

MINUTES
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #79
 MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1998
 WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

I The meeting was called to order by President Craven at 1:30 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Allen, J.
 Bandopadhyay, S.
 Barnhardt, C.
 Basham, C.
 Boone, R.
 Bruder, J.
 Cooper, B.
 Corti, L.
 Craven, J.
 Curda, L.
 Deal, S.
 Dinstel, R.
 Fitts, A.
 French, J.
 Gatterdam, R.
 Gavlak, R.
 Johnson, T.
 Lando, C.
 Lin, C.
 McBeath, G.
 Mortensen, B.
 Nance, K.
 Nielsen, H.
 Perkins, M.
 Porter, D.
 Robinson, T.
 Ruess, D.
 Whalen, M.
 Weber, J.
 Wilson, B.
 Yarie, J.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Conti, E.
 Finney, B.
 Kramer, D.
 Maginnis, T.
 Schatz, M.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gregory, G.
 Illingworth, R.
 Juday, G.
 Keating, J.
 Knight, C.
 Layral, S.
 Lewis, C.
 Martin, W.
 McBeath, J.
 Sparrow, S.
 Wadlow, J.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Nuss, S. - President, ASUAF (M. Shields, S. Casey)
 Alexander, V. - Dean, SFOS
 Hedahl, G. - Dean, CLA
 Tremarello, A - University Registrar

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

Eichholz, M. - GSO
 Long, P. - President, UAFSC

B. The minutes to Meeting #78 (March 9, 1998) were approved as distributed via e-mail.

C. The agenda was approved as distributed via e-mail.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions approved:

1. Motion to approve a new policy on academic probation.
2. Motion to approve a new policy on academic disqualification.
3. Motion to adopt an interim promotion & tenure process for ACCFT faculty

associated with the UAF MAU.

B. Motions pending: none

III Comments from Chancellor Joan Wadlow -

Chancellor Wadlow spent a few minutes giving her sense of what might happen in the legislature. At this time, she believes that we can avoid a cut if we keep up the pressure on the legislators, both those of us from the interior and as well as from elsewhere in the state. This is based on two or three things. First, our supporters are very active. Most importantly, it is based on the sense that a number of community leaders have gained as a result of their meetings with legislators. For example, the Board of Trustees of the UA Foundation met in Juneau, and as part of that meeting a number of Fairbanks community leaders were there. In groups of two to four, they met with more than 40 legislators. The important message that they conveyed in a later debriefing was that the legislators were listening. The general sense from the group was that there would be no further cuts to the university's budget. This is optimistic, but if we keep up the pressure we can avoid the cut. Along with avoiding a cut we need to be sure there is new money available for salaries. It is extremely important for non-university employees to make their voice's heard. Friends and neighbors should be urged in the next few weeks to write, fax, or send Public Opinion Messages (POM) to their legislators.

After the group of volunteers assessed the Brooks Building and came up with their estimates of the cost of renovation, the Regents ask us to take a look at the what would be the likelihood and the desirability of having a bigger building. The volunteers came back on campus and did a walk around the campus central area and concluded that the foot print of the Brooks Building should remain the same. Changing it would destroy the view of the fountain area.

The chancellor then concluded with brief excerpts from four unsolicited letters. One was from a 1995 alumni expressing her support of the justice program. The second letter came from a student in New York who attend UAF last year for one semester. It expressed general support for the faculty at UAF. The third letter was from a rural student, and indicated UAF had talented professors who helped give her the tools to deal with everyday issues. Rather than being considered a burden to the state, those students pursuing their educational goals should be considered as much a resource to Alaska as salmon, oil, and timber. The last letter was from an undergraduate student who attended the AGU meeting last fall. He was funded as part of the undergraduate research program that the provost launched this year. The support he received, financially and academically, was remarkable. Other presenters and attendees were impressed. This kind of support spoke well for him and the university. The chancellor indicated that this is the type of testimony which makes it possible for UAF to get private funding to support the undergraduate research program next year. UAF recently received an anonymous donation of \$20,000 which will enable UAF to continue the program.

John Bruder asked about funding for the negotiated union salaries. Chancellor Wadlow indicate that the university has requested this increase as a separate funding item. McBeath indicated there were two requests--one for this year and one for next year. These are additional requests.

Comments from Provost John Keating -

The provost also announced the anonymous donation of \$20,000. This year UAF started the undergraduate competition with \$25,000 from the one-time only deferred maintenance money. Eighteen undergraduate research projects were funded.

The first return of faculty positions for the RIP has been announced. We are trying to get a sense of the funding for next year. The intent was to fund/release only 25% of the RIP savings for the first go around. As funding becomes clearer an additional percentage would be released. The provost has received 44 proposals for positions.

