FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Jayne Harvie
474-7964 jbharvie@alaska.edu
Zoom Link: https://zoom.us/j/666518148

A G E N D A
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #215

Monday, May 2, 2016
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1:00	I	Call to Order – Debu Misra A. Roll Call B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #214 C. Adoption of Agenda	4 Min.
1:04	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions A. Motions Approved: 1. Motion to approve Unit Criteria for the Geophysical Institute 2. Motion to approve Unit Criteria for the Institute of Northern Engineering 3. Motion to limit number of courses in classification lists 4. Motion to approve a New Minor in Creative Writing 5. Motion to approve discontinuation of BA in Theatre B. Motions Pending: None	1 Min.
1:05	III	A. President's Remarks – Debu Misra (3 Min.) B. President-Elect's Remarks – Orion Lawlor (3 Min.)	6 Min.
1:11	IV	A. Interim Chancellor's Remarks – Mike Powers (3 Min.) B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs (3 Min.) C. VC for Research Remarks – Larry Hinzman (3 Min.) D. Members' Questions / Comments (3 Min.)	12 Min.
1:23	V	Public Comment	5 Min.
1:28	VI	Governance Reports A. Staff Council – Faye Gallant B. ASUAF – Mathew Carrick C. UNAC – Chris Coffman UAFT – Jane Weber UNAD – Katie Boylan D. Athletics – Dani Sheppard	12 Min.
1:40	VII	Adoption of Consent Agenda A. Motion to approve the 2015-2016 degree candidates, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 215/1) B. Recognition of Service for Interim Chancellor Mike Powers, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 215/2) C. Recognition of Service for Debu Misra, submitted by the	1 Min.

Administrative Committee (Attachment 215/3)
D. Resolution for the Outstanding Senate Service of the Year, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 215/4)
E. Special Recognition of Senate Service (Attachment 215/5)

1:41 VIII Award Presentations and Announcements 19 Min.
A. Presentation of the Outstanding Senate Service of the Year Award
B. Announcement of Emeriti Faculty Awards (Attachment 215/6)
C. Special recognition of Senate Service and Governance Participation
D. Presentation of Resolution of Appreciation for Interim Chancellor Mike Powers
E. Presentation of Resolution of Appreciation for Debasmita Misra

2:00 BREAK

2:10 IX New Business 25 Min.
A. Motion to approve Unit Criteria for the Natural Sciences, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 215/7)
B. Motion to approve new Graduate Certificate in Resilience and Adaptation, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 215/8)
C. Motion to extend deadline for submission of Communication Plans, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 215/9)
D. Motion to approve a new Minor in Sustainable Agriculture, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 215/10)
E. Motion to approve revisions to the Grade Appeals Policy, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 215/11 and Handout)
F. Resolution recommending RAC be consulted re OGCA matters, submitted by the Research Advisory Committee (Attachment 215/12)

2:35 X Discussion Item 9 Min.
A. Status of the Blue Book Project – Mara B.

2:44 XI Information Items 1 Min.
A. Changes to Furlough Regulations (Attachment 215/13)
B. UAF Emergency Action Plan Policy (Attachment 215/14)

2:45 XII Public Comments 5 Min.

2:50 XIII Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements 10 Min.
A. General Comments/Announcements
B. Committee Chair Comments
Administrative Committee – Orion Lawlor (Attachment 215/15)
Standing:
Curricular Affairs – Jennifer Carroll, Chair (Attachment 215/16)
Faculty Affairs – Chris Fallen, Chair (Attachment 215/17)
Unit Criteria – Mara Bacsujlaky, Chair (Attachment 215/18)
Permanent:
Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 215/19)
Core Review – Andy Seitz, Chair (Attachment 215/20)

Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry, Chair
Faculty Administrator Review Committee – Debu Misra, Chair
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair (Attachment 215/21)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair (Attachment 215/22)
Information Technology Committee – Julie Cascio, Chair (Attachment 215/23)
Research Advisory Committee – Jessica Cherry, Chair
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Sandra Wildfeuer, Chair (Attachment 215/24)

Note: Committee Annual Reports are included in the attachments noted above if they were received by April 29. These reports and those received after April 29 will be posted as separate documents at the Faculty Senate Meetings web page; and, at each committee's web page.

3:00 XIV Adjournment of the 2015-2015 Faculty Senate

3:10 XV Seating of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate Members 10 Min.
A. Roll Call of the 2016-17 Members
B. President's Remarks – Orion Lawlor
C. President-Elect's Remarks – Chris Fallen

3:20 XVI Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs 5 Min.

3:25 XVII New Business 10 Min.
A. Motion to approve the 2016-17 UAF Faculty Senate Meeting Calendar (Attachment 215/25)
B. Motion to endorse 2016-17 Faculty Senate Committee Assignments (Attachment 215/26)
C. Motion to authorize the 15-16 Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate during the summer months, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 215/27)

3:35 XVIII Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 215/1
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Regents that the attached list of individuals be awarded the appropriate UAF degrees pending completion of all University requirements. [Note: a copy of the list is available in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall]

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: These degrees are granted upon recommendation of the program faculty, as verified by the appropriate department head. As the representative governance group of the faculty, UAF Faculty Senate makes that recommendation.

****

ATTACHMENT 215/2
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION
FOR
MICHAEL K. POWERS

WHEREAS, Michael Powers is completing his term as the Interim Chancellor of the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) on June 30, 2016, during an increasingly challenging period; and

WHEREAS, Michael Powers has been instrumental in the efforts of Title IX compliance of UAF that has been recognized nationally; and

WHEREAS, Michael Powers has successfully promoted the Green Dot program at UAF to secure a safe environment for all engaged in higher education; and

WHEREAS, Michael Powers strongly believes in the merits of shared governance and has promoted this concept with faculty, staff and students through consistent engagement, openness, transparency, and timely communication, and by including them in the discussions of the Chancellor's Cabinet; and

WHEREAS, Michael Powers has continually sought to strengthen the commitment to diversity and workplace ethics, campus safety, and aesthetics of the University of Alaska Fairbanks campus; and

WHEREAS, Michael Powers has served as a member of the Board of Regents (BOR) of UA from 2011 to 2015, being appointed by Governor Parnell; and

WHEREAS, Michael Powers has served as the chair of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the BOR of UA, as BOR secretary, treasurer and, most recently, vice chair prior to taking on the responsibility of the Interim Chancellor of UAF; and

WHEREAS, the faculty of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, through its Faculty Senate, wish to acknowledge and appreciate these outstanding contributions of Michael Powers, the Interim Chancellor of UAF; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the UAF Faculty Senate acknowledges these valuable contributions of Michael Powers and expresses its utmost gratitude and appreciation for his short but committed service to UAF.

ATTACHMENT 215/3
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

RECOGNITION OF SERVICE BY DEBASMITA MISRA

WHEREAS, Debasmita (Debu) Misra has served on the UAF Faculty Senate from AY2004-05 through AY2006-07, and from AY2011-12 through AY2012-13 as an Alternate; and he has served on the UAF Faculty Senate in AY2013-14 as a Senator; and,

WHEREAS, Debu Misra has served on the Unit Criteria Committee in AY2004-05 and AY2005-06, chairing the Unit Criteria Committee in AY2006-07, and serving on Unit Criteria again in AY2013-14; and

WHEREAS, Debu Misra has served as the President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate in 2014-15; and

WHEREAS, Debu Misra skillfully chaired the Faculty Administrator Review Committee in AY2015-16, facilitating a productive review process and its timely completion, as well as helping to lay groundwork for the continuation of a successful review process for years to come; and

WHEREAS, Debu Misra has served as President of the UAF Faculty Senate during the current academic year where he has demonstrated keen insight and made substantive and valuable contributions to the issues that directly affect faculty, students and university programs, including his valuable service on the Chancellor's Search Committee; and

WHEREAS, Debu Misra strongly believes in the merits of shared governance and has actively and effectively advocated for the involvement of faculty, staff and students with UA and UAF administration in discussions and decision-making for UAF, and

WHEREAS, Debu Misra has worked diligently to facilitate important and constructive communication on behalf of the UAF Faculty Senate and shared governance to provide feedback on the Strategic Pathways process, and foster a balance of proposed actions with prudent budgetary decision-making in a very difficult financial climate, and

WHEREAS, Debu Misra has represented the interests of the UAF Faculty Senate at the Faculty Alliance while also working effectively with our colleagues from UAA and UAS to advocate for faculty and program interests across the UA system; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate wishes to acknowledge the outstanding contributions of Debu Misra as UAF Faculty Senate President; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the UAF Faculty Senate acknowledges the valuable contributions of Debu Misra and expresses its utmost appreciation for his exemplary service.

ATTACHMENT 215/4
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

Outstanding Senate Service of the Year Award
Academic Year 2016

WHEREAS, Andrea Ferrante has served as the chair of the Electronic Course Assessment Implementation (ECAI) committee during the 2015-16 academic year and has done so in an exceptional manner; and

WHEREAS, the implementation of UAF's new course evaluation system has been a monumental and, in parts, quite challenging task; and

WHEREAS, Andrea Ferrante demonstrated excellent leadership in guiding the committee through several phases of system implementation; and

WHEREAS, Andrea Ferrante has maintained constant communication with the BLUE® system vendor, UAF administration, faculty, and students, and has worked tirelessly to make adjustments to the system that maximized its performance across the diverse teaching landscape of UAF; and

WHEREAS, Andrea Ferrante developed new and innovative methods to communicate the BLUE® system's functionality and strengths to UAF's teaching community; and

WHEREAS, Andrea Ferrante has initiated and designed an excellent website dedicated to course evaluation (http://www.uaf.edu/inspire-us/) that is providing background information, FAQs, success stories and more; and

WHEREAS, Andrea Ferrante's service to ECAI and, by extension, to UAF has been beyond exceptional and has set a shining example for dedication, professionalism, and rigor; and

WHEREAS, Andrea Ferrante has made many contributions to the faculty senate beyond ECAI as one of the most active and vocal members of the Faculty Development, Assessment, and Improvement (FDAI) committee; and

WHEREAS, Andrea Ferrante has devoted his considerable time and attention to this project as service to the University and not as a Faculty Senator; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the UAF Faculty Senate acknowledges the many valuable and far-reaching contributions of Andrea Ferrante and expresses its utmost gratitude and appreciation for his exemplary service.

ATTACHMENT 215/5
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

RECOGNITION OF SERVICE BY JANE WEBER

WHEREAS, Jane Weber has served on the UAF Faculty Senate since AY1994-95; and

WHEREAS, Jane Weber served continuously on the Developmental Studies Committee for nine years from AY1994-95 through AY2003-04; co-chairing the committee in AY1994-95, AY1995-96, and AY1996-97, and then chairing it from AY1997-98 through AY2003-04; and,

WHEREAS, Jane Weber not only co-founded the Committee on the Status of Women in AY2003-04, she then also served as chair of the Committee for 11 years, from AY2004-05 through AY2015-16, and

WHEREAS, under Jane Weber's capable leadership, the Committee on the Status of Women has founded and hosted the annual promotion and tenure workshop for UAF faculty continuously from AY2004-05 through AY2015-16, and

WHEREAS, under Jane Weber's capable leadership, the Committee on the Status of Women has founded and hosted the annual Women Faculty Luncheon continuously from AY2004-05 through AY2015-16, and secured private funding to do so; and

WHEREAS, Jane Weber has demonstrated excellent commitment and leadership toward addressing issues affecting UAF's women (and all) faculty, and

WHEREAS, Jane Weber has shown the utmost dedication and ethics in all of her committee work, and her contributions are consistently of highest quality; and

WHEREAS, Jane Weber's tireless "behind the scenes" work has supported the success of the UAF Faculty Senate for many years; and

WHEREAS, Jane Weber has always been considered dependable and approachable by faculty and students of UAF over the years; and

WHEREAS, the members (current and past) of the Committee on the Status of Women extend their heart-felt appreciation to Jane Weber for her dedicated service – along with their wishes that she enjoys a well-deserved and happy retirement, and

WHEREAS, the membership of the UAF Faculty Senate heartily concurs with the Committee on the Status of Women members, now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the UAF Faculty Senate acknowledges the many contributions of Jane Weber and expresses its appreciation for her exemplary service.

ATTACHMENT 215/6
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016

2016 UAF Emeriti

Ms. Jenny Bell-Jones, Department of Alaska Native Studies and Rural Development Academic Chair, Emeritus

Ms. Olivia Eddy, University Registrar, Emeritus

Dr. Gregory Goering, Professor of Economics, Emeritus

Dr. Scott Huang, Professor of Geological Engineering, Emeritus

Mr. John Kawula, Professor of Library Science, Emeritus

Mr. Richard Machida, Senior Engineer, Emeritus

Dr. Gerald Mohatt, Professor of Psychology, Posthumous Emeritus

Dr. Allan Morotti, Associate Professor of Counseling, Emeritus

Dr. Chien-Lu Ping, Professor of Soil Sciences, Emeritus

Dr. Channon Price, Associate Professor of Physics, Emeritus

Dr. Jonathan Rosenberg, Professor of Political Science, Emeritus

Dr. Jordan Titus, Professor of Sociology, Emeritus

Ms. Jane Weber, Associate Professor of Developmental Mathematics, Emeritus

Ms. Kathleen Wynne, Professor of Marine Biology, Emeritus

ATTACHMENT 215/7
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for the Natural Sciences, housed in the College of Natural Science and Mathematics.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor Approval

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

****

UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY: ANNUAL REVIEW, PRE-AND POST-TENURE, PROMOTION, TENURE REVIEW

AND

NATURAL SCIENCES UNIT CRITERIA

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS (BOR) CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, PRE- AND POST-TENURE, PROMOTION, AND TENURE REVIEW, SPECIFICALLY DEVELOPED FOR USE IN EVALUATING NATURAL SCIENCE FACULTY IN CNSM. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE CAPITAL LETTERS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO CNSM FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS. THE CNSM MATHEMATICAL AND STATISTICS DISCIPLINES CRITERIA ARE SUBMITTED AS A SEPARATE DOCUMENT.

CHAPTER I

Purview

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment.

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

B. Academic Titles.

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

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank.

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

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

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

E. Following the selection process.

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

F. Letter of Appointment.

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

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

CHAPTER III.

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

IT IS EXPECTED THAT THE CRITERIA FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR ARE TO BE MET FOR THE FOURTH YEAR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW. FOR PROMOTION TO AND TENURE AS ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR HAS TO MEET THE CRITERIA AT THE ASSOCIATE LEVEL. FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR AN ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR HAS TO MEET THE CRITERIA FOR FULL PROFESSOR. CRITERIA FOR ASSOCIATE AND FULL PROFESSOR INCLUDE AN ASSUMPTION THAT CRITERIA AT THE PREVIOUS LEVEL(S) CONTINUE TO BE MET. LISTED EXAMPLES ARE NOT MEANT TO IMPLY THAT ALL OF THOSE PROVIDED ARE EQUALLY MERITORIOUS. WORKLOADS VARY BETWEEN FACULTY MEMBERS IN THEIR RELATIVE EMPHASIS IN THE TRIPARTITE AREAS. THEREFORE, EXPECTED AMOUNT OF ACTIVITY IN TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FACULTY MEMBER'S WORKLOAD.

A. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies" Chapter IV **AND NATURAL SCIENCES 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. **TRIPARTITE FACULTY APPLYING FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION ARE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO GIVE A SEMINAR ON THEIR RESEARCH TO THEIR PEERS BEFORE THE PEER-UNIT COMMITTEE MEETS IN THAT YEAR TO AID IN THESE CONSIDERATIONS.**

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. **WHEN EVALUATING THE QUALITY OF THE TEACHING, CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE NATURE OF THE COURSE (E.G., CORE, NUMBER OF STUDENTS, WRITING INTENSIVE, STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS, ETC.).** Effective teachers **WILL DEMONSTRATE SOME, BUT NOT NECESSARILY ALL, OF THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS IN AN INDIVIDUAL YEAR**:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

SPECIFIC SCIENCES CRITERIA FOR TEACHING PERFORMANCE:

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

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

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

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative

pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere.

1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Whatever the contribution, research, scholarly or creative activities must have one or more of the following characteristics:

a. They must occur in a public forum,

b. They must be evaluated by appropriate peers,

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

d. They must be judged to make a contribution.

2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Evidence of excellence in research, scholarly, and creative activity may be demonstrated through, but not limited to:

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

b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas; these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.

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

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

e. Performance 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, **OR INVITATION TO EDIT OR REFEREE ARTICLES OR PROPOSALS FOR PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS OR ORGANIZATIONS, WHICH CAN BE TAKEN AS EVIDENCE OF OBTAINING STATURE FROM COLLEAGUES.**

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.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR SCIENCE RESEARCH PERFORMANCE:

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

- **ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: MUST HAVE ESTABLISHED AN APPROPRIATE RESEARCH PROGRAM. THE FACULTY MEMBER SHOULD SHOW INDEPENDENCE AND LEADERSHIP BY GENERATING RESEARCH IDEAS THAT TRANSLATE INTO PROJECTS THAT INVOLVE GRADUATE STUDENTS AND MAY ALSO INCLUDE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS. EXAMPLES FOR SUCH A SUCCESSFUL RESEARCH PROGRAM SHOULD INCLUDE SEVERAL OF THE FOLLOWING:**
  - **PUBLICATIONS IN REFEREED PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS DEMONSTRATING SIGNFICANT SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS AS MEASURED BY STANDARD INDICES (E.G. PUBLICATION RATE, CITATION RATES, JOURNAL IMPACT FACTOR). IT IS IMPORTANT FOR THE FACULTY MEMBER TO DISCUSS THE IMPORTANCE OF THEIR SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS CLEARLY IN THE NARRATIVE.**

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

- **<u>PROFESSOR</u>: MUST HAVE ESTABLISHED AN INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED RESEARCH PROGRAM. THE FACULTY MEMBER SHOULD SHOW INDEPENDENCE AND LEADERSHIP IN RESEARCH BY HAVING PRODUCED A SUFFICIENT QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF PUBLICATIONS TO DEMONSTRATE THE EXISTENCE OF AN ON-GOING, PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM THAT HAS ATTRACTED EXTERNAL FUNDING. THERE SHOULD BE A RECORD OF STUDENT INVOLVEMENT INCLUDING SUCCESSFUL MENTORING OF GRADUATE STUDENTS. THE RESEARCH PROGRAM SHOULD DEMONSTRATE:**
  - **EVIDENCE OF AN INTERNATIONAL REPUTATION THAT SHOULD INCLUDE SEVERAL EXAMPLES OF THE FOLLOWING: PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OR PRESENTATIONS AT MEETINGS, CITATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS, DOCUMENTED OPINIONS OF OTHER SCIENTISTS IN THE FIELD, INVITED TALKS, BOOK CHAPTERS, PROFESSIONAL AWARDS, AND INVITATIONS TO SERVE ON STEERING COMMITTEES, REVIEW PANELS, AND WORKING GROUPS.**
  - **EVIDENCE OF AN ON-GOING, PROFESSIONAL, INDEPENDENT RESEARCH PROGRAM THAT SHOULD INCLUDE EXAMPLES OF THE FOLLOWING: PUBLICATION QUALITY AND QUANTITY INDICATED BY THE NUMBER OF CITATIONS, THE QUALITY OF THE JOURNALS AS INDICATED BY THEIR IMPACT FACTOR, AND/OR EXTERNAL REVIEWS STATING THE PAPERS MADE MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS. THE FACULTY MEMBER'S ACQUISITION OF EXTERNAL FUNDING SHOULD BE DESCRIBED, INCLUDING A DESCRIPTION OF THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO COLLABORATIVE PROJECTS.**
  - **EVIDENCE OF MENTORING OF GRADUATE STUDENTS THAT SHOULD INCLUDE SEVERAL EXAMPLES OF THE FOLLOWING: STUDENT GRADUATION, A SIGNIFICANT BODY OF STUDENT PRESENTATIONS, STUDENT AWARDS, OR STUDENT GRANT SUCCESSES, AND PROFESSIONAL PLACEMENT OF STUDENTS. INCLUSION OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN RESEARCH PROGRAMS IS ALSO VALUED AND MENTORING OF**

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS SHOULD BE DEMONSTRATED IF THEY ARE INCLUDED IN THE RESEARCH PROGRAM.

