

MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #183

Monday, May 7, 2011

1:00 p.m. – 3:05 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Cathy Cahill

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Abramowicz, Ken
Baek, Jungho
Baker, Carrie (Jun Watabe)
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar
Barboza, Perry
Brown, Stephen (Leif Albertson)
Cahill, Cathy
Davis, Mike (audio)
Fallen, Chris (audio)
George-Bettisworth, Retchenda
Gustafson, Karen
Hardy, Cindy
Healy, Joanne
Henry, David
Himelbloom, Brian (audio)
Horstmann, Lara
Jensen, Karen
Johnston, Duff
Joly, Julie
Jones, Debra
Lardon, Cecile
Lawlor, Orion
McEachern, Diane (audio)
Metzger, Andrew
Nadin, Elisabeth
Newberry, Rainer
Ng, Chung-Sang
Renes, Sue
Reynolds, Jennifer
Short, Margaret
Valentine, David
Weber, Jane
Winfree, Cathy

Members Absent:

Alexeev, Vladimir
Arendt, Anthony
Bret-Harte, Donie
Golux, Stephan
Mathis, Jeremy
Meyer, Franz
Radenbaugh, Todd
Zhang, Xiong

Non-voting/Administrative

Members Present:

Melanie Arthur
Susan Henrichs
Paul Layer
Dana Thomas
Jon Dehn, Past President
Josef Glowa

Others Present:

Eric Madsen
Barbara Taylor
Linda Hapsmith
Debbie Toopetlook

B. Moment of Silence to Honor Debra Moses

President Cahill called for the reading of a resolution in honor of Senator Moses. The Faculty Senate observed a moment of silence following the reading.

RESOLUTION OF REMEMBRANCE FOR PROFESSOR DEBRA MOSES

Whereas the UAF Faculty Senate mourns the loss of our colleague Debra Moses, Associate Professor of Developmental Mathematics. Her passing leaves us bereft of her wealth of experience, teaching and insight; and

Whereas the UAF Faculty Senate wishes to express its sincere condolences and sympathy to the family and friends of Debra Moses; and

Whereas the UAF Faculty Senate honors the contributions of Debra Moses to the Faculty Senate and her service on the Curricular Affairs Committee, and the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee; and

Whereas the UAF Faculty Senate acknowledges, appreciates, and will miss the contributions of Debra Moses to the State of Alaska, University of Alaska Fairbanks, and the College of Rural and Community Development, and the Community and Technical College; now

Therefore, be it resolved that as a token of our respect and our desire to honor her memory, the Faculty Senate dedicates a moment of silence to our friend and colleague, Debra Moses, as we reflect on the importance of our colleagues in the community of scholars in our lives.

C. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #182

The minutes were approved as submitted.

D. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved: None

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – Cathy Cahill
(Attachment 183/1)

Cathy recapped the responses of the other two MAUs to the UAF Faculty Senate resolution passed at the last meeting regarding the Tobacco User No-Hire policy. UAS Faculty Senate endorsed our resolution, and the UAA Faculty Senate is working on one of their own. Cathy noted President Gamble's memorandum in response to the resolution (attachment 183/1), and mentioned his appreciation for the UAF Faculty Senate's time, effort and input.

Faculty Alliance is aware of the Complete College America resolution that is forthcoming from UAF Faculty Senate and will move this forward with the responses from UAA and UAS to President Gamble.

Cathy reported on the eLabs taskforce recommendations. UAS would like the implementation date moved forward since they advertise their courses farther in advance than the other MAUs, but otherwise they are OK with it. UAA will pick up the recommendations in fall 2013, and UAF already implements what has been recommended.

The recent statewide memo dropping the proposed code of conduct was noted.

Cathy announced that an ad hoc committee will be named to address issues with Wintermester, particularly concerning future dates that overlap with hard closure. Wintermester courses are mainly taught out of the College of Liberal Arts, so the committee will include representation from the college.

In July, information collected from the listening sessions for Strategic Direction will be discussed by faculty, President's Cabinet, Statewide Academic Council and others including Terry MacTaggart.

Mention was made of the news article about UAA offering Ph.D. degrees in Psychology. Cathy explained this is allowed as these degrees are professional doctorates. This does not, however, apply to research Ph.D. degrees which only UAF may offer.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds

Jennifer shared three items of information:

- Cathy and she represent the Faculty Senate on the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC). There are also four other faculty on PBC.
- Jennifer represents Faculty Senate on the Accreditation Steering Committee.
- Normally the Senate president sits on the Usibelli Award Committee, but since Cathy was being nominated for an award, Jennifer sat on the committee this year.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

The Provost's remarks were given first as the Chancellor was en route to campus from a Chamber of Commerce meeting.

Chancellor Rogers commented on the promotion and tenure review cycle just completed. He congratulated several members of Faculty Senate on their accomplishments, including those promoted to associate professor and/or granted tenure: Jungho Baek, Orion Lawlor, Karen Jensen, Carrie Baker, Margaret Short, as well as Chung-sang Ng (award of tenure). Three FS alternates were promoted to the rank of professor included Cindy Hardy and Debu Misra, and Brian Rasley (promotion to associate professor with award of tenure). A round of applause followed. Thanks were also extended to the Usibelli family for the faculty awards they make possible, and mention of the award nominees was noted as one of today's agenda items.

The Chancellor announced that effective today, eLearning and Distance Education will report to him directly. There will be an eLearning Council comprised of individuals from CRCD and the Fairbanks campus as well as from support services. It turns out that 73% of credit hour production by the Center of Distance Ed is for Fairbanks campus students, with about 20% for the Community and Technical College, and 7% for units served by CRCD. The goals are to find ways to better support both urban and rural students, as well as to incentivize schools and departments to offer more courses online and develop online degrees. Another goal is to simplify things administratively; for example, with regard to the fact that students had to deal with multiple bookstores. Former CDE Director Alex Hwu has

accepted a job elsewhere, and a recruitment is beginning to fill the eLearning / Distance Ed position with an executive director.

Chancellor Rogers mentioned that both the operating and capitol budgets have gone to the governor and he has until the 26th of May to make his decisions. The university looks good on the capitol side of the budget. The operating budget for the university did very well in the legislature this year.

Regarding the academic calendars just approved for the next three years, the Chancellor invited comments about moving Commencement to Saturday from Sunday. A change would have implications for commencement-related travel and for the spring semester dates. Any changes considered would be effective no sooner than the 2014 academic year. Rainer asked how students will be consulted on this. Chancellor said ASUAF would be consulted.

Cecile commented about the departure of Alex Hwu from the Center for Distance Education. She expressed hope that the work he started with the dean of CLA to integrate distance education more with what faculty do on a regular basis will be continued. The two methodologies can really inform each other. Chancellor Rogers noted that the work will be continued and confirmed that efforts were made to persuade Alex Hwu to stay.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs gave a report on the results of the promotion and tenure review. Ninety-six files were reviewed this year and she complemented the faculty on their teaching, research and service. The report is available online at the Faculty Senate Meetings web page for this meeting #183.

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2011-2012-meetings/#183>

(See reports and handouts section for this meeting.)

The Provost noted as a positive trend that there will be more files to review next year due to the growing numbers of faculty over the past decade.

The results for promotion and tenure included the following:

- There were a total of 11 tenure-line faculty up for promotion to the rank of professor rank, and nine were successful.
- There were 10 research faculty seeking promotion to varying ranks; and nine were successful.
- Eight faculty applied for promotion and tenure in their mandatory year, seven were successful.
- All seven faculty applying for tenure prior to their mandatory year were successful.
- All four faculty applying for tenure in the mandatory year (already in the rank of associate professor, so not applying for concurrent promotion) were successful.
- All three faculty (already at the associate rank) applying for tenure prior to their mandatory year were successful.
- Overall, there were 43 candidates with 39 of them successful, three unsuccessful and one who withdrew their file.

The results for the fourth-year reviews included the following:

- 20 files were reviewed, and 15 were satisfactory.
- The other five were not satisfactory, meaning that they were not showing sufficient progress toward promotion and tenure in their mandatory year of review. They were advised in areas to improve.

Regarding post-tenure reviews, there were 33 files reviewed and 32 were satisfactory.

Susan added comments to what Cathy had reported about UAA becoming a doctoral granting institution. This was a natural progression which began in 2005 when UAF and UAA agreed to offer a joint Ph.D. in clinical community psychology. The joint degree was approved by the UA system and Board of Regents; however the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) did not approve the granting of a joint degree by both UAF and UAA. UAA could participate and jointly offer a degree awarded by UAF only. Now, UAA has completed their application for doctoral granting status with NWCCU, so they are permitted to offer professional degrees. While they can apply to offer other types doctorates, there are many steps they would have to accomplish before being able to do so. The Academic Master Plan provides guidance on what they can do, as well.

Perry Barboza asked how the change affects the Carnegie ranking of UAF. Susan responded that it doesn't change our status, and UAA won't have a ranking until they become a doctoral research university (DRU). In order for that to occur they would have to have a substantial increase in their research funding and in the number of doctoral degrees awarded. UAF is on the cusp of getting to the highest level possible for granting doctorates; but, UAA has at least a decade or more to go to get above the DRU ranking.

One final item mentioned was the recent discovery that in addition to the mission statement, they must get the UAF core themes approved by the BOR so they can use them for the Year One accreditation report that will be due in August to the NWCCU. Dana has, of course, presented them several times to the Senate. The core themes were read aloud, including the new changes to the core themes of RESEARCH and CONNECT:

EDUCATE graduate, undergraduate students and life-long learners.

RESEARCH to create and disseminate new knowledge, insights, technology, artistic and scholarly works.

PREPARE Alaska's career, technical, and professional workforce.

CONNECT Alaska Native, rural and urban communities by sharing knowledge and ways of knowing.

ENGAGE Alaskans through outreach for continuing education, community and economic development.

Susan invited comments on the themes; none were offered.