The School of Education met with representations of the State Board of Education and were visited by an outside review panel. The outside NASDTEC review recommended that the school be granted the right to recommend certification. The Board of Education considered this and gave the School of Education an 18 month renewal of their ability to grant accreditation. After returning in six months to talk about their progress, they will grant an additional six months. The reason for the two years is that the three schools of education will come together and in two years apply for one broad accreditation. We are pleased that the state board recognized the quality of the education program.

Faculty are busy with the new union-negotiated way to develop workload presentations, which first go to department chairs and then to the deans. The provost will send out a standard form that talks about teaching, research and service and defines what each of those are. He asks that faculty use the forms when submitting them to department chairs in order to get consistency across the various units.

Jerry McBeath asked about the performance adjustment process. Keating indicated that each of the schools and colleges will have the faculty recommend the process for approval by the deans and/or directors. John French indicated that the contract reads that it shall be a faculty-driven process similar to the previous Regents' policy. It is suppose to be a faculty-originated and faculty-driven process. The faculty could adopt the same process as last year. John French would be happy to meet with any group as a union representative.

IV Governance Reports

A. ASUAF -

Matt Shields and Shawn Casey attended for Jean Richardson. They thanked faculty for their support on the April 1st rally. ASUAF just received a resolution from UAA student governance supporting Con Bunde's HB 302. They have also contacted UAS about this issue. Senator Gary Wilken indicates they are supporting flat funding for the university. Matt Shields indicated that the HESS committee will have a teleconference hearing on HB 302; you can participate from the local Legislative Information Office.

Jean Richardson was elected as president of ASUAF for next year.

B. Staff Council - P. Long

No report was available.

C. President's Comments - J. Craven

The president's comments were included in the agenda. In addition, John indicated that the Senate received the draft 1999-2000 academic calendar and this will be handled by the Administrative Committee, with recommendations and will then be made to the Governance Coordinating Committee. Draft copies of the RIP replacements in progress and information on faculty participating in RIP 1 and 2 were distributed as handouts. John asked for assistance in correcting the list. A discussion on the latest status of the RIP will take place under discussion items. Questions for the Senate: Does the Senate have a vision for UAF and does the Senate wish to have the Senate/Union relations committee formulate suggests on how the existing committees can carry out defined tasks in the union contract (e.g., appeal board and MAU peer review board for promotion/tenure)? This committee can address these questions and make recommendations to the Senate. The third item is that Representative John Davies will be at UAF on Friday, April 10th from noon to 2:00 p.m. for an open forum discussion with faculty, staff and students.

D. President-Elect's Comments - M. Schatz

Madeline's report was attached to the agenda. She was not in attendance.

V Public Comments/Questions - none

Glenn Juday indicated that a group of SALRM faculty met to proceed with the implementation of their workload requirements. During this discussion it occurred to them that we are in a natural transition point in the leadership of this university with the departure of a number of administrators. We have an unimplemented mandate for the evaluation of administrators. It occurred to them that it might be appropriate to have a committee to evaluate the chancellor. If it is positive this could reaffirm the leadership we wish to have for this university. If it is negative then we can proceed with identifying the leadership we believe would be best for the university. Adopting the framework of how we wish to be evaluated, the best case would be to identify the accomplishments of the chancellor over her term, that the plans and priorities that she identifies be put forward, and then the faculty evaluates how that relates to the overall situation at UAF. Steve Sparrow also gave his support for what Glenn presented. One reason is that there is increasing emphasis on accountability of faculty. The Faculty Senate has a mechanism for faculty-driven evaluation of UAF administrators. With the appointment of the provost and other reorganization within UAF some years ago, the chancellor's job has changed considerably. There is currently no mechanism with which to formally measure accountability or to evaluate the person holding the position of chancellor.

Keating indicated that there was no mechanism to do this and it would be an extraordinary call of the Senate at this time. There is a mechanism to review deans and directors and the provost, but not for chancellor. We have used the mechanism to review deans and directors on a timely schedule. The chancellor does serve at the will of the president of the Board of Regents. When we have done the deans/directors review we have been very careful to review the functions of the office. Is this office functioning as opposed to the personality functioning in that office. Keating believes that if this is done at this particular time it would not be a positive message.

Glenn Juday understands that the Board of Regents is the final authority for the university and to put it directly to the Senate

what he is suggesting is that this would be individual input. If the Board of Regents and the president wished to continue with an incumbent who has received from the faculty a statement of either strong affirmation or disapproval, then it is their choice.. This is a logical and reasonable expectation. What does the faculty think about the situation, especially as it relates to effective leadership. Glenn makes no recommendation on the timing of this request.

