FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Jayne Harvie
474-7964 jbharvie@alaska.edu
For Audio conferencing:
Toll-free: 1-800-893-8850
Participant PIN: 1109306

A G E N D A

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #198
Monday, April 7, 2014
1:00 p.m. – 3:10 p.m.
Board of Regents Conference Room, 109 Butrovich Building

1:00	I	Call to Order – David Valentine A. Roll Call B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #197 C. Adoption of Agenda	4 Min.
1:04	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions A. Motions Approved: 1. Motion to reaffirm unit criteria for the School of Management 2. Motion to reaffirm unit criteria for the Department of Music 3. Motion to reaffirm unit criteria for the Graduate Program in Marine Science and Limnology 4. Motion to recommend amending the UAF Regulation for Emeritus Status 5. Motion to amend academic probation policy 6. Motion to revise non-UA transfer courses for Perspectives on the Human Condition B. Motions Pending: None	1 Min.
1:05	III	A. President's Remarks – David Valentine B. President-Elect's Remarks – Cécile Lardon	10 Min.
1:15	IV	A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs	15 Min.
1:30	V	Guest Speaker: UA President Pat Gamble	20 Min.
1:50	VI	Governance Reports A. Staff Council – Brad Krick B. ASUAF – Brix Hahn C. Athletics – Dani Sheppard D. UNAC – Falk Huettmann UAFT – Jane Weber	10 Min.
2:00	BREAK		
2:10	VII	Old Business A. Motion to confirm the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award,	15 Min.

submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee (Attachment 198/1)

B. Election of President-Elect for 2014-15, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 198/2)

C. UAF Faculty Senate Election Results (Attachment 198/3)

2:25 VIII New Business 20 Min.

A. Motion to reaffirm Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures Unit Criteria, submitted by Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 198/4)

B. Motion to create new IT Committee of the Faculty Senate, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 198/5)

C. Motion to endorse the Electronic Course Evaluation Report Results, submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee (Attachment 198/6)

D. Resolution urging Board of Regents to Adopt Salary Geographic Differential, submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 198/7)

2:45 IX Discussion Item 10 Min.

A. Proposed changes to Department Chair Policy, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 198/8)

2:55 X Guest Announcement 5 Min.

A. Amber Cagwin, Coordinator, Dean of Students' Office
Topic: Review of the Student Code of Conduct

3:00 XI Public Comment 5 Min.

3:05 XII Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements 5 Min.

A. General Comments/Announcements

B. Committee Chair Comments

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 198/9)
Faculty Affairs – Knut Kielland, Chair
Unit Criteria – Chris Coffman, Chair (Attachment 19810)
Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 198/11)
Core Review Committee – Miho Aoki, Chair (Attachment 198/12)
Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair (Attachment 198/13)
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair (Attachment 198/14)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair (Attachment 198/15)
Research Advisory Committee – Peter Winsor, Chair

3:10 XIII Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 198/1
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by OSYA Selection Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the nomination of Franz Meyer for the 2013-2014 Outstanding Senator of the Year Award.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The selection committee has carefully reviewed the nominations according to the award criteria, and forwards the nomination of Franz Meyer as Outstanding Senator of the Year for confirmation by the Faculty Senate. Procedure stipulates that a simple majority vote of the Senate shall confirm the nomination, and a formal resolution shall be prepared for presentation to the recipient at the May meeting.

ATTACHMENT 198/2
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to affirm the election of M. Syndonia Bret-Harte as the Faculty Senate President-Elect for 2014-2015.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: A single nomination has been accepted for the President-Elect position. Unless further nominations are made and accepted, a secret ballot election need not be held. A simple majority vote will suffice.

****

Personal Statement – M. Syndonia Bret-Harte

I am an Associate Professor with a joint appointment in the Department of Biology and Wildlife and the Institute of Arctic Biology. I earned my Ph.D. from Stanford University, and first came to UAF as a postdoctoral fellow with F. Stuart Chapin, III in 1998. After becoming a research assistant professor in the Institute of Arctic Biology in 2003, I was promoted to Associate Professor and moved into a tenure-track position in 2009. I was awarded tenure in 2013. My research focuses on the interactions between arctic plant species and nutrient cycling in tundra ecosystems, and the response of arctic vegetation to climate change. I am the Principal Investigator on the Cooperative Agreement with NSF that funds the base operations of the Toolik Field Station, and have extensive responsibilities in the management and oversight of that facility. I currently teach scientific writing for graduate students and plant biology for undergraduates in the Department of Biology and Wildlife.

I was first elected to the Faculty Senate in 2006, and represented research faculty until 2009. Following my transition to tenure-track faculty in 2009, I served as a faculty senate alternate from 2009-2011, and as a senator representing the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics from 2012 to present. I served on Faculty Affairs Committee for 3 years, and on the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee (GAAC) for 5 years. I have served as Chair of GAAC and a member of the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee for the last 2 years. In 2013, I also served as the Faculty Senate's representative on the SNRAS-CES Merger Structure Committee. I have also served on various other university committees, am the co-Chair of the Toolik Steering Committee, and engage in professional service including proposal review, panel service for NSF, and manuscript review for journals.

Several challenges face the Faculty Senate in the next two years. First, the projected declines in the university budget are likely to create both difficult choices and perhaps, opportunities. While many decisions concerning responses to changes in the budget are not under the control of the Faculty Senate, it is important for faculty to have a seat at the table while options that might affect them are discussed, and to be able to advocate for our priorities. Second, rapid changes are occurring in the environment for higher education both nationally and in Alaska, and it is important that UAF faculty play a lead role in

shaping the university's response to these changes. Some current issues and efforts include continuing the revitalization of the general education requirements at UAF, achieving greater alignment between the curricula among different campuses in the UA system without compromising UAF standards, and intelligently serving student needs as distance education becomes a more prominent component of instruction.

The current Senate leadership has done an excellent job of creating good channels of communication between the UAF administration and the Senate. I would like to build on this work to continue to engage constructively with the administration, and empower faculty to be informed, critical participants in shared governance. If elected, I will listen to your ideas and solicit your help.

