

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral
312 Signers' Hall
474-7964 FYSENAT

For Audioconferencing: Bridge #: 1-877-751-8040
(Passcode: 523297)
Fairbanks: 474-8050
(Chair's Passcode: 628337)

A G E N D A
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #96
Monday, September 25, 2000
1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Wood Center Ballroom

- | | | | |
|------|-----|---|---------|
| 1:30 | I | Call to Order - Larry Duffy | 5 Min. |
| | | A. Roll Call | |
| | | B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #95 | |
| | | C. Adoption of Agenda | |
| 1:35 | II | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions | 5 Min. |
| | | A. Motions Approved: | |
| | | 1. Motion to amend the Graduate Degree Requirements. | |
| | | 2. Motion to amend the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies & Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty. | |
| | | 3. Motion to approve the deletion of the B.A. & B.S. in Physical Education & Exercise Science. | |
| | | 4. Motion to amend the policy on Minors available for the B.A. degree. | |
| | | 5. Motion to amend Article V: Committees, of the Bylaws. | |
| | | 6. Motion to approve the Certificate and AAS degree concentration in Emergency Medical Services. | |
| | | B. Motions Pending: none | |
| 1:40 | III | A. Remarks by Provost P. Reichardt | 10 Min. |
| | | Summary Report of 1999/2000 Faculty Reviews (Attachment 96/1) | |
| | | C. Guest Speaker - Ted DeLaca, Director Office of Arctic Research (Attachment 96/2) | 15 Min. |
| 2:05 | IV | Governance Reports | |
| | | A. ASUAF -S. Banks / GSO - | 5 Min. |
| | | B. Staff Council - S. Culbertson | 5 Min. |
| | | C. President's Report - L. Duffy (Attachment 96/3) | 5 Min. |
| 2:20 | V. | Consent Agenda | |
| | | A. Motion to withdraw the motion to amend the Faculty Senate Constitution (Attachment 96/4), submitted by Faculty Affairs | |
| 2:20 | VI | New Business | |
| | | A. Motion on Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions (Attachment 96/5), Faculty Appeals & Oversight | 5 Min. |
| | | B. Motion to amend the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies & Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty (Attachment 96/6), Faculty Appeals & Oversight | 5 Min. |

2:30	VI	Committee Reports	20 Min.
	A.	Curricular Affairs - R. Illingworth (Attachment 96/7)	
	B.	Faculty Affairs - P. McRoy (Attachment 96/8)	
	C.	Core Review - J. Brown	
	D.	Curriculum Review - S. Bandopadhyay	
	E.	Developmental Studies - J. Weber (Attachment 96/9)	
	F.	Faculty Appeals & Oversight - G. Chukwu (Attachment 96/10)	
	G.	Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - T. Robinson (Attachment 96/11)	
	H.	Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee - J. Gardner (Attachment 96/12)	
2:50		***BREAK***	10 Min
3:00	VII	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
3:05	VIII	Discussion Items	20 Min.
	A.	Evaluation Process for Administrators (Attachment 96/13)	
3:25	IX	Members' Comments/Questions	5 Min.
3:30	X	Adjournment	

ATTACHMENT 96/1
UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
SEPTEMBER 25, 2000

SUMMARY REPORT OF 1999/2000 FACULTY REVIEWS
Paul Reichardt

Promotion/Tenure and Tenure Only

13 files; 10-yes, 1-no, 2-withdrawn
9 yes at all stages of review
1 no at all stages of review
1 yes from peer committee and Chancellor only (additional
documentation added to this file by candidate after review by Provost)

Promotion

19 files; 17yes, 2-no
8 yes at all stages of review
2 no at all stages of review
2 yes by all but peer committee
2 yes by all but campus committee and Provost
4 yes by all but campus committee
1 yes by all but Dean

Post-Tenure

69 files; 68-"S" or above, 1-"U"
68 "S" or above at all stages of review
1 "U" by Provost and Chancellor

Only one faculty member was judged to have an unsatisfactory performance. However, many files contained recommendations, suggestions and observations aimed at improvement of performance.

