

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral
312 Signers' Hall
474-7964 FYSENAT

For Audioconferencing: Bridge #: 1-800-910-9710
Anchorage: 561-9710

A G E N D A
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #73
Monday, September 15, 1997
1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Wood Center Ballroom

1:30	I	Call to Order - John Craven	5 Min.
		A. Roll Call	
		B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #72	
		C. Adoption of Agenda	
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
		A. Motions Approved:	
		1. Motion to amend Section 3, (Article V: Committees, Standing) of the Bylaws.	
		2. Motion to establish a Statement of Professional Ethics.	
		3. Motion to amend the Transfer of Credit policy.	
		4. Motion to amend Section 3, (Article V: Committees, Permanent) of the Bylaws.	
		B. Motions Pending: none	
1:40	III	A. Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow	15 Min.
		B. Guest Speaker - Wendy Redman, Vice President for University Relations	15 Min.
2:10	IV	Governance Reports	
		A. ASUAF - S. Nuss	5 Min.
		B. Staff Council - P. Long	5 Min.
		C. President's Report - J. Craven (Attachment 73/1)	5 Min.
		D. President-Elect's Comments - M. Schatz (Attachment 73/2)	5 Min.
2:30	V	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:35		***BREAK***	5 Min.
2:40	VI	New Business	5 Min.
2:45	VII	Committee Reports & Discussion of known issue for this academic year	30 Min.
		A. Curricular Affairs - Jerry McBeath	
		B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - Ray Gavlak	
		C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - K. Nance	
		D. Core Review - J. Brown (Attachment 73/3)	
		E. Curriculum Review - J. French	
		F. Developmental Studies - Jane Weber (Attachment 73/4)	
		G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Barbara Alexander	
		H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - David Porter	
		I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - Susan Henrichs (Attachment 73/5)	
		J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - Scott Deal (Attachment 73/6)	
		K. Service Committee - Kara Nance	
		L. University-wide Promotion & Tenure - 1996-97 Annual Report	

- John Keller (Attachment 73/7)

3:15	VIII A.	Other Discussion Items Banner Faculty Workload Module - H. Nielson & G. Hedahl	5 Min.
3:20	IX	Members' Comments/Questions	5 Min.
3:25	X	Adjournment	

ATTACHMENT 73/1
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #73
 SEPTEMBER 15, 1997

Report by John Craven, Senate President

Here we go again! Since we last met the Board of Regents (BOR) has met twice, their Planning and Development Committee has met about four times, the Provost's Council met three times, and I attended one large meeting of the Governors Western University. I am far, far behind in providing useful summaries of what happened, but I will continue to try and catch up. I could not attend the first two meetings of the Provost's Council, but we now have our schedules aligned and you will have received copies of my informal notes from the meeting of August 20th. It is my intention to continue this practice that was started by an earlier senate president. The provost reads and comments on my notes before release, so they should provide a reasonably good summary of meetings. Summaries of BOR actions are published electronically after the meetings and the Governance Office sends copies to each senate member, so I do not plan to replicate those lists again. I will however make comments where I think appropriate. You should also know that full agendas and minutes of the BOR meetings are also being made available from their web page (<http://info.alaska.edu/ua/bor>), but a recent look suggests that they are not up to date.

The first item of interest is the completion and passage of the following new policies and regulations at the August meeting:

- 04.06.09.A Prohibition Against Discrimination
- 04.06.09.B Prohibition Against Sexual Harassment
- 04.06.09.C Consensual Sexual Relations
- 04.06.09.D Limitations of Liability

I urge you to read them, but it is the new section on consensual sexual relations that must be made clear to all faculty and staff. UA has written clear and unambiguous language with regard to consensual sexual relations between individuals in positions of authority and those in their charge; e.g., faculty and student, supervisor and worker. You are urged to review this material. It is my understanding that Statewide will distribute it widely.

