

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #168
Monday, September 13, 2010
1:00 p.m. – 3: 10 p.m.
Wood Center Ballroom

I Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn

Faculty Senate President Jonathan Dehn called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call for 2010-11 Faculty Senate

Members Present:

ALLEN, Jane (Video)
ANGER, Andy (Audio)
ARENDT, Anthony
BAEK, Jungho
BAKER, Carrie
BARBOZA, Perry
BARTLETT, Christa
CAHILL, Cathy
DAVIS, Mike (Audio)
DEHN, Jonathan
DEHN, Lara
DONG, Lily
FOWELL, Sarah (Rainer Newberry)
GANGULI, Rajive (Audio)
HIMELBLOOM, Brian (Alex Oliveira)
HOCK, Regine
JENSEN, Karen
JOLIE, July
JONES, Debra
KADEN, Ute
KERR, Marianne
LARDON, Cecile
LAWLOR, Orion
MCEACHERN, Diane (Video)
MCINTYRE, Julie (Donie Bret-Harte)
METZGER, Andrew
PALTER, Morris

Members Present (cont'd):

RENES, Sue
REYNOLDS, Jennifer
ROBERTS, Larry
THOMAS, Amber
VALENTINE, Dave
WEBER, Jane
WILSON, Timothy

Others Present:

Becky Phillips
Linda Hapsmith

Members Absent:

BROCIOUS, Heidi
HANSEN, Roger
HUETTMANN, Falk
ZHANG, Xiong

Non-voting Members Present:

Susan Henrichs
Anita Hughes (Assoc. Registrar)
Eric Madsen
Doug Goering
Maria Russell
Nicole Carvajal
Jordan Titus
Josef Glowa
Cindy Hardy
Joanne Healy
Stephan Golux
Andy Soria (Video)

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #167

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 Approve the CLA Departments of English and Philosophy & Humanities Unit Criteria
2. Motion to Approve the CLA Department of Theatre Unit Criteria
3. Motion to Approve the CNSM Natural Science Unit Criteria
4. Motion to Amend the Minor Degree Requirements
5. Motion to Change the Study Day Policy

B. Motions Pending: None

III Public Comments/Questions

There were no public comments at the meeting.

IV A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn

Jon welcomed all returning and new members to the new and busy academic year. Important items of ongoing business include the following:

- The continuing process of accreditation, which will need everyone's support, and will bring some business before the senate in the future.
- The need to review the baccalaureate core which will probably mean the creation of a new committee out of Curricular Affairs. Vice Provost Dana Thomas will help with its formation.
- Review and update of the academic appeals policy by the senate.
- The idea of a legislative coordination committee, which would be a place for faculty wishing to communicate with the legislature to go for guidance and current information. This will be a future discussion item.

Progress on the UAF Bookstore front was mentioned. Guest speaker Becky Phillips will share more news in the meeting.

The losses of faculty members Barry McWayne and Erich Follman were mentioned and a moment of silence was observed in their honor.

A reminder from the Chancellor (who was out of town) was announced, about the evening reception for faculty senate members in October following the face to face meeting on the 11th. All members and their guests are invited to the Chancellor's home at 5:30 PM.

B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill

Cathy welcomed everyone to the busy academic year. She announced there will be a brown bag lunch meeting for new senate members before the next senate meeting on October 11.

The university budget is an item that has everyone's attention. The new university president's examination of the current state of the system was mentioned. In his words, we need to take a "strategic pause" and examine what we do well, and maintain the highest standards we can. New program development is going to be very limited in this budget climate, and may require reallocation within the MAU for it to be approved.

The Life Sciences Building bond vote was mentioned, which is coming up in November. Please advocate for it, but not on university time or using resources. It needs everyone's support.

There are a lot of searches for executives coming up this year. Mark Myers is the new vice chancellor for research. He comes from the background of the USGS and the Natural Gas Pipeline Agency. He will come on site in January 2011.

UAS has stolen our past president Marsha Sousa. She is the new Dean of UAS Arts and Sciences, leaving her current position of associate dean at UAF CTC.

The need for a faculty at-large member for CDAC was mentioned. (A volunteer was identified following the meeting.)

V A. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

1. Summary of AY 09-10 Tenure, Promotion, 4th year and Post-tenure Reviews (Attachment 168/1)

Susan described the recent statewide system review by the outside consulting team of James L. Fisher. The external review, requested by President Gamble, came up on very short notice because of the team's limited availability. Their report of the university system is due back quite promptly (approximately within a month).