C. Vice Provost's Remarks – Dana Thomas

Dana Thomas commented on his recent appointment as the interim vice president for academic affairs, following the departure of Dan Julius. He thanked CNSM Dean Paul Layer who will be attending the AACU General Education institute in his stead. He will continue working on the Year One Accreditation Report due to be submitted in the fall.

He recently chaired the evaluation committee for Brigham Young University and brought back something to share with faculty regarding student assessment. Like UAF they have end-of-the-semester course evaluations by students, but they also incorporate a mid-semester student assessment of courses. They ask two simple questions: what's working and what isn't working well in the course. They take the student feedback and then discuss it with the students in the classroom and revise what they are doing accordingly. This extra step is having a large impact on end-of-the-semester course evaluations. Dana asked Faculty Senate members to discuss this idea with their departments.

Dana thanked the Faculty Senate for a very productive year. Particular mention was made of the work done by the members of Faculty Affairs Committee and Chair Andrew Metzger, to look at the electronic faculty activity reporting (eFAR) software.

V Adoption of Consent Agenda

- A. Motion to approve the list of 2011-2012 degree candidates, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 183/2)
- B. Resolution of Appreciation for Catherine Cahill, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 183/3)
- C. Resolution for the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 183/4)
- D. Special Recognition of Senate Service

The consent agenda was voted on and passed unanimously. [See XI, items A through E.]

VI New Business

Rainer asked for FS to approve all four of the new minors at once. With no questions or comments made by Senate on any individual item, the motions were voted upon together and unanimously approved.

- A. Motion to Approve New Minor in Geographic Information Systems – submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 183/5)
- B. Motion to Approve New Minor in Paleontology – submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 183/6)
- C. Motion to Approve New Minor in Geospatial Sciences – submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 183/7)
- D. Motion to Approve New Minor in Geophysics – submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 183/8)
- E. Motion to Adopt a Course Syllabus Statement Requirement for “O” and “O/2” Core Courses – submitted by Curricular Affairs and Core Review Committees (Attachment 183/9)

David Henry brought the motions to the floor and provided some background. He commented on both Core motions, noting they do not add anything to the core course requirements. This motion just adds a statement to the syllabus that clarifies what style of “O” the course is. Cecile L. asked if faculty could just attach a memo for the Core Review Committee rather than putting more info in the syllabus. David stressed that the syllabus statement is for the benefit of the students as well as the instructor, not merely the Core Review Committee. Rainer N. noted that over time the effects of academic drift had taken their toll on many “O” courses, and with newer instructors not picking up on all the requirements the courses had become deficient. Cecile commented about the length of syllabi and whether adding another statement would fix the problem. David responded that it adds clarity, takes only a few minutes to add and will benefit both instructors and students.

A vote was taken. With one abstention, the majority passed the motion to adopt a course syllabus statement requirement for “O” and “O/2” core courses.

- F. Motion to Amend Charge to the Core Review Committee in the FS Bylaws, Section 3 (Article V: Committees) Subsection E., Permanent, 6. Core Review Committee – submitted by Curricular Affairs and Core Review Committees (Attachment 183/10)

David Henry brought the motion to the floor, explaining its purpose was to give the Core Review Committee the power to revoke core designator(s) after a course failed assessment two times in a row and that revocation was reflected in the Catalog – in other words, a very slow process. Thus, restoration could happen more quickly than the revocation itself, and there would be minimal unintended repercussions of slowing student progress toward graduation. David gave examples of two egregious review cases with no syllabi submitted by the instructors. Ken A. asked about how this action may affect students. Rainer said it depends upon whether or not the course is in the Catalog with a core designator. Being in the Catalog with or without the core designator is the deciding factor for student purposes. Petitioning was mentioned as a possible fix for a situation where courses that had core designators revoked were fixed, but had not made it back into the Catalog.

A vote was taken, and the motion to amend the charge for the Core Review Committee was passed with one abstention.

- G. Motion to Approve the CLA Art Department Unit Criteria – submitted by Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 183/11)

Perry Barboza brought the motion to the floor. Chancellor Rogers asked for an amendment on page 30 – to change the reference to the “museum” to “Museum of the North Committee.”

The motion approving the CLA Art Department unit criteria was passed unanimously as amended on the floor.

- H. Motion to Approve the School of Education Unit Criteria – submitted by Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 183/12)

Perry B. brought the motion to the floor, noting the committee’s discussion concerning outcomes assessment which is mentioned in the criteria. He recommended that the Senate pass the criteria.

The motion approving the School of Education unit criteria was passed unanimously.

- I. Motion to Dissolve the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee and Amend FS Bylaws, Section 3 (Article V: Committees) Subsection E., Permanent, 4. Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee – submitted by Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 183/13)
- J. Motion to Amend the Grade Appeals Policy of the UAF Faculty Senate, Section III. Procedures, subsection B, Item 4 – submitted by Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 183/14)
- K. Motion to Amend the Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions (other than the assignment of grades) of the UAF Faculty Senate, Section III. Procedures, subsection B, Item 2 – submitted by Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 183/15)

Andrew Metzger brought the motion to the floor and mentioned that agenda items J and K are related to this motion. Faculty Affairs Committee was tasked to review the committee early in the fall semester, and these motions have resulted from completing that review. He described the functions of the committee and duties performed on an as-needed basis. He then explained how duties would be

reassigned were this motion and the related ones approved. Dave V. suggested voting on all three in toto, and Cathy C. agreed since the failure of item I would render the remaining two moot.

The vote was taken on all three items, and they were passed unanimously.

- L. Resolution on Complete College America – submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 183/16)

Jennifer R. described the development of the resolution which was written by joint effort of the Curricular Affairs Committee, the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee, and the Administrative Committee. She noted that Senators had been extended an invitation to comment and make suggestions via the Google discussion group. Jennifer noted that an addition will be made to the second line of the resolution so that it reads, "...Alaska State Legislature, **the Governor's Office**, and the administration of the University of Alaska..." since Governor Parnell's office was involved in the discussion of this topic.

Jennifer read the first part of the resolution aloud with the missing reference to the governor's office, recapping the reasons Faculty Senate will not endorse the Complete College America program. [See attachment 183/16, included with these minutes.]

The resolution was voted upon and unanimously approved. It will be taken to the Faculty Alliance.

The meeting break occurred at 1:59 PM, and the meeting reconvened at 2:10 PM.

VII Discussion Items

- A. Ad hoc Committee's Report on eFAR Software – Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 183/17)

Jennifer R. reminded Faculty Senate about the ad hoc committee that was formed after the last meeting in order to finalize the review of software packages for electronic faculty activity reporting. The two packages reviewed were Faculty180 and Activity Insight. The ad hoc committee's final report is attached as an informational item; the final decision will be in the hands of university administration. Faculty180 was the preferred software package. The current Word document format being used now actually came in as second choice, with significant opposition to Activity Insight software package.

Elisabeth N. asked about the third software option [name sounded like "Research and View"]. Jennifer noted that it came in as a distant second to Faculty180, but still ahead of Activity Insight. It will be discussed at a meeting with Eric Madsen, Dana Thomas, Cathy Cahill and her, tomorrow. Elisabeth asked about testing of the software by faculty. Provost Henrichs responded that a test by faculty would be prudent and is planned. They'll pick two units to try it out and also take volunteers. There will be vendor support available during that test. Jennifer commented on the past Digital Measures test, noting the recently reviewed software is much improved. She also expressed appreciation for the opportunity to have faculty involved in the process of evaluating the software.

VIII Public Comments/Questions

Linda Hapsmith shared information about a new Banner / UAOnline program for academic advising which allows appointments to be made online. Those using it in her office think it's fantastic. A demo will take place in the fall. Faculty advisors using the new program will need to have FERPA

certification updated annually. Linda provided a handout “cheat sheet” on how to use the program. She also noted the program will be used at UAA and UAS, so department names are specific to the MAU.

Barbara Taylor, Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Activity (URSA) director, announced a research fair happening on September 5 and 6. She wanted to catch faculty before they leave for the summer. A job fair event is being combined with the research fair again for the second time because it worked so well last year. She encouraged departments to reserve a table through the Career Services Office.

IX Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Pips Veazey

No report was available.

B. ASUAF – Mari Freitag, Robert Kinnard

No report was available.

C. UNAC – Melanie Arthur

Melanie reported on the April representative assembly meeting. She mentioned there will soon be a request for proposals for faculty research to look into the university health care costs. The executive board meets on May 9, and the meeting is open to members. There will also be a general membership meeting to discuss health care on May 10 at Wood Center room C-D; this is in response to feedback from faculty who want to see a plan of action formed. Members should attend and be prepared tell them what they want to see happen and what might be acceptable sacrifices in care, should they become required in the future. Many administrative health care decisions are anticipated over the summer, so this may be the last chance to provide some direction.

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane commented there was nothing new to report.

X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. Announcements

B. Chair Comments / Committee Reports and Year-end Summaries

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 183/18)

Rainer noted he anticipates cool stuff coming up next year.

Faculty Affairs – Andrew Metzger, Chair

Andrew reported on changes made to the current eFAR form in response to discussions with Barbara Taylor and Dana Thomas. The changes allow faculty to report on undergraduate research and mentorship. More information and a copy of the form will be included in the Faculty Affairs Committee year-end report which will be available soon online.

Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Chair (Attachment 183/19)

Perry recommended that faculty tell their units to invite a UC member to their discussions about unit criteria revisions before those criteria revisions are submitted to the committee for review. This will help clarify and expedite the process for everyone.

Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 183/20)

Jane noted the year-end report is attached and had nothing new to add.

Core Review Committee – Latrice Bowman, Chair
No report was available.

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
The committee hopes to be done with its reviews soon, probably later this week.

Faculty Appeals & Oversight – No report.

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa, Chair (Attachment 183/21)
Josef noted the year-end report is attached.