ATTACHMENT 198/3
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by Administrative Committee

2014 FS Election Results

College of Liberal Arts

Representatives	Alternates
Arts & Communication – **Brian Cook (16)**	Arts & Communication – Karl Knapp (15)
English & Humanities – Chris Coffman (15)	English & Humanities – **Alicia Hall (16)**
Language & Culture – Anna Berge (15)	Language & Culture – **Patrick Plattet (16)**
Social Sciences – Amy Lovecraft (15)	Social Sciences – Chanda Meek (15)
Applied & Distance Program – J. Rob Duke (15)	Applied & Distance Programs – Vacancy
At large – **Diana Di Stefano (16)**	At large – Wendy Croskrey (15)
At large – **Walter Skya (16)**	

Libraries

Leslie McCartney (15)	Elizabeth Humrickhouse (15)
Dennis Moser (16)	

College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics

Representatives	Alternates
Elizabeth Allman (16)	Ataur Chowdhury (15)
Mark Conde (15)	**Falk Huettmann (16)**
Donie Bret-Harte (15)	Brian Rasley (15)
Cathy Hanks (16)	Vacancy (16)
David Maxwell (16)	
Franz Meyer (15)	
Margaret Short (15) – Going on Sabbatical; remainder of term to be filled by **Rainer Newberry**	

College of Rural & Community Development

Representatives	Alternates
Bill Barnes (15) – UAF CTC	Diane McEachern (15) - KUC
Barbara Blake (16) - DANSRD	**Joshua Peter (16) – UAF-CTC**
Galen Johnson (15) – UAF CTC	**Sandra Wildfeuer (16) - CRCD**
Todd Radenbaugh (15) - BBC	
Jane Weber (16) – CRCD	
Cathy Winfree (15) – UAF CTC	

College of Engineering & Mines

Representatives	Representatives
Chris Hartman (16)	**Jenny Liu (16)**
Orion Lawlor (16)	Rorik Peterson (15)
Debu Misra (15)	

School of Natural Resources and Extension

School of Natural Resources & Agriculture*

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Julie L. Joly (15)	**John Yarie (16)**
David Valentine (16)	

Cooperative Extension Service*

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Julie Cascio (16)	**Mara Bacsujlaky (16)**
Leslie Shallcross (15)	

*Reference Bylaws, Sect. 1 (Article III Membership) subsection E.

School of Education

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Joanne Healy (15)	Phil Patterson (15)
Joan Hornig (16)	

School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences

Representatives	Alternates
Sarah Hardy (15)	**Brian Himelbloom (16)**
Andrew McDonnell (16)	Vacant (15) *A.M. now a rep*
Lara Horstmann (15)	
Allison "Sunny" Rice (16)	

School of Management

Representatives	Alternates
Ken Abramowicz (16)	Charlie Sparks (15)
Ping Lan (15)	

Geophysical Institute

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Jonathan Dehn (15)	Gerhard Kramm (15)
Andrew Mahoney (16)	

Int'l Arctic Research Center

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Jessie Cable Young (15)	**Jessica Cherry (15)**
Georgina Gibson (16)	(one-year term)
Chris Fallen (15)*	

*Finishing elected term. (ARSC is now at GI)

ATTACHMENT 198/4
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014
Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The Unit Criteria Committee reviewed the unit criteria which were submitted by the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. The unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

****

UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY AND DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES& LITERATURES 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 FOREIGN LANGUAGES & LITERATURES DEPARTMENT. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS.

CHAPTER I

Purview

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment

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

B. Academic Titles

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

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank

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

D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

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

E. Following the Selection Process

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

F. Letter of Appointment

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

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

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

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

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

Bipartite Faculty

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

The dean or director of the relevant college/school 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

FACULTY IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES ARE REQUIRED TO TEACH ALL LEVELS OF THEIR LANGUAGE, AND OFTEN HAVE UNUSUALLY HIGH TEACHING LOADS. THUS, EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING IS THE DEPARTMENT'S HIGHEST PRIORITY. EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH AND SERVICE CANNOT COMPENSATE FOR AN INSUFFICIENT TEACHING RECORD.

UNTENURED FACULTY MEMBERS WILL HAVE A YEARLY PEER TEACHING OBSERVATIONS, EITHER BY THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR OR ANOTHER FACULTY MEMBER. STUDENT OPINIONS OF INSTRUCTION WILL ALSO BE CONSIDERED WHEN ASSESSING A CANDIDATE'S TEACHING RECORD. THE CANDIDATE MUST ADDRESS CONSISTENTLY LOW STUDENT OPINIONS OF INSTRUCTION IN HIS OR HER SELF-NARRATIVE.

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.

ALL PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS SHALL BE CONSIDERED SIGNIFICANT. THIS INCLUDES NOT ONLY THE WRITING OF JOURNAL ARTICLES AND BOOK CHAPTERS BUT ALSO ANY PEER-REVIEWED TRANSLATION OF ARTICLES, BOOKS OR JOURNAL VOLUMES, AS WELL AS CONTRIBUTIONS TO TEXTBOOKS AND OTHER PEDAGOGICAL RESOURCES.

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.

PRESENTATIONS AT CONFERENCES ARE ENCOURAGED AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED VALID PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH ACTIVITY. HOWEVER, TRAVEL FUNDING EITHER FROM THE UNIVERSITY OR OUTSIDE SOURCES IS OFTEN UNAVAILABLE. THE CANDIDATE SHOULD ADDRESS THE FREQUENCY OF CONFERENCE PRESENTATION AND AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING IN HER/HIS NARRATIVE STATEMENT.

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

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

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

g. Citations of research in scholarly publications.

h. Published abstracts of research papers.

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

j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.

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

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

m. PUBLICATIONS IN FOREIGN JOURNALS ARE STANDARD IN THE DISCIPLINE. CANDIDATES WILL SUPPLY A TRANSLATION OF THE TITLE OF ANY WORK IN A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH AND ARE ENCOURAGED TO PROVIDE AN ABSTRACT IN ENGLISH AS WELL AS A DESCRIPTION OF THE JOURNAL.

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.

l. TRANSLATION OF DOCUMENTS FOR THE PUBLIC

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. OUTSIDE REVIEWER ON THESIS COMMITTEES.

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.

ATTACHMENT 198/5
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the UAF Faculty Senate, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E., Permanent Committees, to create a new Information Technology Committee.

EFFECTIVE: AY2014-15

RATIONALE: The creation of this new committee supports the need for UAF Faculty Senate to be able to address information technology issues and needs affecting all aspects of faculty work at this university. The Office of Information Technology has also expressed its willingness to work with such a committee in addressing needs and issues (e.g., criteria and strategies for addressing standards for a UA course management system).

****

BOLD CAPS = Addition
[[ ]] = Deletion

UAF Faculty Senate Bylaws, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E.:

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

…

PERMANENT

9. THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE WILL ADDRESS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ISSUES AND NEEDS AFFECTING ASPECTS OF WORK FACULTY ENGAGE IN. THEY WILL ALSO BE THE RECOGNIZED COMMITTEE TO WORK WITH REQUESTS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (OIT).

MEMBERS SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT. TO HELP ENSURE THAT PERSPECTIVES FROM ACROSS UAF ARE REPRESENTED, MEMBERSHIP WILL CONSIST OF AT LEAST FIVE REPRESENTATIVES, WITH NOT MORE THAN ONE FROM EACH OF THE SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, INSTITUTES OR LIBRARIES. REPRESENTATIVES FROM OIT AND E-LEARNING SHALL BE EX OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. THE COMMITTEE CHAIR MUST BE AN ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE FROM FACULTY SENATE.

ATTACHMENT 198/6
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to approve the main recommendation formulated in Sections 3.1 – 3.3 of the report on "Assessment of Electronic Course Evaluation Technology and its Applicability to the University of Alaska Fairbanks – Stage 2: AY 14," submitted to the Faculty Senate in March 2014 jointly by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement (FDAI) Committee and the Electronic Course Evaluation Workgroup.