Pre-Tenure

6 files; 5-"S" or above, 1-"U"
 5 "S" or above at all stages of review
 1 "U" by campus committee, Provost and Chancellor

Overall, 107 files were submitted for review. Two were withdrawn. Of the 105 which went through the entire review process, 93 received the same recommendation (positive = 90; negative = 3) at each stage of review. There were 8 cases in which the Chancellor's decision did not follow the campuswide committee's recommendation. One of these was a post-tenure review case in which the campuswide committee had voted "3-S, 2-U" and the peer committee had voted "2-S, 2-U, 1-A." In one promotion-tenure case, the applicant added substantive information to the file after it had been reviewed by the Provost. In all other cases in which the Chancellor's decision did not follow the campuswide committee's recommendation, the Chancellor's decision was consistent with the recommendations made at two or more levels of review. In no case except the post-tenure review described above was the Chancellor's decision inconsistent with both levels of faculty recommendations.

Overall, there were significant changes in the nature of the post-tenure review recommendations from those of the previous year. Recommendations at all levels were more focused on actual recommendations, comments and suggestions than those of 1998-1999. While this was particularly true at the unit peer committee level, there still were some unit reviews which focused almost entirely on "the vote." However, it does appear that UAF has made considerable progress toward turning this exercise into a useful method for providing both praise and constructive criticism for tenured faculty members.

The pre-tenure comprehensive review process appears to be working very well. Both peer committees and administrators did very thorough and conscientious jobs of advising untenured faculty on their progress toward tenure.

 ATTACHMENT 96/2
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
 SEPTEMBER 25, 2000

MEMORANDUM

DATE : 23 June 2000

TO : Chancellor Lind
 Provost Reichardt

FROM : Ted DeLaca, Director Office of Arctic Research (OAR)

RE : Reorganization of OAR to create UAF's Office of Sponsored Programs

The attached memoranda and other explanatory materials describe my proposal to reorganize the Office of Arctic Research (org chart 1) to provide a higher level of service to the UAF campus and the UA System. The new office should be called the Office of Sponsored Programs (org chart 2). The proposed tasks and duties are consistent with those published by many other universities of similar sizes and missions. Unfortunately, there is some negative inertia within UAF that must be overcome before I can fully realize the full cooperation with other elements of UAF proposed herein. If this proposal is accepted, I expect full implementation within two years (2002), with substantial improvements in service by the end of the first year (2001). While I will

present these plans to the Deans and Directors, per Paul Reichardt's request, I feel that it is appropriate to present the plans to both of you first to get your agreement for me to seek their endorsement. With your agreement, I must immediately hire a replacement for the Ann Trent position as a "Proposal Development Specialist" to maintain services to UAF.

Many circumstances have changed since a former (fledgling) UAF Office of Sponsored Programs was dissolved and the OAR was created by then Chancellor Wadlow. This proposal is driven by several factors including the following needs:

- _ Coherent management of pre-award administration across UAF;
- _ Consolidation and improvement of information access and internal and external communications;
- _ Enhancement of proposal development for the campus;
- _ UAF point of contact to coordinate EPSCoR related developmental activities.
- _ Development of an electronic grants administration capability;
- _ Development of a Research Integrity Office for UAF; and,
- _ Creation of a Campus-wide Facility for Advanced Instrumentation and the evolution of ADVAL into a support component of the developing data and teaching center for remote sensing. Both of these last items will be done in coordination with CSEM.

PROPOSED CHANGES: (SEE ATTACHED TASKS AND DUTIES AND POSITION DESCRIPTIONS.)