AS A POINT OF CLARIFICATION, THERE IS NO EXPECTATION FOR FACULTY AT ANY RANK TO AMASS PUBLICATIONS AS EITHER FIRST OR SOLE AUTHOR. IT IS COMMON FOR MANY DISCIPLINES TO HAVE THE PRIMARY AUTHOR LISTED LAST (OFTEN AS CORRESPONDING AUTHOR), AND IT IS CONSIDERED FAVORABLE FOR STUDENTS TO BE INCLUDED AS COAUTHORS OR FIRST AUTHORS. IT IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE FACULTY MEMBER TO CLARIFY IN THEIR NARRATIVE THEIR ROLE AND CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS IN MULTIPLE-AUTHORED PUBLICATIONS. THIS PHILOSOPHY OF EXPLAINING THE ROLE ALSO APPLIES TO COLLABORATIVE PROPOSALS.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service and PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is a fundamental part of the university's obligation to the people of its state. In this tradition, faculty providing their professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge, is identified as "public service." The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assume 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 a systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing, programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, or 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 and/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, INCLUDING CLINICAL CONSULTING IN A FACULTY MEMBER'S AREA OF EXPERTISE**.**

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 **CONTRIBUTIONS INCLUDING INTERVIEWS**, newspaper articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media;

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

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 activities 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 accrediting reviews.

e. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.

f. Service in support of student organizations and activities.

g. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.

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

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

j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

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

3. **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**

a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations (**IF NOT COUNTED AS RESEARCH; SEE C.2.F.**).

b. Active participation in professional organizations;

c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.

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

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

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

4. Evaluation of Service

Each 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, university, and **PROFESSIONAL** service may be demonstrated through, e.g., appropriate letters of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards, and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

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

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

SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR SERVICE PERFORMANCE:

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

E. CRITERIA FOR CURATION AS A SERVICE COMPONENT WHEN RELEVANT.

CURATORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA MUSEUM (UAM) CAN HOLD A TENURE-TRACK FACULTY POSITION. RANK AND TENURE ARE HELD WITHIN DEPARTMENTS AT UAF, AND CURATORS ARE THUS TREATED AS JOINT APPOINTMENTS BETWEEN A DEPARTMENT AND UAM. AS IS THE CASE FOR ALL TENURE-TRACK FACULTY AT CNSM, CURATOR'S PERFORMANCES ARE EVALUATED ON THE BASIS OF THEIR ACTIVITIES IN TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE.

1. **CURATION INVOLVES THE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF A FORMALLY RECOGNIZED UNIVERSITY COLLECTION THAT EXISTS TO SERVE AS A RESEARCH RESOURCE FOR STUDENTS AND RESEARCHERS AT UNIVERSITY, STATE, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS. EXAMPLES OF CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:**

    A. **MAINTAINING, ENHANCING, AND ENLARGING THE COLLECTION (INCLUDES COMPUTERIZATION AND DATABASE DEVELOPMENT, ARCHIVAL UPGRADES, SPECIMEN CONSERVATION AND IDENTIFICATION, AND ADDING SPECIMENS OR OBJECTS TO EXISTING COLLECTION);**

    B. **INTERACTING WITH STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES AND WITH THE PUBLIC ON COLLECTIONS-RELATED ISSUES;**

    C. **FACILITATING COLLECTIONS USE THROUGH LOANS, EXCHANGES, AND VISITING RESEARCHERS;**

    D. **MAINTAINING APPROPRIATE PERMITS (AS NEEDED FOR THE COLLECTIONS);**

    E. **SUPERVISING COLLECTIONS MANAGERS, STUDENT EMPLOYEES, AND VOLUNTEERS;**

    F. **WORKING WITH PUBLIC PROGRAM STAFF TO CREATE EXHIBITS AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATE TO THE COLLECTION;**

    G. **PURSUING FUNDING FOR COLLECTIONS GROWTH AND MAINTENANCE;**

    H. **PRODUCING CURATORIAL OR COLLECTIONS-RELATED PUBLICATIONS, REPORTS, AND/OR MANUALS;**

    I. **ENSURING UNIVERSITY COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS AND INTERNATIONAL TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS THAT PERTAIN TO THE COLLECTION.**

2. **SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR CURATORIAL PERFORMANCE:**

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AND CURATOR

EVIDENCE OF CURATORIAL ABILITY AND A COMMITMENT TO DEVELOPING AND MANAGING RESEARCH COLLECTIONS RELEVANT TO THE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING:

A. CURATORS WILL DEVELOP THE COLLECTIONS AS A PERMANENT RECORD OF THE NATURAL AND/OR CULTURAL DIVERSITY OF ALASKA, THE CIRCUMPOLAR NORTH, AND BEYOND AND AS A RESEARCH RESOURCE FOR STUDIES OF BIOLOGICAL AND/OR CULTURAL DIVERSITY.

B. COLLECTIONS CARE INCLUDES RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PHYSICAL CONDITION AND STORAGE OF OBJECTS/SPECIMENS, CORRESPONDING DOCUMENTATION, BUDGETARY MANAGEMENT, AND ANNUAL REPORTS.

1. **CURATORS WILL PRESERVE THE SPECIMENS, ARTIFACTS, OBJECTS, AND MATERIAL UNDER THEIR PURVIEW THROUGH THE USE OF METHODS AND TECHNIQUES PROFESSIONALLY ACCEPTED WITHIN THEIR RESPECTIVE DISCIPLINES.**

2. **CURATORS WILL ENSURE THAT ALL RECORDS AND FIELD NOTES CONCERNING COLLECTION MATERIALS ARE MAINTAINED IN A SECURE FASHION AND MEET OR EXCEED DOCUMENTATION STANDARDS FOR THEIR RESPECTIVE DISCIPLINE.**

3. **CURATORS WILL MAINTAIN CURRENT ACCESSION FILES, DEACCESSION FILES, AND CATALOGUES OF OBJECTS IN THEIR COLLECTIONS. THEY WILL DEVELOP ELECTRONIC DATABASES WITH COMPUTER DATA FORMATS THAT FOLLOW DATA STANDARDS OF THE RESPECTIVE DISCIPLINE AND UAM.**

4. **CURATORS WILL DEVELOP, MAINTAIN, AND REVISE WRITTEN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR CURATION OF OBJECTS OR SPECIMENS IN THEIR COLLECTIONS.**

C. CURATORS WILL TAKE PART IN INTERPRETIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE MUSEUM IN ORDER TO FULFILL THE MUSEUM'S MISSION TO INTERPRET THE NATURAL AND CULTURAL HISTORY OF ALASKA. IN THIS REGARD, PREPARATION OF A SMALL EXHIBIT IS APPROXIMATELY THE EQUIVALENT OF PUBLICATION OF A PROFESSIONAL ARTICLE; PROJECT DIRECTION OF A LARGE AND COMPLEX EXHIBIT THAT INCLUDES PREPARATION OF A SERIOUS CATALOGUE IS APPROXIMATELY THE EQUIVALENT OF PUBLICATION OF A SCHOLARLY BOOK.

D. CURATORS WILL ACTIVELY SUBMIT GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR EXTERNAL SUPPORT FOR THEIR CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES AND COLLECTIONS-BASED RESEARCH.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND CURATOR

CONSISTENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERPRETIVE (EDUCATION AND EXHIBITION) ACTIVITIES OF THE MUSEUM, RESPONSE TO COLLECTION-RELATED INQUIRIES (FROM OTHER PROFESSIONALS, THE PUBLIC, AND STATE AGENCIES) AND/OR DEVELOPMENT OF INTERPRETIVE MATERIALS FOR THE PUBLIC-AT-LARGE ARE EXPECTED. USE OF THE COLLECTIONS FOR TEACHING AND/OR RESEARCH MUST BE EVIDENT. ACTIVE SOLICITATION FOR EXTERNAL FUNDS TO SUPPORT CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES AND COLLECTIONS-BASED RESEARCH MUST BE EVIDENT.

PROFESSOR AND CURATOR

SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLLECTIONS UNDER THE CURATOR'S CARE IS EXPECTED. THIS DEVELOPMENT INCLUDES SUSTAINED GROWTH OF THE COLLECTIONS AS RESEARCH RESOURCES AND AS A MEANS OF FULFILLING THE MUSEUM'S MISSION OF ACQUIRING, PRESERVING IN PERPETUITY, INVESTIGATING, AND INTERPRETING OBJECTS AND SPECIMENS RELATING TO THE NATURAL AND OR CULTURAL HISTORY OF ALASKA AND THE CIRCUMPOLAR NORTH. SIGNIFICANCE OF COLLECTIONS WILL BE MEASURED IN TERMS OF RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE, VALUE TO UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA RESEARCH AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, AND VALUE TO NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS. THE CURATOR SHOULD BE A RECOGNIZED AUTHORITY IN HIS/HER FIELD, LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY. HE OR SHE MUST HAVE A RECORD OF SUCCESS IN ACQUIRING EXTERNAL FUNDS FOR CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES AND COLLECTIONS-BASED RESEARCH.

3. EVALUATION OF CURATION

A COMMITTEE COMPOSED OF THE TENURED CURATORS AT THE MUSEUM WILL PROVIDE AN EVALUATION TO THE UNIT PEER COMMITTEE. IN CASE THERE IS JUST ONE OR NO TENURED CURATORS, IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT TWO OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEWERS BE CURATORS. IN FORMULATING CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND INDICES FOR EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE, THE MUSEUM SHOULD INCLUDE EXAMPLES OF CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES AND MEASURES FOR EVALUATION APPROPRIATE FOR THAT UNIT. EXCELLENCE IN CURATION MAY BE DEMONSTRATED THROUGH, E.G., APPROPRIATE LETTER OF COMMENDATION, RECOMMENDATION, AND/OR APPRECIATION, CERTIFICATES AND AWARDS, AND OTHER PUBLIC MEANS OF RECOGNITION FOR SERVICES RENDERED.

ATTACHMENT 215/8
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new Graduate Certificate of Resilience and Adaptation, housed in the Graduate School.

Effective: Fall 2016 upon all required approvals.

Rationale: This program would enable students already enrolled in a graduate program to obtain a certificate in Resilience and Adaptation (RAP), by completing 12 additional credits of coursework. The certificate program is open to any graduate student, although it is targeted at students in the Resilience and Adaptation Program (RAP). RAP encourages and fosters students to take a "systems" approach to research that explores the interactions of social, economic and ecological components holistically. Hence, RAP students are given the academic freedom to solve complex real world problems, such as resource management, using the best tools available and without the limitations of commonly accepted tools within single disciplines. The certificate would provide students a workforce advantage for both private industry and state agency positions, as it would demonstrate their knowledge of resilience and adaptation theory as well as the practical research techniques associated with interdisciplinary scientific approaches. Certificate awardees will be aware of adaptive cycles, which include both fast and slow variables. The certificate would "boost" a traditional MS or PhD degree and indicate the recipient has a broader knowledge base. The certificate supports UAF's strategic plan's goal of serving Alaska's diverse communities by enhancing the strategy of obtaining a Carnegie Community Engaged Institution designation.

See the program proposal #31-GNP on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

****

Program Summary Statement:

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Introduction

The request for a certification in Resilience and Adaptation Studies grows out of the highly successful Resilience and Adaptation Program or RAP. RAP began as an NSF funded IGERT grant under the direction of Dr. Terry Chapin in 2002 and was designed to promote regional sustainability research via team-taught multidisciplinary courses and internships as well as spawn research collaboration among departments. In 2012, RAP was institutionalized by the University with support from the State of Alaska. Under Dr. Lawrence Duffy's direction, the program continues to adapt, evolve, and improve to meet new challenges and take advantage of new opportunities. Educating students to meet the state of Alaska's needs is of paramount importance.

Demand for Program
Demand for RAP admission remains extremely competitive. RAP affiliated faculty members select a small cohort each year from UAF graduate student applicants. A student can apply to an academic department and RAP simultaneously or can be admitted to RAP after beginning coursework. Over 100 graduate students have participated in the program, representing every college and school at UAF.

e-learning
Due to its focus on cohort building, incoming RAP students are asked to spend fall semester at the UAF campus. The foundation courses (4 credits) are taught at this time and students share office space in the RAP trailer behind the Reichardt Building. After the initial semester RAP students may move to other locations such as the UAS or UAA campus. The students may then take courses via distance delivery as offered or needed. The monthly All RAP seminar is videoconferenced.

Effects on other programs
RAP complements both the traditional academic departments and interdisciplinary students by providing a forum for cross-disciplinary learning and communication. As a result, departments may draw students from other areas that would not normally enroll in a course or conduct research in a given discipline. For example, recent MFA graduate (CLA) and ceramicist Perrin Teal Sullivan conducted some of her studies with the assistance of the Advanced Instrumentation Laboratory (CNSM).

Alignment with university mission, goals, core themes and objectives
The RAP certificate aligns well with UAF's mission to integrate teaching, research and public service with an emphasis on the circumpolar North and its diverse peoples. RAP appeals to students with an intellectual curiosity that are willing to step outside disciplinary boundaries with their research design. Students are selected based on their desire to approach Northern research questions from a holistic perspective that includes both natural and social science elements. RAP already attracts the best and brightest students; the certificate will be one more means of recruiting and retaining talented graduate students.

RAP prepares students for employment in governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, academia and private industry. 100 percent of alumni respondents surveyed in 2013 felt that RAP increased employment opportunities. *"The RAP allowed me to extend my strong natural science foundation into work as a social scientist with a profound understanding of the cultural and economic issues facing Alaskan individuals and communities."*

RAP students design projects with community needs in mind. They work with community members to observe, listen, document and develop strategies and/or solutions to identified needs. RAP students generously share their insights and promote knowledge and ways of knowing through scholarly articles, presentations, educational outreach and involvement in community organizations. Students are often the force behind new partnerships and collaborations and serve as the catalyst for change. Students provide the energy to move good ideas and projects forward. RAP students have made significant contributions to the understanding of climate change and Arctic research; their success reflects on the university's reputation.

Alignment with Shaping Alaska's Future themes
The certificate will contribute to state accountability by documenting the students' csuccessful program completion. The number of students in relation to the cost of the program will support the "Shaping Alaska's Future" by improving the efficiency of the program.

- Student Achievement and Attainment: The students who apply to RAP are high achievers. They have the initiative to pursue research questions from an interdisciplinary perspective. The awarding of a certificate following 12 credits will acknowledge their progress and provide motivation for completing their Master or PhD degree.

- Productive Partnerships with Public Entities and Private Industries: State and federal agencies and non-governmental organizations have hired a significant number of RAP alumni. Both governmental and non-governmental organizations value the students' ability to analyze complex problems and develop effective strategies. Perhaps as a result of the cohort experience, RAP students are excellent communicators. They learn from day 1 how to express their ideas so that others outside their academic discipline can learn and understand.

- Research and Development and Scholarship to Enhance Alaska's Communities and Economic Growth: The approach to research using both a physical and social science perspective benefits the individual Alaska communities where the research is conducted and contributes knowledge to Alaska as a whole. RAP students are very cognizant that they must keep their communities informed throughout the entire research process from study design through dissemination of results. For example, Katty Jo Deeter is sharing her knowledge of building a successful tourism business in the Interior with Igiugig's ecotourism development goals.

- Accountability to the People of Alaska: The certificate will demonstrate accountability by documenting the students' successful completion of the program. A majority of the students' research addresses impacts of climate change. Whether they are documenting traditional knowledge regarding caribou migration or analyzing cortisol levels in whales to determine stress, the state of Alaska will benefit from the knowledge gained.

Alignment with Academic Master Plan goals

RAP selects students with interests related to the circumpolar North and appeals to students who are informed, responsible citizens. While they often work at the community level, their research often has implications well beyond the state level. Culturally aware, their work extends from Alaska's rural communities to the international stage. RAP alumna Robin Bronen, for example, is considered an international expert on migration as a result of climate change (climigration). Following graduation, students are in demand to fulfill leadership roles in academia as well as state and federal agencies. RAP students are adept at building partnerships and initiating collaborative work in an effort to build a more sustainable Alaska.

State needs to be met

Workforce Development: RAP students have a good employment track record. They learn to conduct multidisciplinary research, acquire technical expertise from GIS – drone surveillance, and are dedicated to uncovering and sharing knowledge. The majority of RAP students have remained in Alaska.

Budget

Since any student who has an undergraduate degree is eligible to apply for the RAP certificate program, it is expected that enrollment numbers will significantly increase. The certificate is expected to attract both new and existing UA students. Tuition and fees for the six required credits in year 1 (FY18) are expected

to generate $65,700. This estimate is based on tuition and fees for 15 students (eight Alaska residents and seven nonresidents*). We anticipate that increased students will apply and be accepted as the program becomes better known. By year 3 we anticipate an enrollment of 30 students generating $134,205.

Adjuncts are recruited from exceptional upper level RAP graduate students or alumni. Using adjuncts provides advanced students (or alumni) excellent teaching experience at minimal cost. It additionally keeps the program fresh and relevant. Additionally, by using courses offered across the university curriculum, the cost of instruction is lowered and the graduate class size is increased. This cost saving measure allows an increased allocation of state funding to student support in the form of fellowships, travel to professional meetings (network formation) and publication costs (Dissemination of research knowledge gains). Administration: RAP uses the existing administration of UAF's graduate school.

*Resident and nonresident numbers are based on the last three RAP cohorts where 50 percent of accepted applicants were in state and 50 percent were nonresidents.

RESOURCE COMMITMENT TO THE PROPOSED DEGREE PROGRAM

Additional resources are not required.

Resources	Existing	New		Total
	College/School	College/School	Others (Specify)	
Regular Faculty (FTE's & dollars)				
Adjunct Faculty (FTE's & dollars)				
Teaching Assistants (Headcount)				
Instructional Facilities (in dollars and/or sq. footage)				
Office Space (Sq. footage)				
Lab Space (Sq. Footage)				
Computer & Networking (in dollars)				
Research/ Instructional/ office Equipment (in dollars)				
Support Staff (FTE's & dollars)				
Supplies (in dollars)				
Travel (in dollars)				

Signature _____ Date 1/22/16

Dean of College/School Proposing New Degree Program

28

Board of Regents Program Action Request
University of Alaska
Proposal to Add, Change, or Delete a Program of Study

1a. UA University (choose one) UAF	1b. School or College Graduate School	1c. Department or Program Resilience and Adaptation Program

2. Complete Program Title Resilience and Adaptation Certificate

3. Type of Program

☐ Undergraduate Certificate ☐ Associate ☐ Baccalaureate ☐ Post-Baccalaureate Certificate

☐ Master's ☒ Graduate Certificate ☐ Doctorate

4. Type of Action

☒ Add ☐ Change ☐ Delete

5. Implementation date (semester, year)

☒ Fall ☐ Spring ☐ Summer Year 2016

6. Projected Revenue and Expenditure Summary. Not Required if the requested action is deletion.
(Provide information for the 5th year after program or program change approval if a baccalaureate or doctoral degree program; for the 3rd year after program approval if a master's or associate degree program; and for the 2nd year after program approval if a graduate or undergraduate certificate. If information is provided for another year, specify (1st) and explain in the program summary attached). Note that Revenues and Expenditures are not always entirely new; some may be current (see 7d.)

