DRAFT MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #176
Monday, September 12, 2011
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I   Call to Order – Catherine Cahill
      A.   Roll Call

Members Present:	Members Present (cont'd):	Others Present:
Abramowicz, Ken	Newberry, Rainer	Doug Goering
Alexeev, Vladimir	Ng, Chung-Sang	Pete Pinney
Arendt, Anthony	Radenbaugh, Todd (audio)	Linda Hapsmith
Baek, Jungho	Renes, Sue	Joy Morrison
Baker, Carrie	Reynolds, Jennifer	
Barboza, Perry	Short, Margaret	
Bret-Harte, Donie	Weber, Jane	
Brown, Stephen (audio)	Winfree, Cathy	
Cahill, Cathy	Members Absent:	
Davis, Mike (audio)	Bandopadhyay, Sukumar	Guest Speaker:
Fallen, Chris (Don Morton)	Jones, Debra	Kris Racina, HR Director
George-Bettisworth, Retchenda	Valentine, David	
Golux, Stephan	Zhang, Xiong	
Gustafson, Karen	Non-voting/Administrative	
Healy, Joanne	Members Present:	
Henry, David	Brian Rogers	
Himelbloom, Brian (audio)	Susan Henrichs	
Horstmann, Lara	Dana Thomas	
Jensen, Karen	Jon Dehn, Past President	
Johnston, Duff	Mike Earnest	
Jolie, Julie	Jordan Titus	
Lardon, Cecile	Pips Veazey	
Lawlor, Orion	Mari Freitag	
Mathis, Jeremy (audio)	Robert Kinnard	
McEachern, Diane (audio)		
Metzger, Andrew	Committee Reps:	
Meyer, Franz	Josef Glowa	
Moses, Debra	Latrice Laughlin	
Nadin, Elisabeth	Cindy Hardy	

B.   Approval of Minutes to Meeting #175
        The minutes were approved as distributed.

C.   Adoption of Agenda
        The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II   Status of Chancellor's Office Actions
        A.   Motions Approved:
1.   Motion to Amend Course Compression Policy
        2.   Motion to Enforce Core Assessment Compliance Across Delivery Methods
        3.   Motion to Approve Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes for
                Developing General Education Curriculum and Assessment
        4.   Motion to Amend Academic Dismissal Policy for Graduate Students
        B.   Motions Pending: None.

III   Public Comments/Questions

No public comments were made.

IV   A.   President's Remarks – Catherine Cahill

Faculty Alliance serves as the voice for faculty at the statewide level and is comprised of nine faculty members: president, president-elect and past president from each of the three MAUs. Issues discussed involve those affecting all three MAUs. They had their first retreat and some of the items coming out from that include information on strategic direction. President Gamble is emphasizing faster completion of degree programs by more students -- an effort that includes academic advising to help more students complete classes and programs. The shift is from strategic planning (goals with deadlines) to strategic direction (progress in a steady direction). With that, a memo was received today about streamlining paperwork to get rid of duplication of efforts. Please share any examples for Alliance with her, Jennifer Reynolds or Jon Dehn.

Alliance will also be looking at BOR policy and how it impacts the MAUs differently. One example is the "Incomplete" grade example. Here at UAF the "I" becomes an "F" after one year, which does not happen at the other MAUs. There are student transfer issues and others they will be looking at and may have to take to the Board.

B.   President-Elect's Report – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer gave an update on the status of the web timesheet project which was presented to the Faculty Senate last spring. It's been under development for implementation across the UA system over the summer for two main reasons: to streamline the process for paying employees and to address grant effort reporting – also called grants compliance. HR wishes to streamline the grant effort reporting process and address what it sees as invalid or improper practices that have been used with the paper system.

Currently a pilot program is underway for staff. Faculty participation will start in November beginning with "easy" units (those with the least amount of grant reporting). Issues to be addressed include: how to address timesheets for those who do not have sufficient web access. They're talking about allowing individuals to complete up to two timesheets in advance which would cover a month. Another issue under discussion is who can approve the timesheets. Under the new system faculty

will only need to file timesheets if they need to report the use of leave, so it greatly simplifies the system (if grant reporting isn't part of the process for those faculty).

Elisabeth N. asked if a separate software program has to be downloaded. Jennifer responded that the system being used is a web interface.

Cecile L. asked what some of the restrictions are that Jennifer is aware of for grant reporting. PPAs have been removed from the timesheet reporting process. They will only have FYI access to look at the timesheets, but can not have more involvement with directly changing it. Currently, there have been cases where PPAs change timesheets and make changes and corrections without the direct involvement of the faculty. HR has argued that they're building in more error checking into the process and the PPA involvement won't be needed.

A.   Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers

The UAF accreditation visit is coming up the first week of October. The report is online and everyone is encouraged to read it. Be prepared to be approached by a team member to answer questions about your respective units.

The Board of Regents will get their first view of the FY13 budget request at their meeting later this month. They're still in the negotiation process about what is and isn't included in the request. The president's focus is very similar to last year with an emphasis on deferred maintenance projects.

The strategic direction process underway for the UA system will include a lot of community involvement. Terry MacTaggart is participating. Early drafts will be out this fall and will include some major new directions and changes to existing directions for the UA system as a whole. This will have an impact on the UAF mission, goals and themes for the next round of accreditation which begins as soon as the current accreditation process is completed.

B.   Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs
Promotion and Tenure Summary Report (Attachment 176/1)

Susan called attention to the attached promotion and tenure summary report of last year's reviews, noting 90% received awards of tenure and/or promotion and there were mostly favorable fourth-year and post-tenure reviews as well. She emphasized that fourth-year reviews are supposed to be formative and assist newer faculty to improve, rather than be taken as any sort of final judgment of performance or indication of prospects for tenure. She noted there's a lot to be proud of concerning UAF faculty and every year the process helps her get acquainted with the faculty and their accomplishments. This year's review will cover 105 files.

She also mentioned the accreditation site visit, noting that under the new process there is no chance to rest on our laurels once it's completed. Next year at this time the Year One report is due with updated strategic plan and mission statement.

C.   Remarks by Vice Provost Dana Thomas

By means of a PowerPoint presentation, Dana covered the basics about institutional accreditation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) of UAF. [A handout of the presentation is posted online at the senate Meetings page.] The site visit process UAF is about to

undergo will probably result in some additional recommendations that may include some reporting requirements and perhaps additional visits by NWCCU accreditors.

The comprehensive self-evaluation report is posted online at the Provost's web site. It includes many appendices and much online information. The report is now in the hands of the accreditors who are beginning to make contact with individuals on campus to ask questions about UAF.
- www.uaf.edu/accreditation

The site visit takes place October 3-5, and a public presentation is planned for Oct. 5 at 9:30 AM at the Davis Concert Hall. It will be made available by audio conference, also. They'll read their commendations and share their recommendations at this brief meeting (30 minutes). No question and answer period is included. The recommendations will drive what we do in the near and long-term.

NWCCU President Sandra Elman is coming to UAF with the nine evaluators during this site visit. There will be separate open meetings with faculty, staff and students. Those who are asked questions are encouraged to be frank and open. Questions will be associated with the core themes and one's role associated with those. The faculty meeting is Tuesday, Oct. 4, from 3:00 – 4:00 PM at Wood Center.

Following the accreditation team's initial recommendations, the Commission will develop a final list of recommendations which should be available toward the end of January or early February. The Provost's Office will start working on the Year One report which is due Sept. 15, 2012. It's an opportunity to revisit the university's five core themes and make changes, if desired. With those themes are specific objectives and indicators of achievement. There are a total of 37 indicators of achievement for the institution which Dana feels is rather too long and he hopes they'll recommend a shorter list.

He encourages everyone to review and discuss the themes and indicators which can be found on the second page of Chapter 4 of the report. We need to connect to our strategic planning efforts and mission revision through these themes and indicators of achievement. Start discussing how we should revise our mission and talk about we what should take on as strategic targets.