1. Hire Diane McLean as Deputy Director OSP at 1/3 rd time. In addition to allowing expansion of office responsibilities, McLean will provide essential supervision of proposal development during periods of times when the director is on business travel or leave.
2. Hire a new secretary. That position will be hired at a low (72-73) level. The position will deal with many of the phone and correspondence requirements and also perform data entry. The position will primarily report to the Deputy Director, but also share some responsibilities with the Assistant to the Director.
3. Dissolve the Proposal Office. Positions in the former Proposal Office will become "Proposal Development Specialists" under the direct supervision of the Director and Deputy Director of OSP. There will be four such positions including the 1) Chris Baker and 2) Ann Trent positions. Ann Secrest will be the third proposal development specialist for private and corporate foundations and will hold the title of "Associate Director" in recognition of her foundation development activities.
4. Hire a fourth Proposal Development Specialist. This additional position would be advertised mid-year, after the office is established and the second development specialist (Ann Trent position) is in place. This fourth position will be advertised at a lower level or 73 or 74.
5. Eliminate the proposal information coordinator position (the Ann Trent position). Most of the efforts related to those duties have been removed by the services of the "Community of Science" (COS) and Institutional Research Information System (IRIS) programs that UA and UAF presently subscribes to. The coordination and information distribution functions as well as creation of our UAF News Page and Alert Services will be provided by the Assistant to the Director (a position currently filled by Mary Floyd).
6. Create a UAF Research Integrity Office (RIO) (see attached memorandum). The RIO will coordinate existing efforts related to: radiation safety, animal care and use, human subjects, hazardous materials, physical plant safety, and related personnel management

through a standing committee and will provide federally required information and education and certification related to misconduct in science. The UAF RIO will coordinate institutional responses related to allegations of misconduct in science.

_ It is proposed that that committee be named the UAF Research Integrity Committee. It will be chaired by the UAF Research Integrity Officer (also director of OSP) be supported within a newly coined Research Integrity Office (a sub-element of the OSP). The committee will meet monthly.

_ I am also proposing a new standing committee consisting of three professorial level faculty and chaired by the UAF Research Integrity Officer. The committee will be prepared to deal rapidly and effectively with any allegations of misconduct related to UAF faculty, staff or students. That committee should be named the UAF Research Ethics Committee. That committee will meet as needed but at least once a year to review its charge and any changes in Federal regulations. I believe this proposed change is necessary, if not required, by existing and pending Federal regulations.

7. Further develop and expand the Advanced Instrumentation Laboratory (AIL). A separate memo will follow this proposal to detail the creation of a UAF facility for advanced instrumentation (AIL) to serve the needs of the campus. The AIL will be a recharge center distributed across the campus but centered within CSEM. It will focus on providing high quality service for research and educational missions of UAF in a cost-effective manner. AIL will initially be a collaborative effort between OSP and CSEM with other UAF entities drawn in over time.

8. Redirect the mission of the ADVAL. While the original mission of ADVAL, which was to provide GIS and visualization capabilities to the Bonanza Creek LTER and to faculty and students across campus, has served a valuable service to the campus, it is beginning to outlive its usefulness. Shari George and I agree that it is time to reconsider its mission. I propose that a merger be made between CSEM (Woodall/Sharpton) and OSP to create a new research and teaching element related to remotely-sensed data using the newly acquired remote-sensing teaching laboratory, obtained with end-of-year funds (~\$130K including a 50% industrial match), and the new MODIS down link (~\$500K federal to OAR) be merged with ADVAL to provide service to UAF.

ATTACHMENT 96/3
UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
SEPTEMBER 25, 2000

President's Comments - Larry Dufffy

Welcome back for the start of the academic year. I want to thank all of you for the help last summer with working on various aspects of the reaccreditation process. Ron Gatterdam is directing the process in that we will have a first draft by mid-October. Also, the new UAF 2005 Strategic Plan Draft will be coming out shortly for your comment.

I want to call your attention to the draft UA Mission Statement and University Values that the Board of Regents are considering. This is important in line with the UA initiative process. Over the last two years the process has evolved and both UA and UAF administrators have been responsive to our calls for more faculty input on these initiatives. Work with your colleagues and departments to submit proposals. Remember your departmental activity is the basis of faculty governance.