EFFECTIVE: Spring 2014

RATIONALE: In late summer 2012, Provost Henrichs asked Eric Madsen to facilitate a campus-wide discussion about electronic course evaluation systems. In response to this request and in cooperation with the FDAI committee, an Electronic Course Evaluation Workgroup was formed in fall 2012 that has since been analyzing electronic course evaluation technology specifically in light of its applicability to UAF. In careful and intensive evaluation of all involved factors, the workgroup has formulated a three-part recommendation that was presented to and discussed by the Faculty Senate during its meeting in March 2014. With this motion we ask the Faculty Senate to formally approve this recommendation (listed below) in order to allow the process to move forward to the next step.

****

RECOMMENDATION REGARDING ELECTRONIC COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEMS
as stated in in Sections 3.1 – 3.3 of the report on "Assessment of Electronic Course Evaluation Technology and its Applicability to the University of Alaska Fairbanks – Stage 2: AY 14":

Part 1: The electronic-Course Evaluation Workgroup recommends that UAF should move to an electronic course evaluation system

Paper-based course evaluation systems are costly to deploy, retrieve, and store; they demand large amounts of personnel time; data-analysis is inefficient; refining questions to make them more meaningful is difficult; and security is problematic. In viewing the system demonstrations and questioning the presenters, the workgroup was mindful that electronic course evaluation systems present their own versions of some of these same challenges and introduce others. Throughout the process, we considered as separate questions: Should UAF move to an electronic course evaluation system? Is there an electronic course evaluation system that adequately addresses concerns and offers enough advantages to make a transition worthwhile?

After analyzing the capabilities of state-of-the-art electronic course evaluation technology and assessing the pros and cons of electronic means of course evaluation, the workgroup recommends that UAF should move to an electronic course evaluation system.

Part 2: The Electronic-Course Evaluation Workgroup recommends eXplorance/Blue Course Evaluations

Based on an initial analysis of 12 e-course evaluation systems and a consecutive more detailed assessment of 4 finalist systems, the workgroup determined that the eXplorance/Blue system met all of the electronic course

evaluation features important to UAF and addressed more of those considerations or addressed them more adequately than the other systems considered.

Part 3: A workgroup should be formed by the Provost and Faculty Senate Leadership to help design, oversee, and evaluate a pilot of eXplorance/Blue that is appropriate for UAF

To capture all relevant input, this workgroup shall include representation from faculty, staff (incl. the Office of Information Technology), and administration. The Faculty Senate shall be represented through at least one representative of the FDAI committee. To preserve the expertise collected throughout the course of this study, the membership of this new workgroup should show some overlap with the membership of the outgoing Electronic Course Evaluation team.

ATTACHMENT 198/7
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by Faculty Affairs Committee

RESOLUTION:

Whereas the State of Alaska in 2008, contracted the McDowell Group to do an extensive study on the cost of living for state employees that live in urban and rural communities across the state; and

Whereas the Alaska Department of Administration used the McDowell study to address pay equity and implemented the recommendations regarding salary differentials for state employees; and

Whereas University of Alaska has not updated its own salary differential for the faculty and staff in many years; and

Whereas the University of Alaska Fairbanks has many employees that live in areas of the state where costs have increased significantly; and

Whereas the current pay differential in place by the University does not reflect the true costs of living for the employees that work for the University in a number of communities in Alaska; and

Whereas the effects of this disparity in pay equity has made it difficult for UAF to recruit and retain employees in many of our communities; and

Whereas the Board of Regents Policy states in P04.05.060:
Geographic differentials may be established by University regulations and be based on the most recent state of Alaska geographic differential study; and

Whereas the UA Regulation states in R04.05.060:
Geographic salary differentials in the university are based on the most current State of Alaska geographic differentials study…The president will adjust the listings as necessary,

Therefore be it resolved, that the UAF Faculty Senate goes on record urging the UA President to adopt the salary differential recently implemented for state employees (from the McDowell 2008 study) for the staff and faculty of the University.

ATTACHMENT 198/8
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by Administrative Committee

CAPS and **Bolded** – Additions
[[ ]] – Deletions

UAF Department Chair Policy

The following is a description of the role and duties of the department chair, and procedures for the election of department chairs at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. The size and composition of departments and programs are defined by each individual college and school.

I. ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

A. The department chair [[is the administrative and academic officer of the department and as such]] has the primary responsibility [[and authority]] for: (1) leadership in developing high quality academic programs which fulfill department, college, and university objectives; (2) leadership in the implementation of college and university policies and programs at the department level; (3) leadership in developing resource requests and an appropriate departmental budget; and (4) service on the college/school executive committee.

B. The department chair is first a faculty member. The department chair is primarily a teacher-scholar serving as a leader of his/her department colleagues. The department chair is a role model for faculty responsibility.

C. The department chair is responsible for providing mechanisms and processes for members' participation in discussion and decision making within the department. All members of the department should be informed of these mechanisms and processes. Regular meetings should be held for purposes of communicating information, discussing issues, and making decisions on department matters.

D. The department chair is [[expected]] **REQUIRED** to communicate faculty perspectives and concerns to the administration and other segments of the community as appropriate. The department chair is the primary spokesperson **FOR** the faculty of the department. The department chair will also [[convey]] **BE REQUIRED TO CONVEY** administration views and concerns to the faculty.

II. DUTIES OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

The department chair is responsible, either directly or by delegation, for performance of at least the specific duties enumerated below (the duties are not prioritized) which shall be performed in accordance with the extant collective bargaining agreements on the role and status of department chairs.

A. Academic Programs

1. Initiate, plan, oversee implementation of, and review the preparation and offering of the academic program, after appropriate involvement of members of the department and consultation with the dean.

2. Ensure interdepartmental coordination and cooperation.

3. Take leading role in ensuring academic program quality.

4. Ensure reports are prepared as needed. Ensure that course [[schedule]] **SCHEDULES** are prepared in a timely manner.

5. Ensure catalog is current.

6. Supervise departmental office and ensure that files and records are maintained.

7. Keep the dean informed of departmental and faculty activities. Act as a liaison with the University community.

B. Personnel

1. Coordinate [[and evaluate]] professional activities of all members of the department, to include providing guidance to faculty concerning expectations regarding promotion and tenure. [[Request and obtain faculty activity reports as appropriate to this process]].

2. Provide recommendations for appointments, [[promotion]], sabbatical leaves, [[tenure]], and release of faculty after consultation with members of the department.

3. Review and recommend to dean/director workloads **IN CONSULTATION WITH AND** as proposed by faculty members.

4. Take lead role in departmental faculty and staff recruitment and retention.

5. Provide for the management and supervision of support staff.

6. Appoint appropriate committees within the department.

7. Facilitate support for faculty teaching, research and service activities.

8. Function as spokesperson and advocate for the department, both within and outside the University community.

C. Students

1. Administer the departmental student advisement program and counsel students.

2. Recruit students in cooperation with other members of the department and the dean.

3. Act on student petitions.

4. Provide for the management of student assistants.

5. Address student concerns as appropriate.

D. Budget, Inventory, Facilities, Etc.

1. Initiate resource and budget requests with justifications.

2. Maintain fiscal control of departmental budgets.

3. Ensure upkeep of equipment and facilities assigned to the department**.**

III. ELECTION AND TERMS OF SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

A. Departments Involved

The procedures will apply to every unit that is considered a department.