Projected Annual Revenues to the University in FY 18		Projected Annual Expenditures in FY 18	
Unrestricted		Salaries & benefits (faculty and staff)	$8145
General Fund	$13145.	Other (commodities, services, etc.)	$5000
Student Tuition & Fees	$65658	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$13145
Indirect Cost Recovery	$	One-time Expenditures to Initiate Program (if >$250,000)	
TVEP or Other (specify):	$	(These are costs in addition to the annual costs, above.)	
Restricted		Year 1	$
Federal Receipts	$	Year 2	$
TVEP or Other (specify):	$	Year 3	$
TOTAL REVENUES	$78803	Year 4	$

Page # of attached summary where the budget is discussed, including initial phase-in: 3

7. Budget Status. Items a., b., and c. indicate the source(s) of the General Fund revenue specified in item 6. If any grants or contracts will supply revenue needed by the program, indicate amount anticipated and expiration date, if applicable.

Revenue source	Continuing	One-time
a. In current legislative budget request	$	$
b. Additional appropriation required	$	$
c. Funded through new internal UA university redistribution	$	$
d. Funds already committed to the program by the UA university[1]	$13145	$
e. Funded all or in part by external funds, expiration date	$	$
f. Other funding source Specify Type:	$	$

8. Facilities: New or substantially (>$25,000 cost) renovated facilities will be required. ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, discuss the extent, probable cost, and anticipated funding source(s), in addition to those listed in sections 6 and 7 above.

[1]Sometimes the courses required by a new degree or certificate program are already being taught by a UA university, e.g., as a minor requirement. Similarly, other program needs like equipment may already be owned. 100% of the value is indicated even though the course or other resource may be shared.

9. Projected enrollments (headcount of majors). If this is a program deletion request, project the teach out enrollments.

Year 1: 15	Year 2: 20	Year 3: 30	Year 4: 30

Page number of attached summary where demand for this program is discussed: 1

10. Number* of new TA or faculty hires anticipated (or number of positions eliminated if a program deletion):

Graduate TA	0
Adjunct	0
Term	0
Tenure track	0

11. Number* of TAs or faculty to be reassigned:

Graduate TA	0
Adjunct	0
Term	0
Tenure track	0

Former assignment of any reassigned faculty:
For more information see page of the attached summary.

12. Other programs affected by the proposed action, including those at other MAUs (please list):

Program Affected	Anticipated Effect
None	

Page number of attached summary where effects on other programs are discussed:

13. Specialized accreditation or other external program certification needed or anticipated. List all that apply or 'none': None

14. Aligns with University or campus mission, goals, core themes, and objectives (list):Expand graduate programs in targeted areas of identified need and existing strengths. Develop innovative approaches to resource management that support the University's mission and position UAF to meet the challenges of the future.

Page in attached summary where alignment is discussed: 1

15. Aligns with Shaping Alaska's Future themes:

Page in attached summary where alignment is discussed: 2

16. Aligns with Academic Master Plan goals:

Page in attached summary where alignment is discussed: 2

17. State needs met by this program (list): Workforce Development: RAP students have a good employment track record. They learn to conduct multidisciplinary research, acquire technical expertise from GIS – drone surveillance, and are dedicated to uncovering and sharing knowledge. The majority of RAP students have remained in Alaska.

Page in the attached summary where the state needs to be met are discussed: 3

18. Program is initially planned to be: (check all that apply)

☒ Available to students attending classes at UAF campus(es).
☐ Available to students via e-learning.
☒ Partially available students via e-learning.

Page # in attached summary where e-learning is discussed:

Submitted by the University of Alaska Fairbanks.
(choose one above)

_____/_____ _____/_____
Provost Date Chancellor Date

☐ Consensus Support of SAC ☐ Not Supported by SAC

☐ Recommend Approval by VPAAR _____/_____
☐ Recommend Disapproval by VPAAR UA Vice President for Academic Affairs Date

*Net FTE (full-time equivalents). For example, if a faculty member will be reassigned from another program, but his/her original program will hire a replacement, there is one net new faculty member. Use fractions if appropriate. Graduate TAs are normally 0.5 FTE. The numbers should be consistent with the revenue/expenditure information provided.

Attachments: ☒ Summary of Degree or Certificate Program Proposal ☐ Other (optional)

Revised: 04/20/2015

ATTACHMENT 215/9
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to extend the deadline for submitting an initial Communications Plan to the Provost's Office from April 15, 2016 to May 14, 2016, and clarifies the language regarding how long existing O and W designators will remain in place by specifying the academic year of the catalog.

New implementation timeline for transition:

1. Communication Plans will be reviewed and initially approved by the College or School's Curricular Review Committee, Academic Council, or other committee as appropriate and then continuously reviewed as part of the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan review process.
2. Each baccalaureate degree program will submit an initial Communications Plan to the Provost's office by May 14, 2016.
3. During AY 2016/17 Departments will make any necessary changes to implement their plan.
4. Plans will be in place and implemented by Fall 2017.
5. Existing O and W designators will remain visible (if appropriate) on course numbers through the AY 19/20 catalog to facilitate students under catalogs with O/W requirements.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2017

RATIONALE: Some programs need additional time to submit their reviewed plans to the Provost's Office. The additional time will not affect the overall implementation timeline of the new Communications Plans. Providing the catalog year provides more clarity.

****

ATTACHMENT 215/10
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new Minor in Sustainable Agriculture, housed in the School of Natural Resources and Extension.

Effective: Fall 2016

Rationale: The demand for information on sustainable agriculture practices increases every year and competing Land Grant Universities throughout the nation offer degrees at multiple levels in sustainable agriculture. Creating a minor in sustainable agriculture is a necessary step to remain competitive in this field. The courses exist and offering them as part of this minor will address broad interests by students across disciplines, as well as enhance enrollments.

****

Overview:

Students of sustainable agriculture learn concepts and techniques that are environmentally and socially sound as well as profitable for agriculture and food production. The proposed minor is a cohesive suite of courses that provides a foundation in the emerging concepts and practices of soil, plant and animal management using a comprehensive, sustainable approach.

The courses in this minor focus on agroecology and the interactions of natural and agricultural ecosystems for a comprehensive sustainable approach. Traditional and alternative production systems will be examined to support healthy environments, cultures and economies, promoting food security and community structure. The sustainable agriculture concepts and principles will also be related to current issues such as population growth, changing climate, social structures and use of resources. The proposed courses already exist. There is no anticipated negative impact on budget, facilities/space or faculty.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

Sustainable Agriculture
The minor in Sustainable Agriculture is based on social, economic and environmental aspects of agriculture and food production. The curriculum supports a basic understanding of sustainability science in global and US. agriculture, and an appreciation for the integrated nature of the biological, physical and social sciences that make up sustainable agriculture.

1. Complete all of the following *
   NRM F101 – Natural Resource conservation and policy – 3 credits
   NRM F210 – Introduction to sustainable agriculture – 3 credits

NRM F235 – Introduction to Natural Resource Economics (ECON) - 3 credits

2. Complete 3 of the following
NRM F211 – Introduction to applied plant science – 3 credits
NRM F220 – Introduction to animal science – 3 credits
NRM F380 – Soils and the environment – 3 credits**
NRM F303X - Environmental Ethics and Actions (h) – 3 credits***
NRM F403 W, O - Environmental Decision Making – 3 credits

3. Minimum credits required – 18 credits
a) Students majoring in NRM are not eligible for the sustainability minor.

** Students must earn a C- grade or better in each course.*
***Prerequisites: CHEM F105X*
****Requires Junior standing*

Relationship to Purposes of the University:

The demand for information on sustainable agriculture practices increases every year. Offering a minor is the first step in addressing this demand and provides the foundation for future program building. The multidisciplinary nature of sustainable agriculture has broad appeal, spanning numerous departments campus wide and creation of the minor is expected to attract students from many of these different programs (e.g., Geography, Philosophy and Humanities, School of Management, Anthropology, Northern Studies, Cross-Cultural Studies, Biology). The minor is open to students from all other Departments and Schools.

Concepts of sustainability embrace current thinking in land use management and food security throughout the world and are informing policy decisions at home and abroad. Competing Land Grant Universities throughout the nation offer degrees at multiple levels in sustainable agriculture and although we are only proposing a minor, it is a necessary step to remain competitive. http://sustainableaged.org/projects/degree-programs/

Providing this introduction to students gives them insight into the interrelatedness of human and environmental values and the importance of food security at multiple levels.

ATTACHMENT 215/11
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following changes to the UAF Grade Appeals Policy.

Effective: Immediately

Rationale: The Grade Appeals Policy was last revised in 2013. The current revisions bring the policy in line with Board of Regents' Policy (Chapter 09.03 - Student Dispute Resolution). It clarifies the informal and formal procedures, and addresses the inclusion of any represented faculty member instead of only tenure-track faculty members on the Grade Appeals committee. It establishes an ad hoc faculty senate Student Appeals Committee.

****

Additions in bold italics and ~~deletions indicated with strike-through.~~

Grade Appeals Policy:

I. Introduction

The University of Alaska is committed to the ideal of academic freedom and so recognizes that the assignment of grades is a faculty responsibility. Therefore, the University administration shall not influence or affect an assigned grade or the review of an assigned grade.

The following procedures are designed to provide a means for students to seek review of final course grades alleged to be arbitrary and capricious. Before taking formal action, a student must attempt to resolve the issue informally with the instructor of the course. A student who files a written request for review under the following procedures shall be expected to abide by the final disposition of the review, as provided below, and may not seek further review of the matter under any other procedure within the university.

II. Definitions

A. A "grade" refers to final letter grades A, B, C, D, F, and Pass ***or Fail***. The I (incomplete) ***and DF (deferred)*** designate~~s~~ a temporary grade, ~~for one year~~ not a final grade, so ~~it is~~ ***these are*** not subject to appeal until ~~it~~ ***they*** become~~s~~ final.

B. For the purpose of this procedure, "arbitrary and capricious" grading means:

1. the assignment of a course grade to a student on some basis other than performance in the course, or

2. the assignment of a course grade to a student by resorting to standards different from those which were applied to other students in that course, or

3. the assignment of a course grade by a substantial, unreasonable and unannounced departure from the instructor's previously articulated standards.

C. "Grading errors" denotes errors in the ~~calculation~~ ***assignment*** of grades rather than errors in judgment.

D. ~~As used in the schedule for review of academic decisions, a~~***A "***class day***"*** is any day of scheduled instruction, excluding Saturday and Sunday, included on the academic calendar in effect at the time of a review, ***as defined in university regulations (R09.03.024).*** Final examination periods are counted as class days.

E. "Department chair" for the purposes of this policy denotes the ~~administrative chair~~ ***faculty member responsible for*** ~~of~~ the academic unit offering the course**.** ~~(e.g., head, chair or coordinator of an academic department, or the campus director if the faculty member is in the College of Rural Alaska).~~

F. The "dean/director" is the administrative ~~chair~~ ***head*** of the college or school offering the course or program from which the academic decision or action arises. For students at extended campuses the director of the campus may substitute for the dean/director of the unit offering the course or program.

G. ***The*** "~~F~~***f***inal grade" ~~for the purposes of this policy~~ is the grade assigned for a course upon its completion.

~~H. A "grading error" is a mathematical miscalculation of a final grade or an inaccurate recording of the final grade.~~

H ~~I~~. The ***"***next regular semester***"*** is the fall or spring semester following that in which the disputed academic decision was made. For example, it would be the fall semester for a final grade issued for a course completed during the previous spring semester or summer session. The spring semester is the next regular semester for an academic decision made during the previous fall semester.

III. Procedures

A. ***Informal Procedures***

Errors by an instructor in determining and recording a grade or by the university staff in transcribing the grade are sources of error that can be readily corrected through the student's prompt attention following the normal change of grade procedure.

1. Review the UAF Appeal of Grade form.

2~~1~~. It is a student's obligation to notify the instructor ~~of any possible error~~ ***in writing with an explanation of the perceived grading error within 15 class days of the next regular semester (i.e., fall semester for grade issued at the end of the previous spring semester or summer session; spring semester for grade issued at the end of the previous fall semester).*** ~~immediately by the most direct means available. If this is through an oral conversation and/or the issue is not immediately resolved, it is the student's responsibility to provide the instructor with a signed, written request for review of the grade, with a copy to the unit department chair and the dean of~~

~~the college or school in which the course was offered.~~ ***A copy of the request should also be provided to the department chair.***

2~~. Notification must be received by the instructor and/or department chair within 30 class days after the beginning of the next regular semester (i.e., fall semester for grade issued at the end of the previous spring semester or summer session; spring semester for grade issued at the end of the previous fall semester). [FS Meeting #157, March 2009.]~~

3. The instructor is responsible for notifying the student in writing of his or her final judgment concerning the grade in question within 5 ***class*** days of receipt of the request, and for promptly submitting the appropriate change of grade form to the Registrar's Office if an error occurred. ***If the decision was not to reconsider the grade, the instructor should notify the student, the department chair and the dean/director in writing by completing the informal portion on the Appeal of Grade form.***

4. If the student does not receive a response from the instructor or the unit department chair by the required deadline, the student must seek the assistance of the dean of the college or school in which the course was offered~~.~~ ***to begin the formal appeal process.***

5. If the instructor is no longer an employee of the university or is otherwise unavailable, the student must bring the matter to the attention of the unit department chair who will make every effort to contact the instructor by the 15th class day of the next regular semester.

    a. If the instructor cannot be contacted but course records are available, the department chair will effect resolution within 5 class days of notification by the student. The department chair may correct a grading error through the regular change of grade process on behalf of the instructor.

    b. If the instructor cannot be contacted and course records are either unavailable or indecisive, the student may request a ***formal*** review ~~following the procedure outlined below.~~ ***as described in section B. below.***

    ~~c. If the instructor can be contacted and elects to participate, then a constructive participation is to be welcomed by the review committee. The procedures of Paragraph III.A.5.a. or Paragraph III.A.5.b. will be instituted if the instructor withdraws from participation.~~

6. There may be extenuating circumstances when the deadlines cannot be met due to illness, ~~mail disruption,~~ or other situations over which the student may have no control. In such a case, upon request from the student, the ***dean/director*** ~~dean of students~~, after review of supporting documentation provided by the student, may recommend to the grade appeals committee that the deadlines be adjusted accordingly. ***At the discretion of the dean/director,*** ~~A~~ ***a***n extension of the deadline will be limited to one semester but every effort should be made to complete the appeal process within the current semester.

B. ***Formal Procedures***

If ~~no such error occurred~~ ***not resolved in the informal process***, the remaining option is by review for alleged arbitrary and capricious grading, or for instances where the course instructor is unavailable and s~~atisfaction~~ ***resolution*** is not forthcoming from the appropriate department chair.

1. This review is initiated by the student through a signed, written request to the department chair with a copy to the dean of the college or school in which the course was offered.

    a. The student's request for review may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and available at the Registrar's Office.

    b. ~~By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the review of the grade, and that the university's administration cannot influence or affect the outcome of the review.~~ ***The student completes the grade appeal checklist and submits the Grade Appeal form, acknowledging the completion of the informal process.***

    c. The request for a review must be received ***by the dean/director of the college or school in which the course was*** offered, ~~ON OR BEFORE THE 30TH DAY OF INSTRUCTION OF the next regular semester (i.e., fall semester for grade issued at the end of the previous spring semester or summer session; spring semester for grade issued at the end of the previous fall semester or Wintermester)~~ ~~or~~ within 5 ***class*** days of ~~receipt of~~ ~~notification~~ ***completion*** of the ***informal grade appeal*** process***.*** ~~by the dean/director of the college or school in which the course was offered.~~

    d. The request must detail the basis for the allegation that a grade was ~~improper, and~~ the result of arbitrary and capricious grading***,*** and must present the relevant evidence.

2. ~~It is the responsibility of the~~ ~~department chair to~~ ***The dean*** formally ~~notify~~ ***notifies*** both the instructor who issued the grade and the ~~dean~~ ***department chair*** of the unit ~~'s~~ ~~college or school~~ that a ***formal grade appeal has been filed.*** ~~request for a review of grade has been received.~~

3. ~~If the instructor of the course is also the department chair, the Dean of the College will designate another department chair within the college to act as the department's representative for all proceedings.~~ If the instructor of the course is also the Dean of the College, the Provost will designate another Dean within the University to act as the college's monitor of all proceedings.

4. A ~~5-member~~ review committee will be appointed as follows:

    a. The dean shall appoint one non-voting ~~tenure-track~~ faculty member ***holding academic rank, who is represented through the current applicable collective bargaining agreements***, from the academic unit in which the course was offered (other than the instructor of the course). This individual shall serve in an advisory role.

    b. ~~Two~~ ***Three*** ~~tenure-track~~ faculty members ***holding academic rank, who are represented through the current applicable collective bargaining agreements***, from ***the faculty senate ad hoc Student Appeals Committee (SAC) shall be appointed by the SAC committee chair. One voting member shall serve as chair of the student appeal committee.*** ~~within the college~~

~~or school but outside of the unit in which the course was offered shall be appointed. One of these members shall be appointed by the dean. The other shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President. This person shall be a member of the Faculty Senate (including alternate members), if available.~~

~~c. One [[tenure track]] faculty member~~ ***~~holding academic rank, who is represented through the current applicable collective bargaining agreements~~***~~, from outside the college or school in which the course was offered. This person shall be a member of the Faculty Senate (including alternate members). The Senate member shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President.~~

~~d.~~ ***c.*** The fifth member to be appointed by ***the Associated Students of the University of Alaska Fairbanks (ASUAF)*** ~~the dean~~ will be a non-voting student representative.

~~e.~~ ***d.*** ~~The campus judicial officer or his/her designee~~ ***A facilitator appointed by administration*** shall serve as a nonvoting ***member*** ~~facilitator~~ for ***formal*** grade appeals hearings. This individual shall serve in an advisory role to help preserve consistent hearing protocol and records.

e. In the case of a grade appeal from a graduate student, a representative of the graduate school may serve on the committee in a nonvoting capacity.

5. The committee must schedule, within 10 ***class*** days ~~of instruction~~ from receipt of the student's request, a mutually agreeable date, time and location for the appeal hearing. If the request for appeal is received any time other than during a regular semester, then the hearing must be scheduled on or before the 10th ***class*** day ~~of instruction~~ of the next regular semester.

a. During this and subsequent meetings, all parties involved shall protect the confidentiality of the matter according to the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and any other applicable federal, state or university policies.

b. Throughout the proceedings, the committee will encourage a mutually agreeable resolution.

c. The mandatory first item of business at this meeting is for the committee to rule on the validity of the student's request. Grounds for dismissal of the request for review are:

1) ~~This is not the first properly prepared request for appeal of the particular grade.~~ ***A properly prepared formal appeal of the particular grade has already been denied.***

2) The ***alleged*** actions of the instructor do not constitute arbitrary and capricious grading, as defined herein.

3) The request was not made within the policy deadlines.

4) The student has not ***completed the informal procedures*** ~~taken prior action~~ to resolve the grade conflict with the instructor***.*** ~~as described under section III, A.~~

d. In the event that the committee votes to dismiss the request, a written notice of dismissal must be forwarded to the student, instructor, department chair and dean within five ***class*** days of the decision, and will state clearly the reasoning for the dismissal of the request.