Jane W. asked when the open faculty meeting will take place. It will be audio conferenced. [It's on Tuesday, October 4, 3-4 PM at Wood Center.]

Cecile L. asked about what opportunities for input on the formulation of a new mission there might be. Chancellor Rogers responded, noting that changes to the mission have to be approved by the BOR, so it will be a broad and inclusive process on the campus before anything is taken to BOR.

VI   New Business
        A.   Motion to Approve a New Minor in Marine Science,
                submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 176/2)

Rainer N. brought the motion to the floor, noting that there is zero cost for this new minor and stating that the proposal is put together well and will improve the stature of the program. The motion was called to question and seconded. The motion to approve the new minor passed unanimously.

B.	Motion to Reaffirm Unit Criteria for CEM, submitted by the
	Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 176/3)

Perry B. brought the motion to the floor. He mentioned the merging of the Computer Science Department to the college as an explanation for some of the changes to the criteria. In general, it was a smooth process for the committee to approve them and he encouraged the criteria be approved. The motion to reaffirm the CEM unit criteria was called to question and seconded, with a unanimous vote of approval.

C.	Reaffirmation of the Resolution for Open Promotion and Tenure Meetings,
	submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 176/4)

Cathy brought the resolution to the floor, reading it aloud. A vote was taken to reaffirm the resolution, and it passed unanimously. [Reference attachment 176/4.]

VII	Discussion Items

A.	Dean's Council General Education Revitalization Revision
	Recommendations – Dana Thomas (Attachment 176/5)

Dana asked the Deans to meet this summer in the spirit of shared governance to discuss the implications of revising the core curriculum. The General Education Revitalization Committee had expressed their concerns about the potential impact of tuition revenue generation affecting the schools and colleges. Engaging the deans early in the process of the core revision was done to help them understand and engage in the process. The last three years of core course tuition revenue figures were provided to the deans to give them a clear picture of the financial side. Of course, the impact of what the GER Committee develops and brings to the Faculty Senate won't be known until they finish their work of deciding what courses and experiences will comprise the changed core. To date the committee has completed a new set of intended learning outcomes.

He asks the senate to review the deans' recommendations and discuss them. A suggestion has been included that the committee writes a series of guidelines about what the expectations are for the courses meeting the various components of the new intended learning outcomes and then identify which unit(s) will provide them. The deans noted that the existing guidelines also need attention. The book "Academically Adrift" has noted common problems like the fact that many baccalaureate students have never had to write a paper of twenty or more pages in length. Guiding the student's experience should also be included in the committee's work.

Cecile L. shared about the difficulties the psychology department has had since instituting a capstone course about ten years ago. Transfer students have a problem with it when they come in with insufficient background or the reverse—too many qualifying courses. Currently the department is talking about doing away with the capstone and replacing it with a thesis or project, but the problem they face with that direction is there are not enough department faculty to service over 300 majors. Dana said he would discourage the department from getting rid of the capstone, since the new senate outcomes include a capstone experience (if not a course).

Jordan asked what the timeline is concerning the committee's work. Sociology is a small department that is also rethinking its capstone course. Their thinking will be greatly influenced by what happens with the core curriculum and she's wondering how much change their department should do now as opposed to later with these core changes are finally determined by the committee.

What is the timeline? Dana urges the Faculty Senate to be responsible for the timeline. He is hopeful about getting the work done this year but understands the senate might take longer. Chancellor Rogers noted there would also have to be a timeframe for implementation of a new core, as well.

Cathy commented on the recommendations to look at current core course assessment processes, and asks the Core Review Committee to specifically look at that piece both now and for future courses. Courses with written and oral intensive designators need to be reviewed so faculty know the courses still meet requirements and standards and haven't drifted away from the intended learning outcomes. Dana mentioned there are actually core courses which haven't been taught in more than five years.

Lara H. asked how many core courses are being taught by new faculty, and Rainer noted that it's a problem because courses have lost focus and drifted away from learning outcomes in some cases.

Franz M. commented about changes in technology that may have influenced change in core courses.

Cathy mentioned that it's time for moldy courses to be reviewed at the curriculum committees.

Lara asked what comprises the core course evaluation process. Cathy responded that guidelines for assessment of Written- and Oral-intensive and Natural Science core courses are pretty clear; how to assess other core requirements isn't so clear. Assessing drift from the core purpose currently and in the future core is necessary. The work needs to be divided between Core Review for current courses, and future core development at the General Education Revitalization Committee. It should also be determined if future assessment can occur within one committee or if review processes need to be expanded down the road.

> B.   Program Review and Draft Motion to Amend Educational Effectiveness
> Policy – Dana Thomas (Attachment 176/6)

Dana reminded everyone about the motion last year to move program review from a five-year cycle to a three-year cycle. Also, at the same time there was a request from the chancellor to review all programs. Chancellor's Cabinet is finalizing that program review right now. Any programs recommended for discontinuation will have to be reviewed at Faculty Senate as motions and then go to the Board of Regents.

Faculty Senate was reluctant to approve the three-year cycle and so now Dana proposes falling back to the five-year cycle. However, he'd like to have the timeline reviewed regarding the educational effectiveness policy (i.e., outcomes assessment) so that reporting would occur every other year. That is of key importance to the accreditation process. Doing so also helps makes it clear to all department chairs that they will have a role (during their two-year terms) in seeing that the outcomes assessment report is produced. The draft motion includes having the accreditation coordinator receive a copy of the reports produced.

Orion L. mentioned the use of the word "biannually" to more clearly indicate every two years.

Ken A. asked if there's any accommodation in the timeline for schools already undergoing a two-year review cycle for their specialized accreditation. Dana said they could accommodate those cycles.

Cecile L. asked about what is involved in these reports. Dana suggested reviewing the Assessment portion of the Provost's web site which contains much helpful information and reports: www.uaf.edu/provost/assessment-review/assessment

Jennifer R. urged people to go back to their departments and discuss the timing and requirements of assessment and program review reporting with their department faculty and chairs. Bring information from those discussions back to the senate. There will be more discussion on this topic in future senate meetings.

> C.   Legislative Coordination ad hoc Committee – Cathy Cahill

Faculty Alliance met with Chris Christianson, the new legislative person for the university in Juneau. Now is an opportune time to form an ad hoc committee to develop processes to involve faculty in a year-round effort of communicating with legislators. Cathy asked that interested faculty contact her directly.

Stephan G. commented on the need to reduce duplication of effort in areas like this one where there are numerous requests for reports about the good things the university accomplishes. Cathy agreed on the need for a one-stop shop to report to and will keep that in mind and speak with Marketing about that.

> D.   Suggested Change to the "I" (Incomplete) Grading Policy – Cathy Cahill

Cathy asked the senate to consider changing the I to F policy, possibly adding a mechanism in the process to address situations where a grade higher than an F might be warranted. Currently, a student has to be passing the course to file for an incomplete grade.

Mike E. asked if I becomes the default grade for anyone who's not getting an A by the end of the semester; in other words, do all students get the same opportunity to raise their grade if they haven't achieved an A be the end of the semester. Rainer noted the two sides of the issue with the example of someone doing very well in the course but having a family emergency the last two weeks of class versus someone who's scraping along and wants an extension of time to essentially re-take the course. Lara H. noted there should be exceptions to the rule (a student gets deployed) but we shouldn't coddle students who are using the system and who don't really care about completing the course. Cecile L. commented that students must be treated like adults, and that faculty must be clearer in communicating the situations that allow for and incomplete to be granted -- not just grant them to be nice.

Ken A. asked Mike E. to address the fact that administrative exceptions to the policy are granted. Mike responded that the circumstances for which exceptions are being allowed are serious, such as military deployment or serious illness.

A tentative show of hands in the room to gauge how senators felt on this issue indicated that further discussion is warranted on the topic.