Program review, which is mandated by Board of Regents policy, has been on a 5-year cycle. This doesn't fit the new 7-year accreditation cycle. The plan is to streamline the process by having a lot of it based on institutional research, with student learning outcomes assessment info provided by the programs. Programs will examine the institutional research data for their unit, along with answering some questions and providing information about unique aspects of their program. The new process will be far less taxing on individuals, though faculty input and review will remain a part of it. The Planning and Budget Committee will meet soon and will also be charged with looking at the new program review process. Any recommended deletions of programs will follow the established faculty senate process.

As Cathy mentioned, with budgets tightening, there is going to be a lot more scrutiny of everything the university does in terms of cost effectiveness. All aspects of what the university does, not just

academic programs, but all administrative support services (such as those for research, student services, etc.) are being looked at.

Thus, there is not a lot of flexibility to add new programs that require new infusions of state money. The state has not been that generous to the University system over the last decade in that regard, and it's not going to get better in the current situation. The draft of the budget request from statewide reflects that fact (still needs to be reviewed by the BOR). The operating budget request asks for substantial fixed cost increases to cover salary and benefit increases; however, the three faculty union contracts are expiring soon so some of the actual costs are unknown and not yet specified. And, there is the possible staff bargaining unit to take into consideration. In terms of new operating requests, they're limiting it to \$2.5 million dollars (which is a lot less than in previous years). The UAF portion of that request is just under one million dollars, and includes mainly existing programs or activities that have been funded out of internal reallocation or some other kind of one time funding or grant funding that's expiring. The same applies to other institutions in the system.

In terms of capital funding requests, they're not requesting any new buildings, but they might reassess that if the bond package (with the Life Sciences building) isn't passed by the voters.

Statewide is including \$75 million for deferred maintenance across the system, and \$25 million across the system for Renewal and Repurposing (*R&R*). UAF has more deferred maintenance and would get perhaps \$40 million of that amount. The *R&R* funding would be useful for repurposing buildings on campus, as well. The governor is interested in addressing deferred maintenance and wants to see it funded.

Cecile L. asked if more funding for instructional technology on campus will be requested. Susan didn't recall seeing funding requests for that, but has only had today to review the new budget. Past similar requests have never been funded; the legislature is not generous with equipment requests. The problems are recognized and ways to reallocate within the system are being looked at by administration.

Susan mentioned the 2009-10 summary of promotion and tenure report attached to the agenda. Her main concern has to do with the requests for tenure prior to the mandatory year (PTMY) or requests for promotion to professor after only a few years in the associate professor rank. The question needs to be asked whether only two or three years in the associate rank is enough to have amassed the performance record of sustained excellence required for promotion to professor (as described in the Blue Book). Similarly, questions need to be asked regarding the PTMY promotion to associate professor and tenure applications. She expects further discussions on these issues with the university-wide review committees.

She would also encourage the senate with regard to revising and updating the Blue Book that they consider some of these issues. Should there be a requirement for time in rank for promotion to professor? If it's something that the faculty feel strongly about, it's something that could be included in the criteria (and used to be, in the past).

Jordan Titus asked about the issue concerning PTMY promotion to associate professor and tenure requests. Did it concern new people beginning here, or those coming from outside the university with a prior academic track record? Susan said it was mixed – both cases were true.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Maria Russell

Staff Council's first meeting is on Wednesday. Right now there is a non-retention ruling in the courts locally which will bring into question how the university may release staff from employment. Also, the staff will vote in the months of October and November on whether to unionize. (This doesn't include staff who are supervisors, confidential staff or safety employees.)

Jane W. asked when the vote opens and how long it's open. Maria responded that it's open for 30 days, between Oct. 4 and Nov. 5 (by mail only).

Jordan T. asked about the court case Maria mentioned. The Taylor case was ruled on July 26, and statewide is still discussing their response. It may be hinging on the unionization result as that would be a factor to consider in their response.

B. ASUAF – Nicole Carvajal

Nicole announced the hire of Michele Hebert as the sustainability coordinator, who will work with the student board. They're having biweekly meetings and there is a listserve for interested people. Send an email to either Michele or herself president@asuaf.org. Four students have been hired to work on the recycle bins.

