HONOR IS RESERVED FOR THOSE WHO HAVE DEMONSTRATED OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE IN THEIR FIELDS, WHICH IS SUSTAINED OVER A SIGNIFICANT INTERVAL OF TIME. SPECIFICALLY, IN THE YEAR THE CANDIDATE APPLIES FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR, A VOTE WILL BE TAKEN BY THE PRC. A SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATE FOR PROFESSOR SHOULD ATTAIN AT LEAST A SATISFACTORY RATING IN TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE IN THE VOTE OF THE PRC. IF ONE OF TEACHING OR RESEARCH IS RANKED SATISFACTORY, THE OTHER MUST BE OUTSTANDING.**

Bipartite Faculty

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

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

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

B. Criteria for Instruction

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities. **THE DISSEMINATION OF IDEAS OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT RESTRICTED TO, STATISTICAL AND COMPUTING CONSULTING FOR STUDENTS; ASSISTING STUDENTS IN THE DESIGN OF EXPERIMENTS; DIRECTING UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE RESEARCH. FURTHER, IT INCLUDES PUBLICATION OF TEXTBOOKS THAT ARE PRINCIPALLY INTENDED FOR CLASSROOM USE.**

1. Effectiveness in Teaching

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

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

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. DEMAND HIGH PEDAGOGIC STANDARDS ESSENTIAL TO THE DEPARTMENT'S MISSION.

I. DEVELOP A TEXTBOOK THAT IS USED EXTERNAL TO UAF.

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). **THIS IS REQUIRED FOR UNTENURED FACULTY AND RECOMMENDED FOR FACULTY APPLYING FOR PROMOTION. THEY WILL BE REVIEWED BY THE PRC (THAT INCLUDES THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR). THIS COMMITTEE WILL SEND REPRESENTATIVES TO REVIEW CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE AS WELL AS SYLLABI AND SAMPLES OF GRADED MATERIAL. REPRESENTATIVES WILL WRITE A REPORT THAT INCLUDES A NARRATIVE PORTION AS WELL AS AN OVERALL RANKING OF TEACHING THAT USES THE SCALE: OUTSTANDING, SUPERIOR, SATISFACTORY, NEEDS IMPROVEMENT AND UNACCEPTABLE. WHEN A FACULTY MEMBER STANDS FOR TENURE, REPORTS FROM AT LEAST TWO YEARS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE FILE, PROVIDED THE FACULTY MEMBER HAS BEEN EMPLOYED AT LEAST THREE YEARS AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION FOR TENURE. IF THE CANDIDATE HAS BEEN EMPLOYED FOR AT LEAST ONE YEAR AT THE TIME OF APPLICATION FOR TENURE, THEN AT LEAST ONE REPORT FROM THE PRC SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE FILE. IN THE CASE OF DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN PEER OPINIONS AND STUDENT OPINIONS, THE FORMER WILL BE CONSIDERED TO BE MORE ACCURATE.**

d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials.

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. 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. **CANDIDATES AT ALL LEVELS MUST DEMONSTRATE ACHIEVEMENT CONDUCTING RESEARCH IN AN INDEPENDENT AND CREATIVE FASHION. WORK WILL BE JUDGED FOR IMPORTANCE, ORIGINALITY AND QUALITY. CONSIDERATION WILL INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE RESTRICTED TO, THE CANDIDATE'S PAPERS PUBLISHED IN REFEREED JOURNALS AND REFEREED CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS; PAPERS, LECTURES AND PRESENTATIONS DELIVERED; OTHER PAPERS AND TECHNICAL REPORTS; BOOKS, BOOK CHAPTERS, RESEARCH PROPOSALS, SOFTWARE DEVELOPED AND RESEARCH DONE THROUGH CONSULTING. THE WORK MUST BE PRESENTED IN A PUBLIC FORUM WHERE ITS CONTRIBUTION CAN BE JUDGED BY PEERS EXTERNAL TO UAF. AS SUCH, LITTLE CONSIDERATION WILL BE GIVEN TO RESEARCH THAT APPEARS IN NON-REFEREED PREPRINTS. NOR WILL WORK THAT IS DONE BY PRIVATE CONTRACTING BE CONSIDERED IF IT APPEARS ONLY IN INTERNAL COMPANY REPORTS. THE RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS FOUND IN A BOOK WILL BE BASED ON THE EXPOSITION OF NEW IDEAS. BOOKS THAT ONLY GATHER MATERIAL FOUND IN OTHER LOCATIONS WILL BE CONSIDERED TO BE EXPOSITORY AND NOT RESEARCH DOCUMENTS.**

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, these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.

c. Presentation of research papers before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.

d. Exhibitions of art work at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics.

e. Performances in recitals or productions, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.

f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.

g. Citations of research in scholarly publications.

h. Published abstracts of research papers.

i. Reprints or quotations of publications, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline.

j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.

k. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.

l. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.

M. RESEARCH RESULTS SHOULD BE MEASURED BY QUALITY, IMAGINATION, LONG TERM IMPACT, DEPTH AND ORIGINALITY. THE DEPARTMENT EXPECTS FACULTY WITH A 30% RESEARCH LOAD TO BE PUBLISHING AT A RATE OF APPROXIMATELY ONE PAPER PER YEAR. AT A 50% LEVEL OR ABOVE THERE SHOULD BE APPROXIMATELY TWO. HOWEVER, IT SHOULD BE EMPHASIZED THAT THIS IS ONLY AN APPROXIMATE GOAL. THE MORE IMPORTANT GOAL IS QUALITY RESEARCH. HIGH QUALITY RESEARCH CAN BE PRODUCED AND DISSEMINATED IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES AT A LOWER RATE. ACCORDINGLY, CANDIDATES SHOULD NOT TRY TO MEET A RESEARCH TARGET IN TERMS OF NUMBER OF PAPERS PUBLISHED. FURTHER, HEAVY PRODUCTION RATES OF LOW QUALITY PUBLICATIONS IS DISCOURAGED.