You all know by now that the second of three possible RIPs is going forward. United Academics passed a resolution on 26 July 1997 asking the Board to establish a task force to look at the impact of the RIP on academic quality and other issues, and I reminded the BOR at their August meeting that the Constitutional obligation is theirs to have a vision for UA and to make certain it's carried out. My intention was not to question the abilities and objectives of the three chancellors, but the RIP is a management tool and in the middle of financial difficulties short cuts might look attractive. I urged the board to pause and look at how the RIP is progressing by November and make certain that elements of their vision are not lost by actions of the chancellors. This means, of course, that the board,

collectively, must have a vision for the university. I will not address that subject here. By the time you read this, there will have been a public meeting to collect faculty comments, and the final report to President Komisar is either completed or nearly so. I trust that the University's communications system got the message about the RIP Impact meeting to everyone before the meeting occurred.

With regard to the three meetings of the Planning and Development Committee, it was clear that it is President Komisar and his staff that will lead the Board through the difficult times. It has been clearly articulated by the Board and President Komisar that there are two issues: the year-to-year cuts by the Legislature (the short-term acute problem) and the problem based on the fact that yearly expenditures are about \$20M above current income (the long-term chronic problem). The Board must handle both at once, so short-term solutions may have unintended consequences on the long-term goals. How to do both with minimum harm is a great concern. The "high" point of the June meeting was centered around Vice President Creamer's financial analysis that suggests a greater cost savings can be gained by greater centralization of the administrative functions common to all MAUs and greater utilization of the geographic coincidence of the Fairbanks campus and the Statewide Offices, as opposed to letting the three MAU become wholly independent. The SAC (Statewide Academic Council, a.k.a. the MAU's academic officers) is also considering the designation of central focuses at each campus (e.g., sciences, mathematics and engineering at UAF and liberal arts at UAA). This certainly launched a blizzard of newspaper editorials, with Anchorage believing that UAF and Statewide were involved in a grand conspiracy against UAA. You may recognize the variation on this theme that is more common in Fairbanks. Clearly, the them-versus-us issue is one that will impede the Board's work. George Kaludis and two associates were present at the July meeting and walked the Board through ways of viewing their problem. The Board was assured that they were not alone, that others have had similar problems, some even worse, and that there is a way to reach the objective. This six-hour meeting was, to me, the most productive of the last three in laying out a broad view, and I think it rejuvenated some on the Board. Unfortunately, a motion at the end of the day intended to describe what happened over the six hours took much of the gloss off the day's otherwise bright outlook on a way to go. The meeting in August was largely saved from obscurity by President Komisar's draft document on the scope and role of the University and a schedule for the intermediate and long range planning activities, including the development of a Strategic Plan by June, 1999. President Komisar has also created five committees to address specific issues in the short term. They are:

- * SW Vice President Creamer - Administrative Savings: Transaction costs
- * Chancellor Wadlow - Administrative Savings: Redesign of the System Office (Recommendation of potential savings through changes in the role and mission of system office and campus administrative processes. Complete in November 1997. UAF members are Frank Williams and Mike Rice.)
- * Chancellor Gorsuch - Allocation Model (Development and recommendation of a resource allocation model for the University. Complete in April 1998. UAF members are Paul Reichardt and John Craven.)
- * Chancellor Lind - Extended Campuses (Development of a resource allocation model and academic program paradigm for the University's extended campuses. Complete in November 1997. UAF members are Ralph Gabrielli, Ruth Lister, Maynard Perkins, and a TBD member)
- * Statewide Academic Council and the UA Learning Cooperative - Instructional Equipment and Distance Education

(Recommendation on UA's investment in instructional equipment and organization of efforts in distance education. Complete in November 1997)

The objective is to complete much of this work by November so the Board will have a set of defined objectives with which to assure the Legislature that UA is being responsive to actual and rumored inefficiencies. This meeting was also distracted by a return to the old argument about whether or not UAF is the only Ph.D. granting MAU in Alaska. It is never a pretty sight.

The Western Governors University held a two-day meeting last week in Denver for representatives from each of the 16 pilot providers presently associated with the WGU by virtue of their \$100,000 entrance fee. The purpose of this meeting was to summarize for academic and corporate officers the present state of development in preparation for its opening next January and to seek critical comments on the program as it is currently envisioned. At the invitation of the President's office, I joined UA's formal representative at that meeting, Mr. Jim Stricks of the UALC and the UAF Center for Distance Education and Independent Learning. My role was as a faculty member peeking inside the developing organization. It is my intention to write a longer report in the near future. Meanwhile, several thoughts:

- * This is a bold experiment for which the Law of Unintended Consequences leaves us largely unable to speculate as to the outcome for higher education.
- * Even if the original concept fails, the WGU has broken new ground in several areas that will have a long-term impact on higher education; They include inter-regional accreditation and student financial aid.
- * The language of competency- and fee-based training and educational opportunity is new to traditional faculty, students, and administrators, but not to those working in industry. It will take time. The mixing of the two presents interesting challenges.