The Alliance, through the academic liaison faculty fellow is providing faculty input to the provosts and others on issues such as the timeline for FY03 initiatives. Regarding program initiatives, at least one Alliance member is part of a program initiative advisory group.

Richard Hacker was selected by the president as the first annual academic liaison faculty fellow to work with the Alliance and provide faculty input to the president. Hacker has been on the faculty of UAS for many years, heading up the paralegal studies program among others. Hacker has served as president of the old UA General Assembly, the precursor of the present system governance system and is very familiar with the concepts and linkages between faculty governance, administration and the Board of Regents. The Alliance recommended the establishment of this position and participates in the recruitment and recommendation of candidates to the president for this position.

UAA Faculty Senate and UAS Faculty Council are reviewing the mission and values statements and I intend to provide that input directly to the Board of Regents in October. The Alliance has Ron Gatterdam working with university legal counsel and others on the Information Resources regulation language to protect, to the extent possible, privacy, academic freedom and research.

Lastly at the end of this meeting, we will discuss the review process for the evaluation of administrators. Please read this carefully, you will be finalizing about 10 years of faculty effort on this issue. I believe this issue is an excellent one for beginning this century of UAF faculty governance.

Board of Regents

DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT
and
VALUE STATEMENTS
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SYSTEM

At its June 9, 2000 meeting, the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Regents crafted the following draft mission statement and value statements for the University of Alaska System. The board now requests public input from its constituents. Comments can be sent to: Board of Regents' Office, University of Alaska, PO Box 755300, Fairbanks, AK 99775; call (907) 474-7908; e-mail SYBOR@ALASKA.EDU; or fax (907) 474-6342.

The Board of Regents will take official action on the mission statement and value statements at its meeting on October 5-6, 2000. Please submit your comments and suggestions by September 15, 2000.

DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT

"The University of Alaska, with its Land, Sea, and Space Grant institutions and international research centers, inspires learning, advances and disseminates knowledge through teaching, research, and public service, emphasizing the North and her diverse peoples."

DRAFT VALUE STATEMENTS

The University of Alaska values:

- Excellence in our programs and services;
- Leadership for Alaska's people and institutions;
- Accountability to our students, faculty, staff, and the citizens of

Alaska;

- Stewardship of our resources;
- Diversity in our response to the cultures of Alaska;
- Unity in promoting communication and collaboration;
- Accessibility for all Alaskans.

ATTACHMENT 96/4
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
 SEPTEMBER 25, 2000
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY AFFAIRS

MOTION:
 =====

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.

ATTACHMENT 96/5
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
 SEPTEMBER 25, 2000

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

MOTION:

=====

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 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.

5. 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.

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 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.

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 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.

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

ATTACHMENT 96/6
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
 SEPTEMBER 25, 2000
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

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 revue 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.

ATTACHMENT 96/7
UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
SEPTEMBER 25, 2000
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Report

The Curricular Affairs committee held its first meeting on September 6, 2000 as an audioconference from 1100 to 1205. All but 3 members were in attendance or on the audioconference.

The committee agreed to the following meeting schedule:

27 September, 2000	1100-1200
11 October, 2000	1100-1200
25 October, 2000	1100-1200
8 November, 2000	1100-1200
22 November, 2000	1100-1200

All meetings will be audioconferenced as well as face to face as several members of the committee are from outside Fairbanks.

As there were several new members to the committee, introductions were made and the committee responsibilities were discussed.

The issue listing was presented and discussed and members were asked to identify other issues which may come to their attention and submit them for inclusion. Additionally, it was agreed that we would address the issues of prerequisites in the catalog and of removal of courses from the catalog as well as frequency of course offering information in the catalog at our next meeting 27 September, 2000.

Sukumar Bandopadhyay has agreed to chair the Curriculum Review committee. The chair of this committee must come from Curricular Affairs.

Wanda Martin from the Advising Center, submitted a Transfer Credit Equivalency request for the area of Certified Payroll Professional Examination. This was approved with minor cleanup of language.

The meeting was adjourned.