N. A CANDIDATE'S PUBLICATION AND FUNDING RECORD SHOULD BE COMPARED WITH INDIVIDUALS IN THE SAME OR RELATED DISCIPLINES. THE PRACTICE

OF LISTING COAUTHORS WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED LITTLE TO A PUBLICATION IS UNCOMMON IN THE MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES. EXCEPT IN UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES, EACH COAUTHOR WILL HAVE MADE A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION. COAUTHORS ARE OFTEN LISTED ALPHABETICALLY.

O. FOR DMS FACULTY CONDUCTING RESEARCH IN MATHEMATICS EDUCATION, APPROPRIATE RESEARCH PRODUCTS, IN ADDITION TO THOSE NOTED ABOVE, MAY ALSO INCLUDE DEVELOPMENT OF MATHEMATICAL CURRICULA THAT ARE INNOVATIVE AND BASED ON ORIGINAL RESEARCH. IN ADDITION TO JOURNALS INTENDED FOR THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY, DMS WILL ALSO VALUE PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS INTENDED FOR THE BROADER EDUCATION RESEARCH COMMUNITY. THIS INCLUDES JOURNALS DEVOTED TO TEACHER PREPARATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AS WELL AS A READING AUDIENCE OF EDUCATION POLICYMAKERS, TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

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

1. Public Service

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. It includes all activities which extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing, programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, professional contributions to the community or to one's discipline, or other activities in furtherance of the goals and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis.

Examples include, but are not limited to:

a. Providing information services to adults or youth.

b. Service on or to government or public committees.

c. Service on accrediting bodies.

d. Active participation in professional organizations.

e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

f. Consulting.

g. Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.

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

i. Training and facilitating.

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

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

2. University Service

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

a. Service on university, college, school, institute, or departmental committees or governing bodies.

b. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance 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 **OF FACULTY.**

j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

K. SERVICE AS OUTSIDE REVIEWER ON UAF THESIS COMMITTEES.

L. PREPARATION OF UNIVERSITY REPORTS.

M. CONSULTING WITH UAF FACULTY IN AND OUTSIDE DMS IN DISCIPLINE SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES THAT ARE NOT COUNTED AS RESEARCH (E.G. THAT DO NOT LEAD TO A COAUTHORED PUBLICATION).

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.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO, JOURNAL WORK, SERVICE TO NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, WORKING WITH TESTING ORGANIZATIONS TO DEVELOP STANDARDIZED EXAMS, EDITING FOR TEXTBOOK AND SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHERS, ORGANIZING CONFERENCES, DEVELOPING, ORGANIZING OR PRESENTING IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS, GIVING COLLOQUIUM LECTURES, REVIEWING PROPOSALS AND BOOKS. IT INCLUDES PRESENTATION OF EXPOSITORY MATERIAL INCLUDING EXPOSITORY TEXTS, WHICH ARE NOT PRIMARILY MEANT FOR CLASSROOM USE. OUTREACH TO EDUCATORS (E.G. OFFERING INSERVICE WORKSHOPS OR INSTITUTES FOR K-12 MATHEMATICS TEACHERS) IS ALSO APPROPRIATE PROFESSIONAL SERVICE FOR DMS FACULTY.

4. Evaluation of Service

Each individual faculty member's proportionate responsibility in service shall be reflected in annual workload agreements. In formulating criteria, standards and indices for evaluation, promotion, and tenure, individual units should include examples of service activities and

measures for evaluation appropriate for that unit. Excellence in public and university service may be demonstrated through, e.g., appropriate letters of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

RATIONALIZATION AND COMMENTARY

THE ABOVE PORTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS MEANT TO OUTLINE THE PROCESS AND INDICES OF EVALUATION. WHAT FOLLOWS BELOW ARE A FEW REMARKS MEANT TO GIVE SOME EXPLANATION TO THIS SCHEMATIC.

FOR PROMOTION TO THE LEVEL OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR A RECORD OF QUALITY INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH IS IMPORTANT. THE DMS RECOGNIZES THAT AT THE LEVEL OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, SERVICE IS SECONDARY TO TEACHING AND RESEARCH. THIS DOES NOT IMPLY SERVICE AT THIS LEVEL IS UNIMPORTANT. FACULTY NEW TO THE PROFESSION CAN PROFITABLY SPEND THEIR TIME ESTABLISHING A RESEARCH RECORD AND PERFECTING TEACHING TECHNIQUE.

DMS TAKES EXCEPTION WITH IDEAS FOUND IN CERTAIN QUARTERS ON SPECIFIC AND OBJECTIVE MEASURES OF IMPACT FACTORS. TO QUOTE FROM THE OCTOBER 2006 NOTICES OF THE AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY,

> **"PEOPLE MISUSE THE IMPACT FACTOR BECASE THERE ARE NO EXPLICIT PRINCIPLES GOVERNING ITS INTERPRETATION. THE IMPACT FACTOR IS USED TO MEASURE THE VALUE OF THINGS FOR WHICH IT WAS NEVER INTENDED (ARTICLES AND AUTHORS, FOR EXAMPLE), AND IT IS USED TO MAKE FAULTY COMPARISONS BETWEEN UNLIKE OBJECTS, INCLUDING JOURNALS THEMSELVES…FOR DECADES, SCHOLARS HAVE COMPLAINED ABOUT THE MISUSE OF THE IMPACT FACTOR, AND THERE IS EXTENSIVE LITERATURE OF SUCH COMPLAINTS AND ADMONITIONS. BUT IN A WORLD GONE MAD WITH AN OBSESSION TO EVALUATE EVERYTHING 'OBJECTIVELY', IT IS NOT SURPRISING THAT DESPERATE AND SOMETIMES INCOMPETENT EVALUATORS USE A POORLY UNDERSTOOD, BUT EASILY CALCULATED, NUMBER TO COMFORT THEM."**

DMS STRONGLY MAINTAINS THAT IN ADDITION TO ANY QUANTIFIED METRICS WE MUST ADD PERSONAL JUDGEMENT BY PRC AND OUTSIDE EVALUATORS. SCHOLARLY PEERS, SUBJECTIVE THOUGH THEY MAY BE, ARE THE BEST JUDGES OF QUALITY. MAKING SUCH DECISIONS IS HARD WORK BUT A NECESSARY RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH MEMBER OF THE PRC.