Moving to UAF issues, you are probably now aware that the Spring 1998 calendar has been altered to correct an error. The story is long, but the bottom line is that the Board of Regents believes that their will was subverted and they were in no mood for compromise. After one meeting with the UAF Coordinating Committee and a polling of committee members, the chancellor made a determination that the lost Monday classes on Civil Rights Day would be made up on a Saturday. Other options were to eliminate All Campus Day (students did not favor) or go against Senate policy on an open day between the last day of classes and the first day of classes. I thank the chancellor for her respect of existing senate policy. Sadly, I must admit that this was the first year I had ever attended the orientation activities for incoming students, so not having attended before I have no way of gauging the level of participation by students. However, my first impression was that faculty attendance was on the shy side during Sunday's "mass meeting" in the Auditorium. I have asked the Service Committee to review the activities (since the committee's chair was there) and to compile a list of "lessons learned" about faculty participation, including communications with the faculty prior to the orientation activities. I extend my personal congratulations to Carrie Dershin (student activities coordinator) and all the others who worked on the orientation activities. It is hard to reach back the several (!) decades since I was an incoming freshman elsewhere, but the students certainly seemed to be having a good time. From my own two experiences as a parent, these activities are not to be underrated. Well done, everyone. With regard to communications between the administration and faculty, I will be watching how the communications issue this year, and I ask your comments as the year

unfolds on what is working and what is not working.

Lastly, I do not want faculty members to believe that my position on governance and the bargaining unit is that the Senate is only concerned with academic issues and the bargaining unit is only concerned with issues of mandatory negotiation. Prof. Norm Swazo kindly reminded me several days ago that we have senate committees clearly given responsibility for certain issues that are now subjects of mandatory negotiation and that does not mean those committees cease to function. That is true. It is also true that I am much more familiar with issues at the curricular level and that I must depend on faculty members who are much more attuned to these other issues, and in particular those on the relevant committees, to bring them forward. This is certainly one reason why I was saddened by Prof. Swazo's abrupt departure from the Senate last year when he perceived that the Senate and he did not agree on an issue. Remaining in the Senate is a far more fruitful way to influence issues. Issues for mandatory negotiation certainly can be discussed here, but you must remember that members of the Senate are active, willing members of ACCFT or United Academics, or not, and each is or will be covered by different contracts, like them or not. Hence, motions related to a bargaining unit's issue can raise difficulties for other members of the Senate. Second, and more to my reason for not wanting to get involved in "union" issues is that I do not consider it wise to have Senate debates about issues of negotiations while the negotiations are going on. If I incorrect, I stand corrected. In either case, this Senate will accept comments and wishes for action by any faculty member on any subject.

ATTACHMENT 73/2
UAF FACULTY SENATE #73
SEPTEMBER 15, 1997

Report by Madeline Schatz, Senate President-Elect

The first semester of the new academic year is well underway and your governance representatives have been hard at work.

The Administrative Committee met only once, at the beginning of the summer, on May 18 to discuss prioritization of the FY 99 Budget Request Initiatives sent to us by Chancellor Wadlow. Not only were we given a voice in the prioritization of these requests to the Legislature, but we were also pleased that both the Staff Council and the ASUAF governance body agreed with our #1 priority request. The following list of priorities was sent to the UAF Governance Coordinating Committee:

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | Instructional Pool to address the needs of underserved students at UAF: | \$250.0 |
| 2. | Faculty and Staff development and training as well as the development of faculty and staff to support distance education: | \$250.0 |
| 3. | Outcomes Assessment and Excellence in Professional Programs | \$250.0 |
| 4. | Value-Added Alaska Fisheries Products | \$250.0 |

After being forwarded to the System Governance Council the number one priority was sent to Chancellor Wadlow who sent that request at the top of her list.