John Craven indicated that it would be appropriate to send this topic to the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

VI Old Business

A. Motion prohibiting faculty from receiving a graduate degree from UAF, submitted by Faculty & Scholarly Affairs

Ray Gavlak introduced the motion and indicated they did deliberate on which degrees to include. They reviewed terminal degrees, masters degrees, and Ph.D.'s. The consensus of the committee was to include all graduate degrees. Vera Alexander asked about emeritus faculty. Jim Allen asked about re-specialization. Gavlak indicated that it would excluded them. Roxie Dinstel spoke against the motion. We do not have another university down the road we can go to and receive a degree. We have a lot of people who work for the university who are not required to have a Ph.D. before they come to work. Clif Lando asked if this applied to instructors. Gavlak indicated that it did not include them as they are not tenure track. Gavlak indicated there are faculty who were hired with a masters degree at the assistant professor level. The problem is that they are paid by the state and is it appropriate for them to spend workload time pursuing a degree? There is a different level of standard for faculty, some units encourage their faculty to go outside; some units that is not the case. He finds it difficult to be looked at favorable as faculty when we have someone in a department as an associate professor working on a degree and have non-tenured faculty who will be making decisions on that degree. It is inappropriate. Kara Nance questioned the fact that faculty can take all the courses for a degree and then not receive a degree. Rich Boone spoke in favor of the motion. Charlotte Basham asked if the committee considered ways to write it that would preclude that kind of ethical question. Gavlak indicated that questionable cases should be processed through the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee. Dinstel asked about limiting this by not allowing degrees within the faculty members' department. Hans Nielson spoke about the perception of favoritism or bias. There are department on campus that have found ways for their faculty to earn degrees from other universities. Clif Lando asked again why this did not apply equally to instructors. Gavlak said that the committee felt it did not apply because often instructors do not have the same level of input academically on students. Many instructors are junior in their career and if they wish to pursue a degree while teaching at the university they should be able to do it. Ann Tremarello said there were two reasons given. First, the image of the institution: Many staff get degrees from the university. The other reason is ethics. Ann sees this from many areas including spouses and children taking courses. Burns Cooper indicated that there is always a possibility of bias. Nance asked about taking courses for professional development. A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed with a vote of 14 yes and 11 nays.

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to prohibit tenured faculty, tenure

track faculty, and research faculty hired after this motion becomes effective, or not currently enrolled in a graduate degree program, from receiving a graduate degree from UAF.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: It is ethically questionable for faculty to confer graduate degrees upon themselves. Included are tenured, tenure track, and research faculty. Though research faculty are not tenured, they are equivalent to regular faculty in other ways: they are full-time, they are presumed to have graduate degrees or the equivalent before starting the job, and most importantly, they supervise graduate students and sometimes teach as affiliates to academic departments. Thus they are involved in the degree-granting process.

The motion is not intended to restrict faculty professional development derived from enrolling in courses to enhance one's performance in one's own field.

Tenured, tenure track, and research faculty already in graduate degree programs by the effective date of the motion, are grandfathered. For questionable cases, the affected individual should process his/her appeal through the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate.

VII New Business

A. Election of the 1998-99 UAF Faculty Senate President-Elect

John Craven asked for any other nominations. He then directed any comments and questions to Ron Gatterdam. Ballots were distributed.

B. Resolution to ratify the election of 1998-99 UAF Faculty Senate President-Elect, submitted by Administrative Committee.

The election results were ratified unanimously.

RESOLUTION
=====

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate ratifies the election of President-Elect on the basis of the following ballot.

BALLOT
PRESIDENT-ELECT

Please vote for ONE individual to serve as the President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate for 1997-98.

** Ron Gatterdam, Professor
Computer Sciences & Mathematics

** President-Elect

C. Motion to amend the Deadlines for Academic Changes to include a spring review cycle for New Degree Programs and Deletion of Programs, submitted by Ad Hoc Committee on Catalog Review

Michael Whalen indicated that this motion was to even out the review of all courses and degree programs by including a complete review in both the fall and spring. John Craven said the Senate received a request to have reviews in the spring so that a catalog could be worked on during the summer and made available in January. The catalog could then be used for recruiting students for the next year. This motion would spread the effort out and have two complete reviews a year. John French said the committee had two main sentiments. One, most students with access to the web are much more likely to access the web site than the print catalog. The other was in review of the schedule they felt the schedule worked well, but there was no justification for program changes only in the fall. Program changes could then be made in a timely manner and be incorporated in an electronic form. Ann Tremarello expressed concern about the motion and the effective dates of the spring actions. Also the opinion that the catalog is the official contract with students. Jerry McBeath asked that this motion be referred back to the committee with the addition of Ann as a member. There is a need to get a legal opinion of the use of the catalog as a contract or the use of the web. The motion to refer passed by a vote of 12 yes and 7 nays.