B. Eligibility to Vote

All full-time faculty members holding academic rank who are affiliated with the department are eligible to vote. **THOSE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE MUST BE REPRESENTED EITHER BY UNITED ACADEMICS (UNAC) OR BY UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FEDERATION OF TEACHERS (UAFT)** [[Visiting faculty who are in an academic rank position are eligible to vote]].

A full-time faculty member currently holding academic rank is affiliated with a department if:

[[1) the chair of that department evaluates the faculty member or;]]

[[2)]] **1)** the chair of [[the]] **THAT** department reviews the faculty member's workload agreement.

C. Eligibility to be Nominated and Serve as Department Chair

Only tenured members of a department who are eligible to vote are eligible to be nominated and serve as department chair. **[[**Only in exceptional circumstance,**]] W**here the majority of the department faculty feel that options are severely limited, **[[**should there be deviation**]] THEY MAY ELECT TO DEVIATE** from this policy.

D. Procedures for Elections

1. By March 15, those faculty in the department who are eligible to vote will establish a list of nominees for department chair. The names of the nominees will be placed on an official secret ballot for the department and distributed from the dean's office to those faculty eligible to vote.

2. Faculty members eligible to vote but who are absent because of sabbatical leave, leave of absence, or for other official reasons will be provided with an absentee ballot.

3. Secret ballots are to be cast and. the person receiving a simple majority of the votes cast will be elected. In the case of a tie which cannot be resolved by the voters, the dean shall select the department chair from those faculty involved in the tie vote.

4. If no nominee receives a simple majority of the votes, a run-off election of the top two nominees shall be held immediately under the same procedures outlined above. The deadline for accepting ballots for the run-off election will be the last working day prior to April 15.

5. Departments and the provost will be notified of election results by May 15.

E. Term of Elected Department Chair

A department chair shall serve for a term of two years, beginning July 1, following his/her election. The department chair may continue in the position indefinitely by a simple majority of the voting faculty of the department.

F. Department Chair Disputes, Vacancies, and Recall

1. If an action of the department chair is appealed by a simple majority of the eligible voting members of the department and the issue cannot be resolved within the department, the matter shall be referred to the dean for arbitration. If necessary, the dean will refer the matter to the Provost.

2. If the department chair's position becomes vacant due to unexpected prolonged leave, illness, death, resignation, or other circumstances, the dean shall appoint a department faculty member **OR ANOTHER ELIGIBLE TENURED FACULTY MEMBER** to act as department chair. **THE TENURED FACULTY MEMBER APPOINTED BY THE DEAN TO ACT AS DEPARTMENT CHAIR MUST BE REPRESENTED EITHER BY UNITED ACADEMICS (UNAC) OR BY UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FEDERATION OF TEACHERS (UAFT)**. An election to fill this position will be held the following April 15.

3. The department chair shall appoint an acting department chair whenever their absence from the department is for a period of less than two months. If this absence extends beyond two months, the procedure defined in Section F. 2. above is to be followed.

4. Election of a new department chair may be requested by petition to the dean signed by three-quarters of the eligible voting members of the department or by the petition of the Dean to the department approved by 3/4's of the voting members of the department. After the election by the faculty [[and ratification by the Dean]], the new department chair will take office immediately and serve the unexpired term.

G. Acknowledgement for Department Chair Duties

A Department chair's duties may be acknowledged through release time, remuneration, and/or their service component of their faculty duties. Any acknowledgement must be agreed upon between the Department chair and the Dean and must be consistent with UAF and Board of Regent's policies and extant Collective Bargaining Agreements.

ATTACHMENT 198/9
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes 10 March 2014 1-2 pm Kayak Room

Present: Rainer Newberry, Chair; Ken Abramowicz; Rob Duke (audio); Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy (audio); Dennis Moser; Jonathan Rosenberg; Margaret Short; Todd Radenbaugh (audio); Casey Byrne; Libby Eddy; Alex Fitts; Doug Goering; Linda Hapsmith (audio); Stacey Howdeshell; Jayne Harvie.

1. Minutes for the 10 February meeting were approved as submitted.

2. GERC update via Jonathan Rosenberg + Cindy Hardy

Jonathan reported that Ilanna Kingsley has been appointed to the GERC as the representative from the Library. They have been talking about reinstating the LIB F101X course as a core requirement or as a prerequisite for English required courses.

Feedback from CEM regarding the Communication attribute was received and found to be helpful. More is needed in the "C" attribute concerning writing. They have been discussed adding a diversity component in the Foreign Language courses.

Alex F. and Annie A. are working on assessment materials for capstone courses.

GERC will have a revised report to the Curricular Affairs Committee by March 21. CAC will discuss with goal of bringing the report to the March 28 Administrative Committee and as a discussion item at the April 7 Faculty Senate meeting (potentially with voting action at the May meeting). It was noted that the report is still fluid at the Administrative Committee.

3. Report by Sine Anahita RE her experimental 'less compacted' Wintermester course of Dec 2013-Jan 2014

Sine spoke about the 3-credit, 5 week, SOC F100X core course she taught over winter break at the invitation of UAF-CTC. She had four students, three of whom were students at other colleges, but home for the break. Those three finished the course early.

Difficulties encountered getting face-to-face meetings. Ultimately they didn't happen and instead the course became exclusively electronic, with late-night facebook-based discussions, reviewed the next morning by Sine. Linda H. mentioned having staff work over the hard closure could be a barrier to teaching more courses in this fashion. Sine thought this format worked bettwen than the highly compressed version, but recognized that the students were highly motivated and taking the course out of interest. She thought teaching in this format bear further experimentation.

4. Report by Dean Alex Fitts RE efforts to restructure and improve the UAF probation policies

Alex described a three-tier warning system which includes early warnings to students who are struggling in courses (via the Early Warning Program), probation, and academic disqualification, with the objective of having an action plan for the Faculty Senate next October or November.

There was much discussion on various aspects of the current procedures for student probation and how they can be problematic. The committee was in general agreement with the concept of the three-tier system, especially as it will be become a more automatic in notifying students, faculty and the registrar's office.

The committee will meet in two weeks on March 24. The plan is to receive the GERC report by Friday the 21st and discuss it on the 24th.

It looks like Dennis M., Ken A. might be able to continue next year, pending their unit elections. Cindy H. (SADAC Chair), Sarah H. and Todd R. will continue next year on Faculty Senate.

Despite general disinclination to adjourn, the meeting was halted about 2:08 pm when the next group arrived to use the meeting room.

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for 10 February 2014 1-2 pm Kayak Room

1. **Approve Minutes of last meeting**
   Minutes for January 27 were approved as submitted.

2. **GERC update via Jonathan Rosenberg + Cindy Hardy**

The Provost brought up several issues both before & during the last Fac Senate Meeting. She set up a meeting with the Chairmen of GERC and CAC, the Fac Senate President, and the Vice Provost, in which she discussed means to move forward. Either Jonathan or Rainer or Alex or all three will discuss her suggested strategies, including unified math/Engl requirements.