The list of continuing Faculty Senate issues which we will discuss today is a result of the September 5 Administrative

Committee meeting and the good work of the Chairs of the Senate Committees. We took the issues from the end-of-year committee reports, amplified or reduced the list, and added issues which had been submitted to us prior to the September 5 meeting. I thank the committee chairs for their fine work.

At our October 13 meeting I will be submitting motions for proposed changes to the Senate Constitution and Bylaws. If you have any suggestions for changes I would appreciate your input in addition to those which I will offer to the body on that date. Please get any proposed changes to me by the end of September.

It is an honor and privilege to serve you as this year's President-Elect. I am delighted that you have put your confidence in me and I will work very hard to learn my way around the workings of governance this year in order to be ready to serve you as President next year. This should be a very interesting year for all of us and I look forward to working with you.

ATTACHMENT 73/3
UAF FACULTY SENATE #73
SEPTEMBER 15, 1997
SUBMITTED BY CORE REVIEW

Core Review Committee Report - Jin Brown, Chair

The primary focus of this committee for the Fall will be to continue the process of planning the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation process for the University's Core Curriculum.

Substantial progress has been made in bringing the Communications area of the Core through the planning stage and into data collection. The Department of Communication has had a plan in place since Fall 1996 and has both collected data and processed the data to demonstrate outcomes at the BOR meeting in the Spring of 1997. The Department of English has established a plan for assessment and will be collecting data from classes this Fall.

Library Science has established a tentative plan for assessment.

At the end of the 1996-1997 academic year the remainder of classes in the Perspectives on the Human Condition area were brought together by this committee and set on a track to finish developing assessment plans by the end of Fall 1997. The Ethics group (Philosophy, Communication, Political Science, and Natural Resources Management) have a plan in place and will be collecting data this Fall.

The plan this year is to start early helping the Perspectives departments get assessment plans in place and beginning the process in the remainder of the Core departments.

In addition to assessment, the committee will continue its work at increasing the available upper division "W" and "O" classes for the general curriculum and continue assisting those classes already established as writing and oral classes in preparing for assessment.

The committee will also continue reviewing petitions to the Core and working at other assignments as they come our way.

ATTACHMENT 73/4
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #73
 SEPTEMBER 15, 1997
 SUBMITTED BY DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

Developmental Studies Committee Report - Jane Weber, Convener

The Developmental Studies Committee will continue to work on the following issues for the 1997-98 academic year.

1. Document student outcome from 100-200 level courses.
2. Outcomes Assessment for developmental courses.
3. Transition between developmental & academic courses.
4. Role of the Rural Campuses and developmental education.
5. Improving student placement into developmental (and academic) courses.

ATTACHMENT 73/5
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #73
 SEPTEMBER 15, 1997
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Graduate School Advisory Committee Report - Susan Henrichs, Chair

Issues for GSAC, beginning of 1997-98 Academic Year:

1. Graduate School statement on intellectual property rights of students. A draft statement exists which needs review by faculty and graduate students.
2. Counting of graduate students. Certain categories of graduate students, e.g., those registering only during summer, those enrolled in the TFA program, have not been counted in graduate enrollment figures. GSAC needs to follow up with Dr. Kan and the Registrar to ensure that all students are counted appropriately.
3. TA Training. GSAC needs to develop recommendations for TA training.
4. Graduate School funding for graduate students. The graduate school administers several types of graduate student support, e.g., Resource Fellowships, Thesis Completion Scholarships, Tuition Scholarships, Travel Grants. GSAC has been considering whether any changes in the administration of these funds should be made.

ATTACHMENT 73/6
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #73
 SEPTEMBER 15, 1997
 SUBMITTED BY LEGISLATIVE & FISCAL AFFAIRS

Legislative & Fiscal Affairs Committee Report - Scott Deal, Convener

The Legislative & Fiscal Affairs Committee -

There are several efforts that could be made this year to enhance the university's position with the Legislature. The first would be the strengthening of this committee, which currently stands at three members. A vital committee could then carry out a two-fold task of informing the faculty at large of impending issues and challenges on a timely basis, then identifying and implementing strategies of engagement with the legislature. At this time, the key to success is communication and understanding on both ends. An informed faculty is hopefully prepared to communicate with representatives and senators in time to make a difference. A House and Senate courted instead of embattled by faculty will hopefully find it easier to defend the university's position in the state.