TO FURTHER UNDERSCORE THE ABOVE POINTS, WE QUOTE FROM A 2006 WHITE PAPER RELEASED BY THE AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY.

"MATHEMATICS IS OFTEN CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE PHYSICAL AND NATURAL SCIENCES, BUT ITS PUBLICATION PRACTICES DIFFER FROM THESE OTHER DISCIPLINES IN SEVERAL FUNDAMENTAL WAYS.

MATHEMATICIANS TEND TO PUBLISH AT RATES THAT ARE MODEST COMPARED TO SOME OTHER SCIENCES. THE MAJORITY OF MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH IS PUBLISHED IN REFEREED RESEARCH JOURNALS RATHER THAN CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS OR BOOKS. THE MATHEMATICAL LITERATURE IS SPREAD AMONG A WIDER COLLECTION OF JOURNALS THAN IN MOST RELATED FIELDS. AND, SINCE AN ARTICLE TYPICALLY REPRESENTS A MATURE TREATISE ON A MATHEMATICAL QUESTION, AND SINCE MATHEMATICS RESEARCH IS NOT CONSIDERED TIME-SENSITIVE, DELAYS IN PUBLICATION ARE COMMON.

EVEN SOME OF THE BEST YOUNG MATHEMATICIANS PUBLISH RELATIVELY FEW PAPERS. A STUDY OF THE 40 MATHEMATICIANS WINNING SLOAN FELLOWSHIPS IN 2005-2006 SHOWS THAT 70% PUBLISH AN AVERAGE OF TWO OR FEWER ARTICLES PER YEAR IN THE FIVE YEARS PRECEDING THEIR AWARD. THESE TWO GROUPS REPRESENT AN EXCEPTIONAL GROUP OF HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE MATHEMATICIANS.

OF THE 274 PUBLICATIONS BY THESE GUGGENHEIM FELLOWS, 75% WERE IN REFEREED JOURNALS. ONLY THREE PUBLICATIONS WERE BOOKS. IN FACT, OF ALL ITEMS COVERED BY MATHEMATICAL REVIEWS IN THE YEARS 2001-2005, FULLY 80% WERE FROM REFEREED JOURNALS.

WHEN JUDGING THE WORK OF MOST MATHEMATICIANS, THE KEY MEASURE OF VALUE FOR A RESEARCH PROGRAM IS THE QUALITY OF PUBLICATIONS RATHER THAN RATE. THE INFORMATION ABOVE ABOUT THOSE WHO HAVE WON PRESTIGIOUS AWARDS STRONGLY SUPPORTS THIS VIEW."

CERTAIN DISCIPLINES FOUND IN MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES HAVE LITTLE OPPORTUNITY IN THE WAY OF EXTERNAL FUNDING. ACCORDINGLY, THE ABILITY TO FIND FUNDING SPEAKS WELL FOR A CANDIDATE AT ANY LEVEL. HOWEVER, ABSENCE OF FUNDING MAY NOT NECESSARILY SPEAK AGAINST THE CANDIDATE. DMS DOES NOT CONSIDER THE FUNDING OF GRANT PROPOSALS TO BE THE GOAL OF ANY RESEARCH PROJECT. RATHER, WE FOCUS ON WHAT IS ACHIEVED WITH OR WITHOUT RESEARCH FUNDING.

TO SUMMARIZE, THE PRIMARY RESEARCH METRIC IS NOT NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS, NOR NUMBER OF CITATIONS, NOR QUANTITY OF GRANT MONEY. IT IS RESEARCH RESULTS AS MEASURED BY QUALITY, IMAGINATION, LONG TERM IMPACT, DEPTH AND ORIGINALITY.

FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE CULTURE OF MATHEMATICS AND DISTINCTIONS FROM OTHER ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES CAN BE FOUND AT:

http://www.ams.org/profession/leaders/culture/culture

ATTACHMENT 201/4
UAF Faculty Senate #201, October 6, 2014
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

RESOLUTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate endorses UAF Staff Council's Resolution 2014-252-1 in support of the FY16 UAF capital budget request to expand the Early Childhood Program (Bunnell House).

****

SC 252 - Approved

Resolution 2014-252-1

University of Alaska Fairbanks
Staff Council
Resolution 2014-252-1

The University of Alaska Fairbanks Staff Council unanimously approved the following resolution at Staff Council Meeting #252, on August 20, 2014.

Resolution 2014-252-1: Resolution Supporting the University of Alaska Fairbanks FY16 Capital Budget Request Titled "Expanding the Early Childhood Program (Bunnell House)"

WHEREAS in recognition of the summary finding of feedback received during the recent Staff Council "Better Place to Work" Survey: Expand on-site childcare, now;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that UAF Staff Council supports the University of Alaska Fairbanks FY 16 capital budget request titled "Expanding the Early Childhood Program (Bunnell House)" for $850 thousand in State Appropriations.