The meeting described above took place. GELO announced that alignment of Math and English placement is in the works. GERC will be refining their proposal in response to this effort.

GERC is beginning its effort to respond to feedback it has received. The feedback has been mixed concerning the new attributes. The "C" attribute (for Communication) needs clarification. One suggestion was to implement the plan in incremental steps, but GERC prefers to put forth a comprehensive proposal.

Timing of student feedback on the proposal will probably occur closer to the completion of the proposal, after the current administrative hurdles are dealt with. GERC will decide when to tackle the issue of getting student feedback.

Vice Provost Alex Fitts will follow up on how the effort toward common Math and English placement will be coordinated by statewide between the three universities. CAC wants to know who takes the next step and what that is to be.

Fall 2015 is the goal for accomplishing this unification effort for Math and English placement.

3. **OLD BUSINESS**
   A. **One more time:**

Motion to Revise Non-UA Transfer of Courses

The Committee talked about the need for some back-up data on how many students would benefit now from this proposed change, even though it might only be for a year or so until the new General Education Requirements are in place. Prior to 2005-06 (when this table became more rigid) the transfer system was much more broad.

-- here's the wording we agreed to at the last meeting. Proposed Revision to Perspectives on the Human Condition section of the Non-UA Table of Substitutions:

Perspectives on the Human Condition	Transfer Courses
HIST F100X--Modern World History ECON/PS F100X--Political Economy ANTH/SOC F100X—Individual, Society and Culture	Introductory courses in different social sciences
ENGL/FL F200X--World Literatures	An introductory course in the humanities
ART/MUS/THR F200X, HUMS F201X, ANS F202X--Aesthetic Appreciation	an introductory course in the arts which does not stress skills acquisition
BA F323X, COMM F300X, JUST F300X, NRM F303X, PHIL F322X, PS F300X--Ethics (Values and Choices)	an upper-division course in ethics, or, with approval of the philosophy department, a lower-division course in ethics

We need a strong justification, with some data. The Provost seems to strongly support this. Would it be wrong /unwise for us to ask her to make a public statement in support???

B. Unified UA Calendar – is it coming our way???

Presumably we'll know better after the Febr BOR meeting. If the BOR do mean business, how do we go about negotiating with UAA & UAS??? Not to be settled today.

There was a brief discussion about the origin of this idea and how to proceed. It will take an effort by each of the three faculty senates.

4. New Business

Probation policy revision. Plans are afoot to significantly modify the probation policy next fall. In the meantime, Dean (and Vice Provost) Fitts has asked CAC to consider the motion listed on the next page.

Curricular Affairs Committee passed the following motion with some additional revisions. The final revision is shown just below:

PROBATION
Undergraduate students -- Students whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after each fall and spring semester will be put on academic probation. Students on probation may not enroll in more than 13 credits a semester, unless an exception is granted by the appropriate dean. Probation may include additional conditions, as determined by the dean of the college or school in which the student's major is located. Students on probation will be referred for developmental advising/education and/or to an advising or support counseling center. The student [[will]] **SHOULD** work with an academic advisor to prepare an academic plan for achieving a higher GPA**.** [[; the advisor is responsible for forwarding this plan to the appropriate dean. A student on probation will not be allowed to register unless the academic plan is on file.]] Removal from probation requires the student's cumulative and semester GPAs to be at least 2.0.

---------- Older proposal below--

MOTION:
The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the academic policy regarding undergraduate probation.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014

RATIONALE: While an academic plan is an important tool for students on probation, the current policy is neither being followed nor enforced. The dean and advisor may still impose additional conditions on probation students, including the preparation of an academic plan, but the requirement that one be filed before a student is allowed to register is confusing and difficult to enforce.

****

Current*UAF Catalog* language from the online version, page 51:

PROBATION

Undergraduate students -- Students whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after each fall and spring semester will be put on academic probation. Students on probation may not enroll in more than 13 credits a semester, unless an exception is granted by the appropriate dean. Probation may include additional conditions, as determined by the dean of the college or school in which the student's major is located. Students on probation will be referred for developmental advising/education and/or to an advising or support counseling center. The student will work with an academic advisor to prepare an academic plan for achieving a higher GPA; the advisor is responsible for forwarding this plan to the appropriate dean. A student on probation will not be allowed to register unless the academic plan is on file. Removal from probation requires the student's cumulative and semester GPAs to be at least 2.0.

CAPS = Additions
[[ ]] = Deletions

Proposed *UAF Catalog* policy language:

PROBATION

Undergraduate students -- Students whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after each fall and spring semester will be put on academic probation. Students on probation may not enroll in more than 13 credits a semester, unless an exception is granted by the appropriate dean. Probation may include additional conditions, as determined by the dean of the college or school in which the student's major is located. Students on probation will be referred for developmental advising/education and/or to an advising or support counseling center. [[The student will work with an academic advisor to prepare an academic plan for achieving a higher GPA; the advisor is responsible for forwarding this plan to the appropriate dean. A student on probation will not be allowed to register unless the academic plan is on file.]] Removal from probation requires the student's cumulative and semester GPAs to be at least 2.0.

The meeting was adjourned rather quietly as everyone tiptoed around the specter of *uniform* universities.

ATTACHMENT 198/10
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
MINUTES: Tuesday, February 18, 11:30-12:30 Kayak Room Participants' PIN: 5336747

Present in the room: Xavier, Mark, Chris.
Online: Steve, Cathy Tori, Leif, Debu.
Absent: Christine Cook.

Foreign Languages Representative: Joseph Josef Glowa

I. Housekeeping

1. Approval of Agenda
Approved

2. Approval of Minutes from 1/21/14 Meeting. See attachment.
Xavier : Has the calendar for permanent meetings been finalized?
Answer: Addressed in Item 1(c).
Question: Have we got a list of criteria that we will be discussing this semester?
Answer: That is a question for Jayne.

II. Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures: Reaffirmation of Existing Unit Criteria

Associate Prof. Josef Glowa attended as department representative.

Question: Are the criteria as presented changed from before?
Answer: No the department decided to keep them as before. The criteria do not specify precise numbers for publications, translations etc – which was deemed appropriate for a CLA school. Department is considering revising the criteria for scholarly works and service to the community, but that is in progress. Again the trend will be to avoid specific numbers. Possibilities for scholarly work are becoming more complex with new media and internet etc. The Foreign Language department is renewing criteria now because it is mandatory – but they can resubmit them at any time. *Josef confirmed that all affected members reviewed and approved the criteria as presented to this committee.*

Xavier: Raised several questions regarding grammatical correctness of the criteria, but committee determined they are acceptable as written.

Xavier: Asked about how teaching is evaluated.
Josef: All untenured faculty in this department have an annual teaching evaluation by the chair.

Debu: New language in the CBA would preclude this practice. Specific problem is with making it an *evaluation* by the Department Chair. The Chair can perform a teaching observation, but not evaluation. (Only the Dean can evaluate; Chair or peers can only observe, not evaluate.)