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Chair (Attachment 183/22)
Orion shared a novel idea from GAAC. They want to publicize examples of both good and bad things out of departments; for example, good or bad syllabi or notable work with graduate students (good or bad). They could have a GAAC badge of shame, and a badge of honor. It would be an informal way to show what is and what isn't working well for graduate programs.

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
Cindy noted the lively discussions the committee had this year. They talked a lot about repercussions of Mandatory Placement. She shared about the brown bag lunch event with faculty and veterans, noting that many good ideas were generated. They plan to do at least two more brown bag lunches next year with the topics they came up with as a result. She also noted there will be motions for the Senate coming out of their committee next year.

Research Advisory Committee – Peter Webley, Orion Lawlor, Co-chairs (Attachment 183/23)
Peter noted that their report is attached and had nothing new to add.

C. Other Comments

Dean Paul Layer, referencing GAAC's idea of badges of shame, brought up the fact that often deans don't look at Faculty Senate reports. Faculty Senate committee chairs should be encouraged to give deans a heads-up on topics or issues that might come up for their units, helping their units avoid "badges of shame" situations. He commented that he doesn't want to find out about these types of things in the local newspaper.

Cathy Cahill thanked Jayne Harvie for her work on behalf of the Faculty Senate, and a round of applause became a standing ovation of such length that Jayne tried to retreat behind her laptop screen, being reduced to grateful tears.

XI Award Presentations and Announcements

A. Presentation of the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award

Cathy Cahill read the resolution aloud and presented the framed copy to 2011-2012 award recipient, Dr. David Valentine. Reference attachment 183/4 of these minutes for a copy of the resolution.

B. Announcement of Usibelli Awards (Attachment 183/24)

Provost Henrichs announced the 2011-2012 Usibelli award winners and nominees. Reference attachment 183/24 of these minutes for a list of award winners and nominees.

C. Announcement of Emeriti Faculty Awards (Attachment 183/25)

Provost Henrichs announced the emeriti award recipients. Reference attachment 183/25 for a list of the award recipients.

D. Recognition of Senate Service

Cathy C. and Jennifer R. distributed the letters and certificates of recognition to each of the Faculty Senate committee chairs. Melanie Arthur was also recognized as the representative to the Senate for United Academics.

E. Presentation of Resolution of Appreciation for Catherine Cahill (Attachment 183/3)

Jennifer Reynolds read aloud the resolution recognizing the outstanding service of Faculty Senate President Cathy Cahill, and presented her with a framed copy. Much applause followed the presentation. Cathy expressed her appreciation and reminded all she will chair Faculty Alliance in the coming academic year. Reference attachment 183/3 to these minutes for a copy of the resolution.

XII Adjournment of the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate

XIII 2012-2013 Faculty Senate Members Take Their Seats

A. Roll Call of 2012-2013 Members

<u>Members Present:</u>	<u>Members Present – continued:</u>
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (13)	MARR, Wayne (14)
ALBERTSON, Leif (14) - audio	METZGER, Andrew (14)
ALEXEEV, Vladimir (13) Gibson, Georgina	NADIN, Elisabeth (13)
BANDOPADHYAY, Sukumar (13)	NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)
BROWN, Stephen (13) Cascio, Julie	NG, Chung-sang (13)
CHAMBER, Izetta (14) - audio	REYNOLDS, Jennifer
DAVIS, Mike (14) - audio	SHORT, Margaret (13)
FALLEN, Chris (13) - audio	VALENTINE, Dave
GEORGE-BETTISWORTH, R. (13)	WEBER, Jane (14)
GUSTAFSON, Karen (13)	WINFREE, Cathy (13)
HARDY, Cindy (13)	WINSOR, Peter (14)
HEALY, Joanne (13)	YARIE, John (14) Glenn Juday
HENRY, David (13)	
JENSEN, Karen (14)	
JOHNSTON, DUFF (13)	
JOLY, Julie (13)	<i>Members Absent – next page</i>
LARDON, Cecile (13)	
LAWLOR, Orion (13)	

<u>Members Absent:</u>	
BRET-HARTE, Donie (13)	
CEE, Vincent (14)	
COOK, Christine (14)	
FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)	
GOLUX, Stephen (13)	
MATHIS, Jeremy (13)	
MCEACHERN, Diane (13)	
MEYER, Franz (13)	
RADENBAUGH, Todd (13)	

B President's Remarks – Jennifer Reynolds
Faculty Senate Committees and Election Results To Date (Attachment 183/26)

Jennifer welcomed the new Faculty Senate and provided a summary of the 2012-13 Faculty Senate election results and the 2012-13 Senate committees. Web and print documents will be updated for the fall. She explained that the chairs and conveners will convene the first meeting for their respective committees, and elections for chairs will take place, if needed. There will be an orientation meeting for new senators before the first Senate meeting in the fall.

C. President-Elect's Remarks – David Valentine

David spoke about looking forward to the upcoming year and providing as strong a voice as possible for faculty in his role as President-Elect. He invited members to contact him with any questions or concerns they would like Faculty Senate to address.

XIV Remarks by Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs was not available for remarks due to another meeting.

XV New Senate Business

A. Motion to Approve the 2012-2013 UAF Faculty Senate Meeting Calendar, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 183/27)

Jennifer brought the motion to the floor. A vote was taken on the calendar motion and unanimously approved.

B. Motion to Authorize the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate during the summer months, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 183/28)

Jennifer brought the motion to the floor and explained the reasons for the motion and the composition of the committee. A vote was taken and the motion authorizing the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate over the summer months was unanimously approved.

XVI Adjournment

The 2012-13 Faculty Senate was adjourned at 3:05 PM.

Patrick Gamble, President
Phone: (907) 450-8000
Fax: (907) 450-8012
Email: ua.president@alaska.edu



UNIVERSITY
of ALASKA
Many Traditions One Alaska

202 Butrovich Building
910 Yukon Drive
P.O. Box 755000
Fairbanks, AK 99775-5000

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 2, 2012
TO: Cathy Cahill, President
Faculty Senate
FROM: Pat Gamble, President 
RE: Faculty Senate Resolution 182

This memo is in response to the UAF Faculty Senate resolution passed at meeting #182, April 2, 2012.

Thank you for the Faculty Senate input into the proposal that the University of Alaska not hire tobacco users as a long-term cost reduction to overall UA healthcare. I accept your resolution in opposition to the proposal. (Although it has become clear to me that the direction national healthcare is taking will, in fact, in the future, routinely place a personal healthcare cost on individual lifestyle choices ...a cost that is currently absorbed by the entire baseline of employees.) I also accept your observation that other avenues for cost reduction have not been explored. To that end I have approved a formal suggestion by the Staff Alliance to form a small independent task force to examine the multitude of non-traditional concepts you referred to that could replace our current pay-as-you-go process. In the meantime, HR has been directed to go back and, with JHCC, review suggestions made by a consultant a couple of years ago that were either rejected or not fully implemented at that time, to see if they have application today under our present more acute circumstances.

To be clear, nothing has been decided yet and constructive, viable suggestions (of which there are several so far) will get a full and fair vetting by Governance. It's important to keep in mind as we all wrestle with this burden that the costs we share for healthcare are the accumulation of actual individual medical charges for treatment. The university pays the provider directly as the bill comes in. The only fundamental way to significantly reduce those costs is to require less medical care. If we can't find a way to acknowledge

Cathy Cahill
May 2, 2012
Page 2

that and deal with it in our potential solution search, we will continue to lose ground to the increasing cost of growing medical bills.

I am committed to working this problem in a search for both near and long-term successful solutions with UAF Faculty Senate, JHCC, and all the Governance advising groups. Please thank your members for me for their contributions.

Warm regards,

PKG

cc: System Governance Office
Donald Smith, Interim Chief Human Resources Officer

ATTACHMENT 183/2
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

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

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

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

ATTACHMENT 183/3
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

RECOGNITION OF SERVICE BY CATHERINE CAHILL

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill has served the UAF Faculty Senate for nine years in a manner deserving of the UAF Faculty Senate's highest admiration and respect; and

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill created a positive atmosphere for participation by UAF Faculty in shared governance of the University; and

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill served as Senator to the UAF Faculty Senate from 2004-05 through 2006-07, and again during 2008-09; and

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill served on the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee as a member in 2004-05 and as chair in 2005-06 and 2006-07; and

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill served as chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee in 2008-09; and

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill served on the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee as a member from 2004-05 through 2006-07 and in 2008-09, and served as chair in 2009-10 and 2010-11 (twice as long as anyone in UAF Faculty Senate history); and

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill served as a member of the UAF Governance Coordinating Committee from 2009-10 through 2011-12; and

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill served as President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate in 2009-10 and 2010-11 (twice as long as anyone in Faculty Senate history); and

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill served as President of the UAF Faculty Senate in 2011-12 with clear vision, distinguished dedication, and unflagging commitment; and

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill effectively advocated for UAF Faculty and programs as a member of the UA Faculty Alliance from 2009-10 through 2011-12, notably with regard to the Academic Master Plan and the Tuition Task Force; and

WHEREAS, Catherine Cahill worked strategically and effectively on behalf of UAF Faculty on the Statewide Academic Council and Statewide Governance Council in 2011-12; and

WHEREAS, The UAF Faculty Senate wishes to acknowledge the truly outstanding service rendered the Faculty and the University by the work of Catherine Cahill as she concludes her term as President; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate acknowledges the many contributions of Catherine Cahill and expresses its appreciation for her exemplary service. (Hooray!)