Issues for Curricular Affairs AY 2000-2001:

Distance Delivery

- 1) Policy on correspondence courses
- 2) Policy on seat time (1 cr = 800 min)
- 3) Course approval policies

Dual Enrollment Policy

Removal of Courses from Catalog

Modification of frequency of offering description in catalog

BAS Amendment

- 1) What is the BAS committee makeup

Four year schedule to be added to catalog

Policy re GPA determination for courses retaken

Double counting of courses issue

Course Equivalency decision

Flagging/tagging of prerequisites

1) Prerequisite validity

Transfer core acceptance: Associate level

ATTACHMENT 96/8

UAF FACULTY SENATE #96

SEPTEMBER 25, 2000

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY AFFAIRS

FACULTY AFFAIRS MEETING REPORT, SEPTEMBER 13, 2000 - C.P. McRoy,
Chair

Members Present: C.P. McRoy (chair), M. Davis, B. Mortensen, J. Weins

Visitors: C. Gold

New Business:

1) Sabbatical Leave Policy

Dr. Gold presented an exchange of email with M. Hostina concerning the interpretation of the sabbatical leave policy with respect to compensation. Apparently the wording in the CBA is identical to pre-existing Regents' policy but the interpretation of how a faculty member is compensated may be different. Faculty Affairs will examine this and include it as an agenda item (Weins).

2) Research Faculty

A motion concerning the membership of research faculty on the Faculty Senate was discussed. The motion had a first reading at the last Senate meeting in spring. The committee discussion raised several issues with the motion as presented and will study the issue (McRoy). A related issue concerns the promotion review process for research faculty.

3) Emeritus Procedure

In response to a request from Provost Reichardt at the last Administrative Committee meeting, Faculty Affairs will review the policy of nominations to emeritus status. Present policy requires only that three faculty members from any unit submit the nomination. Should the department/college/school be in the nomination queue?

4) Information Resources Regulation

The IR policy is currently in draft form for the Regents next meeting. R. Gatterdam is the point person for faculty comments. Faculty Affairs will review policy for possible comment.

Other business:

Faculty Affairs will meet this academic year on the 2nd Thursday of the month at 1500 hrs in the Runcorn Conference Room of Natural Sciences. Next meeting 12 October.

ATTACHMENT 96/9

UAF FACULTY SENATE #96

SEPTEMBER 25, 2000

SUBMITTED BY DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

Minutes of The Developmental Studies Committee
September 14, 2000, Chancellor's Conference Room

Attending: Barbara Adams, Patty Baldwin, John Bruder, Rich Carr, John

Creed, Marty Getz, Cindy Hardy, Marjie Illingworth, Ron Illingworth, Wanda Martin, Greg Owens, Jane Weber.

The committee discussed the following items:

Grading Systems for Developmental classes:

We began the year by reviewing those items of concern to the committee, which have carried over from last year. The first of these was a continuing discussion of grading systems, particularly the possibility of implementing an A/B/ No Pass system for Developmental classes.

The following concerns were raised:

1. How to implement a system of grading that indicates a student needs further work at that level but that does not affect GPA or financial aid eligibility?

Suggestions included having a statement in the catalogue listing "B or better" in the previous level as a prerequisite for the next level; having admissions print lists of those students in a class who don't meet this prerequisite for faculty to have before class starts; and having a report sent to these students indicating they don't meet the prerequisite.

Marjie agreed to gather further ideas on this by e-mail from committee members and will bring them to the next meeting.

2. How to ensure accurate placement of students through effective testing and advising?

Suggestions included establishing more sites for COMPASS and requiring that students bring their scores the first day of class; developing an "in house" test in the manner of the Math 107 test; and requesting a block on admissions for students who try to register without appropriate test scores or advising.

Cindy agreed to contact the Admissions office to see if they could catch students needing DEV placement at that level-thus avoiding the need to put a block in BANNER.