Debu: Noted that IAS evaluation forms are mandatory. But again these students cannot evaluate; they can only provide opinion on instruction.
Debu: Asked (by way of follow up) what additional value do we get by adding language referring to student evaluation, when it is already mandatory?

Committee: Recommended that Josef take back to the department the language on student "input", with a suggestion that this sentence be removed. All references to "student evaluation" should be replaced with "student opinion of instruction".

Tori: Verified from checking the Provost's web site that Debu's concern (regarding who can *evaluate*) is legitimate.

Xavier: Criteria specify that low teaching evaluations must be addressed in self narrative. Questioned whether this should explicitly require that pathways to *improvement* be addressed. Committee felt that this is implied.

Debu: Suggested that word "judge" be replaced by word "assess". This was thought to be a good idea, although it was determined that a change of this importance would need to be taken back to the department for approval, and then brought back to this committee.

Xavier: (Re page 6) Questioned why there are specifications relating to plants and animals?
Answer: These words are inherited from the relevant template.

Chris: (Re page 8, point (K). Question regarding outside reviewer on thesis committees. Shouldn't this be regarded as teaching, not service?
Xavier: As an outside examiner it is more appropriate as service, whereas for a committee member it should be treated as teaching.)
Committee: Again this should be taken back to the department for consideration.

Mark: When criteria are up for mandatory renewal, is there a date by which all questions must be resolved?
Jayne: Ideally that same academic year. But pre-existing criteria can remain in effect until revisions are finalized.

Xavier: (Re point L, page 8) What type of translation tasks count?
Josef: The department does this a lot, based on community requests etc. There are many forms of such tasks, and they are considered a part of service.

See attachment:

- Foreign Language and Literatures Unit Criteria

III. Continued Discussion of Committee Bylaws

See attachment:

- Proposed Bylaws.

Chris: Who should remove "track changes" entries (strikethroughs etc) after we discuss some proposed criteria? Chris suggested the units should "clean up" these items before the approved document goes forward to the full senate. But Mark noted that this means he document will be worked on by people other than the committee after the approval step. Mark suggested that we request both a "clean" and "marked up" copy of the proposed criteria. Cathy likes the idea of having both forms presented. Chris agreed that we will amend bylaws to specify this as a future requirement.

Tory: Questioned whether we could require changing from the existing "all caps" format for calling out changes to instead use underlining. Currently there is considerable uncertainty regarding whether we have the power to enforce such a large change, so for now we are keeping the "all caps" practice in place.

Xavier: Comment regarding notation: "SNRAS" is changing to "SNRE" and our language should reflect that.

Closing update: Various criteria that we have worked on are being brought forward to the full senate for consideration.

ATTACHMENT 198/11
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women,
Minutes Wednesday, February 26, 2014; 9:15 am to 10:15 am pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Jane Weber, Mary Ehrlander. Ellen Lopez, Megan McPhee, Kayt Sunwood, Shawn Russell

Members absent: Jenny Liu, Nilima Hullavarad, Derek Sikes, Michelle Bartlett, Diana Di Stefano

1. Promotion & Tenure Workshop
    501 IARC, Friday, April 25, 10 am to 12 pm, Roxie, Ellen, Sine, Amy, Mary, Stephi, Karen

2. Fall 2014 Luncheon Speaker
    Tuesday, September 16. Margaret Thayer from recently retired curator of Chicago Field Museum of Natural History. Frequently posts in women in science. Travel will be paid for by museum. Kayt voiced concern that the speaker address a women's issue. Derek will talk to Margaret about her presentation.

3. Women's Center Advisory Board
    Move to Wood Center will be done by July 1. Some of the board members meeting with chancellor in June about making the coordinator position 12 month, full time. Danielle Dirks is coming to Fairbanks on Thursday March 27, 7-9 pm Brooks gathering room. She will talk about activism on blowing the whistle on campus rape. Please share this information.

4. Conversation Café on Faculty Mentoring: Why we need it?
    March 11, 1:00 to 2:30. Tables/ themes/ facilitators. Three topics. Ellen, Diana, Amy will be facilitators. A handout should be developed for each table. Objectives: Build community, have a voice on interesting topic, bring something away from the discussions. We will have handouts to Kayt by March 5. Bring 30 handouts.
    1. Finding Mentors: The More the Merrier (Diana)
    2. Mentoring: Best Practices (Amy)
    3. Navigating Mentoring Relationships: What I Wish Someone Had Told Me (Ellen)

5. Summer faculty get-together. Maybe we can work with Michelle Bartlett to offer something.

6. Upcoming CSW meetings:
    9:15 to 10:15 am: March 26, April 16.

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/13-14-csw/

ATTACHMENT 198/12
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by the Core Review Committee

Core Review Committee
Minutes from February 27, 2014 Meeting

Voting members:
Miho Aoki (Chair), Walter Skya, Jennifer Schell

Non-voting members:
Caty Oehring, Allan Morotti, Holly Sherouse, Andrea Schmidt, Carol Murphrey (via phone)

1. Petitions
   The committee reviewed two petitions. One of them was for petitioning a seminar course to be counted as a writing intensive course. The course was not a writing intensive course, but the instructor designed the syllabus to follow the writing intensive course designation guidelines. There was an attempt to make this course into a writing intensive course by the department in the past, but it was denied. Currently the course is repeatable for credits. The majority of the committee agreed that approving this and similar petitions would set a precedent. Miho has consulted Rainer Newberry about making this course into a writing intensive course. The department will try to make the course into a writing intensive course again by turning in the proposal with syllabi for each variation of topic.

2. Core Course Proposals
   The committee reviewed revised ANTH/LING 435 and approved the proposal.

3. Meeting minutes from February 14th meeting
   The committee edited and approved the meeting minutes from February 14th.

4. OW Course Assessment Spring 2014
   Miho has requested but not obtained the list of courses from the CLA office, however, she is expecting to receive it in this week.
   update: Miho received the list on Feb. 28th.

5. Next meeting: Friday March 14th, 2014

Core Review Committee
Minutes from February 14, 2014 Meeting

Voting members:
Miho Aoki (Chair), Andy Seitz, Tyson Rinio, Walter Skya

Non-voting members:
Caty Oehring, Allan Morotti, Holly Sherouse, Kevin Berry, Carol Murphrey (via phone)

1. Meeting minutes from January 31st meeting
   The committee edited and approved the meeting minutes from January 31st.

   About MATH 194 (X) Preparation for Calculus (trial course): The trial course cannot have “X” designation. Until the course turns into the regular course with a permanent course number, students have to petition to fulfill the core math requirement with this course. The committee discussed blanket approval for this course. The registrars office like to have the approval from the committee chair every semester. The chair can use the core petition form for this approval.