ASUAF is looking into buying textbooks for core 100- and 200-level courses, to have on reserve in their offices for students to use at that location (not to check out).

ASUAF is interested in having input regarding +/- grading issue. They keep hearing that students are unhappy with the system, particularly the C- issue.

ASUAF will be sending two students and the president to the BOR meeting in Juneau later this month, specifically regarding tuition.

At the ASUAF meeting yesterday, seven seats were filled; however, there are still some vacancies so please send interested students their way.

Jane W. asked about whether paper recycling is being done. Nicole wasn't certain at this time what is being worked out on that issue.

Dave V. asked about the grading issue. Nicole clarified that a grade of C- is causing students to fail some of their classes, and, in general, it's dragging GPA's down. Jon D. commented that Administrative Committee has talked about the issue, and that the Curricular Affairs and Graduate Academic and Advisory committees are also discussing the issue. Amber T. commented that she thinks C- is a passing grade in the Core, but not for courses in a major. Nicole clarified that she meant C- is a failing grade for a course in one's major.

C. UNAC – Jordan Titus

Jordan Titus mentioned that UNAC has just begun negotiating the new collective bargaining agreement. Also, the university had filed a unit clarification request to the Alaska Labor Relations Board. It's gone through procedure, and the post-hearing briefs were submitted at the end of August. They're hoping to have a decision from the Board this fall. The ORP lawsuit is still ongoing.

Jane W. mentioned that UAFT CBA negotiations are still ongoing (and have been for the past month).

VII Guest Speaker

A. Rebecca Phillips, Manager, UAF Bookstore

As of July 21, the campus bookstore is now owned and run by the Follett Corporation. The entire staff (except for one person) was retained. They've hired about 30 temporary and student employees for the semester start-up, and they'll keep about 15 student employees through the semester.

Textbooks are back on campus. They also have a variety of e-books. About 30% of textbooks are now available for rent, with a savings of 55% from the new price for students who take advantage of that. They have a good variety of logo merchandise and are bulking up on the study aids and school supplies. In the coming semesters they'll have more time to audit the textbook shelves.

Jane W. thanked Becky and her staff for the great job they're doing, and is glad to see all the books again.

Becky mentioned the October 1 e-adoption deadline for textbooks. They'll also take any paper adoption forms.

Cecile L. asked if there's a price difference if a book is ordered online. Becky explained that it's not different online than locally any more. The local Follett store personnel see the online order and pull the book for the student here. The student doesn't pay freight charges, unless they want the book mailed to them.

Lara D. asked about the advantage of renting a book vs. buying a used book. Becky explained that renting is cheaper than buying a used book, with a price difference of 25%. The rental option is cheaper for one semester; so, if a book will be used for two semesters the students are encouraged to purchase it so it's cheaper. The bookstore will buy it back if it's in useable condition.

Cecile asked about e-books. Becky reported that the bookstore sold 85 this semester. Clerks talked them up, but buyers were still a little hesitant. Faculty may elect e-books during the adoption process.

If faculty want a textbook to be on the local rental list, they should plan to use that textbook for at least four semesters. Follett also has a national rental book list, which includes some textbooks already in use at UAF. The textbook should not contain a consumable that can't be reused (codes or workbooks, for example).

Dave V. asked how long this bookstore contract is in effect. Becky hasn't seen the contract, but believes it's for five years.

BREAK

VIII New Business

- A. Reaffirm the Resolution for Open Promotion and Tenure Meetings, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 168/2)

Dave V. spoke in opposition to the motion. At SNRAS they want the candidate's letter from the committee to accurately reflect their discussion which is more frank and open with a closed meeting. The letter that results is more informative, better constructed and more defensible in terms of the discussion, than it would be if the candidate were present.

Jennifer R. noted the philosophy behind the resolution is, theoretically, that one wouldn't say anything in the meeting that wouldn't be said directly to the candidate's face. Only legitimate comments should be made about the file at hand. With that in mind, she asked Dave why they feel it's better to hold closed meetings.

Dave responded that there's a potential element of personal acrimony. He agreed that peers should uphold the standard of only speaking to the content of the file and the candidate's record. But he doesn't believe that keeping the meetings open will necessarily accomplish that.

Amber T. asked why this motion was brought forward. Jane W replied that the Committee on the Status of Women feels strongly about the issue and asked for it to be put forward. Cathy C. mentioned it's also the start of the review cycle and unit peer committees are being formed, so it's timely.