D. Resolution to recommend the insertion of the URL address of UAF on the front cover of the UAF catalog, submitted by ad hoc committee on Catalog Review

Again there is a need for clarification from General Counsel about the catalog as a contract. Clif Lando asked that this motion be referred back to committee. The motion to refer passed unanimously.

E. Motion to recommend revisions of the proposed Regents' Policy and University Regulation 09.06.00, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Jerry McBeath spoke on the committee's recommendations of these proposed policies. Ron Gatterdam indicated his strong objection to the policies where the DSS coordinator can make unilaterally make changes to degree requirement or general university requirements they felt appropriate without any consultation with faculty. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends the revisions of the proposed Regents' Policy and University Regulation 09.06.00 (Services for Students with Disabilities) as proposed by the Curricular Affairs Committee and to forward these recommendations to the Faculty Alliance

The committee considered the proposed policy and regulations for students with disabilities as submitted by the Board of Regents to the Faculty Alliance.

Chapter 06. Definitions

F. Student with a Disability. In the opinion of the committee, this section required either a cross-reference to the definitions in the regulations (Chapter 6, Provision of Appropriate Academic Adjustments ... A. Requesting Accommodation for Students...) or the definition in policy should state that documentation of disability status needs to be supplied.

Accommodation of Students with Disabilities.

Maynard Perkins questioned how this section of policy would apply to rural sites. The committee thought the language in the section (for example, implementation subject to resource limitations and the making of reasonable modifications and adjustments) would protect the university against exorbitant costs, but thought the language should be reviewed by university legal counsel

Provision of Appropriate Academic Adjustments...

Section B.2. The committee found the wording of this section inappropriate in a university that prizes cooperative and not adversarial approaches to the resolution of issues. It recommended substituting the following language:

"2. Suggesting appropriate academic adjustments and other programmatic accommodations for qualified students with disabilities in consultation with faculty and staff, in accordance with Regents' Policy, University Regulation, MAU rules and procedures, and established faculty senate procedures, and working cooperatively with faculty and staff for their provision and coordination."

Section C. Responsibilities of Faculty and Staff in providing accommodations for students with disabilities. The committee thought this section was adversarial and instituted administrative directives to faculty and staff. It recommended these changes:

"Faculty and staff will work with the DSS coordinator to agree upon and provide appropriate academic adjustments and other programmatic accommodations. The university will make training available to faculty and staff regarding adequate accommodation for students with disabilities."

The committee recommended the deletion of the following paragraph (beginning "The dean or director of a program...") because it would be superfluous if a cooperative approach were instituted.

Comments on Regulations

Section A. Requesting Accommodations for students.

1. This paragraph has the same problems as the parallel policy language. The committee recommended substituting it with the following:

"If the student is eligible for services, the DSS coordinator or designee will work cooperatively with faculty and

staff to design appropriate academic adjustments and other programmatic accommodations, with a copy to the student.

Section B. Implementation of Authorized Appropriate...

The committee proposed the deletion of this paragraph, which would be unnecessary if a cooperative approach were implemented. In the opinion of the committee, these issues required a joint effort of the DSS official and faculty/staff.

F. Motion on UAF Faculty Senate meeting calendar for 1998-99, submitted by Administrative Committee

Jerry McBeath made a amendment to delete the September meeting. The amendment failed. The original motion passed unanimously.

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following calendar for its 1998-99 meetings.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Meetings have to be scheduled and the Wood Center Ballroom reserved well in advance.

UAF FACULTY SENATE

1998-99
Calendar of Meetings

Mtg. #	Date	Day	Time	Type
81	9/14/98	Monday	1:30 p.m.	audioconference
82	10/12/98	Monday	1:30 p.m.	audioconference
83	11/16/98	Monday	1:30 p.m.	face-to-face
84	12/7/98	Monday	1:30 p.m.	audioconference
85	2/8/99	Monday	1:30 p.m.	face-to-face
86	3/8/99	Monday	1:30 p.m.	audioconference
87	4/5/99	Monday	1:30 p.m.	audioconference
88	5/3/99	Monday	1:30 p.m.	audioconference/ face-to-face

Location: Wood Center Ballroom

G. Motion to assign credit to faculty members responsible for supervising students, submitted by Faculty & Scholarly Affairs