There are formidable challenges ahead for the faculty of the UA system in dealing with the current Alaska State Legislature. Wendy Redmond and I met this week and discussed some of the issues concerning the university, as well as the direction this committee might possibly take in addressing those issues. Below is a synthesis of her thoughts, which she will present at the Faculty Senate meeting on September 15, 1997.

Current Issues in the Legislature -

State Funded Research: Some in the legislature will be looking into the productivity and dollar return through increased revenues and federal matching funds of money given to the UA system for research. Some research, such as fisheries, has a history of fiscal success, yet other areas do not and might possibly come under scrutiny.

Community College Separation: This is a possible issue in Anchorage, as the move to combine the university and community college has not been as successful as originally predicted.

Employment Needs in the State: Certain industries are citing a need for more employable individuals in the state, particularly in blue-collar jobs. This could cause an effort to reconfigure funds for job training, or leave the university open to the criticism of not being responsive to needs of the state.

Rural Education: A familiar issue, involving discussion over the validity of maintaining campuses and faculty in outlying areas.

Other issues are resource allocation, outcome analysis of UA graduates, and faculty compensation.

ATTACHMENT 73/7

UAF FACULTY SENATE #73

SEPTEMBER 15, 1997

SUBMITTED BY UNIVERSITY-WIDE PROMOTION & TENURE

UNIVERSITY-WIDE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE Annual Report, 1996-1997 Academic Year

I. Statistical Information

TENURE

The campus-wide P/T committee evaluated 19 files for tenure.
ONLY THREE FILES WERE SUBMITTED AT THE MANDATORY REVIEW

YEAR; two of these achieved final approval and one did not. Eighteen were concurrent candidates for promotion to associate professor, and one had previously attained the rank of associate professor. Seventeen files came to the committee with support from all levels. The P/T committee supported all 17 of these by unanimous votes. One file had split support at earlier levels, and by a 3 to 5 split vote the committee did not support this file for tenure. One file was not supported at any prior level and was not supported by the committee. Table 1 summarizes these data.

Table 1. Tenure Statistics (1996-1997)

Total number of files	19
Concurrent with promotion	18
Mandatory year	3
Supported by:	
Head, peer, Dir./Dean, P/T	17
Head, Dean	1
No support	1

PROMOTION

The campus-wide P/T committee evaluated 11 candidates for promotion, not including the 18 who were candidates for concurrent tenure. One was candidate for promotion to research associate professor in GI, one was a candidate for promotion to research professor in GI, and 9 were candidates for promotion to professor. Of the 11 files, 5 were supported at all levels of review including the P/T committee, and one was supported by all except the department head. Five files were not supported by the P/T committee. Two of these were unanimous at lower levels (both 8 to 0 against in P/T), two were supported by the department head only (one 8 to 0, one 5 to 3 against in P/T), and one was supported by Head and Dean (5 to 3 against in P/T). Table 2 summarizes these data.

Table 2. Promotion statistics (1996-1997)

Concurrent with tenure (see above)	18
To research associate professor	1
To research professor	1
To professor	9
Supported by:	
Head, peer, dean, P/T	5
Peer, Dean, P/T	1
Head, Dean	1
Head	2
None	2

PROVOST/CHANCELLOR ACTION

The Chancellor awarded tenure (one file) and promotion (3 files) in several cases where the university-wide promotion and tenure committee made negative recommendations. In one promotion case the committee voted to deny promotion by 8 to 0 vote in agreement with the Peer committee and Dean. In the other cases, the committee voted 5 to 3 against tenure or promotion, with various splits at previous levels. Table 3 summarizes the outcomes of these cases.

Table 3. Cases in which the Chancellor (and Provost) and P/T committee reached opposite conclusions on promotion files (1996-1997).

P/T Committee vote	Chanc & Provost	Chanc & Provost agreed with
Tenure		
No (5 to 3)	Yes	Head, dean
Promotion		
No (5 to 3)	Yes	Head
No (8 to 0)	Yes	Head
No (5 to 3)	Yes	Head and dean

Statistics from the previous six years, showing the cases in which the Chancellor's decision differed from that of the P/T committee, are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Cases in which the Chancellor and P/T Committee reached opposite conclusions (1991-1996). Data taken from annual reports of the University-Wide P/T Committee.