ATTACHMENT 183/4
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

**OUTSTANDING SENATOR OF THE YEAR AWARD
FOR
ACADEMIC YEAR 2012**

WHEREAS, David Valentine has served the University in the UAF Faculty Senate for four years at UAF; and

WHEREAS, David Valentine has served as Senator to the UAF Faculty Senate from 2010 through 2012; and

WHEREAS, David Valentine served on the Curricular Affairs Committee from 2010 to the present year, during which no less than 24 motions were passed and brought before Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, David Valentine has distinguished himself as an active and engaged colleague in the UAF Faculty Senate, particularly with regard for the need to revitalize the university core curriculum; and

WHEREAS, David Valentine has worked tirelessly to further the work of the General Education Revitalization Committee (GERC), and was instrumental through his efforts on the Curricular Affairs Committee in the formation of the GERC, chairing GERC in 2010-11 and helping to find a chair for that committee in 2011-12; and

WHEREAS, David Valentine has not only been an active participant in committee meetings, but has listened to his colleagues and treated all ideas and perspectives with respect (even when he has respectfully disagreed!); and

WHEREAS, David Valentine has brought wit, humor, and perspective to committee discussions while simultaneously fighting to uphold the highest possible academic standards at UAF; and

WHEREAS, David Valentine has demonstrated sharp insight and made valuable contributions to many discussions of the Faculty Senate that have far-reaching implications for faculty and students and the direction of university programs; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, the UAF Faculty Senate recognizes David Valentine as Outstanding Senator of the Year for Academic Year 2011-12.

ATTACHMENT 183/5
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Minor in Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012
 Upon Chancellor's approval.

RATIONALE: See the program proposal #46-UNP on file in the Governance
 Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Overview:

Geographic Information Systems or GIS has become an industry and agency standard for the collection, manipulation, display and query of all forms of topographic, geographic, climate, environmental (geology, plant communities, landforms) and human (population, culture, infrastructure) spatial data. From within SNRAS, we have been asked to create a minor in GIS for students majoring in Natural Resource Management. GIS perfectly complements, and is in fact often a required tool in most resource and management careers. It is logical that such a minor would equally complement other majors on campus by providing a valuable job skill that today is extensively used in many fields.

The recent development and proposal for a new course GEOG/GEOS 222 Fundamentals of Geospatial Sciences (part of a collaborative effort with Geology and Geophysics and a shared Geospatial Sciences concentration between departments) fits well in the GIS minor and adds a valuable introduction to geospatial sciences and breadth to the minor in GIS.

The NRM degree and concentrations / departments within SNRAS will all benefit by being able offer NRM majors a minor in GIS.

Students majoring in many other disciplines will benefit from the opportunity to complement their course of study with high demand knowledge and skills in GIS. Many federal and state agency jobs have minimum credit requirements in GIS and related coursework, and this minor will improve employment prospects for students applying for jobs in public and private sector fields such as wildlife management, range management, mining, fisheries, forestry, engineering, journalism, natural resource management, emergency management, insurance, environmental impact assessment, urban planning, etc. . It is also expected that a GIS minor on the books will increase enrollment in the courses listed. The opportunity earn a minor in GIS (from a range of disciplines and degrees) may attract more incoming students to UAF as well.

Geography currently offers a minor in "Geography" aimed mostly at students who wish to broaden their education with basic geography, regional, and/or environmental/human geography coursework. This new minor specifically in GIS allows students to have "GIS" on their diploma and clearly defines a set of classes, knowledge and skills acquired.

Geography faculty and faculty from Geology and Geophysics have worked collaboratively to develop a Geospatial Sciences *concentration* within their respective degrees. However, no other minor or certificate program in Geographic Information Systems currently exists at UAF. No negative impact on any programs or departments is expected.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

Complete the following:

- GEOG F111X Earth and Environment: Introduction to Physical Geography (4 cr)
- GEOG/GEOS F222 Fundamentals of Geospatial Sciences (3 cr)
- GEOG F309 Digital Cartography and Geo-visualization (4 cr)
- GEOG F338 Introduction to GIS (3 cr)

Complete one of the following:

- GEOG 435 GIS Analysis (4 cr)
- GEOG F430 Google Earth and Neogeography (3 cr)
- NRM F369 GIS and Remote Sensing for Natural Resources
- GEOG 300 Internship in Geography (if in GIS, and approved by dept chair)
or any GIS related course approved Geography Dept chair

Minimum credits required 17

Relationship to the “Purposes of the University”:

Justification of a GIS Minor at UAF:

We believe that a minor in GIS will serve many students at UAF, allowing them to complement and strengthen their existing major with the highly marketable GIS skills, and geographic perspective, provided in this minor. We have had many requests over the past few years for a GIS minor from students majoring in NRM, Wildlife Biology, Fisheries, Marine Science, etc. A minor in GIS could potentially serve students in biology and wildlife, anthropology, earth science, engineering/mining, social sciences, all areas of management, business, and emergency planning.

GEOG F111X Earth and Environment (a university core natural science lab course) introduces students to the basic principles and driving forces of geologic, biologic, and climatic processes shaping the surface of the Earth. The course explores the interconnectedness of these systems, as well as the impact of human activity on the physical environment. The lab fosters critical thinking through the collection, analysis and evaluation of various types of data. Students are introduced to the concepts of spatial sciences and the practical use of topographic maps, aerial photos, satellite imagery, and some of the technological tools used to view, interpret, and query geographic patterns on Earth. A broad exposure to dynamic natural (geologic, biologic, climatic) systems and processes, and the patterns they create, makes this a perfect course to successfully segue students from various disciplines into the field of geography and the widely applied tools of GIS.

The other courses (GEOG/GEOS 222, GEOG 309, GEOG 338) emphasize the governing principles and tools used in mapping, visualization, and Geographic Information Systems. An ability to choose among specified courses and/ or an internship experience, will allow students to shape part of the GIS minor toward their specific academic and career interests.

Justification and Background in GIS (and application in many career fields):

GIS allows us to view, question, interpret, understand, and visualize data in many ways that reveal relationships, patterns, and trends in physical, biological, climatic and human systems on Earth. The interdisciplinary nature of many problems and the increasingly global nature of human activity is moving the field of Geography and the central tool of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to the forefront of research, management, and decision making at local, regional, national, and global scales.

Having originally emerged from the discipline of Geography, GIS has become an essential tool in many disciplines from resource management, wildlife biology, planning, hazards and risk assessment, business, and medical and social science fields. Students with a minor in GIS will enter their respective careers with a basic understanding and skill set in GIS.

Justification of Minor in Context of Career Training and Certification:

This program satisfies the educational requirements of the GIS Certification Institute's professional GIS certification. Although there does not currently exist a national standardized GIS certification system, numerous institutes and agencies are working to define certification programs or minimal requirements for specific jobs. This minor is a first logical step in a planned development of certification program in GIS currently being developed in Geography program and School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences. The result could be 'GIS certification' (however that takes shape nationally) earned via a minor in GIS, and/or undergraduate course work (e.g. via Geospatial Sciences concentrations), and/or possibly a post-graduate certification program.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Minor in Paleontology.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012
 Upon Chancellor's approval.

RATIONALE: See the program proposal #10-UNP on file in the Governance
 Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Overview:

Paleontology is an interdisciplinary field; graduate paleontology programs may be housed within geology or biology departments. We regularly receive inquiries from students of biology and anthropology who are interested in taking paleontology courses, and the recent addition of a vertebrate paleontologist to our faculty has added new breadth and expertise to our paleontology curriculum. The current Geology minor provides a flexible option for students, but does not provide a clear path for students interested in fossil organisms. The proposed Paleontology minor is designed to provide a customized emphasis for interested BA students, Anthropology majors, or Biological Sciences majors who wish to add breadth to focus on a topic of lifelong interest, add breadth to their degree program, or pursue graduate studies in paleontology, respectively. The foundation courses will provide students with a solid grounding in geological concepts and practices. The electives allow students to strengthen their understanding of sedimentary environments and biostratigraphy (GEOS 322), investigate the morphology and evolution of a particular group (invertebrates GEOS 315W; vertebrates GEOS 486, or plants GEOS 453), master fossil preparation and curation skills (GEOS 3170) or explore the classic and current paleontological literature (GEOS 485).

Proposed Minor Requirements:

Paleontology

College of Natural Science & Mathematics

1. Complete the following foundation courses:

- GEOS FIOIX--The Dynamic Earth4 credits
- GEOS F112X-The History of Earth and Life.....4 credits

2. Complete three of the following Paleontology electives:

- GEOS F315W--Paleobiology and Paleontology4 credits
- GEOS F322--Stratigraphy and Sedimentation4 credits

GEOS F3170--Paleontological Research and Laboratory Methods	2 credits
GEOS 453--Palynology and Paleopalynology	4 credits
GEOS F486--Vertebrate Paleontology.....	3 credits
GEOS F485-Mass Extinctions, Neocatastrophism and the History of Life.....	3 credits
3. Minimum credits required	16-20 credits

Relationship to the “Purposes of the University”:

Paleontology is an exciting area of current research in Alaska and an area of growing expertise in the Dept. of Geology and Geophysics. UAF paleontologists Druckenmiller and Fowell receive regular inquiries from students who would like to study paleontology, conduct undergraduate research or volunteer at the VA Museum. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the field, students often have difficulty figuring out which department offers paleontology courses. Many students search for a "paleontology department" and are confused not to find one. The proposed paleontology minor will help students to locate paleontology courses, expose students to results from ongoing research projects, connect faculty with interested undergraduate researchers and volunteers, and provide a conduit for disseminating new discoveries in Alaskan paleontology.

The proposed minor highlights the diversity of topics housed beneath the Geoscience umbrella and provides students with a clear path to a concentration in paleontology. Because the minor consists of courses required for all Geoscience students (GEOS 101 and GEOS 112) and elective courses that are central to the Geology (GEOS 322) and Paleontology Options (all other courses), the minor places no additional demands on faculty workloads. Unless the Paleontology minor attracts upwards of 5 students per year, we do not foresee a need for additional space. Therefore, while we expect a small increase in enrollments within the Geoscience degree program, the minor provides a service to students at little cost to the department or college.