ATTACHMENT 201/5
UAF Faculty Senate #201, October 6, 2014
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee
25 August 2014 MINUTES 9 – 11 am Chanc Conf Rm

Present: **Brian Cook, Catherine Hanks**, **Cindy Hardy**, **Dennis Moser, Ken Abramowicz, Rainer Newberry**, **Rob Duke** (remote), **Todd Radenbaugh** (remote), **Doug Goering, Jayne Harvie, Alex Fitts, Carol Gering, Holly Sherouse**, **Libby Eddy**, **Jonathan Rosenberg**, **Leah Berman**

I. Introduction to the issues facing us today and this semester – rj newberry
Rainer spoke briefly concerning our committee's charge for the year: major modifications to the UAF's 'core',

II. Election of chair for Curricular Affairs and Curriculum Review committee
Rainer Newberry was elected to both positions

III. Attempt to set meetings day/time for semester:
We agreed to Wed afternoon 2 -3 pm, dates to be announced.

IV. Proposed statement to go to Fac Senate as part of their pre-meeting package and to be basis for short presentation & Discussion at Fac Senate Meeting (attachment 1)
Strategy: Divide Overall Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees into two parts
(a) General Education Requirements (='identical' at UAA, UAS, UAF)
(b) Baccalaureate Requirements (= unique to UAF)
This was approved with minor modifications. Those modifications are in current version
What to do with GERC? Leah agreed to serve as new chair. No decision was made.

IV. PROPOSED MOTIONS TO FAC SENATE

A. RESOLUTION: to approved changes in UA GER Regulations—to be supplied by Leah Berman. We approved this, sight unseen, and many regretted doing so. Will introduce instead at Senate meeting as a topic for discussion. The text is attachment #2.

B. MOTION
==========
The Curricular Affairs Committee moves that the Faculty Senate submit the following changes to the UAF baccalaureate requirements for a faculty vote of approval:

Each student must complete a capstone experience in the student's major or program, as described below. It will be the responsibility of each Department, Program, and (or) College/School to create, deliver, evaluate, and assess their capstone experience.

Rationale: This change is proposed in support of satisfying UAF's Learning outcome #4: *"Integrate and apply learning, including synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies, adapting them to new settings, questions, and responsibilities, and forming a foundation for lifelong learning. Preparation will be demonstrated through production of a creative or scholarly project that requires broad knowledge, appropriate technical proficiency, information collection, synthesis, interpretation, presentation, and reflection*."

Many UAF Departments and Programs currently have baccalaureate capstone experience requirements; the purpose of this change is to create a UAF-wide requirement. Hence, we envision this proposed change as not adding a significant burden to UAF faculty and students.

Proposed criteria for Capstone Experience
The Capstone experience will demonstrate students' ability to integrate a wide range of learning. Students will make connections among ideas, skills, and bodies of knowledge, and will synthesize and transfer their learning to new, complex areas of inquiry, products, or situations within or beyond conventional coursework. Specifically, the Capstone will:

- Require that students demonstrate the appropriate skill levels in communication and (as appropriate) quantification.
- Integrate learning from major requirements.
- Guide students through a project or experience relevant to their educational goals
- Provide a basis for evaluating student performance
- Be suitable as a potential means for assessing the major requirements

Proposed Instructional Objectives
The student will integrate and apply learning from multiple disciplines and skill sets.
The student will demonstrate an ability to contribute to existing bodies of knowledge, work in professional settings, and (or) create products relevant to the student's further educational, career and life goals.
The experience will demonstrate the student possesses intellectual and practical capabilities at a level expected of one receiving a baccalaureate degree from a major university.
Each student will complete a body of work as the culmination of the student's baccalaureate education

Course examples
NORS 484 W/O Seminar in Northern Studies: An interdisciplinary seminar focusing on topics relating to the North with emphasis on the physical sciences, the peoples, and the socioeconomic and political aspects of the area. Specialists in the various fields will assign readings and conduct discussions. Prerequisites: ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213X; junior standing; or permission of instructor. (3+0)

PS F499 W Senior Thesis: Thesis will draw from the literature in at least two sub-fields of political science (U.S. government/politics, political theory, public law, comparative politics, international relations) in its analysis. Prerequisites: ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213X; PS F101; PS F222; senior standing; permission of instructor. (1.5+0+7.5)

Non-course examples
Portfolio internship performance / presentation participation in competition professional publication
****

C. We discussed the two different motions we created last spring: one to approve the 'O/W→' and one to remove the 'O/W' altogether. After considerable discussion, it was agreed to find some compromise solution and to present that to the faculty senate for consideration at some later date. We need to present something to faculty senate, however, as a discussion item

DISCUSSION ITEM: WHAT TO DO WITH THE O/W requirement?

1. **GERC's proposal:** Replace the current requirement for 2 written-intensive and one oral intensive class with three courses marked 'C', that integrate several kinds of communication practices with upper-division content, typically in a student's major, as described below.

Draft Guidelines for 'C' courses Minimum criteria for course approval:
1. Explicitly address at least three of these objectives:
A. Students will be able to revise written work in response to instructor and peer feedback.
B. Students will be able to write effectively for diverse audiences.
C. Students will be able to recognize and navigate the concepts, genres, and conventions of the course discipline.
D. Students will be able to select appropriate writing technologies to collaborate in personal, professional and civic relationships.
E. Students will be able to listen effectively and respond effectively to communication practices in the course.

2. At least 50% of the grade must come from assignments utilizing the types of writing and combination of written and non-written forms of communication most appropriate to disciplinary needs and standards and course content. Non-written forms of communication may include, but are not limited to: oral presentations, discussions, training, videography, podcasting, or performance.

3. Provide guided and prompt feedback and opportunities for student revision on student projects, presentations, and papers.

4. In addition to written and spoken communication, address other forms of communication in the course discipline, such as reading and listening and multimodal, digital, or visual communication.

5. Address and practice accurate and ethical referencing/citation practices of source material as it pertains to source authority, academic honesty, and personal credibility.

6. Faculty must have attended a training workshop, to be offered every semester

---

Notes concerning the proposed requirement:

1. The ultimate rules for 'C' courses are not yet fixed; these are the proposed rules and are included to give faculty members a better understanding of what the 'C' courses would likely entail.
2. Based on the above, all existing O and W courses would need to be revised and reviewed to qualify for 'C' status. None would automatically become 'C' courses.
3. It is not clear how current W,O or W, $O_{½}$ courses would fit into this scheme. Would they become C2, C^2, or simply be counted as 'C'?
4. At this time a majority of Curricular Affairs Committee members do not favor this proposal.