Academic year	P/T Committee	Chancellor	No. cases
1990-1991	split	yes	1
	Unanimous yes	no	2
	Unanimous no	yes	2
1991-1992	split	no	1
	Unanimous yes	no	1
	Unanimous no	yes	2
1992-1993	split (maj. neg.)	yes	1
	Unanimous no	yes	1
1993-1994	split (maj. neg.)	yes	1
	split (maj. pos.)	no	1
1994-1995	Unanimous no	yes	1
	split (maj. neg.)	yes	1
	split (maj. pos.)	no	2
1995-1996	split (maj. neg.)	yes	1
	split (maj. pos.)	no	1

II. Other Results, Comments, and Recommendations

1. Non-SET teaching evaluation. During annual reviews, candidates and academic mentors are strongly urged to document candidates' teaching accomplishments with additional tools besides SET's. This may be in-class evaluations, reviews of teaching materials, videos of teaching activities, or similar items. In each case, a written evaluation should be included in the annual report.

2. Publication information in candidate files. Candidate files are much enhanced by publication lists that include the complete bibliographic information for each publication. Also, it is desirable to include a commentary for each publication that describes the role of the candidate in preparing the manuscript (if it is a multi-author paper), the type and quality of the journal, the editorial review policy of the journal, the citation record for the article, if it is known, and other details that will help reviewers at all levels

appreciate the publication.

3. Evaluation of research. The report from the peer committee should include an in-depth analysis that reflects the expertise of the committee members in the discipline or disciplines related to the candidate's discipline, especially regarding evaluation of specific items in the candidate's list of publications. For instance, any available data concerning literature citations to the articles, or data concerning the impact factor of the journal the article is published in, should be included in the report. If such data do not exist within a certain discipline, then anecdotal evidence about the type of publication and its quality should be adduced.

4. School of Management. Candidates and peer committees at the University of Alaska Fairbanks are advised to consult with their colleagues in the UAF School of Management concerning preparation and analysis of tenure and promotion files. SOM thoroughly documents and analyzes faculty productivity in a manner that should be emulated throughout the University.

5. A copy of this report should be included in information packets sent out to tenure and promotion candidates.

6. 1997-1998 university-wide promotion and tenure committee chair. T. Harikumar was elected chair of the committee for the next year.

7. Faculty Senate Motion to change P/T representation. The committee proposed an amendment to the regulations concerning the makeup of the committee. Briefly, the regulation (IV.B.3.d.) was changed from "one representative per school or college" to twelve as enumerated in the motion. Passed. Approved by Chancellor.

8. Faculty Senate Motion to add a regulation regarding access to P/T files. The added paragraph (IV.B.2.par 5) restricts access to the candidate, the candidates approved representative, the appropriate personnel at each review level included designated staff. Passed as amended on the floor. Approved by Chancellor.

III. Committee members and alternates

	1996-1997	
Members		Alternate
Walter Benesch (CLA)		Kes Woodward
Larry Bennett (SOE)		Deben Das
T. Harikumar (SOM)		Kelley Pace
Scott Huang (SME)		vacant
Meriam Karlsson (SALRM)		Stephen Dofing
John Keller (CNS)		John Morack
William Parrett (SOEd)		Dauna Browne
Brian Paust (SFOS)		Dolly Garza
Sheryl Stanek (ACE)		Don Quarberg
vacant (CRA)		

	1997-1998	
Members		Alternate*
Marvin Falk (CLA/SS.)		
Kes Woodward (CLA/Hum.)		
Vacant (CLA/Ed)		Dauna Browne
Deben Das (CSEM/Eng.)		
Erick Follmann (CSEM/Sci.)		Larry Duffly
John Gimbel (CSEM/Math)		

Harikumar Sankaran (SOM)
 V. Kamath (SME)
 Meriam Karlsson (SALRM)
 Brian Paust (SFOS)
 Sheryl Stanek (ACE)
 Arvid Weflen (CRA)

Robert Logan
 Gang Chen
 Stephen Dofing
 Dolly Garza
 Tom Jahns
 Mike McGowan

*Alternates will be elected Fall 1997.