In short, the proposed Paleontology minor will Educate, exposing students to current and classical research in the field of paleontology; Prepare students for graduate studies, biostratigraphy positions in the petroleum industry or jobs as museum technicians; Connect active researchers with an interested undergraduate population; Engage students from other BS and BA programs through active learning and student-driven projects; and Discover, offering research and field opportunities to talented undergraduates.

ATTACHMENT 183/7
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Minor in Geospatial Sciences.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012
 Upon Chancellor's approval.

RATIONALE: See the program proposal #11-UNP on file in the Governance
 Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Overview:

Earth is our habitat and it is important to understand that it works as a dynamic system that changes with time. Geospatial science uses information technology to understand people, places, and processes on the Earth. Knowledge of fundamental principles behind geospatial sciences, and skill-to use technology and apply it for decision-making, will empower our students to be success in personal and professional life.

The Department of Geology and Geophysics and the Geography Department are heavily vested in Geospatial Sciences. Faculty and leadership of both Departments have been working closely over the last year not only to raise the bar for geospatial science education, but also to make it widely appealing and accessible. This minor strengthens those ongoing efforts.

The positive impact of offering this minor are that it will provide an opportunity to a broad base of undergraduate students to learn about and use geospatial technology for understanding the Earth system and Earth processes. It will prepare the students to use technology for spatial orientation, mapping, planning and decision making. This knowledge and skill-set is high in demand in industry and this minor will prepare students to join the growing geospatial workforce.

This minor will prepare the undergraduate students to first understand that the Earth is a dynamic system and that exploring the evolution of the Earth helps to provide context to the present and future of the planet Earth. The minor then focuses on providing students with an introduction to geospatial sciences (remote sensing, geographic information systems (GIS) and global positioning systems (GPS), followed by honing student's skill sets in using emerging technologies in geospatial sciences.

The sequence of courses prescribed for the minor helps the students to systematically meet the above mentioned objectives.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

Geospatial Sciences

College of Natural Science & Mathematics

1. Complete the following:

GEOS F101X--The Dynamic Earth	4 credits
GEOS F112X--The History of Earth and Life	4 credits
GEOS/GEOG F222--Fundamentals of Geospatial Sciences	3 credits
GEOS F225--Field and Computer Methods in Geology	2 credits
GEOS F458--Geoscience Applications of GPS and GIS	3 credits
GEOS F422--Geoscience Applications of Remote Sensing	3 credits

2. Minimum credits required 19 credits

Relationship to the “Purposes of the University”:

This minor is anticipated to:

- have high appeal
- improve enrollments
- provide experiential learning as courses have hands- on lab component)
- prepare students to join the industry and be successful

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Minor in Geophysics.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012
 Upon Chancellor's approval.

RATIONALE: See the program proposal #12-UNP on file in the Governance
 Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Overview:

The Department of Geology and Geophysics currently has a minor focused on the geology side of the department, but no minor available for those interested in Geophysics. We regularly get students interested in Geophysics because of its application to the oil industry, volcanoes, earthquakes, glaciers, climate, and related studies relevant to living and working in Alaska. Because of the prerequisites necessary to accomplish the coursework proposed for this minor, the most likely students to request it are Physics, Math, Chemistry, Engineering or similar majors. In particular the Geophysics minor can provide these students with rigorous, quantitative, intriguing Earth Science applications for the theories and fundamentals they are acquiring as students in these other departments. UAF has a world-renowned research program in geophysics. The minor would help connect the geophysics expertise to a pool of undergraduate students seeking to gain breadth and flexibility for future opportunities in either academia or the workforce.

Proposed Minor Requirements:

Geophysics Minor

1. Complete the following*:
 - GEOS F10IX- The Dynamic Earth4 credits
 - GEOS F112X- The History of Earth and Life4 credits
 - GEOS F377 0- Ice in the Climate System3 credits
 - GEOS F318- Solid Earth Geophysics-3 credits
 - GEOS F406- Volcanology3 credits
 - GEOS F431- Foundations of Geophysics4 credits
 - Minimum credits required21 credits

Relationship to the “Purposes of the University”:

The Geophysics Minor highlights the diversity of topics housed beneath the Geoscience umbrella and provides students with a clear path to a concentration in geophysics. Because the minor consists of courses required for all Geoscience students (GEOS 101 and GEOS 112) and courses

that are central to the Geophysics Option (all other courses), the minor places no additional demands on faculty workloads. Unless this minor attracts more than 5 students per year, we do not foresee a need for additional space. Therefore, while we expect a small increase in enrollments within the Geoscience degree program, the minor provides a service to students at little cost to the department or college.

The Geophysics Minor is intended to provide a path for students in Physics, Math, Chemistry, Engineering or other science who wish to learn in more depth about how the basic sciences can be applied to study the Alaskan landscape. As mentioned above, we regularly get students interested in Geophysics because of its application to the oil industry, volcanoes, earthquakes, glaciers, climate, auroras, environmental engineering, and related studies relevant to living and working in Alaska. This program will provide a connection between UAF undergraduate students and UAF's world renown expertise in Geophysics in research and graduate studies. In particular, this minor would provide a conduit for undergraduate students to engage in innovative research pertinent to Alaska's changing landscapes.

ATTACHMENT 183/9
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs and Core Review Committees

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the recommendation of the Core Review Committee requiring a syllabus statement for Oral Intensive O and O/2 courses.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012 and/or upon chancellor's approval

RATIONALE: The Core Review Committee's assessment of W and O course syllabi has found that there is frequent confusion amongst some faculty members about the general and specific requirements for the three options of the oral intensive O designator and for the single O/2 designator. The inclusion of this statement in a course syllabus will make explicit the general course requirements for the O or O/2 designation and provide a reference location for the numerous specific requirements. Inclusion of this statement will make the syllabus requirement for the O and O/2 courses consistent with the existing syllabus requirement statement for Writing Intensive W courses, per Faculty Senate Meeting #109 on May 6, 2002. No new course requirements result from this action. These syllabus requirements should be added to the Faculty Senate's "UAF Syllabus Requirements."

Syllabus Statement Regarding the Oral-Intensive (O) Requirement:

This statement, or a statement similar to it, MUST appear in the syllabus of each "O" or "O/2" course. Courses failing to provide this information jeopardize their continuing status as "O" or "O/2" courses.

This course is designated as Oral-Intensive (O). This designation means that the "O" or "O/2" is evident in the course number on the syllabus (e.g., Education F452 O). The designation applies to upper-division courses. **ORAL ACTIVITIES IN THIS COURSE WILL FOLLOW THESE RULES:**

- A minimum of 15 percent of the graded work in the O course (7.5 percent for "O/2") will be based on effectiveness of oral communications.
- Students will receive intermediate instructor assistance in developing presentational competency.
- Students will utilize their communication competency across the span of the semester, not just in a final project.
- Students will receive instructor feedback on the success of their efforts at each stage of preparing their presentations.

In addition, THE SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS APPROPRIATE FOR THE PARTICULAR 'O' OPTION REPRESENTED BY THE COURSE (FOUND AT <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course-degree-procedures/guidelines-for-core-desig/>) WILL BE LISTED.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Faculty Senate Bylaws, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E, Permanent Committees.6. and to approve the Core Review Committee's authority to revoke O or W status (Oral intensive or Writing intensive designator) for classes following the second consecutive time that they fail to pass review by the Core Review Committee.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012 and/or upon Chancellor's approval

RATIONALE: Many classes with the O or W designator fail multiple assessments by the Core Review Committee. The appropriate Dean and Department Chair are then informed of the need to bring syllabi into conformity with the O or W guidelines, but often no changes are made. It is hoped that this will spur action.

CAPS = Addition [[]] = Deletion

SECTION 3 (ART V: COMMITTEES), SUBSECTION E., PERMANENT COMMITTEES:

6. The Core Review Committee reviews and approves courses submitted by the appropriate school/college curriculum councils for their inclusion in the core curriculum at UAF. The Core Review Committee coordinates and recommends changes to the core curriculum, develops the process for assessment of the core curriculum, regularly reports on assessment of the core curriculum, monitors transfer guidelines for core courses, acts on petitions for core credit, and evaluates guidelines in light of the total core experience. This committee will also review courses for oral, written, and natural science core classification. **IF THE COMMITTEE DETERMINES THAT A COURSE FAILS TWICE IN A ROW TO MEET O OR W GUIDELINES AS SPECIFIED BY THE FACULTY SENATE, THE COMMITTEE SHALL HAVE THE POWER TO REVOKE O OR W DESIGNATORS FROM THAT COURSE.* COMMITTEE ACTIONS MADE PRIOR TO MARCH 1 WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE IN THE NEXT YEAR'S CATALOG. DESIGNATORS WILL BE RESTORED AS SOON AS THE COURSE HAS BEEN REAPPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AS ONCE AGAIN CONFORMING TO O OR W GUIDELINES.**

***AS FOUND AT: [HTTP://WWW.UAF.EDU/UAFGOV/FACULTY-SENATE/CURRICULUM/COURSE-DEGREE-PROCEDURES-/GUIDELINES-FOR-CORE-DESIG/](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course-degree-procedures-/guidelines-for-core-desig/)**

The committee shall be composed of one faculty member from each of the core component areas: (Social Sciences, English, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Communication, and Library Science) and one faculty member from a non-core component area. Membership on the committee will include an undergraduate student and representatives from the colleges specifically tasked with core assessment.

MOTION

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for the CLA Art Department.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012
 Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the CLA Art Department. Revisions were agreed upon by the department representatives and the Unit Criteria Committee, and the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

**UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY
AND ART DEPARTMENT UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND INDICES**

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS' CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, PRE-TENURE REVIEW, POST-TENURE REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY ADAPTED FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE FACULTY OF THE ART DEPARTMENT. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS.

CHAPTER I

Purview

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment

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

B. Academic Titles

Academic titles must reflect the discipline in which the faculty are appointed.