Ray Gavlak indicated that John French had asked the committee to look at the assignment of workload credits to faculty. When the motion was submitted to the Administrative Committee, they asked them to consider specific courses. The chair, therefore, introduced a substitute motion. This motion includes the courses covered by reserve numbers. It is currently common for the department head to be listed for these courses. It is, however, possible to list these courses by the faculty member responsible, but it is not widely used. Ann Tremarello indicated that departments need to submit the complete information of all possible faculty responsible with their proposed course schedule. The substitute motion passed.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to assign academic credit for the special or reserve numbers (-91 through -99) to the faculty member(s) immediately and directly responsible for supervising the students or the courses.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Student supervision is a time consuming instruction activity and is recognized in BOR policy and the United Academics contract, which requires a greater accountability for workload. Tracking the credit hours back to the faculty will help document actual workload. At present, some credit can be incorrectly assigned, for example, to a departments' graduate program coordinator.

It is often the case that more than one faculty member takes the lead role in directing a student. It is likely and desirable that the committee members will sort out an appropriate allocation of the credit hours; however, it is important to ensure that these allocations are not triggered by some mechanical algorithm that always assigns credit to the committee chair.

For reference, the current special or reserved numbers at UAF are as follows:

-92	Seminar
-93	Special Topics courses (intended to be offered only once)
-94	Trial Courses
-95	Special Topics Summer Session courses (offered only in the summer)
-96	NICSA Course offerings
-97	Individual Study
-98	Individual Research
-99	Thesis

These numbers are applicable at all levels, from 100 through 600. These courses may be repeated for credit.

H. Motion to create a Permanent Committee on Faculty Seminars, submitted by Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement

David Porter indicated that this was an item left over from last year. The idea of the seminar series was to increase the intellectual exchange on campus and allow discussion with colleagues presently involved in major projects, particularly those who have returned from sabbatical leave. In the course of the year the committee found that the announcement of such seminars were not enough to draw an audience. The level of activity and detail involved in scheduling these seminars was beyond the scope of the duties already assigned to the Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement Committee. It was concluded that there should be a new permanent committee convened to help make these seminars a success. Jerry McBeath spoke against the motion. He felt the existing committee was sufficient to handle the work and we did not need additional bureaucracy and committees. The nays carried and the motion failed.

MOTION FAILED

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend Section 3 (ARTICLE V: Committees, Permanent) of the Bylaws to create a Permanent Committee on Faculty Seminars.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: In 1996-97 the Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement Committee initiated a Faculty Seminar Series by UAF faculty recently returned from sabbatical leaves and/or engaged in significant research projects. Two seminars were held.

The success of these seminars is dependent on long-range scheduling, timely and accurate promotion, proper arrangements for the lecture at the venue and an appropriate reception.

It was determined by the Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement committee during the demonstration year for the Faculty Seminar Series that the effective execution of the tasks associated with a successful series was incompatible with an expectation that the important and traditional functions of the Permanent Committee on Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement.

I. Motion to endorse membership on an Ad Hoc Committee on Unit Criteria, submitted by Administrative Committee

John Craven indicated that at the previous Senate meeting we were asked to approved the procedure for the ACCFT tenure review for this year. We have since been informed that we need to approve a unit criteria. An ad hoc committee was formed and they have reviewed the unit criteria. The rules of the Senate require the endorsement of such committees. The motion passed.

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to endorse the following membership on the Ad Hoc Committee on Unit Criteria.

Ron Gatterdam, Curricular Affairs
 Ray Gavlak, Faculty & Scholarly Affairs
 Michael Whalen, Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs
 Rich Seifert, Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement
 Kara Nance, Service Committee

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The UAF Faculty Senate has been informed by Executive Dean Ralph Gabrielli that the ACCFT "Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Review Process for UAF ACCFT members (Unit Criteria) needs to be approved by the Senate in order to proceed with the review of the candidate up for tenure this year. (The Senate approved a one-time acceptance of the ACCFT review procedures at the last meeting.)

J. Motion to endorse membership on an Ad Hoc Committee on Senate/Union relations, submitted by Administrative Committee

We have had this Senate committee in place for some time and it also needs to be endorsed. The motion passed.

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to endorse the following membership on the Ad Hoc Committee on Senate/Union Relations.

Ron Gatterdam, Curricular Affairs (Chair)
 Ray Gavlak, Faculty & Scholarly Affairs
 David Porter, Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement
 Ron Illingworth, ACCFT
 John French, United Academics

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Senate bylaws specify that the Senate President may create and appoint members to any ad hoc committee necessary for conducting Senate business. Ad hoc committees are subject to later ratification by the Senate. This committee was formed in November and has met several times. With the ratification of the ACCFT and United Academics contracts this committee continues to serve a function for the Senate.