Linda H. asked Mike E. how many Incompletes are processed each semester and he responded that there are hundreds. Linda predicted that the Registrar's Office would become inundated if the word got out that the grade defaulted back to what the student would have gotten anyway even not finishing the incomplete. Rainer reiterated the reality that in the bulk of cases it wouldn't do any good anyway since the grade, factoring in the unfinished work, would be a D- or F. Jennifer R.

clarified Linda H.'s comment so it was clear that the grade becomes the original "default" grade in combination with the remaining work completed or uncompleted during the time extension – not merely the grade they had at the time they requested the incomplete. Linda noted the fact remains that too many incompletes are granted because students beg for them instead of being granted for circumstances that truly warrant their use.

Jennifer R. commented on the fact that Faculty Alliance has discussed this with an eye to aligning the MAUs on the policy; however, it's clear that UAF does not care to go the route of the "perpetual I" as the other two have.

Jordan T. observed that the current UAF policy for allowing the submission of an I is pretty restrictive and is something that she rarely grants a student. Even when given the opportunity, about 90% don't complete the course in spite of all her efforts to communicate with the student.

It was agreed to continue this discussion at the October senate meeting and to set up an electronic means of discussion for the meantime.

> E. Designation of Courses as Arctic in UAF Catalog – Mike Earnest

Mike shared that he will be sending out lists of courses to units to have them identify courses as arctic relevant or northern-centered. They wish to get them into the University of the Arctic search engine as well as note them with a special symbol in the UAF Catalog.

Lara H. asked about the distribution process of the course lists and identifying courses. Mike said he and others have gone through the catalog descriptions and noted courses to put on lists they are sending to the department chairs. It's up to the departments to make the course designation or not.

BREAK

VIII   Announcements

Jane W. announced the CSW Women Faculty Luncheon on Tuesday, October 4.

Perry B. reminded everyone that fall is the best time to get pending unit criteria in to the UC committee. They usually run out of time to consider all submissions, particularly those submitted late in the spring, so fall is the best time to get them in.

Orion L. thanked administration for handling the resolution regarding requested changes to the policy about international student degree completion. He also announced the submission deadline for new course proposals and program proposals to the curriculum committees, including GAAC, which is October 7.

Todd R. from Dillingham announced the 2011 American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Conference taking place at Bristol Bay from September 21-24.

IX   Governance Reports
> A. Staff Council – Pips Veazey

Pips introduced herself as the new president and shared about Staff Council's goal this year of being more organized and handling business items on their agenda before the break time of their meeting.

They also aim to do more work of handling business within the committees to help the meetings focus on actions. Issues they're looking at include compensation of non-represented staff, health care issues, and the tuition waiver process.

B.   ASUAF – Mari Freitag

Mari, who is also the student regent this year, talked about the success of the climbing wall project. She also announced that the Sun Star turned a profit for the first issue, thanks to the new ad manager, Jordan Schilling.

ASUAF plans to focus on student advising this year. The Coalition of Student Leaders is also focusing on this issue, so they hope to coordinate their efforts. They're also looking at the NANA food service contract and hope to make some improvements. They said goodbye to Sabra Phillips at the ASUAF office, and have welcomed in Anne Williamson to the staff position. They're going to focus on training for their student senators and will create a training video to help with continuity since there's a high turnover during the year.

C. UNAC – Jordan Titus

Jordan announced the election of the new executive board. The new president is Abel Bult-Ito. The VP for the UAF campus is Debu Misra. She'll be the rep for the senate this semester.

New executive board is working in incremental ways to increase communication. She is available to hear from senators and other faculty, and meetings of the Board are now being announced via email with an agenda and the minutes attached. Members can phone in and most portions are open to all the membership, though there are some short portions that are closed.

The new Collective Bargaining Agreement is posted on the United Academics web site. Today at 4:00 PM is a general membership meeting focused on the CBA articles IX – evaluation for promotion and tenure, and XII – personnel files.

Jordan mentioned the status of the Alaska Labor Relations case. Investigations are still ongoing about the health care audit review. The ORP Tier I lawsuit is still underway with a trial in January.

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane gave an update on the Joint Health Care Committee meetings. She plans to ask for a report to share with all senators.

X   Guest Speaker
        A.   Kris Racina, HR Director
                Topic: Emergency Closure Policy (Attachment 176/7)

Kris Racina spoke as a representative from Chancellor's Cabinet. The Cabinet is seeking feedback from both faculty and staff on the draft policy addressing emergency closure situations such as the ice storm that occurred last year.

Jennifer R. noted she didn't see anything unfamiliar or new in this draft policy, and asked Kris if this essentially codifies procedures that took place informally last year. Kris acknowledged that it largely codifies what took place last year.

Cecile L. expressed concern that it appears that the employees earning the least will have to use their leave time because they can't work from home or make use of the recommendations that faculty are able to take advantage of. Staff members expressed inequities in the options available to them as opposed to those available to faculty. To be safe at home during the storm they had to use leave. It seems to send an unintended but strong message that they must be at work or use leave time, and so lower paid employees will take more risk to get in to the office rather than have to use their leave time. Kris asked Cecile where she would establish the cut-off if she were in charge. Cecile noted that the message for employees to stay home in a dangerous situation must be clear and understandable. It's dangerous to come in to work during an ice storm whether one is only two blocks away or far away. The system would have worked better if salary was paid due to these types of circumstances and employees knew they should stay home to be safe.

Lara H. made the same point, noting that lower paid staff may actually live farther out (North Pole, for example) because of the higher cost living areas being more central. It's not necessarily possible to hold class online, especially for students living in cabins off campus. The policy doesn't acknowledge the Alaska locale.

Kris mentioned the fact that there are students living in dorms on campus, so that's one reason they should try to hold class.

Elisabeth N. commented on the fact that people with children also face the situation of closed schools and day care, faculty and staff alike.

Cathy urged senators to follow up with Kris with their comments via email.

XI   Chair Comments / Committee Reports (as attached)

Cathy asked if members felt that this section of the agenda is necessary. Cecile and others noted that having a quick report provides the opportunity to ask questions. Cathy proposed keeping reports in the agenda, and giving chairs a chance to highlight a topic. Ken A. proposed providing the corresponding opportunity for response and questions from members. This was agreed to by all.

      A.   Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Convener
      B.   Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Convener
      C.   Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair
      D.   Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair
               (Attachment 176/8)
      E.   Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Convener
      F.   Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
      G.   Faculty Appeals & Oversight
      H   Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Convener
      I.   Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair
      J.   Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Convener
      K.   Research Advisory Committee – Peter Webley, Convener

XII   Members' Comments/Concerns/Questions

No additional comments or questions were made.

XIII   Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 PM.

ATTACHMENT 176/1
UAF Faculty Senate #176, September 12, 2011
Submitted by the Office of the Provost

UAF 2010-11 Results Summary
Promotion, Tenure, Fourth Year and Post-Tenure Reviews

	Yes	No	Withdrawn
UAFT Promotion and Tenure			
Promotion and Tenure: Prior to Mandatory Year	1	0	0
UNAC Promotion and Tenure			
Promotion and Tenure: Mandatory Year	6	1	0
Promotion and Tenure: Prior to Mandatory Year	14	0	1
Tenure: Mandatory Year	1	0	0
Tenure: Prior to Mandatory Year	2	0	0
Promotion	13	1	1
Promotion (Research Faculty)	4	0	0
Total Promotion and Tenure Candidates	41	2	2

	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Fourth Year Pre-Tenure Review	12	4
Sixth Year Post-Tenure Review	26	0
Total Pre- and Post-Tenure Candidates	38	4

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Minor in Marine Science.