Report from the Accreditation Subcommittee:

The Developmental Studies Accreditation Working Group is a working group established by the Accreditation Steering Committee and is a subcommittee of that group. Membership on the committee includes members of the DEV Studies Committee and the DEV Studies Division.

Ron reported that the committee has been waiting for data from Institutional Research. The initial data he received appears to be inaccurate and he is hoping for better data, including some on the demographics of our students. Initial reports show that the number of DEV sections has decreased from 48-33 and that we average around 900 students per semester. We offer 33 DEV classes at different levels: 3 levels in English, 7 in math, and 3 in developmental studies.

The subcommittee will meet to discuss reporting on the following issues: policies, needs of urban and rural students, placement, ratio of full time to part time faculty, and coordination between programs.

Math Tutoring Hotline:

Jane reported that the Math Tutoring Hotline is up and running, tutoring students in DEVM and Math 131 classes. This is funded by a CRA

Distance Delivery grant. We will look at the information at the end of the semester to determine if more tutors and more times are needed.

The next meeting of the committee will be Thursday, October 26, 1-2:30 in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

ATTACHMENT 96/10
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
 SEPTEMBER 25, 2000
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

Report of the first meeting of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight -
 Godwin Chukwu, Chair

Present: Godwin A. Chukwu, SME; Brian Himelbloom, SFOS/FITC; Ed Husted, CRA; Kristy Long, CRA/ACE; George Khazanov, CSEM; Joan Moessner, CLA

Absent: Oscar Kawagley, SOE; Mitch Roth, CSEM; Dennis Schall, SOED; Rick Steiner, SFOS-MAP

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The present committee consists of ten (10) positions representing the units. The following schools/colleges have vacant positions to be filled:

SOM (2)
 SALRM (2)
 SME (1)
 CLA (1)

Sheri Layral has notified the Deans of these schools/colleges to elect representatives to fill the positions.

Old Business

The committee re-visited three (3) major items that were referred from the Faculty Senate.

(a) Appeals policy for academic decisions (attachment).

The committee reviewed the draft policy with minor corrections. (7.2.c)

(b) Guidelines for the Evaluation Process for Administration. The committee deliberated on this submission and recommends the version (with minor amendment) attached to the agenda.

(c) UAF Faculty Appointment & Evaluation Policy

Committee recommends putting the unit criteria back into the Blue Book as is. The committee could not address the concerns of Ron Illingworth, that ACCFT members do not need unit criteria because they have wording in their contract because a copy of the contract was not available to the committee.

NEW BUSINESS

The committee was asked to recommend appeal procedure for candidates rejected to the graduate program. The committee has asked Sheri to invite James Gardner, Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee and Joe Kan, Dean of Graduate School to their October 12, 2000 meeting to share their views on this subject.

Joan Moessner was elected as the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee.

ATTACHMENT 96/11
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
 SEPTEMBER 25, 2000
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement Committee Meeting
 Report - E. Thomas Robinson, Chair

The Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement committee held its first meeting on September 14, 2000 as an audio-conference from 2:00 - 2:55 in the Wood Center conference room A. All known members were accounted for and in attendance unless experiencing a conflict. Special member and colleague Joy Morrison, Provost Associate for Faculty Development, also joined us for the first meeting of the semester.

All meetings will be audio-conference as three members are outside of Fairbanks (Bethel, Dillingham, and Palmer).

Introductions were made as the meeting was called to order by convener, E T Robinson. First order of business resulted in E. Tom Robinson being voted as chair. A meeting time was identified where all known members could attend, with the next meeting to be held at 11:30 - 12:30, Tuesday, September 26, 2000. The meeting will be held in the Chancellor's conference room.