K. Motion to accept the interim standards and indices for ACCFT faculty, submitted by ad hoc committee on Unit Criteria.

This motion appeared as a handout distributed at the meeting. Ray Gavlak introduced the motion. The committee met in response to this very timely issue to discuss the standards and indices by which the faculty member would be evaluated for promotion and tenure. In view of the information provided and the historical documents that have been used by ACCFT for a number of years, the committee felt that the standards and indices for this interim criteria were acceptable. Keating asked if the committee had recommendations for future criteria. Ray indicated that the blue book would have to be change to include ACCFT but at this time they did not have any

recommendations. Ron Gatterdam indicated that their intent was to strike a very narrow resolution which would serve for this one-time period only. The motion passed.

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to accept the interim Standards and Indices for Promotion and Tenure to Associate Professor, bipartite academic, developed and approved by the ACCFT faculty of the College of Rural Alaska and incorporated on pages 9 & 11-13 of their document, Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Review Process for University of Alaska Fairbanks Alaska Community College Federation of Teachers Bargaining Unit Members. These interim standards and indices will be for academic year 1997-98.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: ACCFT faculty have, for the last 6 years, had a regional review promotion and tenure process with standards and indices by which all ACCFT faculty at UAF were evaluated for promotion and tenure.

The standards and indices approved by the UAF CRA ACCFT faculty are identical to the currently existing standards and indices identified above.

The collective bargaining agreement between the University of Alaska and the ACCFT effective from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2000 mandates in item 5.4.B that "The University and the Union agree that evaluation policies in which decisions are made within MAUs are desirable. New policies which reflect this goal will be generated through the normal governance structure and will be patterned on the current Regional Review Process."

In light of the newly agreed upon contract the University of Alaska and United Academics, it is recognized that a rewrite of the current University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty will be necessary and that this rewrite should reflect the contract language binding on both unions and the University thus it is appropriate to establish interim standards and indices pending this rewrite.

PROMOTION

MINIMUM CRITERIA

BIPARTITE ACADEMIC

The criteria listed below are intended as the minimum for determining eligibility for consideration for promotion. However, it is specifically recognized that University programs may require faculty whose education and/or experience may be different from the stated criteria. Exceptions to the minimum time in rank, terminal degree, or experience qualifications for rank must be fully justified through all review levels. The basis for exception shall be outstanding academic performance and/or outstanding professional

experience.

Associate Professor	Meet criteria for initial appointment to associate professor <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> Master's degree in the discipline or appropriate field and Demonstrated evidence of successful college-level teaching and service and Five (5) years at the rank of assistant professor, or which three (3) must be at UAF.*
------------------------	--

EVALUATION GUIDELINES
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR STANDARDS AND INDICES

The key concept for promotion to Associate Professor is "successful," which means "resulted in a positive outcome." The candidate must demonstrate through the promotion file that each workload component meets this requirement.

STANDARD 1: (Teaching)

Provides leadership and guidance regarding curriculum issues and in the development, delivery, and evaluation of educational activity.

INDICES:

The following accomplishments are representative of "successful" performance of the above criteria. The list is not exhaustive, nor is it expected that faculty will accomplish all items. Rather, the quality and quantity of accomplishments is expected to increase with time in rank. The list is not a set of criteria nor is it exhaustive or weighted. The list is merely illustrative and should serve as a guide for faculty and faculty evaluators.

- * Positive student evaluations.
- * Colleagues recognize and seek out the expertise of this individual.
- * Serves as a resource for other faculty in advising students.
- * Demonstrates mature levels of critical thinking and contributes knowledge to the field.
- * Demonstrates leadership in course and curriculum development activities.
- * Serves as a role model in providing academic advising, educational planning, vocational/career counseling on an individual or group basis.
- * Demonstrates leadership in designing and teaching/facilitating credit/non-credit workshops, seminars, and short courses.
- * Demonstrates leadership in designing and developing and/or evaluating materials to enhance the teaching process (i.e. planning sheets, degree formats, etc.).
- * Provides guidance and direction designing and delivering educational services to special student populations (i.e. Alaska Native, disabled, re-entry, economically disadvantaged, etc.).
- * Initiates course development appropriate to area of expertise and student need.

STANDARD 2: (Service)

Demonstrates leadership in service activities.

INDICES:

The following accomplishments are representative of "successful" performance of the above criterion. The list is not exhaustive, nor is it expected that faculty will accomplish all items. Rather, the quality and quantity of accomplishments is expected to increase with time in rank. The list is not a set of criteria nor is it exhaustive or weighted. The list is merely illustrative and should serve as a guide for faculty and faculty evaluators.