Amber T. asked about scope of the resolution, which she thought only extended to the university-wide committees. Is it intended for individual units, also? Cathy noted that the unit peer is more likely to follow the university-wide policy example. Jon stressed this is a resolution and noted that each committee can decide for itself. The committees are forming now, so they want to reaffirm this position now.

Jennifer R. remarked that when this resolution was first drafted several years ago, many committees were holding closed meetings for their own convenience. It was not a considered decision.

Donie B. made a point of clarification about the current policy: it's to make sure people know it's a choice to have an open or closed meeting.

Jordan T. noted that the unions prefer open meetings to ensure that the faculty contracts are being adhered to.

Julie J. asked who chooses whether the meeting is open or closed, the candidate or the committee? The committee chooses whether the meeting is open or closed first, but the candidate can respond and close an open meeting. However, if the committee chooses a closed meeting, the candidate has no choice.

The resolution was moved to question and seconded. The resolution was reaffirmed by a majority vote.

B. Motion to Eliminate the B.S. in Statistics, submitted by Curricular Affairs
Committee (Attachment 168/3)

Rainer described the motion and its origination in the Mathematics department. Curricular Affairs could find no reason not to pass it. Jon D. noted that none of the statistics courses are going away, just the pathway to this B.S. degree. Lara D. asked what difference it makes to eliminate the program if there is no change to courses or faculty. Rainer observed that they won't have to do outcomes assessment on the program anymore. Lara asked what the difference is between the bachelor's and master's in statistics. Rainer noted that getting a math degree with an emphasis in statistics is nearly the same. From the standpoint of an employer or graduate school, the difference is minimal. There's total of five people taking it right now, but there's nobody new in the program. The department itself has made the choice to eliminate the program.

Susan H. commented about the investment in time required for doing student learning outcomes assessment and program review. Every year Statewide publishes a list of programs with their enrollment numbers. They are questioned every year about smaller programs, so it is to their advantage to consider streamlining and consolidating programs. In this case, Curricular Affairs and the department itself have gone forward with streamlining. The advantages may mostly be bookkeeping ones. Lara asked if, in light of how difficult it will be to get new programs in the future, it wouldn't be better to consider revamping the program to better serve an audience.

Lara commented on the need for biostatisticians for state jobs. A master's isn't needed for that position, but a bachelor's is a good idea. She doesn't see how this fits the plan. Rainer reiterated that the math degree with stats emphasis is nearly the same degree, and asked if we can truly afford to keep both programs with the scrutiny from both the state and university administration.

Amber T. noted that, even in this funding climate, we can still work within the parameters of programs that already exist to create new minors and areas of emphasis or refocus energies with existing resources. The Provost confirmed Amber's statement. Susan also mentioned that no university should just sit on its laurels; it should change with its constituency. New programs starting from scratch will still possibly happen, but it will be a harder process in this time of constrained budgets.

Amber asked if anyone was present from the Math department who could respond to Lara's suggestions about revamping the program rather than eliminating it.

Dana Thomas spoke to the concern raised. He has a professorship in statistics in the mathematics department, and it's still his locus of tenure. Both statistics and math department faculty directed this motion because they think this is the best path to go on. The math degree with an emphasis in statistics is their choice for support.

The motion was called to question and seconded. A vote was taken and the motion carried with no nays or abstentions.

C. Motion to Revise the Core Review Committee Membership in the Faculty
Senate Bylaws, submitted by the Core Review Committee (Attachment 168/4)

Latrice Laughlin, chair of Core Review, brought the motion to floor and explained the purpose of the change to that committee's membership bylaws, which is to provide for more support from and representation by individuals working with the Core at different units.

Dave V. asked for further clarification about the motion, which Latrice provided. The motion was called to question and seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

IX Discussion Items

A. Recap of Summer Actions by the Administrative Committee – Jon Dehn

Two meetings were held over the summer, their purpose being to work with other governance groups and have a presence at the BOR meetings. Jon coordinated leadership of all three UAF governance units and the Graduate Student Committee, to meet with President Gamble in July. They had a question and answer session with him about how governance works. President Gamble made a very good impression on them.