Although an agenda was distributed in advance and followed, the main thrust of the meeting was very up beat as Joy Morrison identified what has been done and what is planned. Dr. Morrison, whose term runs from 2000 - 2002, will serve on the committee as the representative of the Office of Faculty Development. As was pointed out and applauded by all those in attendance, we as faculty and members of the UAF community thank the powers that be, for once again having such an office and look forward to interacting with Dr. Morrison. To the Provost, Chancellor, and all others responsible, the committee thanks you! For the record, check out the web site and activities:
http://www.uaf.edu/provost/faculty_development/

A number of items will be discussed at the next meeting including, but not limited to, speakers, instruction assessment surveys, the department chair's role in reviews, activity reports, fourth year reviews, post-tenure review. It should be noted that the committee welcomes and invites interested faculty to join the membership. Contact the governance office (7964) or chair, E T Robinson at 6526 or ffetr@uaf.edu.

ATTACHMENT 96/12
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
 SEPTEMBER 25, 2000
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE ACADEMIC & ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The newly formed Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Jim Gardner chairman) met for the first time on September 6, 2000.

A general outline of some of the duties of this year's committee were

discussed, as this committee is an amalgamation of the Graduate and Professional Curricular Affairs Committee and Graduate School Advisory Committee. The main order of business was the reintroduction of the proposal to create the M.A. in Cross-Cultural Studies. Joe Kan discussed the approval of the proposal by the Graduate School. After all committee members have had a chance to fully review the proposal, they will meet again to discuss the merits of the proposal. Final decision is expected in early October.

The issue of redefining the definition of graduate correspondence versus distance delivery courses was raised as an important issue that the committee needs to address in order to clarify the UAF catalog, and will be an agenda item for a future meeting of the committee.

No other items were on the agenda, and so the committee adjourned, to much rejoicing.

ATTACHMENT 96/13
UAF FACULTY SENATE #96
SEPTEMBER 25, 2000
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

1. The administrator's supervisor appoints an ad hoc evaluation committee consisting of five members drawn from both the faculty and staff pools. At least one committee member will be appointed from within the administrator's constituency.

The committee will secure input from all relevant constituencies on-and-off campus, faculty, staff and students.

2. The administrators to be evaluated prepare self evaluation of activities since the last evaluation or hire date.

The administrators should reflect on their perceived role as leaders of their unit/constituency, and comment on how they see themselves as having fulfilled that role.

This reflective summary should indicate where they believe the unit/constituency should be going over the next three years and some specific steps they see themselves taking to lead their unit/constituency to this goal.

3. The committee chair solicits comments relative to the administrator's performance from the faculty and staff, using a standard questionnaire which will be anonymously returned to the chair of the evaluation committee. The chair compiles and analyzes the results with the committee members.

4. A select sample of faculty, staff, students and other relative people will be interviewed by the committee regarding their opinions about the administrator's performance.

5. The administrator being reviewed will be interviewed by the committee and appropriate feedback will be provided to him/her relative to the information the committee may already have received.

6. The committee reviews all materials, prepares a summary of their findings, and submits findings to the Provost (in the case of Deans and Directors), or to the Chancellor (in the case of the Provost).

7. A. FOR DEANS AND DIRECTORS:

1) The committee will meet with the Provost and deliver their report as well as discuss their findings during the review process.

2) A copy of the committee findings will be made available to the faculty and staff in the units reviewed and others as requested from the Provost's Office.

B. FOR THE PROVOST:

1) The Provost and the Chancellor meet to discuss evaluation and performance priorities for the next review period.

(2) A summary that can be made public is prepared by the Chancellor.

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

1. WITHIN THE FIRST THREE WEEKS OF THE FALL SEMESTER THE SUPERVISOR OF THE ADMINISTRATOR TO BE REVIEWED WILL appoint an AD HOC ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE consisting of THREE faculty and TWO staff members FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR'S UNIT. ADDITIONALLY, TWO MEMBERS OF THE UAF FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE SHALL SERVE IN AN EX OFFICIO CAPACITY AS REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FACULTY SENATE. The AD HOC Committee will SOLICIT input from all relevant constituencies on- and off-campus, INCLUDING faculty, staff, and students. THIS MAY BE ACCOMPLISHED THROUGH VARIOUS INSTRUMENTS, E.G., A STANDARD QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED ANONYMOUSLY AND RETURNED TO THE COMMITTEE CHAIR.