- * Chairs or provides leadership on a Campus/College committee.
- * Serves as Campus/College representative to a community or regional organization.
- * Takes responsibility for development of junior faculty.
- * Develops an area of service that makes a recognizable impact on one of the missions of the Campus/College.
- * Carries out administrative responsibilities skillfully as documented by peers and supervisors.
- * Provides leadership that generates a climate conducive to professional growth within the Campus/College.
- * Serves on a major university committee.
- * Serves as a University representative to a community, regional, or state organization.
- * Actively participates in professional organizations.
- * Campus/College representative to University committee.

STANDARD 3: (Research/Creative Activity)

Initiates, designs, executes, and reports original research/creative activity independently or in collaboration with others. Provides consultative assistance related to research/creative activity to faculty and/or other professionals. Expertise is recognized within the community, region, and state.

INDICES:

The following accomplishments are representative of "successful" performance of the above criteria. The list is not exhaustive, nor is it expected that faculty will accomplish all items. Rather, the quality and quantity of accomplishments is expected to increase with time in rank. The list is not a set of criteria nor is it exhaustive or weighted. The list is merely illustrative and should serve as a guide to faculty and faculty evaluators.

- * Research/creative activity is published in refereed journals or professionally recognized publications.
- * Reports research/creative activities at regional and national meetings.
- * Research projects or program evaluation projects are actively developed and implemented.
- * Consultation on research is sought by faculty members.
- * Authors chapter for book or entire book.
- * Research proposals for external support are approved and/or funded.

- * Non-research manuscripts are published as monographs, book sections, books, or articles.
- * Reputation as an expert researcher is initiated.
- * Serves as guest editor of a journal issue.

VIII Committee Reports

A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath

A report was attached to the agenda. The committee recommended that the information on the syllabus be placed as an informational item. This can be passed along to your colleagues.

B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - R. Gavlak

The following report was distributed at the Senate meeting as a handout.

Minutes for Faculty & Scholarly Affairs Committee Meeting,
3/25/98

Attending: Rich Boone, Burns Cooper, Ray Gavlak, Barry Mortensen, Hans Nielsen, Bob White, John Yarie

The committee discussed (again) the motion on faculty receiving degrees from UAF. Discussion was reopened about whether the motion should deal only with Ph.D.'s or with other degrees as well. Keith Criddle, by e-mail, had pointed out that MBAs are also terminal degrees, and B. Cooper added that MFA's can be terminal degrees in creative writing, art, and music. Because of such cases, and also because at least some members felt the ethical conflict is there for any degree, terminal or non-terminal, the committee agreed to change the wording of the motion from "Ph.D." to "graduate degree."

There was also more discussion of whether or not to grandfather faculty members who are already in degree programs. Bob White suggested that they should not be grandfathered, but helped to move into non-UAF programs. Other faculty who are currently taking on considerable trouble and expense to get degrees from Outside universities may feel unfairly treated, perhaps to the point of litigation. However, Rich Boone suggested that there might be even more problems if people are not grandfathered, and Hans Nielsen added that we can't legislate retroactively. The consensus of the committee was that the best solution was to leave the grandfather clause in, but to move the effective date to "immediately" in order to avoid a rush of people taking advantage of the loophole at the last moment.

The committee also returned to the issue of how credit should be officially assigned for different kinds of teaching. Because this issue is so complex, we limited our discussion for this meeting to thesis and graduate research credits. Currently, in most departments, these are assigned to the department head, but not used by anyone for personal workload statements. Ann Tremarello had indicated that we do have the technical ability to subdivide the hours and assign them as deemed appropriate. Bob White pointed out that we have to come up with workload statements in keeping with the new contract right away (by April 26th), and that these hours are being wasted from that point of view. He reported that hours were already being subdivided in Biosciences.

To deal with this issue, while acknowledging that the situation may be different in different departments, the committee adopted the following draft motion, with statements of rationale and editing changes to be added later by e-mail:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to assign graduate thesis and research, and special topics credits to the faculty member immediately and directly responsible for supervising those students.

This was later edited to the form that will appear in the Agenda.

Finally, we had some brief discussion of the new workload agreements, especially what "30 workload units" means. Bob White mentioned that our definition will have to match up with UA Anchorage's, and there is a meeting to discuss that on April 3. It was generally agreed that faculty should be discussing and resolving this issue, as opposed to leaving it up to administrators to work out.

C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen

A report was attached to the agenda. They have been reviewing the masters degree requirements and a proposed motion is included in the report. Comments are very welcome.

