

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting # 96 on September 25, 2000:

MOTION PASSED
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to withdraw the motion to amend the Constitution presented at the May 5, 2000 meeting concerning research faculty membership on the Senate.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The Faculty Affairs Committee discussion raised several issues with this motion as presented and they will study the issue further before bringing it back to the Senate.

FIRST READING

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend Article III, Section 2 of the UAF Faculty Senate Constitution as follows:

[[]] = Deletions
CAPS = Additions

ARTICLE III - Membership

Sect. 2 Voting members of the Senate must EITHER hold academic rank [[and must be]] WITH full-time CONTINUING APPOINTMENT AT [[permanent employees of]] the University of Alaska FAIRBANKS OR HOLD SPECIAL ACADEMIC RANK WITH TITLE PRECEDED BY ØRESEARCH¹ AND HAVE A THREE-YEAR CONTINUING APPOINTMENT IN THE YEAR OF ELIGIBILITY AND ELECTION.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor approval

RATIONALE: The number of research faculty on campus has increased in recent years. Members of this faculty group seek participation in faculty governance as well as representation on the Faculty Senate. This change accommodates this group of faculty.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting # 96 on September 25, 2000:

MOTION PASSED
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the following Appeals Policy

for Academic Decisions.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately
Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: This motion will bring UAF into compliance with the new UA Regulation 09.03.02 and extend UAF's appeals policy beyond grade appeals.

APPEALS POLICY FOR ACADEMIC DECISIONS
Other Than Assignment of Grades

I. Introduction

The University of Alaska is committed to the ideal of academic freedom and so recognizes that academic decisions (i.e., non-admission to or dismissal from any UAF program) are a faculty responsibility. Therefore, the University administration shall not influence or affect the review of academic decisions.

The following procedures are designed to provide a means for students to seek review of academic decisions alleged to be arbitrary and capricious. Before taking formal action, a student must attempt to resolve the issue informally. 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. As used in the schedule for review of academic decisions, 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. Final examination periods are counted as class days.
- B. "Department Chair" for the purposes of this policy denotes the administrative head 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).
- C. The "dean/director" is the administrative 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.
- D. 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. A student wishing to appeal an academic decision other than a grade assignment must first request an informal review of the decision.

1. Notification must be received by the Provost within 15 days from the first day of instruction of the semester in which the decision takes effect.
2. 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 Provost, after review of supporting documentation provided by the student, may adjust the deadlines accordingly. An 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.
3. The Provost will request the appropriate department chair or dean to conduct an informal review of the decision and a determination of whether the original decision should be overturned or changed in any way. This review shall take no more than ten (10) days.
4. The Provost will consult with the student on the department chair/dean's recommendation. If the student does not find that recommendation acceptable, he/she may request the Provost to conduct a formal review.

B. The formal review will be conducted as follows.

1. This review is initiated by the student through a signed, written request to the Provost.
 - a. The student's request for review may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and available from the Office of the Provost.
 - b. By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the review of the decision, and that the university's administration can not influence or affect the outcome of the review.
 - c. The request for a formal review must be received no later than 10 days after the student has learned the outcome of the informal review (IIIA4).
 - d. The request must detail the basis for the allegation that the decision was made on a basis other than sound professional judgment based upon standard academic policies, procedures and practices.
2. The Provost will appoint a 5 member review committee composed of the following:
 - a. One tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the decision was made.
 - b. Two tenure-track faculty members from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the decision was made. If available, one of these two members will be selected from the members

of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

- c. One tenure track faculty member from outside the college or school in which the decision was made. If available, this member is to be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.
 - d. The fifth member to be appointed by the Provost will be a non-voting student representative.
 - e. The campus judicial officer or his/her designee shall serve as a nonvoting facilitator for appeals hearings. This individual shall serve in an advisory role to help preserve consistent hearing protocol and records.
 - f. The department chair of the program in which the decision was made will act as the program's monitor of all proceedings.
3. The committee must schedule a mutually agreeable date, time and location for the appeal hearing within 10 working days of receipt of the student's formal request.
- 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.
 - 2) The request was not made within the policy deadlines.
 - 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 head and dean within five days of the decision, and will state clearly the reasoning for the dismissal of the request.
4. 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 program to the student's allegation.
 - b. A second meeting scheduled to meet within 10 days of the decision to review the request.
 - 1) The student and a representative of the program will be invited to attend the meeting.
 - 2) The meeting will be closed to outside

participation, and neither the student nor 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 tapes will be stored with the campus 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.

5. 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 may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - 1) direct the program to reconsider the decision,
 - 2) provide a final alternative decision.
- b. The academic decision review committee proceedings will result in the preparation of written findings and conclusions.
- c. A formal, written report of the decision must be forwarded to the student, program/department chair, dean and Provost within five days of the meeting. The Provost shall then be responsible for communicating the decision to other relevant offices (e.g., Admissions, Registrar).
- d. The decision of the committee is final.