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank

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

D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

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

E. Following the Selection Process

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

F. Letter of Appointment

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

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

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV, evaluators may consider, but shall not be limited to, whichever of the following are appropriate to the faculty member’s professional obligation: mastery of subject matter; effectiveness in teaching; achievement in research, scholarly, and creative activity; effectiveness of public service; effectiveness of university service; demonstration of professional development and quality of total contribution to the university.

For purposes of evaluation at UAF, the total contribution to the university and activity in the areas outlined above will be defined by relevant activity and demonstrated competence from the following areas: 1) effectiveness in teaching; 2) achievement in scholarly activity; and 3) effectiveness of service.

Bipartite Faculty

Bipartite faculty are regular academic rank faculty who fill positions that are designated as performing two of the three parts of the university’s tripartite responsibility.

The dean or director of the relevant college/school shall determine which of the criteria defined above apply to these faculty.

Bipartite faculty may voluntarily engage in a tripartite function, but they will not be required to do so as a condition for evaluation, promotion, or tenure.

B. Criteria for Instruction

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities. ***CURATORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA MUSEUM OF THE NORTH WITH A FACULTY APPOINTMENT IN ART TYPICALLY HAVE A PORTION OF THEIR WORKLOAD ASSIGNED IN TEACHING TO THE DEPARTMENT. THE ART DEPARTMENT WILL EVALUATE THE CURATOR’S TEACHING RECORD***

1. Effectiveness in Teaching

Evidence of excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, evidence of the various characteristics that define effective teachers. Effective teachers

- a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for students;
- b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject;

- c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are sensitive to student diversity;
- d. emphasize regular feedback to students and reward student learning success ***BY PROVIDING INSIGHTFUL CRITIQUES IN AN INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP CONTEXT; THE ABILITY TO RUN EFFECTIVE, CORDIAL AND INSIGHTFUL GROUP CRITIQUES IS ALSO IMPORTANT;***
- e. demonstrate content mastery, discuss current information and divergent points of view, relate topics to other disciplines, deliver material at the appropriate level;
- f. regularly develop new courses, ***TEACHING RESIDENCIES***, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design;
- g. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching.
- h. ***THE “HANDS ON” NATURE OF STUDIO ART MUST BE RECOGNIZED. DEMONSTRATE TECHNICAL MASTERY AND THE ACQUISITION OF NEW TECHNIQUES INCLUDING DIGITAL MEDIA, DATABASES AND THE INTERNET.***

2. Components of Evaluation

Effectiveness in teaching will be evaluated through information on formal and informal teaching, course and curriculum material, recruiting and advising, training/guiding graduate students, etc., provided by:

- a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms,

and at least two of the following:

- b. narrative self-evaluation,
- c. peer/department chair classroom observation(s),
- d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials.

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere.

ART FACULTY ARE EXPECTED TO CONSISTENTLY CREATE AND EXHIBIT NEW WORK. THE STATURE OF THE EXHIBITION SPACE AND SCALE OF THE EXHIBIT SHOULD ALSO BE CONSIDERED. NOTE THAT AN ART HISTORIAN’S RESEARCH WILL BE LARGELY PRESENTATION, PUBLICATION, AND CURATORIAL WHILE A STUDIO ARTIST’S WILL BE LARGELY EXHIBITION BASED. A DIGITAL ARTIST WILL

NORMALLY PRESENT WORK IN WEB BASED OR OTHER DIGITAL FORMAT. STUDIO ARTISTS, BOTH TRADITIONAL MEDIA AND DIGITAL, NORMALLY MAKE PUBLIC SPEAKING PRESENTATIONS AS A PART OF THEIR WORK.

CURATORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA MUSEUM OF THE NORTH WITH A FACULTY APPOINTMENT IN ART TYPICALLY HAVE A PORTION OF THEIR WORKLOAD ASSIGNED TO THE DEPARTMENT. THE ART DEPARTMENT WILL EVALUATE THE CURATOR'S CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND RESEARCH RECORD.

1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

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

- a. They must occur in a public forum.
- b. They must be evaluated by appropriate peers.
- c. They must be evaluated by peers external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.
- d. They must be judged to make a contribution.

2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

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

- a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings, ***CATALOGS*** and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline. ***ONLINE MAGAZINES AND OTHER DIGITAL PUBLICATIONS ARE VALID VENUES IF SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND APPROVAL BY PEERS.***
- b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas, these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.
- c. Presentation of research papers before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.
- d. Exhibitions of art work at galleries, ***MUSEUMS, ART CENTERS AND ALTERNATIVE SPACES AS WELL AS SITE SPECIFIC LOCATIONS***, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics. ***BOTH JURIED AND INVITATIONAL GROUP AND SOLO EXHIBITS ARE VALID FORUMS. ONLINE VENUES ARE ALSO APPROPRIATE FOR DIGITAL WORK EXHIBITION. THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR EXHIBITIONS IS COMPETITIVE AND COMPARABLE TO PUBLISHING IN REFEREED JOURNALS. SOLO EXHIBITIONS SHOULD TAKE PLACE EVERY TWO YEARS ON AVERAGE AND PARTICIPATION IN JURIED OR INVITATIONAL GROUP SHOWS SHOULD TAKE PLACE FREQUENTLY, ON AVERAGE AT LEAST TWO TIMES A YEAR.***

- e. ***SOLO AND COLLABORATIVE*** performances in recitals or productions, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.
- f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.
- g. Citations of research in scholarly publications.
- h. Published abstracts of research papers.
- i. Reprints or quotations of publications, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship, ***INCLUDING ACQUISITION OF WORK BY PROMINENT PRIVATE, CORPORATE AND PUBLIC COLLECTIONS.***
- l. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study, ***INCLUDING ARTIST-IN-RESIDENCES.***
- m. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.
- n. ***CREATION OF PUBLIC ART COMMISSIONED BY LOCAL, STATE OR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS.***
- o. ***APPLIED RESEARCH SUCH AS BUILDING AND DESIGN OF EQUIPMENT OR PROCESSES USING HISTORICAL AND/OR CONTEMPORARY TECHNOLOGIES.***
- p. ***SERVING AS CURATOR OF AN EXHIBIT AT A RECOGNIZED INSTITUTION SUCH AS A MUSEUM, GALLERY OR ALTERNATIVE SPACE.***
- q. ***PUBLIC SCREENING AND BROADCAST OF VIDEO/FILM WORKS.***

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is a fundamental part of the university's obligation to the people of its state. In this tradition, faculty providing their professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge, is identified as "public service." The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assumes a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service."

1. Public Service

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. It includes all activities which extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing,

programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, professional contributions to the community or to one's discipline, or other activities in furtherance of the goals and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- a. Providing information services to adults or youth.
- b. Service on or to government or public committees.
- c. Service on accrediting bodies.
- d. Active participation in professional organizations.
- e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- f. Consulting.
- g. Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.
- h. Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.
- i. Training and facilitating.
- j. Radio and TV programs, newspaper articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media.
- k. Judging and similar educational assistance at science fairs, state fairs, and speech, drama, literary, and similar competitions.

2. University Service

University service includes those activities involving faculty members in the governance, administration, and other internal affairs of the university, its colleges, schools, and institutes. It includes non-instructional work with students and their organizations. Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

- a. Service on university, college, school, institute, or departmental committees or governing bodies.
- b. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance for specific projects.
- c. Service as department chair or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college/school.
- d. Participation in accreditation reviews.
- e. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.
- f. Service in support of student organizations and activities.

- g. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.
- h. Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.
- i. Mentoring.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

3. Professional Service

- a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.
- b. Active participation in professional organizations.
- c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.
- e. Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings.
- f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

4. Other Service: Curation

CURATORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA MUSEUM OF THE NORTH (UAMN) WITH A FACULTY APPOINTMENT IN ART TYPICALLY HAVE A PORTION OF THEIR WORKLOAD ASSIGNED TO THE DEPARTMENT. THE ART DEPARTMENT WILL EVALUATE THE CURATOR'S SERVICE RECORD TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE UAF MUSEUM COMMITTEE.

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

- a. MAINTAINING, ENHANCING, AND ENLARGING THE COLLECTION (INCLUDES COMPUTERIZATION AND DATABASE DEVELOPMENT, ARCHIVAL UPGRADES, SPECIMEN CONSERVATION AND IDENTIFICATION, AND ADDING SPECIMENS OR OBJECTS TO EXISTING COLLECTION);***
- b. INTERACTING WITH STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES AND WITH THE PUBLIC ON COLLECTIONS-RELATED ISSUES;***
- c. FACILITATING COLLECTIONS USE THROUGH LOANS, EXCHANGES, AND VISITING RESEARCHERS;***
- d. MAINTAINING APPROPRIATE PERMITS (AS NEEDED FOR THE COLLECTIONS);***