The external review of the entire university system by the James Fisher consulting group was next mentioned. Jon reported that the review, supported by a grant from the Rasmuson Foundation, included several sessions with faculty at all three campuses. James Fisher spoke to each senate president separately, and a consulting representative spoke with each of the administrative committees of each senate. Each faculty group stressed that we are a very unique university with a broad mission. This makes it difficult to compare us with lower 48 universities, and helps explain our ranking in reports like that of the U.S. News and World Report. In general, the faculty spoke with a relatively united voice across the system. Jon's personal impression was that President Gamble wanted this external view to get a good outside opinion of the university and he suspects it will focus more on what is going on at statewide rather than at the individual campuses.

The Graduate Student Conference was successful. Bill Streever of BP was the keynote speaker. The students plan to have another conference next year.

One of Faculty Alliance's big successes to report is that now on the System Academic Council there is a faculty representative from each campus MAU (where before there were only two representatives and one of the MAU's was always left out).

Faculty Alliance recently had a retreat, and they got to talk with many of the statewide administrators on a one-to-one basis. They asked for a "strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats" assessment from each of them, and got some very good frank answers in return.

The concept of the faculty senate summit is still being discussed. The Faculty Alliance retreat in October with President Gamble will provide more opportunity to talk about this idea.

Faculty Alliance likes how the Academic Master Plan has turned out (recognizing that it was a herculean task), but they feel that it's very long. They are trying to write a summary of it, and plan to present a draft at SAC in October.

B. Academic Master Plan Update – Susan Henrichs, Jon Dehn

Susan mentioned that a draft of the plan was give to the BOR and President Gamble. Input, comments and suggested revisions received from Faculty Alliance, the senates, and other campus groups have been diligently worked into the document. President Gamble wanted

many terms defined and the glossary has been expanded. Draft #28 is at the BOR, after which it will come back to the senates for another look.

Cecile L. asked if there were any sticking points in the plan. Susan said doctoral programs are still an issue. UAA wants free reign to develop all sorts of doctoral programs, while UAF wants to remain the doctoral granting university in the system. The compromise has been to allow UAA (if they wish) to develop a doctorate in Nursing Practice and a doctorate in Education Administration. These are both professional doctorates, as opposed to a research doctorate.

Other areas of concern have mostly had to do with how to avoid areas of nonproductive competition, particularly with engineering, distance ed, health and career programs. How do we decide which institution offers which program or how may we offer programs more collaboratively? How do we divide revenue, credit hours, etc. The AMP only makes an incremental step toward resolving these types of issues.

C. Electronic Student Evaluations – Josef Glowa

Josef Glowa brought the topic forward on behalf of the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee. The issue affects every faculty professionally. The Provost's office would like to move to electronic evaluations for issues of cost efficiency and to replace the current instructional assessment system with a better one, and has sought the input from the Faculty Senate, starting with the FDAI Committee.

The FDAI committee examined available research literature on the topic. The major problem they became aware of is the low response rate of online types of evaluation. There are better response rates with paper versions. There is an average 23% difference in responses rates between paper and electronic evaluations. The problem with a low rate of response is not being able to draw valid conclusions about faculty teaching from them. A 50% to 70% response rate is needed to more accurately do so. Student evaluations are important in the promotion and tenure process. Low response rates become hazardous in that context.

Amber T. suggested that if this electronic system were used, that students must complete them in order to get their grades. She observed that when students do these all together in a classroom, it's a more serious process. By doing it outside of class and making it informal, it may not help the task.

Susan H. noted that many distance courses are evaluated online, and some faculty have elected to use online evaluations. The response rates have been low, as the research Josef mentioned has shown. They recognize there must be incentive to get students to do this task, whether it's linked to Blackboard and access to grades, for example. A clicker system in every classroom would be effective, though it's costly. Another issue prompting them to look at this now is a security issue. The present system is loose and that poses risks. Students collect and courier the forms and have access to them in this process. Steps are currently being taken to address the holes in the process.

Amber T. mentioned her frustration at learning of the loss of all CLA evaluation forms for Spring 2009.

Cecile L. expressed concern that students might use an electronic system to do more venting instead of providing feedback, especially if they're made to do so. She feels the discussion of this topic should be more in-depth, and address how evaluations are being used or should be used.

Susan H. welcomed this type of discussion. She also mentioned that systematic student evaluations of instruction are a requirement of our accreditation, which doesn't mean we are tied to one system or way of doing them. She is leery of using a system where we make up the questions or design our system from scratch. The various national organizations that develop these have done a lot of the basic design work already, considering bias issues, etc.