2. Petitions
   There were no petitions to review in this meeting.

3. Core Course Proposals
   The committee reviewed 2 new course proposals, ANTH 314 (W) and ANTH/LING 435.

4. OW Course Assessment Spring 2014
   Miho has requested but not obtained the list of courses from the CLA office yet.

5. Meeting time for Spring 2014 semester
   Two more meetings at the end of the semester (May 2nd and 7th) are proposed.

6. Next meeting: February 27th, 2014

ATTACHMENT 198/13
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

The Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee (SADA)
Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2014

Attending: Gordon Williams, Cindy Hardy, Brandon Uzzell, Colleen Angiak, Sandra Wildfeuer, Sarah Stanley, Suzan Hahn (guest)

Learning Commons:
The committee invited Suzan Hahn, Head of Collections Services at the Rasmuson Library, to discuss progress on the Learning Commons project. This project resulted from a 2006 resolution originating with SADA and passed by the Faculty Senate. Suzan Hahn, Amy Barnsley, Dana Greci, Reba Dupras, and Cindy Hardy, met over a few years as a joint committee of SADA and the Library, and presented a proposal for a Learning Commons to the Library Interim Dean, and, later to the current Dean in 2011. We asked Suzan to give us an update on where this project stands.

Suzan reported that the learning commons is still on the library agenda, but that they are moving on it without funding and, thus, doing what can be done with the resources they already have. She reported that the following changes have been made or are in progress:

--The Microlab in room 301 is available to students when the room is not reserved for teaching or workshops. There are 25 computers in the Microlab.

--Individual study carrels, located on the 3rd, 5th, and 6th floors of the library, are available for grad students and faculty. They contain a desk and a book case. They are available to graduate students on a one-year basis; after that students need to resubmit the request. This prevents students holding unused carrels for years while others are waiting for a space. She also reported that there are carrels available for short-term use from 1 day to 2 weeks. These are available to grad and undergrad students.

--The library has improved electrical availability through added outlets along the outside wall of the 24-hour study area. She noted that in a recent study they found that every student brings three electronic devices with them to the library. The plug-ins are currently being well-used.

--The Library is repurposing the OIT helpdesk room and the office next to it. This could be a group study or conference room, and it can be reserved. She also noted that the joint conference room on the third floor has been unavailable for over a year, but it will be open again in a few weeks.

--Room 407, the former Sustainability Office is now available and seats 10-12. It can be reserved at the circulation desk, and the library will install whiteboards. (Note: the Department of Developmental Education has already begun to use this space for their Reading/Writing Lab).

--The Library is reviewing/revising their policies to make rooms and equipment more accessible for students and to make checkouts more accountable.

--They are upgrading equipment checked out at the Media Desk, such as laptops, and updating them.

Suzan also told us that she and the head of RIOS went to Atlanta to a library planning workspace workshop. They visited five libraries and gathered ideas such as self-checkout, organization of space, and quiet space. When they returned, they identified places on the 4th floor that are better suited for specific activities such as group study, social interaction, individual study, and quiet areas. They are working on getting more furnishings for

group study. The Library has been conducting a survey to keep track of how space is used. Suzan also shared with us a study done in 2005-2006 that recommended a building expansion to expand study areas and provide space for a project like the Learning Commons. At the time, the cost for building expansion was $5million; now it would be much higher.

She also noted that the Biosciences Library will move into to the Rasmuson Library once they identify available space in Rasmuson.

She noted that various units around campus are already tutoring at the library.

The Alaska Native Language archive has moved to Level 2, so some of the Alaska books moved from level 2 to level 3. When the Biosciences Library moves in, their books will fit on level 5 and 6.

The Kayak Room will be updated with new glass whiteboard during spring break.

We asked if the library computer lab could go to free printing. Suzan will suggest free printing the week before finals.

We discussed the remodeling of Lola Tilly Commons and the availability of space there. Suzan told us that the Sustainability office has moved in there. We asked what is happening to the downstairs at Tilly, but it will need to be renovated once Dining Services has moved out to the new Wood Center space.

Suzan asked if we have seen the Bunnell Collaboration Nook –on the 3rd floor of the Bunnell Building. It has an open computer lab with nice couches, café seating, sectionals, and a counter with places to plug in.

We asked Suzan for a tour of the library spaces she had described, and, since we were in the Kayak Room, we were able to take a walk through. Some of the comments from our walk through discussion included finding locations for Supplemental Instruction group meetings, finding locations for free printing, and finding a coordinator to keep track of use of Learning Commons spaces and activities.

Cindy asked that committee members send her ideas on use of the available space for Learning Commons activities.

Next meeting: Friday, March 14, 10-11:30 am.

ATTACHMENT 198/14
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 27, 2014

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Bill Barnes, Cindy Fabbri, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Eric Madsen, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Channon Price, Leslie Shallcross, Amy Vinlove
Excused: Mike Castellini
Absent: Mike Davis

III. Report from Joy

Joy commended the Committee on the Status of Women for their March 11 Roundtable on Mentoring which was nicely done and well attended. Several roundtables were set up with a different mentoring topic to discuss at each table. Attendees moved around to each table to discuss the different issues and best practices in mentoring.

Five faculty members attended the recent Lilly West conference in California, and our own Amy Vinlove presented at the conference. Joy reported that most attendees felt they learned a lot and found it inspiring.

Libby Roderick, Associate Director of Faculty Development at UAA gave a well-attended talk regarding her co-authored book, *Stop Talking: Indigenous Ways of Teaching and Learning* on March 25. Joy has the URL for Libby's lecture and her Power Point slides. Joy is really working with her faculty development counterparts in Anchorage to bring more faculty development opportunities to UAF. She is going to UAA's Faculty Development Awards Breakfast on April 11 to determine if something similar could be done at UAF. In addition, she is looking into bringing a UAA theatre group to UAF to present skits on bullying in the classroom – which is a real problem for Anchorage faculty. C. P. asked if anyone knew what kind of bullying may be occurring on the Fairbanks campus, or who should know? Joy said she would ask Libby Roderick for more information on what UAA has compiled on their campus. Kelly mentioned that if UAF faculty members are experiencing bullying from students then Don Foley would be the person to ask for more information if faculty have reported the issue to him.

Joy informed us that the Research Schmooze is all set up for April 15 with a meeting room and computers. She also let us know that Bob Lucas will be leading workshops on Scholarly Writing and an Intro to Proposal writing on April 25 from 1:00 – 4:00 pm and all day Saturday, April 26 respectively.

There was a question regarding which faculty members are attending faculty development presentations. We wondered if Joy had a breakdown of the number of faculty from each department. Joy said she may do a breakdown by College for her annual report to the Provost and would share this with the FDAI Committee.
IV. Updates on Electronic Course Evaluation Report

Eric presented the Report findings to Faculty Senate and there was some discussion online afterwards. The goal now is to have Faculty Senate approve a motion to endorse the move to electronic course evaluations. C.P. moved that this be done and it was seconded. Franz read the draft of the motion, and after some discussion, we decided to clarify the three parts of the motion and change the order to 1) the ECE work group recommends that UAF move to electronic course evaluations; 2) the ECE work group recommends eXplorance/Blue as the new vendor; and 3) a new work group should be formed to design, oversee and evaluate a pilot of the new system to determine

methods for implementing it at UAF (summarized). Franz will revise the motion, email it to our committee and has asked that we respond electronically before noon tomorrow (Friday, March 28) so that he can take it to the Administrative Committee meeting later in the day. In addition, we voted that a second motion will be written recommending that Eric and Franz be included in the leadership of the new work group. Franz will email a draft of this to our committee in the near future.