6. Acceptance for consideration of the student's request will result in the following:

a. A request for and receipt of a formal response from the instructor to the student's allegation.

b. A second meeting scheduled to meet within 10 ***class*** days of the decision to review the request.

1) The student and instructor will be invited to attend the meeting.

2) The meeting will be closed to outside participation, ***and both the student*** and ~~a either the student nor~~ ***the*** instructor may be accompanied by an advocate or representative. Other matters of format will be announced in advance.

3) The proceedings will be ~~tape~~ recorded and the ***recordings*** ~~tapes~~ will be stored with the campus ***conduct office.*** ~~Judicial Officer~~.

4) The meeting must be informal, non- confrontational and fact-finding, where both the student and instructor may provide additional relevant and useful information and can provide clarification of facts for materials previously submitted.

7. The final decision of the committee will be made in private by a majority vote.

a. Actions which the committee can take if it accepts the student's allegation of arbitrary and capricious grading must be directed towards a fair and just resolution, and may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1) direct the instructor to grade again the student's work under the supervision of the department chair,

2) direct the instructor to administer a new final examination and/or paper in the course,

3) direct a change of the student's registration status (i.e., withdrawn, audit, dropped) in the course.

b. The academic decision review committee proceedings will result in the preparation of written findings and conclusions. Conclusions will result in one of the following:

1) the request for a grade change is denied.

2) the request for a grade change is upheld; the review committee requests the course instructor to change the grade; and the course instructor changes the grade in accordance with ~~MAU~~ ***the University of Alaska Fairbanks*** rules and procedures.

3) the request for a grade change is upheld; the course instructor is either unavailable to change the grade or refuses to, and the review committee directs the dean/director to

initiate the process specified by ~~MAU~~ ***the University of Alaska Fairbanks*** rules and procedures to change the grade to that specified by the review committee.

c. A formal, written report of the decision must be forwarded to the student, instructor, department chair, dean and ~~Director of Admissions and Records~~ ***registrar*** within five ***class*** days of the meeting.

d. The decision of the committee is final.

Record of Changes to the Grade Appeals Policy:

The following is a complete copy of the Grade Appeals Policy as passed by the UAF Faculty Senate at its Meeting # 56 (March 20, 1995) and amended at its Meeting #61 (February 5, 1996), Meeting #80 (May 4, 1998), Meeting #89 (September 27, 1999), Meeting #109 (May 6, 2002), Meeting #157 (March 2, 2009), Meeting #183 (May 7, 2012), Meeting #189 (March 4, 2013), and Meeting #215 (May 2, 2016).

- Alignment with UA policy & regulation Chapter 09.03 - Student Dispute Resolution. (Meeting #215, May 2, 2016).
- Clarification made to the time period within which grade appeals will be reviewed (Meeting #189, March 4, 2013).
- Policy at Section III, Procedures, subsection B, Item 4, was revised at Meeting #183 (May 7, 2012).
- Deadlines were revised at Meeting #157 (March 2, 2009).

ATTACHMENT 215/12
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS research, service, and other activities funded through external grants and contracts represent a significant component of the University of Alaska Fairbanks' (UAF's) revenue; and

WHEREAS UAF faculty are being urged by administrators to increase their sponsored activities to bring in additional external funding; and

WHEREAS preparation and submission of competitive proposals requires effective collaboration between faculty and Administrative Services; and

WHEREAS post-award administration of grants and contracts needs to be done effectively, efficiently, and in such a way to minimize the burden of management on the Principal Investigators fulfilling the award; and

WHEREAS an increase in the number of proposals, grants and contracts will increase the workload for UAF Administrative Services, exacerbating the need for efficient handling; and

WHEREAS recent policy changes enacted by the UAF Administrative Services-based Office of Grants and Contracts Administration (OGCA) regarding approval for pre-proposal submissions and removal of overhead caps on sub-awards did not follow principles of shared governance; and

WHEREAS said changes will likely disincentivize proposal writing and lead to a reduction in the competitiveness of those proposals submitted; and

WHEREAS recent public communications from OGCA have highlighted the need for improved dialog between UAF faculty and OGCA; and

WHEREAS policy discussions on issues pertaining to sponsored activities conducted by faculty at UAF have been largely absent from the agenda of the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS the Research Advisory Committee (RAC) of the UAF Faculty Senate and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR) have recently met with the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services (VCAS), the Associate Vice Chancellor for Financial Services (AVCFS), and OGCA to discuss these matters;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly urges that the Research Advisory Committee be consulted in developing policies and resolving administrative issues pertaining to research and other externally sponsored activities at UAF.

RATIONALE

- The efficient submission of proposals and effective post-award financial management are essential for sustain the UAF research enterprise.
- During the current budget crisis, it is essential that UAF represent itself to external funding agencies as an excellent entity with which to do business

UAF also needs to improve its management of sponsored activities to retain valuable faculty members. Ideally, Principal Investigators would not be burdened with having to ensure effective University grant and contract management, but until the effectiveness of pre- and post-award processing improves, the stakes are too high for faculty to ignore.

R04.07.115 Employee Furlough

To address budgetary shortfalls in any unit of the university, employees may be subject to furlough via temporary unpaid leaves of absence or via prospective, temporary reductions in pay and equivalent work hours. Prior to implementation of a furlough plan, other reductions and cost savings, as well as revenue generation, will be considered and implemented as appropriate.

A. Definitions:

1. Furlough: Temporary unpaid leave for a designated period of time, or a prospective, temporary reduction in pay, imposed to meet a budgetary shortfall.

2. Budgetary shortfall: A status of financial health in which projected or actual expenditures are anticipated to exceed revenue.

Employees may request a reduced contract in lieu of furlough. Requests are subject to approval by the employees' dean/director and the regional human resources office.

B. A furlough plan may include, but not be limited to, any of the following at the discretion of the university:

1. A specified number of days each pay period, month or year may be designated as furlough days, with no business being conducted on those days.

2. Salaries of exempt employees may be reduced by a specified percentage.

3. Non-exempt employees may have reduced-hour work weeks (for example, work week reduced from 40 hours to 37.5 hours) or reduced contracts (for example, work schedule reduced to less than 10 days per pay period and/or less than 12 months per year).

4. A different number or percentage of furlough days for employees in different pay grades or classifications.

Reduction of pay will include reduction of expected effort.

C. All university employees (full or part-time, regular, term or temporary) may be subject to furlough, except:

1. Employees who hold H-1B visas, as defined in 20 CFR 655.731;

2. Graduate/teaching/research assistants, postdoctoral fellows/trainees who do not pay FICA, and other student employees;

3. Employees on military leave with pay;

4. Employees who perform functions essential to maintain health and safety, as determined by the chancellor or president; and

5. Employees whose compensation is derived 100% from restricted funds.

D. Employee benefits during a furlough will be affected as follows:

1. Accrual of annual and sick leave will be reduced by a furlough.

2. Holiday pay for benefit-eligible employees will not be reduced for a holiday immediately before or after a furlough day.

3. Health care and life insurance benefits will not be reduced by a furlough.

4. Pay deductions authorized by an employee during a furlough will not be reduced. The employee remains responsible for making all employee contributions during a furlough period, including health coverage.

5. Retirement contributions by both the employee and the University will be reduced by a furlough. Service credit may also be reduced.

E. A furlough plan for unit(s) affected by a budgetary shortfall will be implemented upon recommendation of the chancellor and the vice president for finance and administration, and approval of the president. ~~The president shall consult with governance prior to approval. Governance may request financial records for any unit affected by furlough.~~

1. The Statewide Office of Human Resources will distribute notice of the president's approval of a furlough plan to affected employees at least sixty (60) days prior to implementation. The furlough plan will specify the amount or percentage of furlough time and the applicable time period.

2. After a furlough plan has been implemented, the president may establish a review committee ~~established by the president shall~~ to examine ongoing need and efficacy on a quarterly basis.

3. The president may reduce or cancel a furlough plan at any time.

F. Upon notice of a furlough plan, supervisors may schedule furlough days, in consultation with the employee, subject to the operational needs of the department. Furlough schedules shall be approved by the department dean/director and the regional human resources office.

G. Furlough days shall be taken on days that the employee would normally be scheduled to work. Employees may not be directed or permitted to work on furlough days or to work more than 40 hours in the work week in which a furlough day is taken. No employee may use paid leave to offset all or any portion of a furlough.

H. Furlough provisions for employees under collective bargaining agreements will be clarified through Memoranda of Agreement with each bargaining unit.

I. The Chief Human Resources Officer or designee will review any appeals from employees claiming extreme financial hardship under a furlough plan.

J. The provisions of this section apply only to employee furlough and are not applicable to layoff or any other type of termination of university employment.

Proposed UAF Policy _____

Original Adoption: _____

Revised: _____

Responsible Chancellor's Cabinet Member: _____

Responsible Department/Office: _____

Emergency Action Plan Policy

POLICY STATEMENT

The University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) strives to provide a safe and secure environment. It is the policy of UAF that each building occupied by one or more employees will have a current Emergency Action Plan (EAP); for each EAP to be updated at least annually and when changes occur, and; for all employees to review each applicable EAP at least annually.

BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

Prior to implementation of this policy, each academic and administrative department was required to maintain an emergency action plan specific to the department. Inasmuch that multiple departments occupied a building, some buildings had numerous emergency action plans, resulting in duplication of effort and requiring a high level of coordination. This policy requires a single EAP per building, maintained by the assigned building coordinator in coordination with each of the departments in the building.

The requirements for EAPs are set forth in Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations adopted by the State of Alaska's Occupational Safety and Health (AKOSH) Plan. This policy is intended to conform to OSHA regulations regarding EAPs. Some requirements of this policy may exceed OSHA requirements.

The purpose of the EAP is to provide guidance in determining the appropriate actions to take to prevent injury and property loss from the occurrence of emergency incidents, including evacuation. During emergency situations, special procedures may be required to control and mitigate an emergency. Final acceptance of an EAP grants authority to those individuals and/or positions responsible for implementing and carrying out the plan.

REFERENCES RELIED UPON

29 CFR 1910.38 – Occupational Safety and Health Standards - Emergency Action Plans

29 CFR 1910.165 – Occupational Safety and Health Standards – Employee Alarm Systems

CPL 02-01-037 U.S. Department of Labor Compliance Policy for Emergency Action Plans and Fire Prevention Plans

BOR Regulation R05.09 – Risk Management and Environmental Health and Safety

UAF Fire Safety Policy 12.03.03

RESPONSIBILITES

Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services: In conjunction with deans and directors, ensure that a building coordinator is identified for each building meeting the criteria for a required EAP.

Deans and Directors: In conjunction with the VCAS, ensure that current contact information for key departmental personnel is provided to each applicable building coordinator.

Building Coordinators: Maintain the EAP in a current state with updated building information and contact information for key departmental personnel. Review EAP at a minimum of once per year coinciding with the beginning of the fall semester. Submit updated plans to the UAF Fire Chief for final acceptance and distribution.

Supervisor: Ensure new employees are familiar with the EAP, and that all employees review the EAP at least annually or when substantive changes to the plan occur.

Employees: Remain familiar with the EAP for each building he or she occupies.

UAF Emergency Management Coordinator[1]: Maintain a repository of accepted EAPs for all buildings, in a manner that is accessible to all employees. Provide guidance to building coordinators in EAP development and maintenance. Review, accept, and file new and updated EAPs.

NON-COMPLIANCE

Failure to properly maintain and routinely update the EAP may result in employees not being ready in the event of an emergency. Failure to comply with this policy may increase liability for the University and expose UAF to AKOSH citations and penalties (fines).

EXCEPTIONS

Buildings that are not occupied by at least one employee are not required to have an EAP.

PROCEDURES

1. At least annually and whenever changes in personnel or the building occur, the building coordinator should review and update the EAP. The annual review typically coincides with the beginning of the fall semester.
2. New employees should be made familiar with the EAP during their initial orientation, and all employees should review the EAP at least annually or after major updates are made. The annual

[1] UAF Fire Chief at the time of policy adoption.

refresher should occur at the beginning of the fall semester following the annual EAP review. These are the responsibilities of all supervisors.

3. All EAPs will follow a standard format in order to achieve standardization from building to building and ensure compliance with applicable OSHA regulations. A standard template will be made available with the following minimum elements:
    - Fire and emergency reporting procedures;
    - Procedures for emergency evacuation, including the type of evacuation and exit routes;
    - Procedures for personnel necessary to delay evacuation where critical operations exist;
    - Procedures for securing protected information (e.g. HIPPA, FERPA, APSIN, etc.);
    - Procedures to account for occupants after evacuation;
    - Procedures for performing rescue and medical duties; and
    - Relevant contact information.
    - Alarm systems and provisions to accommodate occupants who cannot recognize an audible or visual alarm.
4. Updated EAPs should be forwarded to the fire chief who, in collaboration with the building coordinator, will finalize, accept, and publish the EAP. Once accepted, the building coordinator will need to inform supervisors and other building occupants.
5. Printed copies of the EAP should be provided in key locations and/or with key personnel in the building.
6. When a building alarm sounds or an emergency occurs, key personnel identified in the EAP shall execute their responsibilities specified in the EAP. The EAP will guide emergency action.

POLICY APPROVED BY:

_____

Mike Powers, Interim Chancellor
University of Alaska Fairbanks

ATTACHMENT 215/15
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

Administrative Committee
Meeting Minutes for Friday, April 22, 2016
1:00 - 3:00 PM at the Chancellor's Conference Room (330 Signers' Hall)

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

COMMENTS

President's Comments - Debu Misra
The Chancellor has requested nominations of faculty and staff to serve on a subcommittee working on employee engagement. Please send nominations to Debu as soon as possible. The goal of the committee is to provide feedback and ideas for improving employee engagement.

The Faculty Administrator Review Committee will meet with Provost Henrichs, Vice Chancellor Hinzman, and Vice Chancellor Peter on May 3 for a final meeting to recap the processes used this past year for the Group A and B administrator reviews. FARC members have come up with helpful best practices and procedures to facilitate the process and for archiving useful templates. They also will discuss means of keeping highlights from past reviews available for future reviews.

President-Elect's Comments – Orion Lawlor
Orion noted the cuts to staffing that had been mentioned by President Johnsen. He asked the Provost for more details about the 20% cuts to administration that the President is seeking.

Provost's Comments – Susan Henrichs
The Chancellor's Cabinet will be considering the recommendations from vice chancellors for reductions in their units. They must prepare a FY17 budget plan at the $36 million gap level for President Johnsen. They must also make the case for UFB they wish to retain and what the negative impacts will be if it is not retained. And, they must put forth a plan for reducing administration by 20%. In this context, administration includes academic officers (provost and chancellor), academic deans and research directors, associate vice chancellors, and non-represented faculty in administrative roles.

Differential tuition surcharges have been unofficially approved for SOM and CEM, and at the current legislative funding level the president is likely to propose a mid-year general tuition increase of 10 – 15%. BOR still needs to make final approval of these tuition increases. A tuition increase would potentially add $4 million in revenues which would help the academic units.

NEW BUSINESS

- Motion to approve Unit Criteria for the Natural Sciences, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee – passed by the Administrative Committee
- Possible Motion to approve new Graduate Certificate in Resilience and Adaptation, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee – passed by the Administrative Committee

- Motion to extend deadline for submission of Communication Plans, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee – passed by the Administrative Committee
- Possible Motion to approve a new Minor in Sustainable Agriculture, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee – passed by the Administrative Committee
- Possible Motion to approve revisions to the Grade Appeals Policy, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee – passed by the Administrative Committee upon revision
  Sandra W. will make some revisions and send them to Orion for a second review and finalization.

DISCUSSION / INFORMATION ITEMS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

- Proposed Resolution adding required statement to 100-level course syllabi
  The Administrative Committee preferred that information about adding syllabi statements concerning required AlcoholEdu and Haven training be shared with Faculty Senate at the May meeting. The penalty to students for not completing the trainings is still being decided upon by the Core Cabinet. Faculty should be made aware of the new requirement, but the committee strongly felt it was a matter to be dealt with at the administrative level and by the Office of Admissions and the Registrar.

- Update on the Blue Book project – Mara B.
  Work still continues on the Blue Book changes. Mara will continue working on the project over the summer months. The Provost noted areas that specifically need to be addressed include atypical joint appointments for which peer committees are difficult to appoint; and, a process is needed for appointing research peer committees.

- Update on the Academic Appeals (other than grades) policy – Sandra W.
  Sandra reported that work has initially begun with a subcommittee planning to meet and discuss the policy. Donie noted that GAAC is interested in having input on this policy.

- Single Accreditation for UA – Letter by VPAR
  Initial inquiry has been made by Vice President White to the NWCCU. It's too early to know what the response from NWCCU might be
  .
- Changes to UA Regulations re furloughs
  Changes to regulations have been proposed at Statewide to remove consultation with governance groups concerning imposition of furloughs. In terms of effects, however, furloughs affect staff and executives. Faculty are protected by their CBAs.

- Proposed resolution from RAC – Jessica Cherry
  RAC would like to propose a resolution concerning the OGCA; however, it is not available yet. Debu asked Jessica to provide it by Monday to the committee if it is to be considered at the May Faculty Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned shortly after 3:00 PM.

ATTACHMENT 215/16
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 30, 2016, 1-2:00 pm

Present: Ken Abramowicz, Casey Byrne, Jennie Carroll, Alex Fitts, Cindy Hardy, Eileen Harney, Jayne Harvie, Joan Hornig, Ginny Kinne, Lisa Lunn (Zoom), Rainer Newberry, Caty Oehring, Patrick Plattet, Holly Sherouse
Absent: Mike Earnest, Doug Goering, Cathy Hanks, Jenny Liu
Guests: Karen Jensen, Suzan Hahn, Steve Hunt, Ilana Kingsley (Zoom); Susanne Bishop, Tyson Rinio

1. Approval/Amendment of Agenda
   The agenda was approved. The discussion with Library Science faculty was moved up from section 4. New Business, item c., to the top of the agenda. (See notes at 4.c. below.)

2. Approval of minutes
   a. Draft Minutes 03/02/2016 – Approved as submitted.

3. Old Business
   a. GER classification implementation update

Capping the number of courses that can be offered by subject code to a flat five was discussed. Initially they had considered four courses per classification list category, but could result in a very long list. The flat five limit fits well with the existing courses in the lists. Administrative Committee agreed with the flat five when discussed with them. CAC also approved the motion setting the flat five limit.

   b. Grade Appeals Policy Subcommittee update

Joan shared documents developed by the subcommittee. These included a flowchart of the appeals process, a form for students to use to submit a grade appeal, and a checklist and description of the process for students. These were discussed at length and will be brought up again at the next meeting in two weeks.

4. New Business (from goals set at beginning of AY)
   a. Motion to approve Creative Writing Minor

Minor edits were made to the motion, and it was recommended that the series of asterisks with lists of prerequisites be removed from the formal motion for Faculty Senate. The course series was discussed (a new course accompanied by major changes to three existing courses). The new Minor was approved to move forward to the April 4 Faculty Senate meeting.

   b. Motion to discontinue Theatre BA

Background for the action was provided along with the reasons a program discontinuation was necessary to accomplish the goal of a combined Film and Performing Arts degree program. Some edits were made to statements in the motion. The committee approved moving the motion (as amended) to the April 4 Faculty Senate meeting.

c. Library Science discussion (Item was moved to top of the agenda)

Faculty from the Library attended and provided information about the Library Sciences core course, LS F101. Karen Jensen provided some background and a handout with information about the course. She and the library faculty would like to see some of the data they've heard about concerning course enrollment. Often the courses appear full, but then a fair number of students drop the course and many seats become available again. The course is also taught online, and students may test out it as well. The course is also taught during May- and WinterMesters. There is a problem with students waiting too long to take the test (late in their junior or senior year) and then running out of time to take it.