C. The entire process must be completed by the end of the semester in which the decision first took effect.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting # 96 on September 25, 2000:

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty: Initial Appointment, Annual Review, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Sabbatical Leave as attached.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately
Upon Chancellor's Approval

RATIONALE: Unit Criteria as a component of evaluation, tenure, and promotion was apparently

removed from the last "Blue Book" due to an erroneous belief that the faculty union contracts rendered them void or redundant in the "Blue Book". This is emphatically not the case, and so we have reinserted the relevant paragraphs on Unit Criteria from the previous "Blue Book".

[[]] = Deletion
CAPS = Addition

III. PERIODIC EVALUATION OF FACULTY

- B. UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES. UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES ARE THE RECOGNIZED VALUES USED BY A FACULTY WITHIN A SPECIFIC DISCIPLINE TO ELUCIDATE, BUT NOT REPLACE, THE GENERAL FACULTY CRITERIA ESTABLISHED IN A., ABOVE, FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE ON AN ONGOING BASIS AND FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND SABBATICAL REVIEW.

UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES MAY BE, BUT ARE NOT REQUIRED TO BE, DEVELOPED BY THOSE UNITS WISHING TO DO SO. UNITS THAT CHOOSE NOT TO DEVELOP DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES MUST FILE A STATEMENT SO STATING WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE WHICH SHALL SERVE AS THE OFFICIAL REPOSITORY FOR APPROVED UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES.

UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES, IF DESIRED, WILL BE DEVELOPED BY THE FACULTY IN A DISCIPLINE. AFTER APPROVAL BY A MAJORITY OF THE DISCIPLINE FACULTY, THE UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES WILL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE COGNIZANT DEAN WHO WILL FORWARD THE UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES TO THE PROVOST. THE PROVOST WILL REVIEW FOR CONSISTENCY WITH POLICY AND WILL FORWARD THESE STANDARDS AND INDICES TO THE SENATE FOR ITS AND THE CHANCELLOR'S APPROVAL.

UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES WILL BE REVIEWED PERIODICALLY BY THE FACULTY OF THE UNIT. REVISION OF UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES MUST FOLLOW THE ESTABLISHED REVIEW PROCESS. IF THE UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES ARE NOT REVISED, A STATEMENT OF REAFFIRMATION OF THE CURRENT UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES MUST BE FILED WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE, FOLLOWING THE REVIEW.

UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES, WHEN DEVELOPED BY THE FACULTY AND APPROVED BY THE SENATE AND THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE, MUST BE USED IN THE REVIEW PROCESSES BY ALL LEVELS OF REVIEW. THEIR USE IS NOT OPTIONAL.

IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CANDIDATE FOR TENURE OR PROMOTION TO INCLUDE THESE APPROVED STANDARDS AND INDICES IN THE APPLICATION FILE.

IV. EVALUATION PROCESS FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND POST TENURE REVIEW

- A. Linkage of Promotion/Tenure. An award of tenure is concurrent with promotion and vice versa. Any faculty member applying for promotion to the associate level must also apply for tenure; and a faculty member at the rank of assistant professor may not apply for tenure without concurrently seeking advancement to the rank of associate professor.
- B. Faculty with Academic Rank
1. Criteria and Eligibility. A record of continuing effective performance shall be expected. Procedures, performance criteria and requirements are set forth in the applicable union contracts, UAF Faculty Policies, and in policies of the Board of Regents and the regulations of the University system currently in effect and as they may change.
 2. Review Process. Promotion and tenure of a faculty member results from a multi-level process of evaluation beginning in the academic unit of the candidate.
 - a. Constitution and Operation of the University-wide Peer Review committees.
 - (1) For the purpose of evaluation for tenure and/or promotion of members of the United Academics bargaining unit, a list of the names of seven tenured unit members will be presented BY THE UAF FACULTY SENATE to the Provost who will select the committee or committees. Each unit peer review committee may nominate one of its members to serve. The list will be determined from those nominees by vote of all faculty who serve on unit peer review committees. Faculty shall remain on the list for a term of two years with the terms being staggered. No specific peer review committee can be represented by more than one person. A faculty member may not stand for promotion during the term of appointment to the list.
 - (2) For the purpose of pre or post tenure evaluation of members of the United Academics bargaining unit, a list of the names of seven faculty members will be presented BY THE UAF FACULTY SENATE to the Provost who will select the committee or committees. Each unit peer review committee may nominate one of its members to serve. The list will be determined from those nominees by vote of all faculty who serve on unit peer review committees. Faculty shall remain on the list for a term of two years with the terms being staggered. No more than one faculty member on the list can be a member of any specific peer review committee. A faculty member may not stand for post tenure review during the term of appointment to the list.
 - (3) For the purpose of evaluation for tenure and/or promotion of members of the ACCFT bargaining unit, a list of the names of

nine faculty members will be presented
BY THE CRA EXECUTIVE DEAN
to the Provost who will select the
committee or committees. The list will be
selected from the tenured faculty in the
ACCFT bargaining unit by vote of those
faculty. Faculty shall remain on the list for
a term of two years with the terms being
staggered. A faculty member may not
stand for promotion during the term
of appointment to the list. The Provost will
appoint two members from the United
Academics University-wide Promotion/
Tenure Committee to serve on the ACCFT
Promotion/Tenure Committee.