EFFECTIVE:	Fall 2011 and/or Upon Chancellor's approval.
RATIONALE:	See the program proposal #129-UNP on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

****

Overview:
The minor in Marine Science will be administered by the Graduate Program in Marine Science and Limnology (GPMSL) in the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences. The minor outlined in this proposal will be available to undergraduate students in all degree programs. It will consist of three new introductory courses that will form the "core" requirement (2 lecture courses + 1 lab course, 7 credits total) and 6 credits in electives in other marine science courses. In addition, students will choose a minimum of 2 credits of additional electives from among selected courses in Marine Science, Fisheries, Biology and Wildlife, and Economics, for a total of 15 credits required for the minor. This program was created in response to numerous requests from Fisheries, Biology and Wildlife, and Natural Resource Management students who, after taking the single undergraduate Marine Science course currently offered (MSL 111X: The Oceans), were interested in continued coursework in the field. Unfortunately, no additional options currently exist. Fisheries students are thus expected to benefit from the breadth this program will offer to their curriculum. In addition, we anticipate this program will appeal to students from other disciplines (e.g., Political Science, Earth Sciences, Biology & Wildlife, Environmental Science, Resource Management, Education) in which possible career paths may require and/or benefit from training in marine science (policy-making, resource management, education, seafood industry, etc.).

Objective and relationship to courses proposed:
This program will provide students with a marine-science knowledge base, skill set, and hands-on experience, which will augment their educational experience at UAF. This minor will strengthen the abilities of UAF graduates to address essential issues in research, education, management, administration or industry related to Alaska's marine resources. To address these objectives, the program will include a required two-semester core course with associated lab that will introduce students to the interdisciplinary field of marine science, including study of the unique physical, chemical and biological aspects of the marine environment, and the organisms that inhabit this environment. Building on this core foundation, students will be able to choose from a variety of more focused courses depending on their specific area of interest. The elective courses will provide more detailed study of marine biology and ecology, and the physics and chemistry of the oceans. Available electives will include field courses that will be taught at the UAF marine lab facility, the Kasitsna Bay Laboratory near Homer, AK, and will emphasize hands-on learning and student-

centered research projects. Several elective options (e.g., Polar Marine Science, Dynamic Alaskan Coastline, Marine Biology and Ecology Field Course) will also emphasize polar regions, and Alaskan marine ecosystems in particular.

Undergraduates that have completed the minor in Marine Science will possess a knowledge base and skill set that will make them more competitive for a wide variety of agency and organization positions, particularly within the state of Alaska. Training provided here will be applicable in jobs with government management agencies (e.g., Alaska Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service), Alaska Native Organizations, non-profit conservation organizations, seafood industry, or in other policy-development, fisheries, education, or outreach capacities.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

1. Students *must* complete the following (7 credits):
MSL 211 – Introduction to Marine Science I (3 credits)
MSL 212 – Introduction to Marine Science II (3 credits)
MSL 213L—Marine Science Laboratory (1 credit)

2. Students *must* complete 6 credits from the following:
MSL 317 – Introduction to Marine Mammal Biology (3 credits)
MSL 330 —The Dynamic Alaskan Coastline (3 credits)
MSL 403— Estuaries (2 credits)
MSL 412 —Early Life Histories of Marine Invertebrates (3 credits)
MSL 431 – Polar Marine Science (3 credits)
MSL 449 – Biological Oceanography (3 credits)
        MSL 463 – Chemical Coastal Processes (3 credits)

3. Students *must* complete 2 additional credits from the following:
Marine Science and Limnology
MSL 220 – Scientific Diving (2 credits)
MSL 317 – Introduction to Marine Mammal Biology (3 credits)
MSL 330 —The Dynamic Alaskan Coastline (3 credits)
MSL 403— Estuaries (2 credits)
MSL 412 —Early Life Histories of Marine Invertebrates (3 credits)
MSL 421 – Field Course in Subtidal Studies (2 credits)
MSL 431 – Polar Marine Science (3 credits)
MSL 449 – Biological Oceanography (3 credits)
MSL 450 – Marine Biology and Ecology Field Course (4 credits)
MSL 456 – Kelp Forest Ecology
MSL 463 – Chemical Coastal Processes (3 credits)
MSL 497 – Marine Field Experience (Independent Study) (1-2 credits)

Fisheries
FISH 288/BIOL 288 – Marine and Freshwater Fishes of Alaska (3 credits)
FISH 301—Biology of Fishes (3 credits)
FISH 425 – Fish Ecology (3 credits)
FISH 440—Oceanography for Fisheries (3 credits)

Biology and Wildlife
BIOL 305 – Invertebrate Zoology (5 credits)

BIOL 473 – Limnology (4 credits)

Economics
      ECON 235 – Introduction to Natural Resource Economics (3 credits)

Relationship to the "Purposes of the University":
The objectives of the minor in Marine Science coincide with the UAF academic mission of providing high-quality education to undergraduates, because the minor will offer a suite of courses to augment student expertise in the natural sciences and resource management, and enable students seeking a career in fisheries or oceanographic research. Thus, the program addresses three core mission areas identified in the UAF strategic plan: Serve students; Provide quality educational opportunities and experiences; Be responsive to the needs of the state of Alaska.

Fisheries majors are expected to receive immediate benefits from this program, and many have expressed interest in additional MSL course offerings being made available to them. The Fisheries program has been growing rapidly over the last several years, with 68 students currently enrolled and numbers projected to increase to 70-80 in the next year. We also expect the program will serve students in other disciplines such as resource management and political science, as described in the sections above, and we intend to advertise the program to draw in students from these other fields.

ATTACHMENT 176/3
UAF Faculty Senate #176, September 12, 2011
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for the College of Engineering and Mines.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011
                        Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the College of Engineering and Mines. Revisions were agreed upon by the department representatives and the Unit Criteria Committee, and the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

****

**UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY AND
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND MINES
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 COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND MINES' DEPARMENT/S. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S/S' FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS.

CHAPTER I

Purview

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. **Criteria for Initial Appointment**
   Minimum degree, experience and performance requirements are set forth in "UAF Faculty 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.

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

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

For purposes of evaluation at UAF, the total contribution to the university and activity in the areas outlined above will be defined by relevant activity and demonstrated competence from the following areas: 1) effectiveness in teaching; 2) achievement in scholarly activity; and 3) effectiveness of service. *THE LEVEL OF PRODUCTIVITY EXPECTED OF A FACULTY MEMBER IN EACH AREA (TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE) WILL BE COMMENSURATE WITH THE PERCENTAGE OF HIS OR HER WORKLOAD DEDICATED TO SUCH ACTIVITY.*

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.

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 *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;

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; *INCLUDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF DISTILLED KNOWLEDGE (FOR EXAMPLE: BOOKS, SOFTWARE, DOCUMENTATION) FOR STUDENT USE*;

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

h. *DISSEMINATE NEW IDEAS TO THE STUDENTS RESULTING FROM RESEARCH AND OTHER ENGINEERING ACTIVITIES, SUCH AS CONSULTING AND SERVICE ON REVIEW PANEL;*

i. *INVOLVE STUDENTS, ESPECIALLY GRADUATE STUDENTS, IN QUALITY RESEARCH ACTIVITIES;*

SPECIFIC CEM CRITERIA FOR TEACHING PERFORMANCE BEFORE PROMOTION/TENURE OR APPOINTMENT TO:

I. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF TEACHING ABILITY AND A COMMITMENT TO A QUALITY TEACHING PROGRAM MUST BE PROVIDED, AS WELL AS EVIDENCE OF AN EFFORT TOWARD CONTINUAL IMPROVEMENT.

II. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: THE RECORD MUST SHOW THAT THE MATERIAL TAUGHT IS CONTEMPORARY AND RELEVANT, AND THAT THE PRESENTATIONS STIMULATE THE LEARNING PROCESS. EVIDENCE OF THE EXPECTED QUALITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE MAY INCLUDE (BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO) COURSE AND/OR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, NOVEL APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION, EFFECTIVE GUIDING AND MENTORING OF STUDENTS, AND EFFECTIVE CLASSROOM TEACHING PERFORMANCE. THERE MUST BE EVIDENCE OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH (AS A MAJOR SUPERVISOR OR CO-SUPERVISOR).