Making the course a co- or prerequisite for the English core courses was discussed. The idea has not had initial support from the English Department. Eileen H. talked about that discussion with the English faculty. The committee was in favor of having the subject brought up again with the department.

The need for pre-test information for students was discussed (e.g., a list of topics covered on the test). A one-page printed sheet would be very useful, or just a very short tutorial so students may decide between testing out or taking the course. Library faculty said they'll be working on that along with an online video. Students also need to know that they should not put off taking it to the last minute before graduation. The test has 70 – 80% pass rates.

Cindy H. asked about a potential model of having a co-requisite of LS F101 with their developmental writing course for degree-seeking students. It would be an added incentive for the students taking her course, as well as of great benefit to them.

Other ideas to incentivize students to take the course or test were discussed, such as making the test free if students take it before their junior year (after which there is a fee imposed to take it).

d. Student Support Services participation on CAC

The committee approved a representative from Student Support Services attending the CAC meetings.

Other discussion:

Academic misconduct policy was discussed. CAC will look it over more closely in the future, and it will likely carry over to next fall.

The pending deadline for the communication plans to be turned in to the Provost's Office was discussed. It was decided that it would be more realistic to extend the deadline. Many departments are still developing their plans. The status of capstone courses was also discussed. Holly reported that over half of departments have provided information on their capstone requirements.

Holly shared a draft list of the GERs for review and invited for feedback.

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 13, 2016, 1-2:00 pm

Present: Ken Abramowicz, Casey Byrne, Jennie Carroll, Alex Fitts, Claire Gelvin-Smith; Cathy Hanks; Cindy Hardy, Eileen Harney, Jayne Harvie, Joan Hornig, Ginny Kinne, (Zoom), Rainer Newberry, Caty Oehring, Patrick Plattet

Absent: Mike Earnest, Doug Goering, Jenny Liu, Lisa Lunn, Holly Sherouse

Guests for Athletics discussion: Gary Gray, Dani Sheppard, Andrea Schmidt

5. Approval/Amendment of Agenda

   The meeting was convened by Joan and Rainer on behalf of Jennie who had an overlapping

appointment.

Joan, who needed to leave early, talked about the grade appeals policy. See notes at 3.b. below.

The Athletics discussion was moved up for discussion after Joan left and Jennie arrived to continue chairing the meeting. See notes at 4.a. below.

6. Approval of minutes
    a. Draft Minutes 03/30/2016 – Minutes were not yet available for review.

7. Old Business
    a. Communication Plans

In addition to tweaking the deadline of the original motion already passed by Senate, some clarification of language pertaining to academic years was also made. Point 5 of the timeline in the motion, concerning the visibility of O and W designators in the Catalog, was changed from "two years" to "through the AY2019-20 Catalog."

Issues with the change-over to communication plans from existing O and W courses were discussed. Jennie gave the example of what will be occurring in the RD program. Petitions will help address some of the situations that will come up. The Core Review Committee (to become the GER Committee) may also have to be more flexible concerning these situations as they occur during the transition period. Once communication plans are turned in to the Provost's Office, and a clearer picture emerges with what is happing to O and W courses, CAC may need to revisit this again in the fall.

    b. Grade Appeals Policy Subcommittee update

Joan recapped the changes that have been by the subcommittee made to the UAF policy to bring it in compliance with the UA regulations. Some edits to the motion were discussed which also fix some typos and clarify the timeline. She wants to send it to General Counsel for review and hopes it will go to the May 2 Faculty Senate. The committee noted some old terminology that needs to be updated within the document (e.g., "MAU" and "judicial officer"), and some corrections (e.g., 6.b.2. language regarding advocates). A cleaned up copy of the document is still needed. Whether or not it really needs to go to General Counsel or not was also discussed, particularly in light of the fact that the effort is to bring it into compliance with existing regulation. The consensus was that it could still go to Senate and a review by General Counsel could follow. Further corrections, if needed, could be taken care of in the fall.

The new form and guidelines that have been developed apart from the policy updates, should help to reduce the number of grade appeals, as well as help students understand the process and initiate it properly. The form and guidelines will be available on the OAR web site when completed.

8. New Business
    a. Discussion re: rules regarding athletics and students.
        i. Guests: Dani Shephard, Gary Gray, and Andrea Schmidt

Rainer provided some background to the past CAC discussions about Athletics. Faculty concerns mainly involve the length of student absences from classes due to the travel schedules of athletic teams. The ability for students to both work on school and have study time during their absences were discussed. Informing faculty sooner about travel schedules was discussed. Possible solutions to address these

concerns were discussed at length. Dr. Gray also shared that Athletics is part of the Phase 0 review in the Strategic Pathways process, and shared some information regarding their funding and revenue generation for the community. Many changes are potentially in store for them between now and the fall semester.

The meeting was adjourned after 2:30 PM.

ATTACHMENT 215/17
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes: Tuesday, March 14, 2016

11:15 AM, Seoul Gate Restaurant, Cowles Street, Fairbanks

Present: Nicole Cundiff, Chris Fallen, Julie Maier, Leslie McCartney, Walter Skya

Absent: Andreas Anger, John Eichelberger (Ex-Officio), Valerie Gifford, Joshua Greenberg, John Heaton

Meeting called to order at 11:25.
Agenda approved.
Minutes from February 24, 2016 approved.

Old business:
Overload resolution - Provost has not been at AdCom; no updates. Walter moved to bring the resolution again to the next AdCom, 2nd Nicole, approved.

New business:
Blue Online

- Chris will draft a resolution in google docs outlining major points regarding low evaluations and concerns for P & T files about this issue

Senate Bill 174 (possession of concealed firearms on campus)

- All committee members voiced their concern about the passing of this bill
- Chris will draft a resolution in google docs outline major points for us to review and add to

Other Business:
Nominate Chris Fallen for President Elect.

12:00 noon, motion to adjourn by Walter, 2nd Julie, approved.

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

FAC Annual Report – see next page.

End-of-year Report

Faculty Affairs Committee

May 2016

Membership

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) for academic year (AY) 2015-2016 originally consisted of members Elizabeth Allman, Andy Anger, Nicole Cundiff, Chris Fallen, Valerie Gifford, Joshua Greenberg, John Heaton, Jak Maier, Leslie McCartney, and Walter Skya. John Eichelberger served as the Ex Officio member. Walter Skya convened the first FAC meeting, held in September. Chris Fallen was nominated and elected to chair. Leslie McCartney agreed to serve as Secretary for a second year. In January, Elizabeth Allman resigned from FAC to serve on the Planning and Budget committee.

Face-to-face FAC meetings were held monthly and a "Google Group" was used for online discussion and announcements. A shared "Google Drive" folder was used for collaborative editing of selected FAC documents. Ownership of the electronic Group and folder will be transferred from Chris Fallen to the next FAC chair, upon request.

Andy Anger graciously volunteered to convene the first FAC meeting of AY 2016-2017.

Actions and Discussions

Senate by-law revisions

FAC brought a motion to Senate for revision of the bylaws to expand the pool of faculty eligible to be nominated for and elected as Senate President-Elect to include elected Senate Alternates. Previously, eligibility was restricted to only Senators and chairs of Senate Committees. This restriction contributed to elections with only one eligible and willing candidate. The motion to revise Senate bylaws was passed by the Senate through the process for amending the Senate Constitution and Bylaws.

Support for student-led campus Sustainability efforts

The campus RISE Board requested the Senate to recommend that faculty support the student-led campus sustainability efforts through optional donations matching the student sustainability fee enacted through ASUAF. After several discussions, FAC wrote and passed resolution in collaboration with the RISE Board encouraging voluntary faculty donations for campus sustainability. The resolution was brought to Senate but was narrowly defeated in an open vote.

Faculty Overload contract benefit rates

FAC member Andy Anger brought an issue of faculty teaching overload contract benefit rates to the committee that often causes overload contracts to be categorically denied due to cost. In particular, units are charged the full faculty benefit rate (approximately 45%) for overload contracts even though many of those benefits (such as leave, time off, and health insurance) do not accrue for the faculty performing the overload work. However, units are charged a much lower benefit rate (approximately 10%) for qualified staff and adjunct faculty to teach the same course. Andy Anger and Jak Maier drafted a resolution describing these concerns and requesting that UA statewide revisit the befit rates charged for faculty teaching overload contracts due to the unintended academic consequences the current benefit rates have on course instruction decisions. The resolution passed in Senate, and FAC will need to remain engaged with UA and Faculty Alliance to ensure the follow-through beyond Senate.

Other issues considered

FAC considered several issues that never moved out of the committee. Two of the issues are described below.

One faculty outside of Senate brought an issue to FAC regarding policy and procedures for faculty to follow when one of their enrolled students is charged with a serious crime that prevents the student from completing the course due to incarceration or a ban from campus. FAC considered the issue and where such policy could be adopted. FAC eventually concluded that the existing "Incomplete" grading mechanism was sufficient to accommodate most of these rare but unfortunate situations.

Another faculty asked FAC to revisit the Department Chair policy that was amended through FAC during the previous academic year. Several small changes were suggested and two of those changes were significant. One non-controversial change corrected intended language specifying eligibility to vote for department chair. The second suggested change restricted eligibility to be nominated and to serve as department chair to only faculty represented by one of the applicable faculty union collective bargaining agreements. This change had proved to be controversial during the process to revise the Department Chair policy in previous years. However, FAC eventually agreed upon language that effectively stated this restriction and brought a motion to the Administrative Committee where it was tabled. A copy of the motion is stored in the FAC Google Drive share.

Unfinished Business

Faculty Blue Book revisions and joint appointments

In the preceding academic year, FAC discussed recommendations from the final report by the ad hoc committee on Joint Appointments for the purpose of amending the UAF Faculty "Blue Book," which has been undergoing revisions during the previous three academic years. The Unit Criteria Committee formed a subcommittee that resumed progress on the Blue Book revisions this year, in collaboration with FAC, and is incorporating recommendations from the Joint Appointments Committee. Valerie Gifford from FAC served on the joint subcommittee. Efforts by the Unit Criteria and Faculty Affairs committees to revise the Blue Book will resume next academic year. Valerie Gifford graciously volunteered to continue working on the Blue Book next academic year.

Blue Online Instructor Evaluations

FAC discussed concerns regarding how the new Online Blue Evaluations will be used to assess teaching performance for faculty promotion, tenure, and retention decisions. Both the survey and the sampling process have changed which necessarily mean that interpretations of instructional assessment metrics must change. There is little information available to faculty on how the new "Blue" metrics will be used in conjunction with the old paper-based IAS metrics to assess instructional performance. In particular, the generalizability of Blue Online evaluations across years being assessed for faculty hired before the Blue system was implemented needs to be carefully considered. Also, students who do not attend class can now evaluate the course with equal weight as students who regularly attend class. Nicole Cundiff helped to prepare a partial draft resolution currently on the Google Drive share that expresses these concerns and recommends that limitations of the Blue Online evaluations be explicitly noted in faculty promotion, retention, and tenure processes.

ATTACHMENT 215/18
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Unit Criteria Committee Meeting Notes
Monday, March 21, 2016

Present: Bob, Sarah, Mara, Jennifer

Old Business:

Joint Primacy issue – what still needs to be done? The question remained as to whether or not the research directors wanted to be part of the promotion and tenure process and in what way. The committee is unsure what our role is – recommendations to Faculty Senate or language in the Blue Book? Write new sections for the Blue Book and advise Faculty Senate. If we alter definitions for non-tenure track positions, it makes sense to put the revision for Joint Primacy issues forward at the same time. Break it up as we move through the approval process: the definitions, then non-tenure promotion process. The definitions for non-tenure track also will move through the CBA. Working with revised definitions will set a firm foundation for the rest of the work. Plan: review the proposed definitions regarding JP and submit to Ad Com.

Approval Process – things are delayed due to format. Do we want to have that process changed? The formatting must be perfect before the item move to Ad Com. Can content be reviewed to move it forward and then have the final approval pending any formatting changes? The process for approving items at Ad Com level is not codified – it has just evolved. Currently it takes a lot of time to move things through due to formatting issues. A suggestion might be to use Google Docs for easy editing. The Unit Criteria template could be posted onto Google Docs.

Non-Tenure Track Promotion Process:

Subcommittee was formed to discuss. The CBA does not indicate any process on promotion or retention. Any new definitions must be in the CBA and also helpful to have the definitions approved by BOR. The promotion process would mirror the process for tenure-track promotion and tenure. Movement of non-tenure track toward academic ranks makes the most sense. UAA and UAS would also need to be on board with this in order for the changes to move forward.

Next Meeting:
Wednesday the 20th @ 2:15 - tentative

Unit Criteria Committee - End of Year Report
2016
Submitted by M. Bacsujlaky, Chair

AY 15-16 Unit Criteria members: Mara Bacsujlaky (chair), David Maxwell, Bob Bolton, Sunny Rice, Sarah Hardy, Carie Green, Jennifer Tilbury, Mark Hermann, Chris Hartman

The committee met monthly from September through April. We cancelled our April meeting because we had no new/old business to complete.

The following criteria were presented, reviewed, approved and moved on to full Faculty Senate approval during the AY15-16 academic year:

> Cross-Cultural Studies (new unit criteria); Geophysical Institute (new unit criteria); Institute of Northern Engineering (new unit criteria); College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (updated unit criteria according to unit criteria review schedule).

Other business:

Joint Appointments: The committee inherited an outstanding issue regarding primacy in joint appointments. Broadly, the issue appeared to be twofold - 1) under current Blue Book policy, primacy for faculty evaluation for promotion/tenure rests in the academic unit in a joint appointment - should the research unit have more involvement/standing in the promotion/tenure process? and 2) funding - since tenure rests in the academic unit, if a joint-appointed faculty has a reduction or elimination of research grant funding, academic units have been picking up the shortfall (at least in the case of CNSM). The charge to Faculty Senate/unit criteria committee was to investigate this issue and make recommendations to the body for changes to the Blue Book to address these issues. Deans Layer and Goering attended the October meeting. Both realize the benefits of offering tenure in attracting quality faculty, and both favor joint appointments where 50% of appointment is tenure track (4.5 months covered by the academic unit and 4.5 months by external grant funding) - but these appointments are less attractive. Both agree that the joint appointment needs to have clear, defined structure, with source of funds clearly defined and identified, and workloads that are established at time of hire. Ideal language for 50/50 appointments should include language about funding, including expectations for successful grants and contracts. This should also be built into the unit criteria under which joint appointed faculty are evaluated for promotion and tenure. This committee also agreed that it would be a good idea to gather information from directors of the research institutes, but failed to complete this step during this academic year. Therefore no recommendations were prepared or moved on to either the Ad Com or full Faculty Senate. The committee is willing to continue working on this issue next fall when we reconvene.

Blue Book Revisions & Promotion/due process for Non-tenure track faculty: Faculty Senate president Misra requested that the unit subcommittee pick up the ongoing revision process for the UAF FS Blue Book - particularly with a focus on the components of promotion and due process for non-tenure track faculty. I convened a subcommittee consisting of Bob Bolton, Jessica Cherry, Jeff Benowitz, Valerie Gifford and Anna Liljedahl. Chris Fallen was also involved at a FYI level through email correspondence. During spring semester we met three times for working meetings, and drafted an updated revision that included new definitions specific to non-tenure track faculty positions, and began delineating promotion processes, and criteria for the composition of a university-wide promotion committee for non-tenure track faculty. We also discussed and drafted revised non-retention notification schedules that align with those for tenure-track faculty. While overall the proposed revisions to the Blue Book did not reach the point where they were ready to be reviewed by the entire unit criteria committee, Ad Com or Faculty Senate, proposed changes to the faculty position definitions, which include reclassification as regular academic rank, were developed and presented to both the Ad Com and Faculty Senate for information purposes and for feedback. Copies were also sent to the Provost, and to the UNAC contract manager. I also met with the BOR chair, Jo Heckman and presented the broad framework and rationale for redefining non-tenure track faculty positions. Feedback received from the Provost, BOR chair, Faculty Senate president, other members of faculty senate, faculty senate

counterparts at UAS and UAA and the UNAC contract manager produced a new version of non-tenure track faculty definitions. Work on these and other components of the Blue Book revision will continue past the end of the spring semester, with an improved draft expected to be completed during the summer. Outreach and solicitation of feedback and input continues.

A current draft of the proposed approach to definitions for non-tenure track faculty is attached to this report. Overall Blue Book revisions are too preliminary at the time of this report to include. Work will resume on an updated, clean version next fall.

At our last meeting, a poll of current committee members present indicated that everyone present at the meeting plan to return to the unit criteria committee for AY 16-17.

DRAFT ATTACHED TO THE REPORT:

University of Alaska
Proposed Non-Tenure Track Academic Rank Definitions
(Modified from the Faculty Handbook of Michigan Tech)

Instructor: An appointment requiring a master's degree, or a bachelor's degree and professional qualifications that align with the State of Alaska's degree equivalencies for state employees. Instructors may be expected to deliver existing courses, develop new courses in response to department/school needs, perform service and develop new programming (if within the Cooperative Extension Service) and perform other faculty functions as assigned. Instructor appointments are semester-to-semester, or year-to-year. Instructors may be promoted within the instructor special academic rank line. Notice of non-retention must be given 90 days in advance of the appointment's expiration.

Assistant Instructor: An appointment requiring a master's degree, or bachelor's degree and professional qualifications that align with the State of Alaska's degree equivalencies for state employees. In addition to the expectations for instructors, a senior instructor is expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching and/or service, represent their department/school in its relationships within the University of Alaska, conduct limited research and serve on committees. Senior Instructor appointments are two-year renewable (rolling) appointments. Notice of non-retention must be given at least one year in advance of the appointment's expiration.

Associate Instructor: An appointment requiring a master's degree, or bachelor's degree and equivalent professional qualifications that align with the State of Alaska's degree equivalencies for state employees. In addition to the expectations for instructors and assistant instructors, an associate instructor is expected to demonstration exceptional achievements in teaching and education and/or service and outreach, either by substantive contributions to the University of Alaska's mission or by broad regional, national or international impact. Associate Instructor appointments are a continuing appointment. Notice of non-retention must be given at least one year in advance of the appointment's expiration.

Professor of Extension/Library Science (Assistant/Associate/Full): A regular academic rank appointment requiring a master's degree, or a bachelor's degree and equivalent professional qualifications that align with the State of Alaska's degree equivalencies for state employees. A professor of extension/library science is expected to have significant education/professional experience relevant to their field, and to perform service, outreach and other assigned faculty functions at the level of quality and accomplishment

of a tenure-track faculty of the same rank. A professor of extension/library science may be expected to deliver existing courses and workshops, develop new teaching materials and course segments, outreach programs and other deliverables, supervise other staff and volunteers, represent the school/department in its relationships within the University of Alaska, regionally and nationally, conduct research, serve as principle investigators on grants and contracts, and be active in professional societies.

Professors of Extension/Library Science appointments are a continuing appointment. Notice of non-retention must be given at least one year in advance of the appointment's expiration.

Research/Clinical (Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Full Professor): A regular academic rank appointment requiring a master's degree or a doctorate degree. Research/clinical professors are expected to possess research, outreach, service, and/or teaching qualifications and mastery in their field of discipline commensurate with that of a regular tenure-track faculty of same rank. The appointment entails full responsibility for research activities, such as serving as Principle Investigator on grants and contracts, managing research facilities and projects, service, teaching, and mentoring of post-doctoral fellows, graduate and/or undergraduate students in the faculty's field of expertise. A research/clinical professor may also be expected to represent the University of Alaska regionally, nationally and internationally in professional conferences and other venues, be active in professional societies, supervise staff, and perform limited service, such as serving on University committees, including peer review committees. Research/Clinical Professor appointments are a continuing appointment. Notice of non-retention must be given at least one year in advance of the appointment's expiration.