D. Core Review - J. Brown

A report was attached to the agenda.

E. Curriculum Review - J. French

The committee is halfway through the process of reviewing approximately 50 requests.

F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber

The following report was distributed as a Senate handout.

Minutes of The Developmental Studies Committee, March 31, 1998

Attending: Charley Basham, Richard Clausen, Cindy Hardy, Marjie Illingworth, Ron Illingworth, Ruth Lister, Wanda Martin, Joe Mason, Mark Oswald, Greg Owens, Kay Thomas, Jane Weber.

The Developmental Studies committee discussed the following items:

Outcomes Assessment:

The discussion focused on two difficulties in developing an assessment method for DEV classes. Both Wanda and Marjie reported some difficulty getting our statistical data into the system to be evaluated. Ron expressed his ongoing concern that the models we've seen are focused toward gathering information from urban students primarily and that rural students will have to be added to the mix in some way. Marjie added that evaluating rural classes will be difficult because their record-keeping systems don't work the same way as the urban campuses.

This discussion was primarily an update on an ongoing process.

Emerging Scholars Program:

Ron and Marjie presented information they've found on Emerging Scholars in other institutions. Though most of the programs they found relate to math and science, they feel that the underlying philosophy—a preparatory year (or two) that deals with developmental issues as well as remediation—applies to English as well. Marjie presented a handout outlining the preparatory year of DEVE, DEVM, DEVS and a DEV Science class, and a second, which is essentially a regular freshman year, supported by DEVS and problem-solving classes. The idea of this program, like those in other schools, is to prepare an underprepared student for work at an honors level; thus the standards of the program are high.

Mark reported that the Biology Dept. had met about the DEV Science course and had concluded that an across-the-board science class would be less of a burden to each department than DEV Science classes in each discipline. A class using this model is already being developed using the Howard Hughes grant. Though the class is designed for elementary science teachers, it could be offered to DEV students as well. The course will include problem solving and major scientific concepts and, using limited jargon, interweave biological and physical sciences. The committee felt that this would serve the need for a DEV Science component in the Emerging Scholars sequence.

We also discussed funding both for this program and its development. The Committee decided to look into both the President's Special Project Funds to bring up a guru to jump-start the project and to look into FIPSE funds for the program itself.

Tracking:

There was a general discussion of the difficulties we are encountering with statistical search requests. Banner still poses problems, as Wanda reported. Greg suggested that it is time to proceed manually. (There were groans around the table!) Wanda still has all the reports the committee requested. We decided to start with a small report—such as DEVE, which has fewer classes—and estimate how much work it will take to do the rest. Jane, Ron, Cindy, Greg, and Kay volunteered to work on this.

DEVS 200 Class:

This has been offered as a pilot course for students on academic probation. It has been approved at other stages of the process and now needs our approval. After discussion, this was approved by consensus of committee.

TRIO grant:

The meeting ended with a discussion of UAF's loss of the TRIO grant and the prospects for a new grant. We agreed that there is a window of opportunity open to apply for this funding again, after the waiting period to reapply for this. This may be another source for the Emerging Scholars program. This discussion will continue at future meetings.

The next meeting will be Tuesday, April 21, in Wood Center Conference Room B.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley

No report was available.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -
D. Porter

David Porter thanked the faculty for returning the questionnaire that was recently sent out. Approximately 100 were returned. The committee will begin the analysis.

I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - S. Henrichs

A report was attached to the agenda.

J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal

A report was attached to the agenda. Scott and Eduard Zilberkant just returned from a trip to Juneau. They spent all day Friday in the State House with mostly republican legislators. Not all was discouraging. There is no new news, everything is still the same as last week. The budget recommendations from the House were flat. From the Senate it is minus \$1 million. They don't anticipate it remaining that way. The POM's are very effective and these should continue.

K. Service Committee - K. Nance

No report was available.

L. Ad Hoc Committees-

Ron Gatterdam said the Ad Hoc Committee on Senate/Union Relations has sent out questionnaires to fifteen universities. These have been sent to union leaders and they have been asked to distribute it to their Faculty Senate and appropriate administrator.

A report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Catalog Review Cycle was attached to the agenda.

IX Discussion Items

Jerry McBeath moved to adjourn. The following agenda item were not discussed.

- A. Governance/Union relations
- B. RIP-1, latest status (handout)

X Members' Comments/Questions - none

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Tapes of this Faculty Senate meeting are in the Governance

Office, 312 Signers' Hall if anyone wishes to listen to the complete tapes.

Submitted by Sheri Layral, Faculty Senate Secretary.