III. PROFESSOR: SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM ARE EXPECTED. THESE MAY INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, CONTRIBUTIONS TO MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS IN COURSE AND/OR CURRICULUM OFFERINGS, UPGRADING OF INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITIES, ABILITY TO MOTIVATE AND/OR INSPIRE STUDENTS, AND EXEMPLARY TRAINING OF GRADUATE STUDENTS. THERE SHOULD BE A RECORD OF CONTINUING SUCCESSFUL MENTORSHIP OF GRADUATE STUDENTS AS EXEMPLIFIED BY JOINT AUTHORSHIP OF PUBLICATIONS, INVOLVEMENT OF GRADUATE STUDENTS IN RESEARCH PROJECTS, AND COMPLETION OF GRADUATE DEGREES UNDER HIS/HER SUPERVISION SINCE THE PREVIOUS PROMOTION. IT IS EXPECTED THAT ASSESSMENT OF

TEACHING BY STUDENTS AND FACULTY DEMONSTRATE CONSISTENTLY HIGH QUALITY PERFORMANCE.

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

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

    and at least two of the following:

    b. narrative self-evaluation,

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

    d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials.

C. **Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity**
    Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere.

    1. **Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity**
        Whatever the contribution, research, scholarly or creative activities must have one or more of the following characteristics:

        a. They must occur in a public forum.

        b. They must be evaluated by appropriate peers.

        c. They must be evaluated by peers external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.

        d. They must be judged to make a contribution.

    2. **Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity**
        Evidence of excellence in research, scholarly, and creative activity may be demonstrated through, but not limited to:

        a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline.

        b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas, 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 *AND ENGINEERING* work*, SCIENTIFIC VISUALIZATIONS AND COMPUTER ANIMATIONS* at galleries, *CONFERENCES AND MUSEUMS, WHERE* selection for these exhibitions *IS* 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 *AND ENGINEERING* works, *SCIENTIFIC VISUALIZATIONS AND COMPUTER ANIMATIONS,* 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.

SPECIFIC CEM CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH PERFORMANCE BEFORE PROMOTION/ TENURE OR APPOINTMENT TO:

I. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF RESEARCH ABILITY AND A COMMITMENT TO ESTABLISH A VIABLE RESEARCH PROGRAM.

II. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: THE FACULTY MEMBER MUST HAVE ESTABLISHED AN APPROPRIATE RESEARCH PROGRAM THAT PRODUCES A SATISFACTORY NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS IN REFEREED HIGH-QUALITY PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS (PREFERABLY INDEXED IN THE WEB OF SCIENCE (SCI), THE ENGINEERING INDEX (EI), AND OTHER APPROPRIATE SCIENCE OR ENGINEERING INDEXES, WHERE APPLICABLE) AND PRESENTED RESEARCH RESULTS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS. PAPERS IN PROCEEDINGS OF CONFERENCES KNOWN FOR RIGOROUS PEER-REVIEW AND DOCUMENTED LOW ACCEPTANCE RATES MAY BE CONSIDERED AS SUPPLEMENTAL PUBLICATIONS, WHERE APPLICABLE. THE SUBMISSION OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS AND ACQUISITION OF EXTERNAL RESEARCH FUNDING, THE COMPLETION OF CONTRACT RESEARCH REPORTS, AND PUBLICATION IN CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS CONSTITUTE SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE THAT THE RESEARCH PROGRAM IS OF HIGH QUALITY. SUSTAINED PRODUCTIVITY MUST BE SHOWN WITH ADEQUATE EVIDENCE OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES AND PUBLICATIONS SINCE INITIAL

APPOINTMENT, WITH THE CANDIDATE TAKING A LEADING ROLE IN RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS. THE FACULTY MEMBER MUST ALSO SHOW INDEPENDENCE AND LEADERSHIP BY THE CREATION OF RESEARCH IDEAS RESULTING IN JOURNAL AND CONFERENCE PUBLICATIONS THAT INVOLVE STUDENTS.

<u>III. PROFESSOR:</u> THE RESEARCH PROGRAM SHOULD HAVE PRODUCED A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL ARTICLES (PREFERABLY INDEXED IN SCI, EI, AND OTHER APPROPRIATE SCIENCE OR ENGINEERING INDEXES WHERE APPLICABLE), CONFERENCE PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER FORMS OF LITERATURE, WHICH ALSO REQUIRE RIGOROUS PEER REVIEW, AND ARE PUBLISHED BY WELL-ESTABLISHED PUBLISHING HOUSES. TO INDICATE THE EXISTENCE OF AN ON-GOING, PROFESSIONAL, INDEPENDENT RESEARCH PROGRAM, THE PUBLICATIONS SHOULD BE OF SUFFICIENT QUANTITY AFTER THE PREVIOUS TENURE/PROMOTION/ APPOINTMENT, WITH DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE OF HIGH QUALITY AND SHOULD DEMONSTRATE STUDENT INVOLVEMENT. A NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL REPUTATION OF THE CANDIDATE (E.G., AS DEMONSTRATED BY A HIGH NUMBER OF ARTICLE CITATIONS, PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES, PRESENTATIONS AT MEETINGS, AND DOCUMENTED OPINIONS OF OTHER ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS IN THE FIELD) IS EXPECTED.

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 THESIS COMMITTEES.*

l. *PREPARATION OF UNIVERSITY REPORTS AND ONLINE INFORMATION.*

3. **Professional Service**
a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.

b. Active participation in professional organizations.

c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.

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

f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

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

SPECIFIC CEM CRITERIA FOR SERVICE PERFORMANCE BEFORE PROMOTION/TENURE OR APPOINTMENT TO:

I. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF A COMMITMENT TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE SERVICE MISSION OF THE COLLEGE.

II. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: POSITIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEPARTMENTAL AND/OR UNIVERSITY MATTERS, EFFECTIVE PROFESSIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PUBLIC, AND/OR EFFECTIVE SERVICES TO THE PROFESSION ARE EXPECTED.

III. PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF LEADERSHIP IN THE SERVICE AREA IS EXPECTED. SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF DEPARTMENTAL AND/OR UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS INCLUDING COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP OR UAF FACULTY SENATE SERVICE AND ASSOCIATED COMMITTEES ARE EXPECTED. EFFECTIVE APPLICATION OF SERVICE INCLUDES PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE PROVIDED TO PROFESSIONAL OR PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS ENGINEERING SOCIETY LEADERSHIP, REVIEWING PROPOSALS, REFEREEING MANUSCRIPTS, AND EDITING FOR PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OR PUBLICATIONS.

EXAMPLES OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATE FOR FACULTY IN ENGINEERING INCLUDE (BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO):

a. K-12 AND/OR INFORMAL ENGINEERING EDUCATION;

b. PRESENTATION OF ENGINEERING TO THE PUBLIC.

MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS OF PERFORMANCE INCLUDE (BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO):

a. ACCOMPLISHMENTS GAINED THROUGH SERVICE TO ORGANIZATIONS;

> *b.* ***OPINIONS OF CLIENTS SERVED AND/OR COLLEAGUES INVOLVED IN DELIVERY OF SERVICE.***

E. Unit Criteria, Standards and Indices

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

Unit criteria, standards and indices may be developed by those units wishing to do so. Units that choose not to develop discipline-specific unit criteria, standards and indices must file a statement stating so with the Office of the Provost, which shall serve as the official repository for approved unit criteria, standards and indices.

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

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

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

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

1. Process of Evaluation

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

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

workload agreement in commenting on progress. The director or dean shall provide a copy of a written evaluation to the faculty member.

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

G.   Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Members

1.   Frequency of Evaluation
a) All tenured faculty at UAF shall be evaluated once every three years according to a schedule and process announced by the Provost.