ATTACHMENT 215/19
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes for Friday, 25 March
10-11:00 AM, 10-11am, School of Ed Conference Room - Gruening 718

Present: Mary Ehrlander, Diana Di Stefano, Alex Fitts, Ellen Lopez, Erin Petit, Kayt Sunwood

1) **Promotion & Tenure Workshop**

- Date/Time: 22 April @ 10-12:00
- Location: Butrovich conference room (Confirmed)!
- Set up: If we can get in on Weds (21 April) late afternoon, we can set up.
  - Jayne, Jane, Ellen and anyone else who is interested can do this!
- Refreshments: Jayne ordered coffee, tea, cookies, etc. We're set!
  - Thanks to Alex for offering to cover expenses if this did not workout
- Panelists:
  - Derek – Facilitator
  - Alex – Introduction - We discussed emphasizing the following:
    - How administration is aware of the stress and challenges everyone is facing
    - The hope for transparency.
    - The understanding that excellence cannot be undermined
  - Diana – CLA, Tenured/Associate, New Mom
  - Erin – Geophysics, Tenured/Association
  - Karen Jenson - Library, Associate
  - Retchata George Bettisworth - Term, Chair Social Work
  - Anna Liljedahl – WERC, Research Assistant Professor
  - Brenda Norris – Full Professor, SFOS
  - Jessie Cherry – Assoc. Research Professor – IARC??? (Not confirmed)

2) **2016 Luncheon**
- Jane and Ellen met with Mike Sfraga. He's committed to funding our luncheon (at least this year)
  - We will remember to acknowledge this during the luncheon!
- Speaker - Susan Heinrich!!!

3. **Resolution on use of gender inclusive language update**

  - We did not discuss.

4. **Conversation Cares/Faculty Equity Community**

  - Small attendance. Requires more advertising
  - Discussed staying with one topic for both the Convo Cafés in the Arctic Java and Pub Night gatherings.
  -

5. **2 open seats on CSW**

- Everyone is aware of this. Voting has started.

6. Spring Meetings in Education Conf Room:

- April: Revised our meeting to 15 April, 10-11:00 (no longer 8 April)
- May: 6 May 10-11:00

*Ellen confirmed location in Education Conf. Room

Committee on the Status of Women
Minutes Friday, 15 Apr 2016, 10-11am, School of Ed Conference Room - Gruening 718

Present: Diana Di Stefano, Derek Sikes, Megan McPhee (via phone), Sine Anahita, Ellen Lopez, Erin Pettit, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Erlander

Members absent: Alex Fitts

1. Planning Strategically for Promotion, Tenure, and Career Advancement.
During Springfest: **April 22, 2016 (10:00-12:00).**
Venue: Jayne Harvie has reserved Butrovich; along with a back up room.
Derek will emcee.
Kayt has arranged with OIT to provide distance delivery.
Kayt will write up a "how-to" on getting OIT to provide this for future reference.
Refreshments: Jayne ordered coffee, tea, cookies, etc.

4-5pm Thursday – set up for workshop.

Proposed panelists:

- Alex Fitts (Vice Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer) – confirmed
- Diana Di Stefano (CLA-Tenured, Family Role) – confirmed
- Retchenda George Bettisworth - Term, Chair Social Work – confirmed
- Jessica Cherry (atmospheric sciences-Research Faculty) – Erin will confirm
- Karen Jensen – confirmed Sine will touched base
- Erin Petitt (Geophysics – Tenured) – confirmed
- Anna Liljedahl – WERC, Research Assistant Professor, confirmed
- Brenda Norcross – Full Professor, SFOS, confirmed

Each will provide ~5min introduction to their situation at UAF (career stage, family status if relevant, workloads, etc.) and any advice or information on what they've learned about the process at UAF.

Sign in sheet improvement – lines for attendees to write name, department, & position. Ellen drafted an evaluation form. Discussion ensued on improvements to the form. We will have a pile at the entry table and pass out / remind people near the end. See evaluation form sent in with these minutes.

2. Last meeting: Thursday 10am May 5th. Ellen will invite 2 new CSW members.

3. Fall luncheon: 12:30-2pm September 20th, 2016. Susan Heinrich. Ellen will confirm details.

4. Conversation Cafés / Faculty Equity Community – great idea but low attendance issue. Past discussion events have worked well when a panel of speakers was involved. Advertisement was good but people are too busy.

5. Fall first meeting: Sine suggested we invite Chris Coffman.

Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes, These minutes are archived on the CSW website: http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/15-16-csw/

Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) 2015-16 Annual Report

CSW membership
Jane Weber (Chair), Ellen Lopez (Co-Chair), Diana Di Stefano, Mary Ehrlander, Erin Pettit, Megan McPhee, Derek Sikes, and Alex Fitts (Ex officio representative), Kayt Sunwood.

CSW Meetings
The Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) met monthly during AY 2015-16 to discuss, assess, and address issues affecting women (and all) faculty at UAF. *The following highlights this year's committee accomplishments.*

Women Faculty Luncheon
On 22 September 2015, CSW hosted UAF's 11th annual Women Faculty Luncheon. The luncheon employed Zoom Link to broadcast and record the luncheon presentations for faculty who could not participate in person. Over 80 women faculty participated, celebrated their successes, and made new acquaintances (seating was purposefully planned to create diversity of colleges/disciplines at each table). Several UAF dignitaries were in attendance, and all were sincerely acknowledged for their unyielding support. Our honored keynote speaker was Alex Fitts, Vice Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer, Dean of General Studies, and Professor of Women's & Gender Studies and Spanish.

Conversation Café Series
CSW continued to facilitate "Conversation Cafés" (established in AY 2012-13) which were conducted in the Wood Center's Arctic Java Café. We also introduced Pub Night Gatherings (Thursdays during Spring 2016). Cafés and Pub Nights offered the opportunity for faculty and others to discuss issues regarding equity, mentoring, time management, and other issues pertinent to career success. Per these cafés, we established a Faculty Equity Community website https://sites.google.com/a/alaska.edu/faculty-equity-community and a listserv https://lists.alaska.edu/mailman/listinfo/uaf-facultyequitycommunity.

Women's Center Advisory Committee
CSW Co-Chairs, Ellen Lopez and Jane Weber, continued to serve on the Women's Center Advisory Committee formed by Chancellor Rogers in Fall 2012. The committee is charged with advising the Women's Center, its manager, and the chancellor on how UAF can best meet the mission of the UAF Women's Center. During FY 2015-16, The Advisory Committee did not meet due to budgetary and other issues. Lopez and Weber periodically met with Interim Chancellor Powers, and Associate Director of Wood Center Programming, Cody Rogers, to maintain connection between the Women's Center and Advisory Committee.

Planning for Promotion and Tenure and Career Success Workshop

On 22 April 2016, CSW hosted its 11th annual two-hour comprehensive, *Planning for Promotion and Tenure and Career Success workshop*. The workshop included a panel of faculty who provided insights regarding their success and challenges related to gaining tenure and/or promotion at various career stages (pre-tenure, tenure, term negotiation, non-tenure promotion). This year, the panel was expanded to gain insight from faculty who were both tenure-track and non-tenure track, including: research faculty and term faculty. Approximately 30 Faculty attended in person, and 10 via distance delivery (provided by UAF's OIT).

The eight workshop panelists represented diversity in terms of college/department affiliation, position, and tenure/promotion situation. They included the following:

- Alex Fitz (Vice Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer), who provided opening remarks and thoughtfully acknowledged the challenges of planning for career success during continuing budget concerns and uncertain times, and answered clarifying questions from participants.
- Diana Di Stefano – Tenured, History
- Retchenda George Bettisworth - Term, Chair, Social Work
- Jessica Cherry – Research Faculty, Atmospheric Sciences
- Karen Jensen – Tenured, Library Sciences
- Ellen Lopez – Pre-tenured, Psychology
- Anna Liljedahl – Research Assistant Professor, WERC
- Brenda Norcross – Full Professor, SFOS

This year, workshop attendees were asked to complete a semi-structured evaluation/comments form to help guide future workshops. Attendees were asked about their motivations for attending the workshop, how well their expectations were met, aspects they found most beneficial, questions or concerns that were left unanswered, and suggestions to improving the workshop. Primarily, participants indicated that they attended the workshop to gain clarity about the T&P process. Most indicated that their expectations were met.

- *Most beneficial aspects* included: tips and discussion related to self-evaluation, self-promotion, and putting together their file. Attendees also noted the broad range of perspectives provided by panel members, and strategies offered for gaining success (such as identifying a mentor and individual who can present one's file during peer unit and university-wide reviews).
- *Questions remaining* included: How to find reviewers when one's department lacks tenured faculty? How will budget issues impact tenure rates? What to do if one does not receive annual reviews from their Deans and others?
- *Suggestions for future workshops* included: providing a diagram of the T&P process, asking Union Representatives to be on the panel (as opposed to in the audience), providing the opportunity for attendees to submit panel questions prior to the workshop, having males represented on the panel.
- *Other comments included:* "Great." "It was great. Thanks." "Useful." "Keep inviting a broad range of faculty! That is great!"

Continued and Future Planning

CSW continues to give focus to, and make progress on the following:

- Providing Tenure, Promotion, and Career Success Workshops that address the salient needs, concerns, and suggestions represented by UAF faculty.
- Developing strategies and opportunities to enhance mentoring for UAF faculty (both men and women) at all career levels

- Examining environmental (structural) factors that may contribute to the lack of women faculty advancing to Full Professor level
- Exploring issues related to term-funded and adjunct faculty, particularly those issues that differentially affect women
- Compiling and analyzing historical data (spanning at least 10 years) pertaining to the significance of gender among UAF faculty in the following: time to promotion and tenure, rank, non-retention, and salary.
- Strengthening liaison relationships across UAF faculty and staff with the UAF Women's Center, and with faculty at the other MAUs
- Informing a UAF Spousal Hire Policy
- Ensuring appropriate and responsive family medical leave policies

ATTACHMENT 215/20
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Core Review Committee

Core Curriculum Review Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 3, 2016

Meeting time: 8:30 to 9:30 am
Meeting location: Chancellor's Conference Room
Meeting convener: Andy Seitz and Margaret Short

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

1. Meeting minutes from 4 February 2016 approved.

2. Discussion with Jennie Carroll, Chair of Curriculum Review Committee, about moving forward with new "buckets" and how Core Curriculum Committee will be involved. Most importantly, the Core Curriculum Committee will review proposals for courses to be included in buckets. Jennie provided a list of criteria for courses to be included in a bucket, which the Core Curriculum Committee will use as its basis for evaluating requests to be in a bucket (see appendix). Additionally, it was decided the Core Curriculum Committee will do an annual review to check whether courses in the buckets are offered annually. If not, letters will be sent to department chairs to check on the planned offerings of the course. If a course in a bucket is not offered for several years, the Core Curriculum Committee will seek to have the course removed from the bucket.

3. There were three requests to include W designators to three ENGL courses (ENGL F375, F376, and F377). The three requests were all prepared by the same person, all met the Faculty Senate requirements for the W designator, and all were approved.

4. Petition

a. Denied – Petition to use Introduction to Thai Language and Culture course taken during a study abroad in Thailand to count as one of the PHC requirements. The petition was denied because a two-semester language sequence, consisting of the same language, must be completed to replace one PHC requirement. The petition will be reviewed by the Provost.

5. Discussion
    a. Miscellaneous discussion about faculty senate items and budget.

GER Course Approval Guide
(Prepared by the Curriculum Review Committee)

Adding a Course

1. Both new and currently existing courses may be proposed for a GER category.
2. Each program will be able to have X courses in the appropriate category/categories (talk to AdComm)
3. Course descriptions must reflect how the course meets the category as defined by University regulations.
    a. Social Sciences: "Courses that fulfill this requirement are **broad survey courses** which provide the student with exposure to theory, methods, and data of the social sciences."
    b. Arts: "Provide the student with an **introduction** to the visual arts and performing arts **as academic disciplines** as opposed to those that emphasize acquisition of skills."
    c. Humanities: "**Introduce** the student to the humanistic fields of language, arts, literature, history, and philosophy."
4. Courses must be 100 or 200 level.
5. Courses must be currently designated a social science (s) or a humanities (h) for the purpose of the BA degree.
6. Course must be introductory, as indicated by the lack of prerequisites (except ENGL 111x).
7. Course should welcome all students (e.g. should not discourage non-majors).
8. Course must be offered regularly as described in the catalog (at least once per year).
9. Course instructors must agree to participate in UAF GER assessment activities.
10. If a program already has X number of courses in a category the program must remove a course to add the new course.

Removing a Course

1. Once a course gets an X designation that X is a permanent part of the course number. Courses taken off the list will need a NEW course number.
2. Departments would submit a new course request and go through the approval process to have the course re-numbered.

Minutes for April 7 and April 28, 2016 Core Review Committee continued next page.
End of the year report follows the minutes.

ATTACHMENT 215/20 - continued

Core Curriculum Review Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 7, 2016

Meeting time: 8:30 – 9:30 am
Meeting location: Kayak Room
Meeting convener: Andy Seitz and Margaret Short

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

1. Approved meeting minutes from 3 March 2016

2. Approved request to include Student Support Services representative, Victoria Smith, on Core Review Committee

3. Petitions

    a. Approved:
        i. Request to attach "O" designator to BIOL F465 Immunology. The O designator will be attached to this class for all undergraduates currently enrolled in the class.
        ii. Request to have CHEM F497 Neuroinflammation count as both an O and W class. This petition was previously reviewed by the committee. In the earlier review, the committee felt that the class does meet the Faculty Senate requirements for O and W designators, but it was not clear on the course syllabus. Therefore, the committee requested that the course instructor add language to the syllabus that specifically describes how the course addresses and meets the Faculty Senate O and W requirements. The committee agreed that after the syllabus was modified, the petition would go to the Committee Chair, rather than the entire committee, for

approval. The modifications to the syllabus were satisfactory and the petition was approved.

b. More information requested:
    i. Petition to have ENGL F688 Writing for Film and Television to count as a "W" course for an Interdisciplinary BA in Yupik Filmmaking. From looking at the syllabus, the course appears to meet the criteria for the "W" designator, except for the criterion of "Teachers regularly evaluate students' writing and inform students of their progress. If a major written project is part of the course, the project should be supervised in stages." Therefore, more information about this criterion is being requested. Should the course meet this criterion, there is no need for re-review by the committee and the chair will approve the petition.

c. Withdrawn:
    i. Petition to have course 806-177 General Anatomy and Physiology taken at Chippewa Valley Technical College count as a natural science core course. This course transferred in as HLTH 114, which does not count as a core natural science class. The committee decided, with input from the registrar's staff, to withdraw the petition and to have the course transferred in as BIOL 1LX. Because the course has a laboratory component and BIOL designator, it will satisfy the core requirement.

4. Discussion
    a. Re-visiting the website.
    b. Anything else?

Core Curriculum Review Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 28, 2016 8:30 – 9:30 am
Meeting location: Chancellor's Conference Room
Meeting convener: Andy Seitz and Margaret Short

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

1. Approved meeting minutes from 7 April 2016

2. Petitions
    a. Approved:
        i. Request to allow a CLEP score of 49 for Western Civilization II count toward satisfying a Perspective on the Human Condition requirement. Western Civilization II transfers in as HIST F100X.
        ii. Request to allow a D+ in HIST F100X count toward satisfying a Perspective on the Human Condition requirement. The student was admitted in the 2010-2011 catalog year, during which a D+ would count. However, the student changed catalog years to allow for a double major. The student also has completed a Yup'ik language sequence, but it can't be counted towards a PHC requirement because it counts towards his major.
        iii. Petition to allow BIOL F393 Medical Physiology to fulfill the requirements of an "O/2" course. The course syllabus clearly demonstrated that the course meets the O/2 criteria.
        iv. Petition to allow PSY F470 taken in Spring 2012 to fulfill W and O requirements. The course currently has O and W designators and the course offered in 2012 was identical to the current course, therefore it meets the W and O criteria.

    b. Denied:
        i. To waive O/2 requirement. Waiving O/2 requirements is out of the purview of the Core Review Committee. The petition was not recommended for forwarding to the Provost because the student has not applied for graduation in Spring 2016 and the justification for the waiver was not deemed satisfactory for forwarding to the Provost.

3. The end-of-year committee report was approved.

4. Discussion
    a. It was agreed that petitions submitted during the summer by students who want to graduate in Summer 2016 will be reviewed by the Core Review chair (Andy). If the petitions are straightforward, the chair will make an executive decision. If the petitions are complicated, the petitions will be circulated via email for a full committee vote.
    b. There was discussion about the future of the committee chair, or in other words, will Andy continue to chair the committee. He is not completely opposed to the idea, but would like to find someone else to chair the committee.

Core Review Committee End of Year Report – see next page

Year-end committee report for Core Review Committee

Chairs: Andy Seitz (School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences)
Margaret Short (College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Department of Mathematics and Statistics)

Members:

College of Liberal Arts:
- Burns Cooper, English (17)
- Brian Kassof, Social Sciences (16)
- Yelena Matusevich, Humanities (16)
- Kevin Sager, Communication (CLA 16)

College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics:
- Margaret Short, Math (17) - Co-Chair
- Lawrence Duffy, Science (16)

Library:
- Katherine Arndt, LIB (17)

At-Large:
- Andy Seitz, SFOS - Co-Chair

Unit Core Assessment:
- Tony Rickard, CNSM
- Kevin Berry, SOM

Ex Officio:
- Provost's Council Rep: Marsha Sousa
- Office of Admissions and Registrar: Caty Oehring, Hayley Williams
- Academic Advising Center: Ginny Kinne, Bobbi Jensen
- Rural Student Services: Gabrielle Russell
- Victoria Smith: Student Support Services (added in April 2016)

Summary of activities:

The Core Review Committee met nine times during AY2015-2016 (five times during fall semester, four times during spring semester). The main activities of the Core Review Committee were reviewing:

1. Petitions to add “W”, “O” or “O/2” designators to courses on an individual course basis
2. Petitions to have transfer courses count towards a core requirement (X)
3. Petitions to allow low scores in courses (<C-) and CLEP exams (<50) count toward core requirements
4. Petition to waive "W", "O" or "O/2" requirement for
5. Requests to permanently attach “W”, “O” or “O/2” designators to courses
6. Requests to list a course in baccalaureate core (X)

	Type	Approve	Deny	Deny, send to Provost	Withdrawn	Total
Petition	Add "W", "O" or "O/2" on invididual course basis	21			1	22
	Transfer course to count as core requirement (X)	4	3	3	2	12
	Allow low scores in courses/CLEP count for core	2				2
	Waive "W", "O" or "O/2" requirement		1			1
Request	Permanently attach "W", "O" or "O/2" to course	4				4
	List course in baccalaureate core (X)	2				2
Total		33	4	3	3	43

In addition to reviewing course request and petitions, the committee discussed current and future practices, which are summarized:

6. Review of Core Curriculum Review Committee bylaws - The Committee decided to shelve any discussion of modifying the bylaws until at least next year, when there is a clearer picture of what the GERs and Communications Learning Outcomes are, and how they relate to the function of the Core Curriculum Review Committee.
7. Review of meeting procedures, specifically, are meetings open, closed, or semi-closed - this discussion stemmed from a meeting in Spring 2015 when a UAF faculty member attended a Core Review Committee meeting and did not leave during the voting for a petition that he signed. The Core Review Committee discussed how to conduct meetings when a guest wants to attend and we agreed upon the following guidelines:
    a. Meetings are open to students and/or representative(s) of that student who signed the student's petition that will be discussed.
    b. The student and/or his/her representative will only be allowed to attend the meeting when the respective student's petition is being discussed. In other words, the student and/or his/her representative will not be allowed to hear proceedings of other petitions on which his/her name is not listed.
    c. The student and/or his/her representative will only be allowed to answer questions posed by the committee (i.e., they will not have an open floor to "pitch" the petition), and will have a maximum of three minutes to do so.
    d. The Core Review Committee reserves the right to table the petition at any time during the discussion of any petition.
8. Changes to GERs – The committee was frequently updated on two main changes to GERs, by both staff and the Chair of Curricular Affairs Committee. These changes are:
    a. Replace Oral (O) and Written (W) requirement with the requirement that each degree program must satisfy Communications Learning Outcomes within the degree program.
    b. Replace the current Perspectives on the Human Condition with general education requirements that follow a "bucket approach." The bucket approach still has general education areas that need to be met, but they may be met by a wide variety of courses.
9. Given the change in GERs, the future roles of Core Review Committee – The committee will still have several roles, including:
    a. The Committee will review O and W designator petitions for students using older catalog years.
    b. The committee will review requests for inclusion of courses in the non-bucket core requirements, such as requests to have new courses meet natural sciences or mathematics core requirements.
    c. The committee will review petitions from students requesting non-core designated courses (non X courses) to meet core requirements.
    d. The committee will review requests for inclusion of courses in the new "buckets." A list of criteria for inclusion in a bucket will be used for evaluating requests (see appendix).
    e. The committee will do an annual review to check whether courses in the buckets are offered annually. If not, letters will be sent to department chairs to check on the planned offerings of the course. If a course in a bucket is not offered for several years, the committee will seek to have the course removed from the bucket.