Rainer asked who, in the end, ultimately makes this decision. Susan expressed hope for mutual agreement on the subject. She's uncomfortable with continuing with the system in use now. She wants the options to be looked at and considered, and seeks alternatives that fix the current situation. The solution doesn't necessarily have to be an electronic one.

Jennifer R. mentioned that the current system does "select" for students who actually come to class, and she hopes that this would be taken into account in choosing a future system.

Jordan T. talked about a national conference she attended where they talked about the issue of low response rates. Incentives could be offered, but there are probably legal problems with making it mandatory.

The Provost said they would have to provide an option in the process of not filling out a form. Susan asked Josef for the report the FDAI committee prepared, and asked everyone to think further about a win-win solution on all fronts for everyone involved. [Note: The report had been posted already with some other related information on the Faculty Senate meeting page for last Spring 2010, as Josef mentioned.]

Jon noted that how we use the results from the system we use is really the key question.

D. Status of Committee/Board Assignments

1. Chancellor's Diversity Action Committee:

Current seats: Jane Weber, Extended 2010; Christa Bartlett, 2011

There's open seat for an at-large faculty member. Let Jane Weber know.

2. Provost's Planning & Budget Committee: Cathy Cahill

3. Research Working Group: Roger Hansen

4. Accreditation Steering Committee: 2 open seats

Interested faculty do not need to be senators. Let Jon or Cathy know if you're interested.

X Committee Reports

Due to time constraints, committee reports were shortened to just mentioning any highlights.

A. Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Convener/Chair Meeting notes provided.

B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair No highlights mentioned.

- C. Unit Criteria – Ute Kaden, Convener
No highlights mentioned.
- D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair
(Attachment 168/5)
Jane W. mentioned the upcoming Women Faculty Luncheon on Tuesday, October 12.
- E. Core Review – Latrice Laughlin, Chair
Minutes were provided as a hand-out.
- F. Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
No highlights mentioned.
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks, Convener
No comments available.
- H Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair
(Attachment 168/6)
Josef mentioned that there will be peer instruction workshops with a noted physicist from Harvard on October 27 and 28.
- I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee –Ken Abramowicz, Chair
Orion reported on a rejected Maymester lab course, FISH F614, which proposed teaching a graduate level lab course inside of two weeks. The committee examined what would be accomplished in that limited timeframe, and concluded that there was no way feasible to compact a lab course of this level to such a short time. There is another 300-level lab course that has been turned into a Maymester course, and they want to see what the outcomes assessment is for that course.
- J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Convener
No highlights mentioned.
- K. Research Advisory Committee (ad hoc) – Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen, Co-Chairs (Attachment 168/7)
Orion was elected chair, and the committee is working on their bylaws.
- XI Members' Comments/Questions
No comments or questions brought to the floor.
- XII Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:05 PM.

Summary of AY 09-10 Tenure, Promotion, 4th year and Post-tenure Reviews

Promotion and Tenure

Category:	Totals
Promotion to Professor	6 yes, 2 no
Tenure, Mandatory	8 yes, 1 no
Tenure, PTMY	6 yes, 0 no, 0 withdrawn
Promotion to Research or Clinical Associate Professor	0 yes, 0 no
Promotion to Research Professor	1 yes, 1 no
TOTAL number of candidates	25
TOTAL number of successful candidates	21

*PTMY = prior to mandatory year

Issues (from the Provost's perspective):

- A high proportion of faculty apply for tenure 1-2 years before their mandatory year. Although their records may not be as strong as they would have been later, the criterion in my view is 'would this be a sufficient record if it were presented in the mandatory year'. This has led to some differences in recommendation between the provost and the campus-wide committee.
- I continue to work with deans to ensure that pre-tenure faculty receive frank annual evaluations and 4th year pre-tenure reviews. If a faculty member's record is not on a trajectory to be sufficient for tenure, notice should be given.
- There is also some trend of faculty applying for Professor shortly after promotion to Associate Professor. The standard for Professor is, in part:

"Professor. Those faculty awarded the rank of professor at the university shall exemplify the attainment of performance and achievement consistent with a high standard of excellence.

The faculty member shall present a record of continuing sustained excellence which demonstrates that the candidate is recognized for contributions to knowledge in the discipline; is recognized by peers and students as an excellent teacher; contributes to the overall effort and reputation of the university through appropriate extension of knowledge and discipline-related service..."