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

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

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

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

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

ATTACHMENT 176/4
UAF Faculty Senate #176, September 12, 2011
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

The following resolution was passed at Faculty Senate Meeting #146 in Fall 2007, and endorsed by a letter distributed to the UAF community in Fall 2008. The Administrative Committee would like to have the Faculty Senate reaffirm the resolution publicly at Faculty Senate Meeting #176 as the current review cycle gets underway.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the members of Faculty Committees are called upon under the concept of shared governance to provide professional review of other faculty candidates undergoing Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Review (Pre and Post-tenure),

WHEREAS the faculty portion of the review process must be fair and reasonable in order to maintain the reputation of the University, and the integrity of the academic process,

WHEREAS open and transparent Committee deliberations facilitate fair and reasonable review,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly requests that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an "open" meeting, and that "mandatory closed" meetings be avoided, including during the 2007-08 review cycle.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty Committee meetings are "open" at the request of a candidate and are consistent with all other relevant UAF rules and procedures.

2. Open meetings provide strong incentives for fair and reasonable review, including the oversight of the candidate.

3. The Committee can query a candidate for clarification of the file, which will greatly reduce the number of false assumptions and errors during deliberation.

4. Open meetings are educational—candidates who opt to attend their review have the opportunity to learn about academic traditions and practices.

5. Attendance can reduce candidates' anxiety, and make them feel like a part of the process.

Deans Council General Education Revision Recommendations   August 2011

During summer 2011 the Deans Council met four times to discuss the revision of UAF's general education requirements. The chancellor and provost contributed to the discussion. These meetings were held, in part, because of the potential impact on college and school tuition revenue, but also to formulate specific recommendations (given below) for consideration by the faculty senate.

Recommendations

1. Revise the existing general education motion to include all baccalaureate degrees, e.g., BM, BT, BBA, BFA, etc. The motion should refer to all baccalaureate degrees and the AA and AS degrees. It should not refer to associate degrees in general because general education requirements do not apply to applied associate of science (AAS) degrees.

2. We encourage the faculty senate to adopt general education requirements of 34 to 35 credits plus a capstone experience. The capstone experience is particularly useful in satisfying the integration component of the new learning outcomes and for assessment. In particular, a capstone experience (many of which already exist, e.g., senior thesis, senior recital or exhibit, and senior seminar), is recommended for every baccalaureate program.

3. The intended learning outcomes of each general education area (e.g., humanities and social science) should be approved by the faculty senate, made available in a convenient web location, and well communicated to the faculty. Guidelines like those for the current W, O, and Natural Science courses, which were approved by the faculty senate, need to be updated. In addition, the course syllabi for general education courses should be reviewed regularly to ensure the intended learning outcomes are included. The following pages list the existing guidelines approved by the senate and those provided by mathematics and library science; the deans were not aware of any other such guidelines. Suggested revisions should specify explicit student experience requirements. For example, W courses might require at least 20 pages written in a semester. Such experiential requirements are consistent with recent general education literature (e.g., see *Student Success in College* by Kuh et al. 2005 or *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses* by R. Arum and J. Roksa 2011).

4. We encourage the faculty senate to incorporate the collaborative learning, globalization, technology competence and sustainability elements of the new intended learning outcomes into the learning objectives of general education requirements. For example, the collaborative learning element could be incorporated in communication or natural sciences requirements. The intended outcomes for these elements need definition. Courses satisfying the collaborative learning (C), globalization (G), technological competence (T), and sustainability (S) elements could be labeled much like W and O courses are now. Existing courses could be revised or new ones created that fulfill these new elements of the intended learning outcomes. Assessment of these elements could be incorporated into the capstone requirement. The senate should consider waving one or more of these requirements for students who complete a related experiential activity such as study abroad, internships or volunteerism, or spending a semester at a rural campus.

5. The collection of possible ways to satisfy the information literacy component of the general education requirements should be expanded to include the existing stand alone LS101X course, a one-credit addition to first-year experience courses, a one-credit addition to other existing courses, or the incorporation of content into existing courses without adding credit. Library faculty would team teach courses in the case of one-credit additions and when the content is incorporated into existing courses; distance methods could be used in these situations. In addition, the information literacy requirement should be a prerequisite or co-requisite for ENGL 211 and 213 to ensure that this requirement is not put off until the end of a student's academic career.

6. Each general education course should include the senate approved intended learning outcomes in the course syllabi distributed to students. Course syllabi should be regularly reviewed for inclusion of intended learning outcomes as well as the faculty senate general syllabus requirements.

7. General education requirements should allow more choices for Alaska and transfer student flexibility no matter where or how delivered provided these choices are regularly assessed to ensure the intended objectives are being fulfilled.

8. General education requirements should be available by a variety of delivery methods to provide broad access so that a path to complete the AA degree is available. Not every general education course need be available by multiple delivery modes but every area of general education should be. Hybrid distance plus intensive in person delivery modes may be warranted for some subject areas.

9. The faculty senate and the administration should identify and implement an ongoing mechanism to add, evaluate, and remove courses from the list of approved general education courses. Approval, evaluation and removal of such courses should be based on intended learning outcomes statements and Regents' Policy and University Regulation. General education courses might be removed for a variety of reasons including but not limited to a) not meeting intended learning outcomes, b) not being offered in any five year period, and c) not taking part in the annual assessment process. A probationary period may be appropriate for those identified for removal so the department involved may revise the course to meet the general expectations. Current faculty senate bylaws empower the Core Review Committee to conduct assessment so this may be a starting point for consideration.

Guidelines for Core Designators

http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course-degree-procedures-/guidelines-for-core-desig/

November 15, 1993
UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #45

GUIDELINES FOR CORE ORAL COMMUNICATION INTENSIVE DESIGNATOR:

1. General Guidelines:

   a. A minimum of 15% of the final course grade should be based on effectiveness of oral communication. This minimum is proposed so that a student's failure to attend to the oral communication aspects of his or her work in an "O" designated course will have an important effect on his or her final grade for the course, while at the same time not overshadowing the importance of subject matter mastery.

   b. Attention to oral communication in "O" designated courses must be developmental, in that students need the opportunity (i) to receive intermediate instructor assistance in developing presentational competency, (ii) to utilize their communication competency across the span of the semester, not just in a final project, and (iii) to receive instructor feedback on the success of their efforts at each stage.

   c. These guidelines distinguish between courses emphasizing Group projects and those emphasizing Public presentations. The guidelines for courses emphasizing public communication are further divided

according to the number of students regularly enrolling in a given course, i.e., Small Class (less than 12 students), Medium or Large Class (at least 12 students), and Large Class (at least 20 students). ***Note specifically that under guideline 5 for a Large Class, a given course fulfills only half of the "O" intensive requirement, so that a student must take two such courses (hence the designation "O/2"). Under each of the other sets of guidelines, a single course would fulfill the "O" requirement.*

    d.   Exceptions to these guidelines may be made by the Core Review Subcommittee because of unique circumstances in individual departments.

2. Specific Guidelines for "O" Designated Courses Emphasizing Group Communication in Medium or Large Class Contexts:

    a.   Each student must be involved in at least one ongoing group project or team of 5 to 8 members, with the group spanning 4 to 7 weeks duration. Group projects must be a coordinated, integrated effort by the group members, not simply 5 to 8 individual projects put together.

    b.   Each student must present both an intermediate and a final presentation on an aspect of the group's work during the span of the project or team.

    c.   Both presentations must be at least 5 minutes in length, must be given to an audience (e.g., the rest of the class), must be integrated with the presentation of the other group members, and must include additional time for a question and answer period.

    d.   Each presentation should receive evaluation by the instructor on oral communication competency, as well as on subject mastery. In addition, the instructor should evaluate the degree of coherence in the overall presentation of the entire group. Students should receive both an individual and group grade for the presentation.

    e.   Students must receive, as part of the course structure, information/instruction on how groups function most effectively, on organization of material for effective presentation, and on development and use of media and visual aids.