- e. ***DIRECTING COLLECTIONS MANAGERS, STUDENT EMPLOYEES, AND VOLUNTEERS;***
- f. ***WORKING WITH PUBLIC PROGRAM STAFF TO CREATE EXHIBITS AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATE TO THE COLLECTION;***
- g. ***PURSuing FUNDING FOR COLLECTIONS GROWTH AND MAINTENANCE;***
- h. ***PRODUCING CURATORIAL OR COLLECTIONS-RELATED PUBLICATIONS, REPORTS, AND/OR MANUALS.***
- i. ***ENSURING UNIVERSITY COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS THAT PERTAIN TO THE COLLECTION.***
- j. ***SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR CURATORIAL PERFORMANCE AT THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR. EVIDENCE OF CURATORIAL ABILITY AND A COMMITMENT TO DEVELOPING AND MANAGING RESEARCH COLLECTIONS RELEVANT TO THE AREA OF SPECIALIZATION INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING:***
 - i. ***CURATORS WILL DEVELOP THE COLLECTIONS AS A PERMANENT RECORD OF THE NATURAL AND/OR CULTURAL DIVERSITY OF ALASKA AND THE CIRCUMPOLAR NORTH AND AS A RESEARCH RESOURCE FOR STUDIES OF BIOLOGICAL AND/OR CULTURAL DIVERSITY.***
 - ii. ***COLLECTIONS CARE INCLUDES RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PHYSICAL CONDITION AND STORAGE OF OBJECTS/SPECIMENS, CORRESPONDING DOCUMENTATION, BUDGETARY MANAGEMENT, AND ANNUAL REPORTS.***
 - iii. ***CURATORS WILL PRESERVE THE SPECIMENS, ARTIFACTS, OBJECTS, AND MATERIAL UNDER THEIR PURVIEW THROUGH THE USE OF METHODS AND TECHNIQUES PROFESSIONALLY ACCEPTED WITHIN THEIR RESPECTIVE DISCIPLINES.***
 - iv. ***CURATORS WILL ENSURE THAT ALL RECORDS AND FIELD NOTES CONCERNING COLLECTION MATERIALS ARE MAINTAINED IN A SECURE FASHION AND MEET OR EXCEED DOCUMENTATION STANDARDS FOR THEIR RESPECTIVE DISCIPLINE.***
 - v. ***CURATORS WILL MAINTAIN CURRENT ACCESSION FILES, DEACCESSION FILES, AND CATALOGUES OF OBJECTS IN THEIR COLLECTIONS. THEY WILL DEVELOP ELECTRONIC DATABASES WITH COMPUTER DATA FORMATS THAT FOLLOW DATA STANDARDS OF THE RESPECTIVE DISCIPLINE AND UAMN.***
 - vi. ***CURATORS WILL DEVELOP, MAINTAIN, AND REVISE WRITTEN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR CURATION OF OBJECTS OR SPECIMENS IN THEIR COLLECTIONS.***
 - vii. ***CURATORS WILL TAKE PART IN INTERPRETIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE MUSEUM IN ORDER TO FULFILL THE MUSEUM'S MISSION TO INTERPRET THE NATURAL AND CULTURAL HISTORY OF ALASKA. IN THIS REGARD,***

PREPARATION OF SMALL EXHIBIT IS APPROXIMATELY THE EQUIVALENTS OF PUBLICATION OF A PROFESSIONAL ARTICLE; PROJECT DIRECTION OF A LARGE COMPLEX EXHIBIT THAT INCLUDES PREPARATION OF A SERIOUS CATALOGUE IS APPROXIMATELY THE EQUIVALENT OF PUBLICATION OF A SCHOLARLY BOOK.

viii. CURATORS WILL ACTIVELY PREPARE GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR EXTERNAL SUPPORT FOR THEIR CURATORIAL ACTIVITIES AND COLLECTION-BASED RESEARCH.

k. SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR CURATORIAL PERFORMANCE AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

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

l. SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR CURATORIAL PERFORMANCE AT THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

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

5. Evaluation of Service

Each individual faculty member's proportionate responsibility in service shall be reflected in annual workload agreements. In formulating criteria, standards and indices for evaluation, promotion, and tenure, individual units should include examples of service activities and measures for evaluation appropriate for that unit. Excellence in public and university service may be demonstrated through, e.g., appropriate letters of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

CURATORS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA MUSEUM OF THE NORTH WITH A FACULTY APPOINTMENT IN ART TYPICALLY HAVE A PORTION OF THEIR WORKLOAD ASSIGNED TO THE DEPARTMENT. THE ART DEPARTMENT WILL

***EVALUATE THE CURATOR'S SERVICE RECORD TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION
THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE UAF MUSEUM COMMITTEE.***

ATTACHMENT 183/12
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for the School of Education.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012
 Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the School of Education. Revisions were agreed upon by the department representatives and the Unit Criteria Committee, and the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

**UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE
APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF
FACULTY
AND SCHOOL OF EDUCATION UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND
INDICES**

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS' CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, PRE-TENURE REVIEW, POST-TENURE REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY ADAPTED FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENTS' FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS.

CHAPTER I

Purview

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment

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

B. Academic Titles

Academic titles must reflect the discipline in which the faculty are appointed.

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank

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

D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

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

E. Following the Selection Process

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

F. Letter of Appointment

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

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

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV, evaluators may consider, but shall not be limited to, whichever of the following are appropriate to the faculty member’s professional obligation: mastery of subject matter; effectiveness in teaching; achievement in research, scholarly, and creative activity; effectiveness of public service; effectiveness of university service; demonstration of professional development and quality of total contribution to the university.

For purposes of evaluation at UAF, the total contribution to the university and activity in the areas outlined above will be defined by relevant activity and demonstrated competence from the following areas: 1) effectiveness in teaching, *INCLUDING CLINICAL SUPERVISION*; 2) achievement in scholarly activity; and 3) effectiveness of service.

Bipartite Faculty

Bipartite faculty are regular academic rank faculty who fill positions that are designated as performing two of the three parts of the university’s tripartite responsibility.

The dean or director of the relevant college/school shall determine which of the criteria defined above apply to these faculty.

Bipartite faculty may voluntarily engage in a tripartite function, but they will not be required to do so as a condition for evaluation, promotion, or tenure.

IN ADDITION TO THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION FACULTY SERVE ALASKA’S SCHOOL DISTRICTS. MUCH OF OUR TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE ARE CONDUCTED IN AND FOR SCHOOLS. WE THEREFORE SERVE THREE CONSTITUENCIES – UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS; OUR PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH COMMUNITY; AND K-12 SCHOOLS, INCLUDING DISTRICTS, TEACHERS, K-12 STUDENTS, AND THEIR FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND COURSES ARE RESPONSIVE TO STATE LICENSURE REQUIREMENTS, NATIONAL ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS, AND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND UA BOARD OF REGENTS' MANDATES FOR THE PREPARATION OF K-12 TEACHERS, COUNSELORS, AND ADMINISTRATORS. THESE REQUIREMENTS CHANGE PERIODICALLY, WHICH REQUIRES REGULAR REVISION TO OUR CURRICULA. THUS CURRICULAR REVISION IS A REGULAR ASPECT OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE OF FACULTY.

B. Criteria for Instruction

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities.

FACULTY RESPONSIBLE FOR ADVISING REMOTELY-LOCATED STUDENTS TYPICALLY PROVIDE NUMEROUS SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICES TO STUDENTS. THESE ACTIVITIES MAKE ADVISING OF REMOTELY-LOCATED STUDENTS A TIME INTENSIVE ACTIVITY, WHICH SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION IN THE TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCESS.

1. Effectiveness in Teaching

Evidence of excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, evidence of the various characteristics that define effective teachers. Effective teachers

- a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for students;
- b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject;
- c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are sensitive to student diversity;
- d. emphasize regular feedback to students and reward student learning success;

- of
- e. demonstrate content mastery, discuss current information and divergent points view, relate topics to other disciplines, deliver material at the appropriate level;
 - f. regularly develop new courses, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design;
 - g. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching.
 - h. MAY ENGAGE IN DIVERSE INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES SUCH AS TEACHING AT RURAL OR BRANCH CAMPUSES, TEACHING DISTANCEDELIVERED COURSES, TEACHING IN SUMMER SCHOOL, AND DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS AND COURSES FOR TEACHERS AND EDUCATORS, INCLUDING THOSE UNIQUELY SUITED TO ALASKAN SCHOOLS.**
 - i. MAY PROVIDE SUPERVISION OF STUDENTS DURING FORMAL CLINICAL PRACTICE, STUDENT TEACHING, OR INTERNSHIPS.**
 - j. MAY INVOLVE STUDENTS, UNDERGRADUATES AS WELL AS GRADUATES, IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.**

2. Components of Evaluation

Effectiveness in teaching AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES will be evaluated through information on formal and informal teaching, course and curriculum material, recruiting and advising, training/guiding graduate students, etc., provided by:

- a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms, and at least two of the following:
- b. narrative self-evaluation,
- c. peer/department chair classroom observation(s), **OR SIMILAR OBSERVATIONS OF INSTRUCTION OUTSIDE CLASSROOMS,**
- d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS IN TEACHING MAY CONSIST OF BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- e. INSTRUCTOR MAY UTILIZE A CLASS PRETEST/POST TEST.**
- f. EXAMPLES OF STUDENT PROGRESS OR SKILLS, REPRESENTED BY IMPROVEMENTS IN EARLY AND LATE SEMESTER SKILLS OR PRODUCTS, OR OTHER MECHANISMS THAT CAN DOCUMENT IMPROVEMENT.**

g. INSTRUCTOR-DESIGNED STUDENT OPINION OF INSTRUCTION TO SUPPLEMENT (NOT REPLACE) UAF-APPROVED INSTRUCTIONAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM.

h. LETTERS OF SUPPORT FROM STUDENTS OR PEERS.

SPECIFIC SOE CRITERIA FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE BEFORE PROMOTION TO:

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: THE RECORD MUST SHOW THAT THE MATERIAL TAUGHT IS RELEVANT AND THAT THE PRESENTATIONS STIMULATE THE LEARNING PROCESS. EVIDENCE OF THE EXPECTED QUALITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE MAY INCLUDE (BUT NOT LIMITED TO) COURSE AND/OR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, NOVEL APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION, EFFECTIVE ADVISING AND MENTORING OF STUDENTS, EFFECTIVE CLASSROOM TEACHING PERFORMANCE, AND/OR EVIDENCE OF SUPERVISION OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH (AS A MAJOR SUPERVISOR OR CO-SUPERVISOR) LEADING TO SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF THE DEGREE PROGRAM.