Some further clarification from the faculty about what constitutes 'continuing sustained excellence' would be helpful in such cases.

	Totals
Post Tenure Review	8 satisfactory, 1 unsatisfactory

4th year Review	Totals
Satisfactory	13
Unsatisfactory	3
Total candidates	16

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 Faculty Affairs and Administrative Committees would like to have the Faculty Senate reaffirm the resolution publicly at Faculty Senate Meeting #168 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.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the elimination of the B.S. degree in Statistics.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011

RATIONALE: See the program proposal #99-UPCh. on file in the Governance
Office, 314 Signers' Hall.

A proposal to eliminate the B.S. program in Statistics has been submitted because of low enrollments. Changes proposed to make statistics an option in the mathematics major have been approved. Statistics courses are largely service courses for other departments, so little impact is anticipated.

Elimination of Statistics B.S. Program

Over the past five years the number of students enrolled in the Statistics B.S. program been very small (fewer than 5) and the number of students graduating from the program has never been more than 2 or 3 in a year.

The B.S. program in Mathematics has a statistics option and we have submitted revisions to this program/option to accommodate students interested in statistics. The Statistics baccalaureate program was built upon existing service courses; the existing statistics option in the Mathematics B.S. program will continue to be offered using these courses. Enrollment in statistics courses remains strong at both the undergraduate and graduate level because these courses provide a service to other departments or the Statistics M.S. program. Thus, we anticipate little impact on other programs, the personnel directly involved with the program, or the budget of the department. This change will allow the statistics faculty to dedicate a bit more of their effort to the much stronger M.S. program in Statistics which helps provide Biometricians for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Department of Interior, Wildlife Division. Currently 3 baccalaureate students are majored in Statistics. The M.S. program has 8 students enrolled. Undergraduate course enrollments in Statistics courses for Spring and Fall semesters 2008 - 2009 are given below (dashes indicate course not taught that semester).

	Spring 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009
STAT F200	105	85	100	71
STAT F300	21	--	26	25
STAT F401	32	41	32	16
STAT F402	--	15	--	22
STAT F461	17	--	--	--

Students currently in the Statistics B.S. program will be allowed to complete their programs under the catalogs they are eligible to use or move to the old or newly proposed statistics option in the Mathematics program. Only one course change is being implemented that may impact such students; STAT 480, Senior Project, will be eliminated and replaced with STAT 454 Statistical Consulting Seminar in the newly proposed statistics option in the Mathematics program. Students wanting to complete a Senior Project rather than take STAT 454 will be given that option. We will keep the Senior Project in the catalog for the next 3 years to accommodate such students. There is no other statistics program available within the UA System so internal transfers are not an issue.

Background Information

The original instructional program request for the B.S. Degree in statistics is unavailable. The following description of the program and its goals is taken from the UAF course catalogue.

Statistics is a collection of methods and theories for making decisions or estimating unknown quantities from incomplete information. Statistical techniques are useful, for example, in estimation plant, animal and mineral abundances; forecasting social, political and economic trends; planning field plot experiments in agriculture; performing clinical trials in medical research; and maintaining quality control in industry. Employment opportunities are excellent for statisticians in many of these areas of application.

The curriculum for the B.S. degree program in statistics was developed using guidelines proposed by the American Statistical Association and provides graduates with a strong mathematics, computation and statistics background and integrates this with an area of application. The program allows considerable flexibility in the choice of the area of application by requiring a major in any area offered by UAF.

Although enrollment in undergraduate statistics courses is typically high, the number of students declaring the statistics major has remained low. There are currently three students seeking the B.S. degree in statistics. Over the past five years the number of students enrolled in the Statistics B.S. program been very small (fewer than 5) and the number of students graduating from the program has never been more than 2 or 3 in a year.

The B.S. Degree in Statistics has no space requirements, nor any special personnel or support service costs.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Section 3 (Art. V: Committees) at subsection E.6, addressing membership requirements for the Core Review Committee.

Effective: Immediately

Rationale: Allowing membership of the college representatives who are already tasked with assessing core courses will improve communication between the Core Review Committee and the colleges regarding substantive changes and additions to baccalaureate core courses.