3. Specific Guidelines for "O" Designated Courses Emphasizing Public Communication in Medium or Large Class Contexts (Regularly enrolling at least 12 students):

    a.   Each student must be involved in the individual preparation and delivery of at least 3 course related presentations of at least 5 minutes duration each, to an audience of at least 12 persons.

    b.   At least one presentation must involve questions from the audience and responses by the presenter.

    c.   All presentations must have a clear introduction-body- conclusion organization, appropriate to the discipline.

    d.   All presentations should receive evaluation by the instructor on oral communication competency (including responsiveness to audience questions), as well as on subject mastery.

    e.   Students must receive, as part of the course structure, information/instruction on effective speaking, on organization of material for effective presentation, and on development and use of media and visual aids.

4. Specific Guidelines for "O" Designated courses Emphasizing Public Communication in Small Class Contexts (Regularly enrolling less than 12 students):

    a.   Each student must be involved in the preparation and delivery either of 2 or more course related presentations of at least 20 minutes duration each or of 3 or more presentations of at least 10 minutes duration each. It is highly desirable and strongly encouraged for the benefit of the student that one of the presentations be to an audience of 12 or more. The remaining presentations need to be to an audience of 5 or more. It is also desirable that the presentation to the larger group be given in a large auditorium and involve the use of a public address system.

    b.   All presentations must involve question and answer interaction. As appropriate for the discipline, it is highly desirable that there be at least one assigned respondent, with questions by other audience members encouraged.

    c.   In a course with 3 presentations, it is highly desirable that one of the three presentations be video-taped, either in or outside of class. Such video taped presentations need to involve at least the

presenter and the respondent, and must be viewed by these individuals with the instructor present to provide feedback on oral communication effectiveness in the presentation and response.

d. For individual presentations that relate to a common theme or project, it is highly desirable that the presentations be organized in a panel format, with a student moderator.

e. All presentations must have a clear introduction-body- conclusion organization, appropriate to the discipline.

f. At least one presentation must involve the development and use of appropriate visual aids, and it is desirable that all presentations do so.

g. All presentations should receive evaluation by the instructor on oral communication competency (including responsiveness to audience questions), as well as on subject mastery.

h. Students must receive, as part of the course structure, information/instruction on effective speaking, effective responding, organization of material for effective presentation, and on development and use of media and visual aids. If thematic panels are used, students should also receive instruction on panel/symposium and moderator techniques.

5. Specific Guidelines for "O/2" Designated Courses Emphasizing Public Communication in Large Class Contexts (Regularly enrolling 20 or more students):

a. Each student must take at least two "O/2" designated courses to meet the Core Curriculum requirement for oral intensive coursework.

b. Each student must be involved in the individual preparation and delivery of at least 2 course related presentations one of at least 5 minutes duration and one of at least 8-10 minutes duration, to an audience of about 20 persons.

c. The 8-10 minute presentation, must be a formal individual presentation, and must involve questions from the audience and responses by the presenter.

d. All presentations must have a clear introduction-body- conclusion organization, appropriate to the discipline.

e. All presentations should receive evaluation by the instructor on oral communication competency (including responsiveness to audience questions), as well as on subject mastery.

f. Students must receive, as part of the course structure, information/instruction on effective speaking, on organization of material for effective presentation, and on development and use of media and visual aids.

Effective: November 18, 1993

November 12, 1990
UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #22

GUIDELINES FOR CORE WRITING INTENSIVE DESIGNATOR:

A. General guidelines for 3-credit course with "W" designator

1. The lower-division writing sequence as specified in the Core Curriculum will be a prerequisite for all "W"- designated courses.

2. Instructors are encouraged to have students write an ungraded diagnostic composition on or near the first day of class to help assess writing ability and general competence in the discipline. [If diagnostic tests indicate that remedial work may be needed, teachers can set up specialized tutoring for their students with UAF Writing Center tutors.]

3. Teachers regularly evaluate students' writing and inform students of their progress. If a major written project (research project) is part of the course, the project should be supervised in stages. If possible, a writing activity should comprise a major portion of the final examination.

4. At least one personal conference should be devoted to the student's writing per term and drafts of papers should receive evaluation from the teacher and/or peers.

5. Written material should comprise a majority of the graded work in the course for it to be designated "intensive." "Written material" can consist of quizzes and exams with short answers or essay sections, journals, field notes, informal responses to reading or class lectures, structured essays, research projects, performance reviews, lab reports, or any forms suitable to the discipline being taught.

B. Guidelines for the "W" designator in Technical courses

1. In order to ensure that technical disciplines can meet the goals of the writing intensive requirements without compromising the technical quality of their courses, such disciplines may substitute longer courses or a series of courses (typically 1-credit labs) for each of the two necessary 3-credit writing intensive or "W"-designated courses. Courses meeting all the general guidelines will, of course, also be acceptable.

2. The longer course option allows the "W" designator for a 4- or 5-credit course in which written material comprises a portion of the grade equivalent to "a majority" of a 3-credit course. The course must also meet the other general guidelines.

3. The series option allows a student to replace one or both 3- credit "W" courses with a series of courses, each of which may be less than three credits--e.g., a series of 1-credit or 1-credit-equivalent laboratories. Each series, however, must sum to the equivalent of at least one 3-credit "W"- designated course. The initial course in the series will be designated "W1" and, while less than three credits, will fulfill all the other general requirements for a "W." The subsequent courses will base a majority of the grade on written material. Students must take the "W1" course before taking the other courses in the series.

*** To grade a course on written work means to use the student's written work as the basis for his or her grade. Written work is graded mainly on content and organization, with tone, word choice, sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling accounting for a smaller fraction of the grade.*

Effective: November 29, 1990

April 13, 1990
UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #18

GUIDELINES FOR CORE NATURAL SCIENCE DESIGNATOR:

The Natural Science requirement in the Core Curriculum shall be two 4-credit hour courses, each with a laboratory (8 credit hours total). Both courses must be selected from those available in one of the two options defined below.

The goal of the Natural Science component of the Core Curriculum is to prepare students for lifelong learning in the natural sciences (biology, chemistry, earth science, physics). In order to achieve this goal, three objectives will be met:

1. Students will become familiar with the methods used for acquisition and expansion of scientific knowledge through laboratory/field exercises which deal with

    a. data collection and analysis,

    b. hypothesis building, and

    c. experimentation.

2. Students will learn and use major concepts of natural science either by exploring in depth a single discipline or the conceptual relationship between at least two of the natural sciences. Although there are no well-defined criteria for identifying a "major concept" of natural science, the following are generally accepted examples: momentum and energy, electricity and magnetism, the atomic and nuclear nature of matter, equilibrium, the cellular basis of life, evolutionary theory, and plate tectonics.

3. Students will understand the relationships between science and society in terms of the historical context of modern science and the influence of science on contemporary issues. They will also study elements of public science policy and the methods by which it is developed.

Any course qualifying for either emphasis must contain elements which address all three objectives outlined above. This probably requires modification of nearly every natural science course which is offered at UAF before it qualifies under the new guidelines. Thus each qualifying course must have:

1. a laboratory/field component which emphasizes data collection and analysis, hypothesis building, and experimentation;

2. substantial content dealing with "major concepts;"

3. science-related issues in society and public policy

Effective: May 7, 1990

*As amended to delete Breadth and Depth distinction, December 8, 2003, Meeting #119.

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics core curriculum courses (see http://www.uaf.edu/dms/core/):

The goals of the mathematics core curriculum are to ensure that students develop basic numeracy skills, are able to employ problem solving strategies, can communicate mathematical concepts, and are able to construct and evaluate mathematical arguments.
Syllabi for all DMS core courses are posted on this page.

Library Science LS 101X – Expected Learning Outcomes (see http://library.uaf.edu/ls101)

The student outcome goals and objectives of the Library Science program are:

- Students will be able to formulate and articulate a research statement and devise appropriate search strategies.

- Students will be capable of carrying out a search strategy using appropriate tools to obtain resources.

- Students will be capable of evaluating the appropriateness of their resources and apply evaluative criteria to determine validity and veracity of information.

- Students' confidence in their ability to use library resources and research strategies will increase.