2. Alternative Suggestion

"Replace the current requirement for two written-intensive and one oral-intensive class with a requirement that all baccalaureate degrees contain a communication element integrated within the upper-division course requirements. The School/College/Program/Department (i.e., hereafter referred to as the applicable unit) in control of each degree is responsible for creating a specific list of communication objectives for each degree and implementing a plan to integrate appropriate communication components within the degree course requirements. The applicable unit shall also create appropriate assessment criteria, collect and review relevant assessment data, and take appropriate actions to close-the-loop in the assessment process. The applicable unit will report on communication actions in a separate section of the report filed as part of the regular UAF program review process."

3. What CAC is in the process of doing: trying to find some middle ground between complete deregulation of O/W and the proposed 'C'. Will take some months.

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY AT THIS TIME

GERC PROPOSED addition to Baccalaureate Requirements

Each student must take one course with each of these attributes:

(E) Civic Engagement (3 credits)
(A) Alaska and the Circumpolar North (3 credits)
(D) Intercultural Competence and Diversity (3 credits)

Courses taken to satisfy these (E, A, D) requirements may also satisfy any other baccalaureate requirements.

Total credits to meet this requirement: 9 credits

Total credits in addition to the GER necessarily required to satisfy this requirement: 0 credits

---

Explanatory Notes

(E) attribute courses will offer coursework and/or experiential learning opportunities that enhance students' understanding in at least one of the following areas: civic identity and commitment, civic communication, civic action and reflection, and civic contexts and structures. These courses will include either direct civic engagement (e.g. a service learning project) with an academic reflection on the experience; address multiple ethical frameworks that inform relationships within and among communities; or explore how historical contexts, issues and developments shape human conflicts and interdependencies from local to global and inform the search for possible solutions to contemporary social problems

(A) attribute courses include topics such as Alaska/northern ecosystems and/or climate change; indigenous peoples, languages and world views; intercultural relations and politics in Alaska and the Arctic; economic development, industry, engineering challenges, and their relation to the environment in the north; natural resources and systems. Courses with this attribute address Alaskan and circumpolar issues as a substantial component of the course and have at least 50% of the readings and assignments of the course devoted to topics relating to Alaska and the circumpolar North.

(D) attribute courses will place social justice in historical and political context; enable students to articulate insights into their own cultural rules and biases; demonstrate a complex understanding of the complexity of the history, values, politics, beliefs, and practices of other cultures; interpret intercultural experiences from more than one worldview; and articulate a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and non-verbal communication. Courses in this category may focus on differences among people in the United States and/or on understanding contemporary issues from a global perspective or understanding cultures and societies different

from those in the United States. Such courses explicitly address at least two of the instructional objectives listed above; address issues of race, ethnicity, gender and sexual identity, and other markers of cultural difference as a substantial component of the course; emphasize the cultural interactions between the Western and non-Western worlds, and/or the interplay between various identity groups within the United States; and have at least 50% of the readings and assignments of the course devoted to topics relating to diversity and intercultural competence.

- Students will be provided with lists of courses with these attributes and such courses will also be indicated in their catalog descriptions. Faculty Senate committees will determine whether a course should have a certain attribute based on the above criterion.
- These requirements should not necessitate taking additional credits to satisfy a student's common baccalaureate requirements, although depending on the choices, the courses could increase that total.
- Majors are not required to offer courses marked A, E, or D.
- It is intended that foreign languages, Alaska Native or American Sign Language, and many Study Abroad programs will satisfy the D requirement.

****

Rationale:

The purpose of this change is to satisfy UAF's General Education Learning Outcome 3:
"Acquire Tools for Effective Civic Engagement in local through global contexts, including ethical reasoning, intercultural competence, and knowledge of Alaska and Alaskan issues. *Facility will be demonstrated through analyses of issues including dimensions of ethics, human and cultural diversity, conflicts and interdependencies, globalization, and sustainability*."

****

Why only a discussion item at this time:

The intention of GERC is that a baccalaureate student **could** satisfy the A, D, and E requirements through taking designated Arts/Humanities/Social Science (and possibly Natural Science) courses while satisfying the BOR 34 credit GERs. (They could also satisfy the requirement by taking courses in addition to the 34 minimum if desired, but the intention is to **not add to the credits** required for baccalaureate degrees). BA students can easily take additional courses with A, D, and E attributes without being overloaded with credit requirements because the B.A. also requires an additional '18 credits of social science and humanities courses'. However, other baccalaureate programs do not have the same flexibility.

Based on responses to the GERC proposal, a requirement for adding A,D, and E attributes is only acceptable to schools/colleges with non-B.A. baccalaureate programs IF the attributes can be incorporated within the 34 credit 'General Education Requirements'. However, requirements for the attributes (e.g., ' have at least 50% of the readings and assignments of the course devoted to topics relating to Alaska and the circumpolar North') seemingly violate the **current restriction** of acceptable GER social science courses to "broad survey courses"). Further, how do we coordinate with UAA and UAS concerning this addition to the requirements for acceptable GER courses?

In sum, although an A, D, E attribute requirement could be put in place and certainly courses outside of the 34 General Education Requirement credit could be so designated, it's not clear how we can go about incorporating the attributes into the 34 'unified UA General Education' credits. For example, one possible solution is for UAA and UAS to add A, D, and E attributes to their GER courses. Of course, they'd have to agree to do so.

Although the majority of Curricular Affairs Committee members do not favor the motion, we offer it to the Faculty Senate out of respect to the GERC sub-committee of CAC.

Curricular Affairs Committee
Weds 3 Sept 2014 MINUTES 2-3 pm Reich 300

PRESENT: Brian Cook, Catherine Hanks, Cindy Hardy, Joan Hornig, Ken Abramowicz, Rainer Newberry, Rob Duke (remote), Todd Radenbaugh (remote), Jayne Harvie, Alex Fitts, Carol Gering, Holly Sherouse, Libby Eddy, Linda Hapsmith, Caty Oehring

I. Minutes of Previous meeting (Aug. 25) were approved

II. Confirmed meetings: alternate Weds, time changed from 2-3 to 3-4 pm Reich 300

III. Review of results from last Friday's AdComm meeting

A. Presentation of proposed changes in Univ Regs RE

These were approved, but we agreed that they shouldn't move forward until each proposed change is justified and the effects of the change be clearly spelled out.