APPENDIX

GER Course Approval Guide
(Prepared by the Curriculum Review Committee)

Adding a Course

11. Both new and currently existing courses may be proposed for a GER category.
12. Each program will be able to have X courses in the appropriate category/categories (talk to AdComm)
13. Course descriptions must reflect how the course meets the category as defined by University regulations.
    a. Social Sciences: "Courses that fulfill this requirement are **broad survey courses** which provide the student with exposure to theory, methods, and data of the social sciences."
    b. Arts: "Provide the student with an **introduction** to the visual arts and performing arts **as academic disciplines** as opposed to those that emphasize acquisition of skills."
    c. Humanities: "**Introduce** the student to the humanistic fields of language, arts, literature, history, and philosophy."
14. Courses must be 100 or 200 level.
15. Courses must be currently designated a social science (s) or a humanities (h) for the purpose of the BA degree.
16. Course must be introductory, as indicated by the lack of prerequisites (except ENGL 111x).
17. Course should welcome all students (e.g. should not discourage non-majors).
18. Course must be offered regularly as described in the catalog (at least once per year).
19. Course instructors must agree to participate in UAF GER assessment activities.
20. If a program already has X number of courses in a category the program must remove a course to add the new course.

Removing a Course

3. Once a course gets an X designation that X is a permanent part of the course number. Courses taken off the list will need a NEW course number.
4. Departments would submit a new course request and go through the approval process to have the course re-numbered.

ATTACHMENT 215/21
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 5, 2016

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 10:01 am.

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

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

Unfortunately Andrea could not be present but sent an email with updates. He states, "Spring course evaluation (for courses ending on May 2-6) has started. On Friday April 1st instructors have been contacted to add personalized questions. They will be able to do so until Sunday April 17. On April 18th evaluation will open to students, until Monday, May 2.

"The UAF website [is] functioning as the main reference point for course evaluation [and] is public and active: http://www.uaf.edu/inspire-us/

"The Marketing and Communication Department has been instrumental in developing an appropriate advertisement campaign. Please see the attached flyers [in his original email] for students and instructors and share electronically (low resolution) or as hard copy (high resolution) as you see fit.

"The last meeting of the ECAI committee for the semester will be held sometime before the end of April. An ECAI annual activity report will be submitted to the FDAI committee by the end of April as well to be included in the FDAI annual report."

Mike stated that he would like the flyers sent to the graduate students as well. Steve said that the flyers need to be posted around campus. Franz opined that the rollout this semester should go relatively smoothly.

We also discussed how deserving Andrea Ferrante was of the Outstanding Senate Service Award from Faculty Senate. Well done, Andrea!

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

Joy reported that April will be a busy month with two faculty development opportunities each week plus one in May. These will include a series of graduate student mentoring trainings. Also Dr. Jean Feldman of NSF will give a presentation on Wednesday that will be great for young researchers. Joy and Barbara Adams will present a training session on April 27 for all faculty involved with the inter-disciplinary PhD program to help clarify what faculty roles are on their respective committees. She will soon send out a one-page list to faculty for April.

Joy once again reported the high level of stress she is seeing amongst first-year faculty and noted that many of them are already back out on the job market.

Franz asked Joy if the post docs were still being invited to participate in faculty development activities as he has two new post docs coming this summer. Joy replied that her list of post docs is at least a year old and that they weren't very interested in organizing as a group from the beginning. It was discussed that the sheer diversity of disciplines within this group makes it difficult to organize them.

IV. Upcoming activities by UAF eLearning & Distance Education

Chris reminded us about the new combined calendar of faculty development opportunities offered by eLearning, OIT and the Office of Faculty Development at https://iteachu.uaf.edu/events/ He also informed us that applications for the summer iTeach program (May 9 – 13) will open up on April 25.

He stated that a group of about twenty faculty members is now involved in the Quality Matters process, and he is continuing to look for more interested faculty who teach online and hybrid courses to add to the pilot group. He stated that they are looking at how to get the review work onto their Workload Agreements, and he's hoping that those faculty members in the pilot group who decide to continue with Quality Matters will become advocates to encourage more participation. Chris will give a full presentation on Quality Matters on April 26. For more information about QM at UAF and a form to fill out indicating your interest, please go to: http://qm.uaf.edu

V. Updates on Faculty Mentoring Survey

Joy informed us that she sent the survey to over 100 people and is collecting responses. She added that the deans have been the most responsive so far. One reminder has been sent out and she will send out more in the next two weeks as she is aiming for at least a 50% response rate. Franz said that this will give him some data as he begins preparing the FDAI Annual Report.

VI. Other Business – Annual Report

Franz said he is hoping to have a draft of the report for our next meeting.

VIII. Upcoming events

a. Next FDAI meeting: Tuesday, 05/03/16, 10-11 am in Bunnell 222
b. Next admin committee meeting: 04/22/16
c. Next Faculty Senate meeting: 05/02/16

IX. Adjourned at 10:30 am. (Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.)

ATTACHMENT 215/22
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 23, 2016

Attending: John Yarie, Don Hampton, Mike Castellini, Mike Daku, Amanda Loibl, Jayne Harvie, Mitch Reed, Donie Bret-Harte, Sean McGee (by phone), Karen Jensen (by phone)

I . Minutes of our meeting on March 9, 2016 were passed.

II. Amanda Loibl reported that she does not yet have numbers on grade appeals vs academic appeals involving graduate students.

III. Updates from the graduate school. Mike Castellini reported that in his time at the graduate school, he has seen no grade appeals involving graduate students but discussions regarding academic appeals by graduate students occur frequently. The Dean's Council was canceled today, so he has no new news from the Deans. The graduate school continues to try to figure out what to do for the FY 17 budget. There are several scenarios, all involve fewer people and less support for graduate fellowships. There is also less carryforward this year than in previous years. The submission date for theses in fall semester has been moved up a week because the graduate school will have fewer people to process theses. He will remind people as we move toward fall semester. The graduate school is already working on preparations for commencement. This is lots of fun and uplifting, and makes everyone feel optimistic.

IV. GAAC discussed all the items currently under review and passed the following course and program changes:
29-GPCh.: Program Change: **MA - Applied Linguistics**
46-GCCh.: Course Change: **ANTH / ART F402; ANTH F602 - Anthropology of Art**

V. New assignments were made.

VI. Our next meeting will be April 20 at 1:15 pm.

ATTACHMENT 215/23
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Information Technology Committee

Information Technology Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 20, 2016

Julie Cascio convened the meeting of the Information Technology Committee on April 20, 2016 at 10:05 a.m. via ZOOM

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

Maintaining student records from online book sources – Rorik
Maintaining student records was anticipated to be a Faculty Senate policy for keeping test information from online books. He mentioned that every vender he has experienced is a little different in sharing that information. If keeping records is not specified, then this is not necessary. Discussion on keeping info on grading and testing has happened at faculty senate, but he could not find that being specifically passed. Saving rubrics so how to understand. Chris shared that no policy was ever passed by Faculty Senate. Whatever policy is created should include homework or exams with information given back to students. Work needs to be done on this as it is unclear at the moment. Siri also thought Faculty will have to be keeping more of this type of info.
Joanne shared that their faculty has gone into Live Text. This is an online credit system, a national system that helps students get information. Then they may run reports so the students can collect data. It will work with any system.

Explorance Blue – Chris shared the period for faculty to add additional questions is over for this semester.

OIT faculty engagement - Martha was not at this meeting. Committee members shared that OIT has gotten better with desk top assistance. Joanne added that the Nook was a good place to go, to plug in and for faculty to collaborate with students. It was comfortable for students, though may be under-utilized. Some suggestions of committee members for OIT input at this meeting were:

- Faculty engagement could be enhanced more by OIT.
- Need someone from OIT at this meeting regularly, as it is necessary for them to talk about things happening.
- Having Roxen on website is difficult to work with. Faculty would like to discuss a more student friendly platform. It seems this is the only company using Roxen for web and it is difficult for people to work with. It would also be helpful to include faculty in the process of developing webpages. With accreditation coming up all places need to be available to students and for faculty to get on the web.
- Faculty may not understand there are other internet options to use so having info on these would be helpful.
- UA faculty's blackboard will be updated again so help understanding, such as having a portal to know this will occur would be helpful. Having someone from OIT to get information on it would be good. Blackboard when updated or changed can be difficult for faculty, so getting an update on when this will happen ahead of time will let faculty get more plans for how to make it happen; knowledge to faculty early of upcoming blackboard change.

Information Technology the committee should consider for next year

1. Maintaining student records from online book sources coordinated through Faculty Senate.
2. Encourage input from OIT on: lecture capture is change; Docusign adjustment; adjusted; status of current online tools being used to faculty; Faculty engagement; type of system used for website.

These options would make members of this committee helpful with faculty notice on learning about new opportunities and upcoming changes and making website.

Sharing experience on online meetings and webinar software used this year for monthly IT meetings: CANVASS, Skype, Blackboard Collaborate, Adobe Connect, Elluminate Live, ZOOM, Google hangouts
ZOOM Up to 50 people can be free when meeting is less than 40 minutes. or longer time period it costs $15 per month. Business enterprise, which allows more hosts, was more expensive. For committee members to get into Zoom is quite quick.
SKPE used well for our meeting but was more difficult when used for a class or larger number of participants.
CANVASS was helpful once participants were in but it took a while to get into it. Video was able to be shared in that meeting. Since it was not accessed by many, there was a request to try CANVASS again. Chris will contact Falk to test it out and let everyone know when this will be.
Next year the committee will meet via ZOOM each month.

The committee discussed the items for the year-end committee report.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 am
Submitted by Chair, Julie Cascio

FY16 Information Technology Committee Report

The IT committee met via online to meet each month. Various webinar softwares were used for the committee to experience how well they worked for a meeting. Those utilized included CANVASS, Skype, Blackboard Collaborate, Adobe Connect, Elluminate Live, ZOOM, Google hangouts. Some then tried them when presenting a class.

Committee Members are: Bill Barnes, ,Julie Cascio, Eric Collins, Joanne Healy, Falk Huettmann, Rorik Peterson, Ruth Prato, Siri Tuttle, Chris Lott ex officio, Martha Mason ex officio, Fred Schlutt ex officio

Electronic course evaluations

- Concern was expressed about the low return rate in summer 2015. There has historically been a 62% rate of return on paper evaluations. The results did not show that disgruntled students were the ones to fill the surveys out. It is suggested to devote time in class to promote filling out course evaluations. Students want to believe that the info given will actually make a difference and are currently uncertain that this is the case. The electronic evaluation is accessible by mobile devices. The downside of using a mobile device is that there is limited feedback. Filling it out online more feedback is provided. How evaluation summaries will be provided in the promotion and tenure process is being discussed with faculty and deans.
- Preliminary aggregate of Fall 2015 semester evaluation rough draft showed the response to Explorance Blue was about 42%, compared to 60% from previous written evaluations. This is

better than anticipated. However, the instructor is not able to have the evaluation open at different times. Students have a 10-day window to respond.

- Inspire us! Is the theme to inform about this and is designed to help students understand how important this is. One instructor did not see her student responses right away. There may have not been enough responses or it may have gotten caught in SPAM. Another shared that she allowed in class time for responses but students responses were minimal and incomplete. Another comment was that some are voluminous responses!

OIT Information.

- Smart classrooms bridge geographic gaps. 75 classrooms, auditoriums and lab spaces are equipped with instructional technology at four varying levels. Maintaining Smart Classrooms is a challenge and the rooms with the most recent upgrades are in high demand. There is no dedicated Smart Classroom fund for refresh. OIT manages those Smart Classrooms scheduled by the Registrar. For classrooms with technology that are scheduled and funded by specific schools or departments, OIT consults. Issues in smart classroom use were brought up to the OIT to look into.
- On the Fairbanks campus there are now 5 venues equipped with lecture capture.
- Phone lines across the state are important. In addition to internet connections, the phone line is needed as well. Analog phone lines in Reichart, Gruening and Brooks classrooms were previously paid for by the Office of Admissions and Registrar at ~$260/ year. Due to cost, these were disconnected. Departments may pay for the costs of these analog lines where needed. A service request should be initiated with the OIT Service Desk. CRCD reconnected four rooms in Brooks.
- OIT has been experiencing problems with the Video Conferencing Infrastructure including phone lines being connected into the conferences. Over the past month technicians have been troubleshooting with vendors to improve the service. Several changes have been made which seemed to reduce the number of dropped calls. OIT continues to monitor the infrastructure and the initial reports indicate a marked improvement with video conference calls. Do call the Service Desk at x8300 to report any problems so that OIT can check tracking data and see what was going on with the network at that time.
- Video conferencing has experienced experiencing some issues. OIT has begun the process of evaluating current video conferencing platform and use.
- Faculty in Alaska Native languages have shared that when using Elluminate Live, there has been quite a bit of noise online. For these evening classes there has been no immediate live help. Elluminate Live does not have support in evening; it is a different provider.
- OIT Training. Awareness of trainings already being offered would be helpful. Attendance of third Thursday OIT trainings varies from 4 to 15 faculty. There is a noon-time barrier for attending this, though holding these over the open hour from 1-2 has not had any better attendance. Other trainings are offered at other times.

Faculty 180 -

A faculty senate committee headed by Eric Madsen led the research into choosing a database system for faculty reporting. This committee reviewed several products, with opportunities for faculty input along the way. Faculty 180 was chosen.

Benefits of Faculty 180 system –

Archives the information.

Reports can be run for specified periods of time. This will be beneficial eventually for doing comprehensive reports…

At the administrative level, deans may be able to access the information without having to go back to the faculty again and again to find it.

Limitations –

Entering information into the Faculty 180 database takes time.

The software itself, as it has some quirks. Several screens must be navigated to add data, to review, and to edit it.

Teaching/Class information entered into the system was not accurate. This info is extracted from Banner and uploaded manually. If the class is not correct in Faculty 180, then it is because the instructor listed in Banner is not correct. Accurate information in Banner will be more and more important including correct start and end dates, as this is also used for electronic evaluation. Correcting banner records are done through the Dean and Registrar. For Faculty 180 questions or corrections, contact Michelle Strickland or Alex Fitts. Other options are use the link at the Provosts website to submit a google form, use the link in Faculty 180 to contact the company, or submit a support ticket.

Faculty evaluations do not currently go into the Faculty 180 system but when they do, privacy will be an issue.

Deans may pull up the information for evaluation after the faculty member has submitted it.

The contract for Faculty 180 is for five years, currently it is in the third year.

Page Up is software purchased by statewide for recruitment, evaluation and other factors related to employees of UA. It was chosen to replace AKjobs and staff performance evaluations.
Kansas State University and University of Alabama who use Page Up were called. Neither used it for faculty evaluation.

Security concerns with internet use –

CITO, Karl Kowalski and CISO, Nathan Zierfuss-Hubbard shared information on security concerns. Nathan looks at privacy concerns, data concerns and the ability to retrieve lost information. Some UAF personnel purchase other internet services. It is important to work with procurement department so OIT knows if some other service is being used, and can look at the security for it. Cloud-computing guidelines for security, outsource vendors and intellectual properties for also worked with for security.
Statistics on security can be shared with faculty at security@alaska.edu.
In the past indication of a potential scam through an email was indicated by poor grammar or spelling. However, targeted attacks have gotten more sophisticated and may be difficult to tell. Be vigilant on sharing information and any kind of requests or links in an email.
FERPA protections are followed in Google email. UA negotiated tighter restrictions when that format was chosen for email.

Maintaining student records from online book sources –

Rorik Peterson looked into assignments turned in via McGraw Hill or other book to keep for a long enough time period. One is an automatic score that gets aggregated into the Blackboard. Grades were not being populated. Maintaining student records was anticipated to be a Faculty Senate policy for keeping student information from online books. He mentioned that every vender he has experienced is a little different in sharing that information. Discussion on keeping info on grading and testing has happened at faculty senate, but Chris shared that no policy was ever passed by Faculty Senate. Whatever policy is created should include homework or exams with information given back to students. Work needs to be done on this as it is unclear at the moment.
Joanne shared that their faculty has gone into Live Text. This is an online credit system, a national system that helps students get information. Then they may run reports so the students can collect data. It will work with any system.

eLearning's efforts to bring Quality Matters to UAF– The design on the Quality Matters rubric used for faculty development to look at quality was given. Comments included interest in applying this rubric to courses, and several would like to take a copy of this rubric to department meetings. Having an account with QM to get a look at the rubric is interested. Contact Chris Lott for more information.

Rorik Peterson will convene the Information Technology committee next fall and take charge of chair elections.

ATTACHMENT 215/24
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for 5 February 2016

Stacy, Sandra, Mike, Bill, Jennifer, Jill, Cindy, Minny

Minutes approved from 12/8

Agenda approved

Grade appeal policy update: Curricular Affairs committee has been looking at this. Cindy and Mike attended the CAC meeting and spoke to the questions that the students had. Much work needs to be done on this policy. A subcommittee was formed by CAC – perhaps one of our members should attend that subcommittee. A SADA member will volunteer. Cindy shared the history of the policy and the need for updates. Language needs to be more specific.

Some of the policy is out of compliance with BOR policy. The language related to the deadlines emphasizes traditional students, not students who are enrolled in non -traditional class schedules. Evolution of policy and procedure need to be reflected in new language. Stacy will serve on that committee. The goal is to have it revised by the end of the semester. Mike will pull BOR policy and UAA/UAS policy.

Update on Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions -- geared more toward graduate students, so the matter was passed on to the Graduate Advisory Committee.