V. Evaluation of Unit Peer Review Committee Criteria and Composition

Franz reported that the Unit Criteria Committee will take the lead on this issue, but they will inform him of their work so he may report updates to the FDAI Committee. While we felt the FDAI Committee should be involved, we also felt that as it was beyond our purview, we should not take the lead. Faculty Senate decided not to try to combine two committees to work on this issue. Joy suggested that of member of the Faculty Affairs Committee also be involved as well.

VI. Other Business

Amy shared some information with us from an interesting presentation she attended at the Lilly West Conference on some new software being developed at Cal Tech that allows students to become more involved with their professors' Power Point presentations via iPads. While the product is not ready for release yet, it does show much promise in encouraging students to add slides with questions or extra notes on them. Amy will forward the slides from the presentation to Franz who will in turn forward them on to our committee members.

We briefly touched on the budget challenge that UAF is facing. Franz told us that a committee has been formed to prioritize increment requests and evaluate/prioritize cuts to the budget. Latest developments regarding this topic will be provided during the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting.

VII. Upcoming Events

a. Next FDAI meeting: 4-24-14 from 4-5:00 pm
b. Administrative Committee meeting: 3-28-14
c. Faculty Senate meeting: 4-7-14

VIII. Adjourned at 5:05 pm

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 20, 2014

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Bill Barnes, Mike Castellini, Mike Davis, Cindy Fabbri, David Fazzino, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Eric Madsen, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Channon Price
Excused: Leslie Shallcross, Amy Vinlove

III. Report from Joy

After we welcomed Joy back, she informed us that she has sent out the OFD February agenda to all new faculty as well as to faculty that are still relatively new to UAF. She is cutting back on the number of the OFD emails by

sending out a monthly agenda to a filtered email list for specific groups of faculty. Joy reported that she is meeting with all new faculty during February – either face to face or via online.

Joy mentioned that the weekly Tuesday, 1:00 – 2:00 pm time slot is still being used for departmental meetings so some faculty are unable to attend the OFD's arranged presentations.

Joy reported that the Faculty Learning Communities formed last fall are going really well with 8 – 12 people in each of the six groups. She credits the facilitators with keeping up the momentum. Mike C. asked for a quick summary of some of the meetings Joy has sat in on. Joy responded that the groups meet for 90 minutes, and the members of the Learning Community that is looking at Flipping the Classroom all bought some kind of technology to use in their classrooms. After reading books on it and presenting their learnings during the fall semester, they have all implemented their various technologies in their respective classes this spring. Joy also noted that another FLC comprised mostly of CLA and Engineering faculty was currently meeting on how to write a good Annual Activities Report as just one of their topics.

Joy informed us that she has just signed another contract with Bob Lucas, so he will be coming to Fairbanks again.

Since UNAC has a new CBA there has been some confusion regarding their OFD funding. Joy reports that UNAC travel funding will be going to the Provost in the future.

The previously-titled Faculty Speed Dating event is now called a Research Schmooze and will take place April 15 on West Ridge from 1:00 – 2:00 pm. Joy has been working with the Office of Sponsored Programs to put the event together. They are hoping for 30 – 40 participants and have about 10 so far. Eric noted that the new electronic Annual Activities Reporting software, Faculty 180, allows faculty to search for research interests amongst their fellow faculty members. Joy indicated that she wants to learn about this so she can show faculty how to go about it. Eric said he would send out an email to the FDAI Committee with instructions. Franz mentioned that Madara Mason of eLearning and Distance Education did a similar Schmooze event to pair research faculty with instructional designers and has written up the results on their website. Joy opined that it would be a good idea to have someone from eLearning on our committee as a permanent member. We all agreed and Franz will let Madara know our next meeting dates/times for the remainder of the semester.

Joy informed us that she still meets with candidates for new faculty positions to let them know what UAF has to offer. C.P. indicated that if this interaction was a factor for new faculty accepting a position at UAF, then Deans and Directors should be made aware of the importance of this service offered by OFD.

Joy also let us know that faculty have been asking her when UAF will be switching to electronic course evaluations as they are tired of waiting so long for their results – which was a perfect segue for the next item on our agenda.

IV. Discussion on Electronic Course Evaluation Report

Franz explained that the report has two main components: 1) a summary of the work that has been done up to this point along with the recommendations of the workgroup that UAF switch to eXplorance/Blue as the new course evaluation vendor; and 2) recommendations on transitioning to a new electronic/paper hybrid system along with what kinds of side-effects may be encountered. He shared that he had received comments on the report draft from 5 – 6 FDAI members and would be sharing the progress of the report with the Administrative Committee at their meeting tomorrow. The plan is to present the finished report to Faculty Senate in March and propose a vote in April. If the Senate approves, the report will then go to the Provost. Joy asked if there was a plan for testing the recommended product. Eric answered that it is too early in the process to tell but presumably it would be tested by a college or department first. He also informed us that the company itself (eXplorance/Blue) has recommendations on how to begin the transition if UAF decides to make the switch.

V. Discussion on Faculty Speed Dating Event

We already discussed this during Joy's report (see III above).

VI. Other Business

Mike C. shared information regarding post docs: A new SFOS faculty member in Juneau is setting up a Post-Doctoral Development Session and would like to get the information out to all UA post docs and faculty. Joy said she will facilitate a meeting with the aforementioned faculty member when she comes to visit UAF.

Mike C. asked about the possible re-naming of our committee, and Franz informed us that we are waiting for the Administrative Committee to make their decisions regarding the proposed mission statements, after which we will again visit the discussion on a possible name change.

Franz indicated that the FDAI Committee was instrumental in bringing the issues some Peer Review committees were experiencing to the attention of Provost Henrichs. He said that the Provost agreed with our suggestion that FDAI be involved in the process of resolving the issues but that our committee should not lead the effort.

VII. Upcoming Events

a. Next FDAI meeting: 3-27-14 from 4-5:00 pm
b. Administrative Committee meeting: 2-21-14
c. Faculty Senate meeting: 3-3-14

VIII. Adjourned at 5:10 pm

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 198/15
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for 2/17/14

Attending: Christina Chu, Elisabeth Nadin, Laura Bender, Jayne Harvie, John Yarie, John Eichelberger, Mike Daku, Donie Bret-Harte, Amy Lovecraft, Vince Cee

I. Minutes from GAAC's meeting of February 10, 2014 were passed

II. GAAC passed the following course changes and proposals (some of these by email following the meeting):
24-GPCh.: Program Change: **PhD - Mathematics**
3-GPCh.: Program Change: **MS and PhD – Geophysics**
7-GPCh.: Program Change: **MS and PhD - Environmental Chemistry**
12-GCCh.: Course Change: **FISH F412/612 - Human-Environment Research Methods**
47-GNC: New Course: **BIOL F6xx - Advanced Immunology**

III. GAAC discussed **MATH F6xx - Topics in Geometry** further and also the proposed **Graduate Certificate in Resilience and Adaptation**. Both of these proposals need modifications. The proposers will be contacted.