B. Adcomm felt that 'capstone' motion was too much but…good opportunity to discuss 'faculty as a whole' vs. 'fac senate' votes for various proposals.

No one was opposed to the notion of taking each change through the faculty senate and not having a vote of the faculty as a whole. However, the proposed procedure would be: introduce the proposed change at one meeting and then vote at the next (or subsequent).

IV. New business: moving forward on finding middle ground between O/W or C and complete deregulation

Cindy has agreed to chair a subcommittee dedicated to finding solutions

Discuss problems with W/O and how not fixed by C

ATTACHMENT 201/6
UAF Faculty Senate #201, October 6, 2014
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes: Tuesday, September 2, 2014
10:00 AM, IAB Library, Room 311-C Irving Building, UAF

Present: Elizabeth Allman, Chris Fallen, Galen Johnson, Julie Joly, Leslie McCartney, Walter Skya, David Valentine

Absent: Bella Gerlich (Ex officio)

Proceedings:
Julie Joly convened the meeting.
This committee deals with anything to do with faculty life that does not fall under another committee. Sometimes issues cross between this committee and the unions.

Old Business:
Last year this committee dealt with:

1. Promotion and tenure of term employees (a separate committee work on this);
2. Interdisciplinary projects (a separate committee work on this) ;
3. Geographic salary differences (the Senate passed the FAC resolution in favor of updated geographic differentials);
4. Department Chair Policy remains outstanding and needs to be addressed this year.

New Business:

1. The Administrative Committee has requested that all committees review their by-laws and amend if necessary. By-laws can be found on the Faculty Senate website;
2. A report about joint appointment s has been written; review report and discuss at our next meeting Perhaps have Bill Bristow to our next meeting to review as he was Chair of the Joint Appointments Committee.

Elections:
Julie nominated Chris to be Chair the committee, seconded by Walter, unanimous vote to elect.

Other Business:
Leslie mentioned that some newer faculty was reluctant to sign the petition regarding the President's bonus as they fear it could affect their ability to obtain tenure. There are policies in place so this will not happen but the committee was unsure how or if they are enforced.
David mentioned the idea of a faculty regent has been discussed; the Governor appoints all regents.
Meetings will be monthly.
Doodle Poll to be created to set next meeting date.

Meeting concluded at 10:15 AM.

ATTACHMENT 201/7
UAF Faculty Senate #201, October 6, 2014
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes for Tuesday, April 22, 11:30-12:30, RASM 502

Attendance in Person: Chris Coffman, Christine Cook, Steve Sparrow
On-line: Mark Conde (signed off at 12:31), Debu Misra (added late after Math criteria discussion),
Absent: Cathy Winfree, Torie Baker, Leif Albertson, Javier Fochesatto

Visitors: John Gimbel (Math and Stats Department); Josh Greenberg (SNRAS)

I. Housekeeping

A. Approval of Agenda - approved

B. Approval of Minutes from 4/8/14 Meeting. See attachment. - approved

II. Continued Discussion of Committee Bylaws postpone to the next meeting due to no quorum (there was a quorum for a short while, but the group was unable to vote on anything at that time)

See attachment:
- Proposed Bylaws.

III. Department of Mathematics and Statistics: Proposed Unit Criteria

Generally speaking, these criteria need to be proofread carefully against the Blue Book/Provost's template and also checked by the peer unit for errors in grammar, usage, and formatting. Some examples are noted below but the unit is responsible for proofing the entire document again before resubmission.

See attachment: Mathematics and Statistics Unit Criteria
- Question: What are the reasons for different categories versus university wide criteria (p. 4); Answer: since they are not set in stone by University wide, the Math faculty want them to be set; Math was originally set first and the University wide changed; good and satisfactory categories confuse people – no one understands the distinction, so wanted clarification
- Page 8 – change (THAT INCLUDES THE DEPARTMENT HEAD). To Department Chair
- Items that are italicized also need to be in boldface and in all caps (anything that was added needs to have that template format) – make sure to keep boldface if it was that way in the template; For example, on page 4 the heading is no longer in boldface, and the PERIODIC EVALUATION OF FACULTY should also be in boldface, but not be in all caps

- Page 8 – instead of a capital H and capital I it should be lowercase to keep with format; but it was pointed out that since all added information should be in capitals, it was determined that for now leave as is (not substantive change)
- Page 10 - Exhibitions of art work at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by PEERS, juries, recognized artists, or critics. (make **PEERS** in bold)
- Page 10 – section f was added (Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.) – should go at the end of the list; f should now be m, and then fix to re-align lettering

IV. School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences / Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station: Proposed Unit Criteria
See attachment:

- Natural Resources / Agriculture and Forestry Unit Criteria

Generally speaking, these criteria need to be proofread carefully against the Blue Book/Provost's template and also checked by the peer unit for errors in grammar, usage, and formatting. Some examples are noted below but the unit is responsible for proofing the entire document again before resubmission.