Update on Placement

Math:
In May some people are going to Anchorage to meet with them to talk about the new math placement. Anchorage isn't happy with Accuplacer for Math. Jill said the Placement Committee met to gather data to see if cut scores need to be changed. Lower level DEVM math courses there was a general upshift of enrollment, pass rates are just the same. ALEKS has shortened the pipeline for graduation. But passing rates in calculus were lower than normal, but pass rates are now back up. Committee role includes clarifying how faculty here feel about ALEKS and then will send out a summary and see if faculty would like to pursue continuation.

Catalog changes regarding math placement – will the scores be adjusted? That analysis has not been done yet. Might not be any reason to up the score. The only issue is whether or not the scores would need to be adjusted up – would need to decide by the third week in March before anyone is allowed to register for fall. Jill looked at other institutions to see about their scores – found that many are using Alex.

English Placement:

Some students had moved from DEVE 104 directly into 111x. Placement language hasn't been changed since 2010, prior to all the changes in the course placement scores. No changes were made for the target course, however: English 111x. DEVS 104 is no longer a prerequisite. Cindy had emailed Sarah to see about making the changes. Updates will be made at the next meeting; no action from the committee needed at this time.

GER update:

List of proposed courses for Humanities, Arts, and Social Science categories was shared. There's a list of criteria that all proposed classes must meet. An update will be shared with Faculty Senate on Monday – list of classes will be shared.

Placement into these classes could be an issue that comes to us. Will all of the proposed classes have pre-requisites? Still unknown.

The explicit W and O designators will go away in Fall 2017 but communications plans will be in place.

Committee Membership:

Another seat from CLA is open – an elected position
Chuckchi and NW campus positions are open
Student rep seat is open

End of Year Report
Student Academic Development and Achievement (SADA) Committee
May 2016

AY 15-16 SADA Membership

Appointed Members: Sandra Wildfeuer (chair), Interior Alaska Campus and Bristol Bay Campus; Jennifer Tilbury (co-chair), Community and Technical College; Cindy Hardy, Developmental Education; Ben Kuntz, Kuskokwim Campus; *Joe Mason, Northwest Campus, retired December 2015;* Stacey Howdeshell, Academic Advising Center; Colleen Angaiak, Rural Student Services

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

Ex officio: Alex Fitts, Provost's Council Rep; Office of Admissions and the Registrar: Holly Sherouse

Meeting schedule: Fall 2015 (Aug 26, Sept 15, Oct 6, Nov 10, Dec 8) and Spring 2016 (Feb 5, Mar 2, Apr 20).

2015-2016 SADA Activities and Discussions

1. Approved a new committee definition, which includes a new position from CLA and the review of policies related to student appeals.

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

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

2. SADA committee reviewed the UAF Grade Appeal policy and the UAF Academic Appeal (other than grades) policy, and then collaborated with the Curricular Affairs committee (CAC) on the Grade Appeal policy and the Graduate Academic & Advisory committee (GAAC) on the UAF Appeal for Academic Decisions policy. Initially it appeared there was out of date language. It was also determined that the documents are not in compliance with BOR regulations and UA policy.
   a. CAC reviewed the Grade Appeal policy and established a sub committee. The chair of SADA served on the subcommittee and participated in rewriting this document. The current version has been reviewed by CAC and is being reviewed by the Administrative Committee. The rationale for changes include bringing the UAF document in alignment with BOR policy and UA regulations; clarifying the informal and formal procedures, establishing a new faculty senate committee for grade appeals, and including faculty that are not tenure-track. In addition, a form was created to guide the student through the informal and formal procedures of the grade appeal.
   b. The chair of SADA established a committee to work on the Appeal for Academic Decisions (other than grades) policy at UAF. Members of the committee include a member from GAAC, a graduate school representative, Vice Provost Alex Fitts, the assistant to the provost, and the dean of students. This document is currently not in compliance with BOR policy or UA regulation. The written UA policy also does not reflect current practice, and there is no form to complete. The committee is meeting to update the informal and formal procedures. This business will continue in Fall 2017, and be ready for review at the start of the academic term.

3. SADA was asked to look into dual degrees and double majors for possible issues that students face. We discussed this issue from the perspective of the advisors and also the registrar's office. There is some confusion about the difference between double degrees and dual majors. The registrar's office will work on a FAQ document for students and advisors to help clarify and explain how to code double majors and double degrees in the software system. This should be ready by Fall 2017.

a. Interesting trends at UAF are that the total number of baccalaureate students has decreased, while the number graduating with a baccalaureate degree has increased.
b. There has also been an increase in the number of students seeking a double bachelor's degree.
c. In Fall 2015, 1% of students were double majors, while 11.4% were double degree seeking. The majority of those seeking double degrees are at the OEC/Cert/AAS level.

UAF Baccalaureate Students: Trends in Multidisciplinary Studies

BACCALAUREATE ENROLLMENT

						Double Degree-Seeking Students by Degree Type			
	Number of Baccalaureate Students	Number that are Double Majors	Percent that are Double Majors	Number that are Double Degree-Seeking	Percent that are Double Degree-Seeking	OEC/Cert /AAS	AA/AS	Second Bachelor's	Masters & Licensure
Fall 2011	4,054	69	1.7%	382	9.4%	194	114	69	5
Fall 2012	4,074	69	1.7%	413	10.1%	205	124	81	3
Fall 2013	3,989	52	1.3%	442	11.1%	209	141	83	9
Fall 2014	3,951	46	1.2%	450	11.4%	203	127	115	5
Fall 2015	3,872	38	1.0%	440	11.4%	209	109	115	7

Note: Baccalaureate enrollment counts include baccalaureate-intended (BI) students.

DEGREES AWARDED

	Number of Students Graduating with a Baccalaureate Degree	Number of Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded	Number of Baccalaureate Degrees that had a Double Major	Percent of Students Graduating that had a Double Major	Number of Students Graduating who Earned a Second Baccalaureate Degree within the same year of graduation	Percent of Students Graduating with a Second Baccalaureate Degree within the same year of graduation
FY11	513	523	17	3.3%	10	1.9%
FY12	529	534	15	2.8%	5	0.9%
FY13	535	550	15	2.8%	15	2.8%
FY14	569	579	9	1.6%	10	1.8%
FY15	561	572	9	1.6%	11	2.0%

Source: *UA Information Systems, Banner SI Closing Extracts 2011-2015.*

4. SADAC approved courses 2015-16 Review Cycle, takes effect in AY2016-17.
   1. 1-Trial: Trial Course: DEVE F094 - Basic Writing and Reading, 4 credits (4+0); prerequisite of appropriate placement scores; grade of C or higher qualifies students for DEVE F194 course; letter-graded; to be first offered spring 2016 upon approval. Status: 11/10/2015: SADAC approved with minor revision to course description; syllabus info. 11/11/2015: Provost approved. 11/10/2015: REVISED DEVE F094 - Basic Writing and Reading (PDF)
   2. 2-Trial: Trial Course: DEVE F194 - Writing and Reading Strategies, 4 credits (4+0); prerequisites are appropriate placement scores, or C or higher in DEVE F094 or DEVE F060 or DEVS F052; letter-graded; to be first offered spring 2016 upon approval. Status: 11/10/2015: SADAC approved with minor revision to course description; syllabus info. 11/11/2015: Provost approved. 11/10/2015: REVISED DEVE F194 - Writing and Reading Strategies (PDF)
   3. 1-DEV: New Course: WRTG F080 - Basic Reading & Writing, 4 credits (4+0); prerequisite of appropriate placement scores; letter graded; to be offered fall, summer and spring as demand warrants; effective fall 2017 (per system alignment) upon approval. (DEVE trial courses will be submitted for spring 2016 offering.) 10/28/2015: Updated signature page; and Format 1 - section 7 on first offering (JH). Status: 11/10/2015: SADAC approved with minor edits. 11/11/2015: Provost approved.
   4. 2-DEV: New Course: WRTG F090 - Writing & Reading Strategies, 4 credits (4+0); prerequisites include appropriate placement test scores, or C or higher in WRTG F080, or DEVE F060 and DEVS F052; letter graded; to be offered spring, fall and summer as demand warrants; effective fall 2017 (per system alignment) upon approval. (DEVE trial courses will be submitted for spring 2016 offering.) 10/28/2015: Updated signature page; and Format 1 - section 7 on first

offering (JH). Status: 11/10/2015: SADAC approved with minor edits. 11/11/2015: Provost approved.

5. 3-DEV: New Course: DEVM F054A - Modularized Mastery Math (M-Cubed): Prealgebra Module A, 1 credit (1+0); prerequisite of appropriate ALEKS placement test scores and required permission of instructor; letter grades; to be offered each fall and spring; effective summer 2016. (Registrar's Office has OK'd summer effective date.) Status: 11/10/2015: SADAC approved. 11/11/2015: Provost approved.
6. 4-DEV: New Course: DEVM F054B - Modularized Mastery Math (M-Cubed): Prealgebra Module B, 1 credit (1+0); prerequisite of Grade of B or better in DEVM F054A or appropriate ALEKS PPL placement test scores; letter grades; to be offered each fall and spring; effective summer 2016. (Registrar's Office has OK'd summer effective date.) Status: 11/10/2015: SADAC approved. 11/11/2015: Provost approved.
7. 5-DEV: New Course: DEVM F054C - Modularized Mastery Math (M-Cubed): Prealgebra Module C, 1 credit (1+0); prerequisite of Grade of B or better in DEVM F054B or appropriate ALEKS PPL placement test scores; instructor's permission required; letter grades; to be offered each fall and spring; effective summer 2016. (Registrar's Office has OK'd summer effective date.) Status: 11/10/2015: SADAC approved. 11/11/2015: Provost approved.
8. 6-DEV: New Course: DEVM F068 - Math Essentials, 4 credits (4+0); prerequisite of appropriate placement test scores; to be offered as class lecture or via synchronous and asynchronous distance delivery; letter graded; to be offered every semester; effective summer 2016 (if OK'd at Registrar's Office). Status: 11/10/2015: SADAC approved. 11/11/2015: Provost approved.
9. 7-DEV: New Course: WRTG F110 - Introduction to College Writing, 3 credits (3+0); prerequisites include C or better in WRTG F090, or appropriate placement test scores; letter graded; to be offered fall, spring, summer as demand warrants; effective Fall 2017 upon approval. Status: 12/8/2015: SADAC approved. 12/16/2015: Provost approved.

5. Early Warning, Early Progress Reports, Freshman Progress Reports; name changes and deadlines
   Until this semester there were two processes. There was an early warning program for core courses and courses with low pass rates. A few weeks later, there were freshman progress reports. Now there is one progress report.
   Discussion:
   a. Does the date come to early or too late in the semester? English may like it later because students are just finishing drafts to complete first paper. Math may want the deadline earlier, so student can drop and swap to a more appropriate class. In math, the instructor can usually determine whether student has prerequisite knowledge within the first few weeks.
   b. What is the follow up procedures with the student? Advisors were asked to pull their advisees and follow up as they did with Early Warning. With early warning, instructors could put in a note. With this system, the only thing that shows is the grade – no information and no explanation. It is challenging to identify faculty advisors. Staff advisors are also rarely notified. There is no central reporting system on students – it's up to faculty and advisors. Let faculty know that this is the new norm. For Math, could there be a broader "window" that is open earlier? Would need to be sure that advisors also check and run reports earlier.
   c. Other reasons for low performance include not having money for books or online access.
   d. The date is set by Faculty Senate. What would be the ideal date? Right before Spring Break is too late. Does this committee feel the date should be adjusted?

6. English alignment and placement

   English placement has been aligned for UAA, UAS and UAF since 2012. Courses are nearly aligned between the different campuses. There is a change from DEVE developmental English, to WRTG writing designator. Some old course numbers are being offered this fall as trial courses, even though the new version of the course has been approved, because the entire English sequence has not been agreed upon yet by all campuses. There are questions about 200 level English courses.

7. Math alignment and placement

   UAF is in the second of a three year math placement policy that uses ALEKS software. This can be taken without a proctor by any incoming student online. There is a fee associated with the test, and students can improve their initial placement by practicing in the online modules provided.
   UAA and UAS use accuplacer, and there is a movement to align placement at all campuses.
   Discussions are being held in Spring 2016 with UAA and UAS about math placement.
   Math courses and numbers were aligned in the previous year.
   At UAF, there is support among the DEVM and the MATH faculty to continue the use of ALEKS.
   The UAF math placement committee shared their reports with SADA and they were reviewed and discussed. There is a general trend of students placing at a higher level than when using accuplacer.

8. Learning Commons Project

   This has been an ongoing discussion item for the SADA committee for several years. The idea is to create a common learning and study area for students with the resources that they need located around the study area. There has also been discussion to create an online forum. There is limited real estate for such a commons at UAF. Last year, the Learning Commons project influenced an increase in the number of available study rooms on the 3rd floor of the library, and the creation of a Developmental Reading and Writing Lab in 407 Rasmuson.

9. Student Resiliency Project

   This has been an ongoing discussion item in terms of identifying the factors that impact student success and failure. In 2014-15 a proposal was discussed to survey students, including why students are not successful. The lead researcher for this project was an invited member from CLA and did not attend SADA this academic year. However, this individual will serve on SADA next academic year as a new committee member, so SADA will continue to discuss ways in which to build student resiliency in AY17.

ATTACHMENT 215/25
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted for the 2016-17 Faculty Senate

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following calendar for its 2016-2017 meetings.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Dates must be firmed up for the meeting schedule to allow for advance planning, and Wood Center room reservations must be scheduled well in advance.

****

2016-17 Faculty Senate Meetings
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom
Remote Participation for all meetings via Zoom for audio and video

Meeting:	Date	Day	Time
#216	Sept. 12, 2016	Monday	1-3 PM
#217	Oct. 10, 2016	Monday	1-3 PM
#218	Nov. 7, 2016	Monday	1-3 PM
#219	Dec. 5, 2016	Monday	1-3 PM
#220	Feb. 6, 2017	Monday	1-3 PM
#221	Mar. 6, 2017	Monday	1-3 PM
#222	Apr. 3, 2017	Monday	1-3 PM
#223	May 1, 2017	Monday	1-3 PM

ATTACHMENT 215/26
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted for the 2016-17 Faculty Senate

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to endorse the 2016-2017 committee membership as attached.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: New Senate members' preference for committee selection were reviewed and weighed against membership distribution from schools and colleges.

****

2016-2017 Faculty Senate Committees

CURRICULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Ken Abramowicz, SOM (18)
Ana Aguilar-Islas, SFOS (18)
Jennie Carroll, CRCD (17) - Convener
Nicole Cundiff, SOM (17)
Cindy Hardy, CRCD - SADAC Liaison
Eileen Harney, SOE (17)
Lisa Lunn, CNSM (17)
Rainer Newberry, CNSM (17)
Dejan Raskovic, CEM (17)
Kate Quick, CRCD (18)

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
Sine Anahita, CLA (18)
Andy Anger, CRCD - CTC (17 - alternate) - Convener
Jeff Benowitz, GI (18)
Valerie Gifford, SOE (17)
Joshua Greenberg, SNRE (17 - alternate)
John Heaton, CLA (17)
Jak Maier, CRCD (17)
Jeff May, CLA (18)
Leslie McCartney, LIB (17)
Debu Misra, CEM (18 - alternate)

UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
Mara Bacsujlaky, CES (18)
Bob Bolton, IARC (18)
Carrie Green, SOE (17 - alternate)
Anna Liljedahl, CEM (18)
Julie Matweyou, SFOS (18)
David Maxwell, CNSM (18)
Sarah Hardy, SFOS (17)
Jennifer Tilbury, CRCD (17)

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE
Bernie Coakley, CNSM (17 - alternate)
Candi Dierenfield, CES (17)
Steven Hunt, LIB (18)
Franz Meyer, CNSM (17) - convener
Rob Rember, IARC (18 - alternate)
Sarah Stanley, CLA (18 - alternate)
Mingchu Zhang, SNRE (18)
Other non-senate members TBD

GRADUATE ACADEMIC & ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Donie Bret-Harte, CNSM (17) - convener
Anna Beaudreau, SFOS (non-senate member)
Jim Bicigo, CLA (18 - alternate)
Michael Daku, CLA (non-senate member)
Daryl Farmer, CLA (17)
Don Hampton, GI (17)
Andrew Mahoney, GI (17 – Alternate)
Roman Makarevich, CNSM (18)
Sean McGee, SOM (non-senate member)
Robin Shoaps, CLA (18 - alternate)
Sean Topkok, SOE (18)

RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Srijan Aggarwal, CEM (18)
Jessica Cherry, IARC (17) - convener
Jame Clark, CLA (17)
Larry Duffy, CNSM (17 - alternate)
Javier Fochesatto, CNSM (18 - alternate)
Melissa Good, SFOS (18 - alternate)
Kris Hundertmark, IAB (non-senate member)
Gay Sheffield, SFOS (17 - alternate)
Gordon Williams, CNSM (18 - alternate)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
Bill Barnes, CRCD CTC (18)
Eric Collins, SFOS (17)
Stefanie Ickert-Bond, CNSM (18)
Art Nash, CES (18 - alternate)
Rorik Peterson, CEM (17) - convener
Siri Tuttle, CLA (17)
Other non-senate members TBD

COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN
Wendy Croskrey, CLA (18) - Senator (req'd in bylaws)
Diana DiStefano, CLA (18 - CSW term)
Jennifer Guerard, CNSM (18 - CSW term)
Tamara Harms, CNSM (18 - CSW term)
Ellen Lopez, CANHR (18 - CSW term; co-chair)
Erin Pettit, CNSM (18 - CSW term)
Megan McPhee, SFOS (18 - CSW term)
Derek Sikes, CNSM (18 - CSW term)
Director, Women's Center

CORE REVIEW COMMITTEE
CLA Members:
Daryl Farmer - English (18 - Core term)
Alex Hirsch - Soc. Sci. (18 - Core term)
Kevin Sager - Communication (18 - Core term)
Humanities - vacant

Library Member:
Kathy Arndt (17 - Core term)

At-Large Rep (outside CLA):
Andy Seitz (17 - Core term)

Math Rep:
Margaret Short (17 - Core term)
Science Rep:
Larry Duffy (18 - Core term)

Core Assessment:
Tony Rickard, CNSM
Kevin Berry, SOM

STUDENT ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT & ACHIEVEMENT *(to be updated in fall 2016)*
Sine Anahita, CLA seat (18 SADA term)
Jill Faudree, Math Rep (17 SADA term)
Cindy Hardy (17 - alternate), CAC Liaison
Bill Howard Science Rep (17 - SADA term)
Ben Kuntz, CRCD Kuskokwim Campus
Joe Mason, CRCD Northwest Campus
Jennifer Schell, English Rep (18 - SADA term)
Jennifer Tilbury, CRCD - CTC (17)
Sandra Wildfeuer, CRCD (18)

CURRICULUM REVIEW *(to be updated in fall 2016)*
Rainer Newberry, CNSM (17) - convener
SNRE: Julie Joly (17 - alternate)
CRCD: Shawn Russell
CTC: Galen Johnson
SOE: Gary Jacobsen
CNSM: Jessica Larsen
SOM: Thomas Zhou (undergrad. curriculum)
CLA: Rob Duke
CEM: Santanu Khataniar
SFOS: Andres Lopez

ATTACHMENT 215/27
UAF Faculty Senate #215, May 2, 2016
Submitted for the 2016-17 Faculty Senate

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to authorize the 2015-16 Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate on all matters within its purview, which may arise until the Senate resumes deliberations in the Fall of 2016. Senators will be kept informed of the Administrative Committee's meetings and will be encouraged to attend and participate in these meetings.

EFFECTIVE: May 2, 2016

RATIONALE: This motion will allow the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate so that necessary work can be accomplished and will also allow Senators their rights to participate in the governance process.

****