IV. Committee operating rules, 1996-1997

UAF University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Committee Operating Rules and Procedures, 1996-97

1. The role of this committee is described in a UAF Faculty Senate resolution passed at Meeting #15 on December 8, 1989, from which the following is excerpted:

Therefore be it resolved, That the primary focus of the University-Wide Promotion & Tenure Committee is to: 1) add a recommendation to the file of the candidate where the conclusions of the unit peer review committee do not coincide with the candidate's administrative supervisors (department head, institute director, and/or dean); and 2) review promotion and tenure files to assure that University-wide standards are met, using unit standards and indices as the major benchmarks for review.

2. Committee members are expected to read each file for promotion and tenure and be prepared to discuss each file at a meeting of the full committee. Access to the files is provided during working hours in 315 Signer's Hall. Members requiring evening access may arrange to check out a key from Sheri Layral in the Governance Office, phone 7964.

3. A schedule will be established for discussion of candidate files. The schedule will consider availability of peer review committee presenters and Promotion & Tenure Committee members. The candidates will be notified of the times for consideration of their file, and each may request an open meeting by contacting the Governance Office. The candidate and members of the audience may not participate in the committee discussion of the file unless requested by the Promotion & Tenure Committee chair.

4. Committee members are responsible for assuring their official alternates will attend meetings in their absence, and the committee chair and Governance Office is notified. The alternate assumes all the member's responsibilities with regard to reading files, discussion, and voting.

5. The normal time to consider a candidate will be 30 minutes. Committee members may request additional time. Only materials included in the file, including valid and official minority reports included per peer review committee rules, will be considered.

6. The peer review committee chair or chair's designee will be invited to give a short (5-10 minute) introduction of the candidate's file, to respond to questions, and to participate in the discussion. The peer chair or designee will not vote. Prior to the straw poll he or she will be excused and will not be informed of the results.

7. Each member of the committee will then be called on to evaluate the file, beginning with the representative of the candidate's school or college. It is the responsibility of each member to give an independent opinion of the qualifications of each

candidate in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and public and university service. Tenure and associate professor candidates must demonstrate continuing effective performance in their discipline.

8. To minimize time spent on files which have unanimous support at previous levels of review, the Promotion & Tenure Committee may, at its discretion, do an initial straw vote before discussion, but after the presentation of the peer committee chair or designee, based upon the presentation and reading of the files.

9. Only committee members present will vote. No absentee voting will be permitted. However, if a member of the committee is absent, the alternate is permitted to vote unless the alternate has considered the candidate at another level.

10. The committee will record a secret straw vote after each evaluation and discussion. Each committee member will indicate "yes" or "no," as well as rating performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service using a scale of excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The rating in each category is by majority vote or average vote. This rating will be indicated in the letters which will be provided to each candidate. A straw vote may be changed at the final voting in open meeting.

11. The "yes" and "no" results of the straw vote will be announced to the candidate if he/she is present at an open meeting. Open meetings will then end, and the straw vote results, both "yes/no" and ratings, are announced to the committee.

12. The first files to be considered will be candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. When all candidates, have been reviewed, an open meeting will be held to record the final voting. The final vote is by voice vote and will be recorded.

13. A letter will be written for each candidate's file to summary the committee's positive or negative recommendation. The committee chair will assign letters to committee members. It is the responsibility of each committee member to compose a draft letter and submit it to each member for corrections and comments. Because of the short time available, the letters will be drafted as soon as possible after the candidate's file has been reviewed. The letter, along with the record of the vote of each committee member, will be included with the file when it is forwarded to the Office of the Provost

14. After the files for tenure and promotion to associate professor are completed, the committee will consider in the same way the files for full professor. Full professor candidates must demonstrate sustained excellence and recognized leadership in their discipline to qualify for promotion, and must receive a majority rating of very good or better in each of the faculty tripartite (or bipartite) areas of activity.

15. After all files have been reviewed and the voting and letters completed, the committee will submit to the Faculty Senate a report of recommendations and comments related to the process, to help subsequent committees in their deliberations. A chair for next year will be elected.