<u>DRAFT</u> <u>MOTION</u>

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness policy as indicated below:

      EFFECTIVE: Upon approval by the Chancellor

      RATIONALE: UAF institutional and specialized accreditation requires outcomes assessment reporting and assessment is important for the continuing improvement of curricula. To ensure that outcomes assessment information is collected regularly, with no long gaps, each program is asked to prepare a report every 2 years. This is consistent with the two year commitments that department chairs make so each department chair will know a report must be filed during their service. In addition, this change will provide timely information to summarize the implementation and results of assessment practices reported annually to the Board of Regents as required in policy P10.06.020.

                        ****

CAPS = Additions
[[   ]] = Deletions

UAF EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS POLICY

In accordance with its mission, the University of Alaska Fairbanks has a continuing responsibility to review and improve performance of its students, faculty, and programs. The UAF therefore establishes the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation to describe the effects of curriculum, instruction, and other institutional programs.

The process will be useful for curricular and institutional reform and will be consistent with UA Board of Regents Policy and institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

The university shall ensure the academic freedom of the academic community in the development and maintenance of this process.

The data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty. Furthermore, no student shall be denied graduation based solely upon information gathered for the educational effectiveness evaluation process.

Each faculty member's activities in developing and/or implementing programmatic and institutional educational effectiveness efforts may be summarized in the instructional section of annual evaluations and promotion and tenure files.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:
1) Student Information

Students shall be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.

2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum

Evaluation of the CORE curriculum shall include course assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.

3) Programmatic assessment

Each degree and certificate program shall establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning

An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of activities and student support services will be conducted.

The chair of each department (or equivalent as identified by the Dean or Director) shall prepare a report at least **BIANNUALLY [[four years]]** summarizing the Educational Effectiveness program for each certificate and degree program offered by that department. The report shall include a summary of the following:

A. Student outcome goals and objectives of the program,
B. The methods and criteria used to evaluate whether the goals and objectives are being met,
C. A description of what information is collected annually, and
D. How the results of such information are being used to improve the curriculum.

The report shall be presented to the dean or director's office **AND THE ACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT ASSISTANT IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE BY THE END OF 9-MONTH FACULTY CONTRACTS IN MAY [[during the month of May]]**. At least some information gathering for this process shall occur annually.

Once an educational effectiveness evaluation program has been implemented for the core, the core review committee of the faculty senate shall prepare a report, at least biannually, summarizing the educational effectiveness of the components of the core curriculum. This report shall be similar in content to the report described above for individual programs but shall provide a summary for the components of the core curriculum. The components of the Core may be summarized in the report on a rotational basis, but at least some information should be gathered annually.

Proposed UAF Policy: 02.05.011

Revised: **March 2011**
Responsible Chancellor's Cabinet Member: Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services
Responsible Department/Office: Marketing and Communications; All Vice-Chancellors

<u>Emergency Closure and Employee Leave Options Policy</u>

POLICY STATEMENT

The University of Alaska Fairbanks has multiple campuses around the state. At the Fairbanks locations, we are a residential campus that will conduct classes, maintain essential services and remain open for business to the extent possible during severe weather conditions or other unusual circumstances. Employees in the Fairbanks area should be prepared to attend work even in severe conditions to the extent they can safely do so.

BACKGROUND & JUSTIFICATION

This policy provides broad guidance for employee leave options or attendance, recognizing that each situation may present unique challenges depending on the severity of conditions, reliability of transportation modes, employee and student residential location, the academic calendar, and date of event.

The Fairbanks campus and locations must conduct classes and remain open for business though conditions may impact some students' and some employees' ability to safely commute. Certain employees are necessary to maintain essential services and are required to attend work to the degree that they can safely do so.

DEFINITIONS

Severe weather conditions, natural or man-made disasters or other unusual circumstances are events which may impact campus operations or employee ability to commute to work.

RESPONSIBILITIES

During emergency situations, Cabinet will convene to review the circumstances and conditions. In consultation with their staff, Vice-Chancellors are responsible to determine essential services and to ensure services, classes and business are continued to the extent possible; in coordination with the UA President, the Chancellor will determine whether to cancel classes or close campus.

For rural campuses under the College of Rural and Community Development, the Chancellor delegates the above responsibilities and decision-making to the campus directors who will report conditions and notify the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor for Rural, Community and Native Education when conditions require invoking procedures under this policy.

In extreme circumstances, the Chancellor may close campus and authorize the use of administrative leave for employee absences from work. Campus closure and administrative leave will be authorized only in extreme circumstances that impact even those students and employees who live on or near campus.

Restricted funds do not allow for payment of administrative leave and individual units will pay

administrative leave time from available unrestricted funds

UAF Marketing and Communications is responsible to disseminate updated information to the campus and community through all available channels.

NON-COMPLIANCE
Non-compliance may result in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

EXCEPTIONS
None

PROCEDURES
Absent conditions requiring the authorization of administrative leave, the following options regarding employee leave may be implemented by supervisors, consistent with Cabinet determinations:

Department Status:
1. Vice-Chancellors must coordinate decision-making through Cabinet and keep the Chancellor advised of planned actions; Vice-Chancellors must coordinate with each other to be assured that essential services are adequately covered.
2. Vice-Chancellors and supervisors should determine essential services and communicate department status and operating hours to employees.
3. Vice-Chancellors may choose to reduce hours or remain fully open for business as circumstances dictate; employees who wish to work and avoid leave use should be accommodated to the extent possible. Supervisors should remain flexible during unusual circumstances and consider whether employee attendance is necessary to perform critical or essential functions.
4. Vice-Chancellors will update Marketing and Communication of department status.
5. Marketing and Communications will communicate information on University status during emergencies.

Leave Options
1. Employees may telecommute from home and work all or part of the day with supervisor approval.
2. If employees can safely commute and have access to their workspace, they can work a normal day.
3. Employees who are unable to safely commute to work, and are unable to telecommute, may use annual leave, leave without pay, or any combination of these leaves, for all or part of the day. Sick leave may be used for qualifying events described in University Regulation 04.06.130.
4. With supervisor approval and if the arrangement does not violate the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), employees who do not have adequate leave may flex their work schedule to make up time missed due to conditions. Overtime and overtime pay must be approved in advance by the supervisor. Approval is subject to budget considerations and department needs.
5. Other options as the Chancellor may authorize under circumstances presented.

Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes for Wed, Aug 31, 2011; 2-3 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Melanie Arthur, Nilima Hullavarad, Jenny Liu, Ellen Lopez, Shawn Russell, Derek Sikes, Kayt Sunwood, Jane Weber

Members absent: Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen, Dan White

1. Luncheon. Jane Weber reported: Carol Gold will be the speaker. Tues, Oct 4th, 12:30 Wood Center ballroom reserved. All present CSW members will arrive 11am to help setup. Use online RSVP form instead of email to reserve seat.

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

Discussion on question of replacing paper invitations with digital in future years. This year's invitations will still be paper - Ellen, Jenny, & Melanie and others will contact Jayne Harvie to setup times to help fold invitations.

2. Brown Bag Lunch subcommittee. Kayt Sunwood, Ellen Lopez, Nilima Hullavarad, Shawn Russell, and Melanie Arthur. Discussion on those held in past years. Meeting to organize next will be Sep 19th, Monday 10:30 in the Woman's Center (also on Elluminate live). https://elive.uaf.edu/join_meeting.html?meetingId=1233801250389

3. Data on UAF faculty salary by gender. Sine Anahita offered to do a gender analysis of salary data which could be used to create posters which hopefully can be ready for posting October 3-5th during the Accreditation visit. The committee voted to give CSW's approval of moving forward on this project.

4. UAF Statistics on P&T and retention - 10 years of data. Jane will contact Dan White & Ian Olson regarding these data and attending next meeting.

5. Next CSW meeting, Oct 11th 2-3pm

6. CSW co-Chair. Jane Weber agreed to continue as co-Chair. Additional co-Chair TBD.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:40;   Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes & Kayt Sunwood

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

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