2. The Administrator to be evaluated WILL prepare A NARRATIVE self-evaluation of activities PERFORMED DURING the three year PERIOD (ACADEMIC YEARS) PRIOR TO THE YEAR OF EVALUATION or since the last evaluation. THIS NARRATIVE SHOULD INCLUDE REFLECTIONS ABOUT HOW ADEQUATELY S/HE HAS FULFILLED RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERSHIP CONSISTENT WITH HIS/HER OWN PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS AND THOSE OF FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS IN THE UNIT. MAJOR OR OTHERWISE SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS SHOULD BE HIGHLIGHTED. ANY ISSUES RAISED IN THE LAST EVALUATION SHOULD BE REFERENCED WITH A VIEW TO WHAT PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE ON THOSE ITEMS. FINALLY, THE SELF-EVALUATION SHOULD IDENTIFY A LIMITED SET OF REASONABLE GOALS FOR THE UNIT OVER THE NEXT THREE YEARS, WITH SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT SPECIFIC STRATEGIES THAT MAY BE UNDERTAKEN THROUGH HIS/HER ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP.

3. THE AD HOC COMMITTEE WILL INTERVIEW A select sample of faculty, staff, students and otherS AS RELEVANT FOR FURTHER EVALUATIVE COMMENTS about the Administrator's performance.

4. The AD HOC COMMITTEE WILL INTERVIEW THE Administrator EITHER IN PERSON OR BY CONFERENCE CALL. THE INTERVIEW SHALL PROCEED ON THE BASIS OF A SELECTED SET OF QUESTIONS WHICH REFERENCE THE ADMINISTRATOR'S SELF-EVALUATION, THE RESULTS OF RETURNED QUESTIONNAIRES, AND THE INTERVIEWS OF FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS.

5. THE AD HOC Committee WILL prepare a summary of ITS findings, and submit ITS REPORT to the Provost (in THE case of EVALUATION OF Deans and Directors) or to the Chancellor (in THE case of EVALUATION OF the Provost). THE AD HOC COMMITTEE SHALL WORK AS EXPEDITIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE IN COMPLETING ITS REPORT AND SUBMIT IT

TO THE PROVOST OR CHANCELLOR BY MARCH 15 OF THE SPRING SEMESTER. THE REPORT SHALL BE SUBMITTED ALSO TO THE UAF FACULTY SENATE'S FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE FOR REVIEW.

(A) AT A DATE TO BE SET BY THE PROVOST, THE PROVOST SHALL MEET IN JOINT CONFERENCE WITH THE AD HOC COMMITTEE AND THE FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE FOR FINAL REVIEW, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND DISPOSITION OF THE ADMINISTRATOR'S EVALUATION. A COPY OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE'S REPORT WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE FACULTY AND STAFF OF THE ADMINISTRATOR'S UNIT UPON WRITTEN REQUEST TO THE PROVOST, WHO WILL, HOWEVER, HAVE DISCRETION TO WITHHOLD ELEMENTS OF THE REPORT, CONSISTENT WITH UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL POLICY GOVERNING CONFIDENTIALITY.

(B) AT A DATE TO BE SET BY THE CHANCELLOR, THE PROVOST AND THE CHANCELLOR SHALL MEET TO DISCUSS THE AD HOC COMMITTEE'S EVALUATION OF THE PROVOST. DURING THIS MEETING THE CHANCELLOR AND PROVOST SHALL IDENTIFY PERFORMANCE PRIORITIES FOR THE NEXT REVIEW PERIOD. THE CHANCELLOR SHALL MEET WITH IN JOINT CONFERENCE WITH THE AD HOC COMMITTEE AND THE UAF FACULTY SENATE'S FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO SUMMARIZE HIS FINDINGS. THE CHANCELLOR SHALL PREPARE AN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE PROVOST'S EVALUATION TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY UPON WRITTEN REQUEST TO THE OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR.

Revisions as suggested by Norm Swazo
21 April 2000