Question about merger: right now School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences and Coop Extension will remain using separate unit criteria; Currently the SNRAS will be held to these standards as those from Coop Extension will not be merged at this point;
Question: will it be clear which criteria will apply to which people – particularly regarding new hires? Answer: It will depend on where they are housed and their primary duties – it will be worked out on an individual basis; unsure if this needs to be addressed in this document; possibly a clarification in the preamble; Josh believed it may make a bit more confusing, but should be cleared later; Can review the criteria again at any time and clarify once the faculty in the unit are more clear on how the merger will play out in unit criteria
Page 4: Professor: major contributions to the instructional program are expected. These contributions may include (but are not limited to) excellent classroom teaching as demonstrated by teaching evaluations, major improvements in course and/or curriculum offerings, upgrading of instructional techniques, ability to motivate and/or inspire students. must provide evidence of excellence in training and mentoring of graduate students for faculty in programs that grant graduate degrees. Pointed out that several sentences are starting with a lowercase letter versus a capital; also that some are not complete sentences; Josh feels instead of a period after student it should be a comma; but question remains as to who should provide evidence? Will look at rewording that section; Also, look at the word evidence – sometimes it is capitalized and sometimes it is lowercase; be consistent throughout the sections (assistant professor, associate professor, professor)
Page 5: this is a fundamental obligation (need to capitalize this)
Page 7: look again at assistant professor, associate professor, and professor – the language looks like a bulletized list versus a complete sentence structure; need to check on capitalization pieces and needs some cleaning up; also the clarity in associate professor must have established a research program that produces original publications in the peer-reviewed or editorial board reviewed, literature (look at the comma use); next

sentence needs a subject demonstrated record of presentation of research results at professional meetings, submission of research proposals, and acquisition of external research funding.
Page 10 has similar issues
Technical issues on compliance with the template; page 3, 1c – semicolon instead of colon; top of page 4 there is a formatting aspect – wording duplicates what was done on letter f (remove duplication and put new wording in section f including web-based materials and distance-delivery teaching.); Page 4 – formatting is off and the margins should be aligned; Page 4 Demonstrate through (thorough) understanding of UAF and SNRAS academic requirements; page 4 i. Demonstrate effective service as major advisor or member of senior thesis and graduate committees. (How is it demonstrated? Being successful is the criteria)
All language added by the unit has to be in boldface caps – sometimes it is underlined instead; will look at provost template and put back into compliance
Page 6: item 2a – language in boldface underline – photographs was left off (be sure to make it all boldface caps); also inconsistent indentation; electronic journals, interactive electronic publications, maps, photographs
Page 2: check on template; chapter III needs to conform to template; III. Periodic Evaluation of Faculty
Page 7: D. Criteria for Public and University Service and professional service; seems a change of intent versus just an addition – change to the template (take out the underline); Josh said they changed it to match the subsequent material; would appear odd if kept in the professional service and did not add to the heading; concern with difference between university, public or professional service – seems implied in the header; section 3 is in the template, so it is not an addition; need to keep the section in there
Page 8 (starts on 7 – 1 Public service) – added wording to the template and then had a spacing issue; bring back up to the end of the paragraph Examples include, but are not limited to:
Page 8: check bulleted list format issue
Page 8: item f, need to return unpaid consulting to original template; take out underline and bold; **Unpaid consulting**
Page 8, check m and o for formatting; end period and comma (i.e., tours,**.)**
Page 9, 3b, check formatting

Consider change to the blue book language to make the header consistent with the 3 sections: Criteria for Public and University Service and professional service (3 sections underneath have all three

Mark dropped off meeting (12:31pm)
Adjourned at 12:35pm

UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes for Tuesday, May 6, 11:30-12:30, Kayak Room

Attendance in Person: Chris Coffman, Christine Cook
On-Line: Debu Misra (needed to leave at 11:55am), Cathy Winfree

Absent: Leif Alberton, Torie Baker, Mark Conde, Javier Fochesatto, Steve Sparrow

Visitors: Alex Oliveira (Marine Advisory Program)

I. Housekeeping

A. Approval of Agenda

B. Approval of Minutes from 4/22/14 Meeting. See attachment.

II. Continued Discussion of Committee Bylaws

See attachment:
- Proposed Bylaws.

III. Department of Mathematics and Statistics: Proposed Unit Criteria

See attachment:
- Mathematics and Statistics Unit Criteria

IV. Marine Advisory Program: Proposed Unit Criteria – Alex present from MAP
Summary of process: make sure the document conformed to the criteria template; all the new changes are in red text to make the new document conform to the template (Chris reviewed and felt it was in compliance with the template); the second step was to look at all the text in bold/italics that had been made and approved by the senate 5 years ago and then made changes that were approved by all members of the MAP program – basic point is to add metrics for evaluation for promotion and tenure to associate professor and professor

See attachment:
- Marine Advisory Program Unit Criteria

Page 2: Minimum degree, experience and performance requirements are set forth in "UAF ~~Faculty Policies~~ Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies", - original one had been 5 years ago, and based on the template back at that time
Page 5: 1. **Effectiveness in Teaching** (the paragraph is split up and needs to be in one uniform paragraph as in the template)
All changes need to be in boldface italics so as not to create confusion
Example on page 5: ***Teaching in the context of a MAP activity is generally defined as proactively planned and delivered instruction*** (although in boldface italics, it is not in CAPS)
Page 11: **D. Criteria for Public, University, and Professional Service** (recall discussion from the last meeting; recommendation to change the header as it has come up with other unit criteria aspects in the past); to make it in-line with the template, the heading for item D needs to conform to the template (take out and Professional)
Page 12: ***Collaborations and partnerships with agencies, regional advisory boards, task forces, focus groups or public special interest groups to identify relevant issues and regional concerns.*** (different than the accrediting bodies – add a bullet for the comments posted, but keep the accreditation information)

Page 12: ***Consulting in the faculty member's area of expertise and the discipline consistent with the obligation for public service.*** (Consulting should not be italics as it was in the original template)
Page 14 and top of page 16: ***Additional indices for documenting effective service activity for MAP faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure to Associate Professor includes:*** (should say include)

Do not see any substantive changes, and only see these minor edits; complete edits and turn in to Jayne and Chris as soon as possible to have committee review and approve as early as possible in fall

Alex had a question regarding on page 14 – added language under number 4 ***invitations to participate at clientele meetings, conferences, and workshops*****,** clarifying that it should be in all caps

Chris recommends that now that it has been reviewed that all writing should be converted into black to turn it back in; Alex wanted to make sure that all the strike-through should also be removed, and Chris agreed; Composition of committee will be changing next year, and Chris does not anticipate any problems in the fall, but wanted to make her aware of the change

Meeting closed at 12:04pm

ATTACHMENT 201/8
UAF Faculty Senate #201, October 6, 2014
Submitted by the Core Review Committee

Core Review Committee
Minutes from September 9th, 2014 Meeting:

Voting Members:
Jennifer Schell, Brian Kassof, Kevin Sager, Larry Duffy, Leah Williams, Tyson Rinio, Yelena Matusevich, Anthony Rickard

Non-Voting Members:
Caty Oehring, Gabrielle Russell, Holly Sherouse, Ginny Kinne

1. Selection of Chair:
   The committee attempted to select a chair. No one was willing to serve in this capacity. Many members cited teaching conflicts with Faculty Senate/Administrative Committee meetings.