CAPS = Addition

[] = Deletion

Section 3 (ART V: Committees), subsection E.6, paragraph two:

The committee shall be composed of one faculty member from each of the core component areas: (Social Sciences, English, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Communication, and Library Science) and one faculty member from a non-core component area. Membership on the committee will include an undergraduate student, **AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COLLEGES SPECIFICALLY TASKED WITH CORE ASSESSMENT.**

ATTACHMENT 168/5
UAF Faculty Senate #168, September 13, 2010

Committee on the Status of Women, Minutes
Monday, August 30, 2010; 1-2 pm
Gruening 718

Members Present: Melanie Arthur, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Shawn Russell, Jane Weber

6th Annual Faculty Women Luncheon: Tuesday, October 12, 2010, 12:30-2:30, Wood Center Ballroom; Audioconferenced and webstreamed. Melanie and Jane will work on setup – need more volunteers. Steffi will work on invitations with Senate Office.

Honorary Degree Recipients and Commencement Speaker: Need CSW member on committee – no volunteers yet

Topics for year:

- 1) Examine P/T stats
- 2) Annual “survey” tied to Annual Activities Report
- 3) Examine mentoring at UAF
- 4) 2017 Vision
- 5) Brown Bag Luncheon Committee

Future meetings: Tuesday, October 5, 1-2
Thursday, November 4, 1-2.

ATTACHMENT 168/6
UAF Faculty Senate #168, September 13, 2010

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes
August 25, 2010

Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Julie Lurman Joly, Joy Morrison, Channon Price

Excused: Alexandra Oliveira, Larry Roberts

We discussed committee membership and noted the following changes: 1) Dana Greci is on a year-long sabbatical; 2) James Huesmann, Marianne Kerr, Alexandra Oliveira, and Xiyu (Thomas) Zhou have resigned from the committee (but Josef will email Alex and ask her to reconsider as input from rural-site faculty is very important to our committee); 3) Diane McEachern is on the committee but we have not been able to connect with her yet; 4) we need to request that the Provost appoint a replacement for James Huesmann to the committee; and 5) Joy will be on a six-month sabbatical starting in January so we will need to continue on with whomever is hired to direct the Office of Faculty Development during Joy's absence.

Meeting day/time for the fall semester will be the second Tuesday of the month from 3:00 – 4:00 pm, with our next two meetings set for Tuesday, September 14, 2010, 3:00 – 4:00 pm, and Tuesday, October 12, 2010, 3:00 – 4:00 pm in Bunnell 222.

2011 Lilly Arctic Conference on Adult Learning is scheduled for Fairbanks in March. Joy suggests that it might be held every two years instead and new speakers should be brought in.

The New Faculty Orientation went very well and had good attendance. Many social activities have been planned to help welcome our new faculty to the community.

Eric Mazur, Harvard Physics professor, is scheduled to come to Fairbanks October 27 – 29 to give presentations and workshops on peer instruction. He is the key speaker for this semester. Joy requests that we look him up online and come up with suggestions on what we might have him do while he is here.

Next year's key speaker will be Ron Burk who specializes in using humor in the classroom (coming in late August 2011).

This year's agenda will be focused on continuing our investigation into electronic student evaluations. Sarah Lewis has resigned her position in order to pursue her education, and Sarah Lundemo has been tasked with administrative support of the IAS process. Josef sent a memo to the Administrative Committee with our recommendations last year, and he will check with Jayne Harvey to insure that it is put on the agenda for Faculty Senate. Joy will ask Dan Julius, Vice President for Academic Affairs about possible plans for electronic evaluations statewide.

Joy asked that we brainstorm ideas on how to better collaborate with UAA so we can share our guest speakers via video conferencing and spread the benefits of their expertise even further.

We will also work on finalizing the Faculty Forum for spring 2011, using Kennedy's book again as a springboard.

Joy mentioned that there will be four weekend workshops in Distance Education offered this year: two this fall and two in the spring. The workshops, which have a competitive application process as announced in the August 23 email to all faculty, will cover a variety of topics including Elive, Second Life, blogs, and Wikis

Next meeting reminder: Tuesday, September 14, 2010 at 3:00 pm in Bunnell 222.

Adjourned at 3:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton and Channon Price.

Research Advisory Committee (Ad hoc)
Sept. 9, 2010 Meeting Notes

Actions taken at meeting:

1. Orion Lawlor was elected committee chair, and Roger Hansen co-chair.
2. The committee's name is now the Research Advisory Committee (RAC) from ARC.
3. We began the process of drafting Bylaws, which are under review by the committee.