2. Meeting Time:
   The committee selected the regular meeting time of 4:00pm-5:00pm on Tuesdays, with next meeting to take place on September 23rd.

3. Petitions:
   The committee reviewed ten core course petitions. The committee was concerned about the number of petitions regarding the W requirement.

4. Application of AP and CLEP scores to core requirements using the new non-UA PHC transfer guidelines:
   Caty Oehring explained the issue to the committee, which expects to discuss it more at the next meeting.

ATTACHMENT 201/9
UAF Faculty Senate #201, October 6, 2014
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for September 15, 2014

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm.

II. Roll call and Introduction of Committee Members

Present: Bill Barnes, Diana DiStefano, Cindy Fabbri, Andrea Ferrante, Mark Herrmann, Brian Himelbloom, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Channon Price, Amy Vinlove
Excused: Trina Mamoon, Leslie Shallcross

III. Introduction to the FDAI Committee Mission and to Expected AY14/15 Activities

After reading the committee's Mission Statement, Franz directed our new members to the Faculty Senate webpage to read about last year's activities for FDAI. Franz explained that the committee interfaces with groups that facilitate faculty development activities such as the Office for Faculty Development that Joy Morrison directs, and eLearning and Distance Education. He also explained that creating and revising the FDAI's Mission Statement was part of our work last year. Faculty Senate will address all the committees' proposed mission statements soon by either approving or recommending revisions where there may be overlap amongst the various committees.

Franz briefed new members on the committee's work regarding electronic course evaluations and informed us that UAF has signed a one-year contract with eXplorance/Blue. Now UAF must develop a new course evaluation form since the questions on the old IAS forms are copyrighted. We could go with a similar form but many faculty have expressed unhappiness with the "old" questions. A subcommittee will most likely be formed through Faculty Senate that will include members of the FDAI committee as well as other people to create a new evaluation form for UAF. This subcommittee will likely report to FDAI at our monthly meetings. Franz will keep us informed of when this subcommittee will be formed and asked for volunteers. Duff, Kelly, Andrea and Franz himself all volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

In addition to creating a new form, UAF must prepare for running a course evaluation trial in spring 2015 (this fall we will still use the old IAS paper forms for course evaluations). Only a few courses will pilot the electronic evaluations. Most likely the aforementioned subcommittee will be active in this phase as well.

IV. Election of Committee Chair, Co-chair, and Note Taker

Franz explained that our committee should have a Co-chair for times when the Chair is traveling and unable to attend FDAI or Faculty Senate meetings. He also explained that the Co-chair does not need to be a Faculty Senator, just the Chair. After some volunteering of names, discussion, and acceptance of the nominations, we decided on the following:

Chair: Franz Meyer
Co-chair and Note Taker: Kelly Houlton
Alternate Note Taker: Channon Price

V. Upcoming Activities of the UAF Office for Faculty Development (Report from Joy)

Joy informed us that the Office for Faculty Development has been removed from the list of possible program eliminations. She was able to show that there is very little overlap between the offerings of OFD (mainly academic and teaching development), OIT (mainly technology training), and eLearning and Distance Education (mainly using technology to teach by distance and instructional design). We were very glad to hear this good news!

This year there has been one big change for the OFD in that UNAC has changed how their travel funds are allocated. The money now goes to the Provost's Office and four people (two from UNAC and two from the Provost's Office) will determine which applicants receive travel funding. The availability of the funds has not yet been announced, so travel for September will not be funded.

Joy reports that all of the Faculty Learning Communities begun last year are continuing this year except for one. Most people wanted to continue to meet and have added some new members. Joy asked that if we know anyone with an idea for a new FLC, please send them her way so it can be considered for next year.

Joy noted that the New Faculty Orientation was a great success and included two optional trips to Denali Park. She also informed us of some upcoming workshops and development opportunities: 1) Walter Crary, the new Veteran's Service Officer, will present a workshop for all faculty working with student veterans; 2) Academic Advising has new advisor training on their website (note: their website is being revamped, as is OFD's, so the link to the advisor training is not yet there); 3) a Mentoring Luncheon is planned; and 4) there will be a luncheon for people interested in learning more about Fulbright Scholarships.

VI. Discussion on Adding Ex-officio Member from eLearning and Distance Education to Committee

After some discussion, we all agreed that having an ex-officio member from eLearning and Distance Ed would be very helpful in keeping up with their faculty development offerings. Franz will approach them to see if they are interested in appointing a representative to serve on the FDAI Committee. If so, we will vote on adding another ex-officio member at our next meeting as this will change our by-laws.

VII. Other Business: Scheduling Upcoming FDAI Meetings

We found that Mondays from 3 – 4:00 pm will fit most committee members' schedules. Joy stated that our meeting area (Bunnell 222) is also available at that time. Our meetings for fall 2014 will be as follows:

Monday, 10-13-14
Monday, 11-10-14
Monday, 12-8-14

VIII. Upcoming Events

a. Next Administrative Committee meeting: 9-26-14
b. Next Faculty Senate meeting: 10-6-14
c. Next FDAI meeting: 10-13-14 at 3:00 pm

IX. Adjourned at 3:47 pm (Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.)