PROFESSOR: SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM ARE EXPECTED. THESE MAY INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO: CONTRIBUTIONS TO MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS IN COURSE AND/OR CURRICULUM OFFERINGS, ABILITY TO MOTIVATE AND/OR INSPIRE STUDENTS, AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING, LEADERSHIP IN DIRECTING GRADUATE STUDENTS' RESEARCH, SIGNIFICANT EXPERIENCE AS GRADUATE COMMITTEE CHAIR LEADING TO SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM(S), AND/OR EFFECTIVE RECRUITMENT OR RETENTION OF STUDENTS, AS EVIDENCED BY LETTERS OF SUPPORT FROM ADVISEES OR OTHER ADVISORS.

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere.

1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

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

- a. They must occur in a public forum.
- b. They must be evaluated by appropriate peers.
- c. They must be evaluated by peers external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.
- d. They must be judged to make a contribution.

2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Evidence of excellence in research, scholarly, and creative activity may include ***THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, WHICH THE UNIT CONSIDERS TO BE IMPORTANT SUPPLEMENTARY CONSIDERATIONS IN THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS:***

- a. Books, ***BOOK CHAPTERS, EDITED BOOKS***, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses, ***INCLUDING ELECTRONIC JOURNALS AND PRESSES***, that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline.
- b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas, these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.
- c. Presentation of research papers ***OR INVITED PAPERS*** before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.
- d. Exhibitions of art work at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics.
- e. Performances in recitals or productions ***RELATED TO THE FIELD OF EDUCATION***, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.
- f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.
- g. Citations of research in scholarly publications. ***TEXTBOOKS, CURRICULA, OR CURRICULA MATERIALS FOR K-12 SCHOOLS OR COLLEGES THAT RESULT IN PUBLICATIONS THAT ARE PEER REVIEWED OR EDITORIAL BOARD REVIEWED.***
- h. Published abstracts of research papers. ***NATIONAL AND STATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING THAT RESULTS IN PEERREVIEWED OR EDITORIAL BOARD REVIEWED PUBLICATION.***
- i. Reprints or quotations of publications, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline. ***PRODUCTION OF***

EDUCATIONAL VIDEOTAPES OR MULTIMEDIA DIGITAL WORKS REVIEWED AND UTILIZED BY SCHOOLS, COLLEGES OR COMMUNITIES.

- j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.
- l. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.
- m. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as **EDUCATIONAL MODELS**, computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.
- n. **DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULA OR CURRICULA MATERIALS THAT ARE REVIEWED AND UTILIZED BY STATE OR LOCAL AGENCIES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS OR COMMUNITY BOARDS.**

SPECIFIC SOE CRITERIA FOR SCHOLARSHIP PERFORMANCE BEFORE PROMOTION TO:

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: MUST HAVE ESTABLISHED AN APPROPRIATE RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, OR CREATIVE PROGRAM AS EVIDENCED BY ANY OF THE FOLLOWING: REFEREED PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS, BOOKS, BOOK CHAPTERS, AND/OR EDITED BOOKS, PEER REVIEWED OR REVIEWED BY AN EDITORIAL BOARD, PROFESSIONAL REPORTS OR SCHOLARLY PRODUCTS, CURRICULAR MATERIALS, OR OTHER APPROPRIATE CREATIVE PRODUCTS IN THE FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION.

THE SUBMISSION OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS, THE COMPLETION OF CONTRACT RESEARCH REPORTS, AND PUBLICATION IN CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS CONSTITUTE SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE THAT THE SCHOLARLY PROGRAM IS OF HIGH QUALITY. MUST SHOW EVIDENCE OF SUSTAINED SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY. THE FACULTY MEMBER SHOWS INDEPENDENCE AND LEADERSHIP BY THE CREATION OF SCHOLARLY IDEAS THAT INVOLVE COLLABORATIONS WITH PEERS IN THEIR FIELD OF SPECIALIZATION, STUDENTS, SCHOOL PERSONNEL OR PERSONNEL IN STATE OR NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY IN EDUCATION IS NOTABLY COLLABORATIVE IN NATURE. THUS IT IS CONSIDERED COMMON PRACTICE IN THE FIELD TO PRODUCE PUBLICATIONS OR OTHER PRODUCTS COLLABORATIVELY. TO DEMONSTRATE A CONSISTENT FLOW OF RESEARCH, A FACULTY MEMBER'S COMPLETE PUBLICATION RECORD, INCLUDING PAPERS PUBLISHED PRIOR TO THEIR AFFILIATION WITH THE UAF SCHOOL OF EDUCATION IS RELEVANT TO PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS.

CANDIDATES WILL DEMONSTRATE RELEVANT RESEARCH THROUOUT THEIR CAREER, AS WELL AS ADEQUATE PERFORMANCE IN RESDIENCE AT UAF.

PROFESSOR: THE SCHOLARLY PROGRAM SHOULD HAVE PRODUCED CLEAR EVIDENCE THAT CANDIDATE IS A LEADER IN THEIR FIELD. PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER PRODUCTS SHOULD BE OF SUFFICIENT QUALITY AND QUANTITY TO DEMONSTRATE THE EXISTENCE OF AN ON-GOING, PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARLY PROGRAM. A NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL REPUTATION (AS DEMONSTRATED BY PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OR PRESENTATIONS AT MEETINGS, THE RECEIPT OF AWARDS, AND DOCUMENTED OPINIONS OF OTHERS IN THE FIELD IS EXPECTED. THERE SHOULD BE A RECORD OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF GRADUATE WORK BY HIS OR HER STUDENTS.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is a fundamental part of the university's obligation to the people of its state. In this tradition, faculty providing their professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge, is identified as "public service." The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assumes a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service."

1. Public Service

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. It includes all activities which extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing, programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, professional contributions to the community or to one's discipline, or other activities in furtherance of the goals and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- a. Providing information services to adults or youth.
- b. Service on or to government or public committees.
- c. Service on accrediting bodies.
- d. Active participation in professional organizations.
- e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

- f. Consulting ***IN THE FACULTY MEMBER'S AREA OF EXPERTISE AND DISCIPLINE CONSISTENT WITH THE OBLIGATION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE.***
- g. Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.
- h. Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.
- i. Training and facilitating.
- j. Radio and TV programs, newspaper articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media, ***NON-REVIEWED CURRICULAR MATERIALS, INFORMATIONAL BULLETINS, JOURNALS AND NEWSLETTERS UTILIZED BY STATE OR LOCAL AGENCIES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS OR COMMUNITY BOARDS.***
- k. Judging and similar educational assistance at science fairs, state fairs, and speech, drama, literary, and similar competitions.
- l. PROVIDING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR K-12 TEACHERS AND OTHER K-12 SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS.***

2. University Service

University service includes those activities involving faculty members in the governance, administration, and other internal affairs of the university, its colleges, schools, and institutes. It includes non-instructional work with students and their organizations. Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

- a. Service on university, college, school, institute, or departmental committees or governing bodies.
- b. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance for specific projects.
- c. Service as department chair or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college/school.
- d. Participation in accreditation reviews.
- e. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.
- f. Service in support of student organizations and activities.
- g. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.
- h. Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.

- i. Mentoring.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

3. Professional Service

- a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.
- b. Active participation in professional organizations.
- c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.
- e. Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings.
- f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

4. Evaluation of Service

Each individual faculty member's proportionate responsibility in service shall be reflected in annual workload agreements. In formulating criteria, standards and indices for evaluation, promotion, and tenure, individual units should include examples of service activities and measures for evaluation appropriate for that unit. Excellence in public and university service may be demonstrated through, e.g., appropriate letters of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

SOE FACULTY TYPICALLY DEVOTE A SIGNIFICANT PERCENTAGE OF THEIR ACTIVITIES TO SERVICE. DUE TO UA BOARD OF REGENTS' AND OTHER UA ADMINISTRATIVE MANDATES, ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT LICENSURE REQUIREMENTS, AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF NATIONAL ACCREDITATION (E.G., NCATE), FACULTY HAVE RESPONSIBILITIES TO NUMEROUS COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS WITH ENTITIES EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL TO THE UNIT. SOME COLLABORATIONS RESULT IN FREQUENT TRAVEL AND SERVICE ON NUMEROUS COMMITTEES. THESE ACTIVITIES ARE OF GREAT IMPORTANCE TO THE UNIT AND SHOULD BE EVALUATED AS SUCH.

SPECIFIC SOE CRITERIA FOR SERVICE PERFORMANCE BEFORE PROMOTION TO:

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR: CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL/COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY MATTERS. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE

PUBLIC, INCLUDING INDUSTRY, GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION.

PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF LEADERSHIP IN THE SERVICE AREA IS EXPECTED. CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEPARTMENTAL/SCHOOL/ COLLEGE/ UNIVERSITY MATTERS ARE EXPECTED AS WELL AS EFFECTIVE APPLICATION OF EXPERTISE TO PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsections A and E. This amendment shall reassign the responsibilities of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee, and then dissolve the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: After a period of discovery and inquiry as to the roles, responsibilities and recent and historic activities of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee is recommending that the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee have its responsibilities reassigned, and thereafter, that committee is dissolved.

After evaluation of the findings and thorough discussion of this topic, the Faculty Affairs Committee arrived at the conclusion that, while activities, roles and duties of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee should be retained by the Faculty Senate, these activities do not warrant a ten-member committee for implementation, as it now stands.

Responsibilities of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee include acting as a pool to provide members, acting on behalf of United Academics, to serve on the faculty Appeals Board. The committee members also oversee evaluation of academic administrators. Per the Grade Appeals Policy and Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions, a member of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee is to be appointed to the (respective) review committees, when qualified members are available.

This motion will reassign oversight of administrator reviews to the Administrative Committee; reassign the “faculty Appeals Board” responsibility to the Faculty Affairs Committee; and Dissolve the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee. Reassignment of participation in the processes of Grade Appeals Policy and Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions shall occur in subsequent motions.

CAPS and **Bolded** – Addition
[[]] = Deletion

A. An Administrative Committee will be composed of the chairpersons of all standing Senate committees and of permanent Senate Committees. The Provost of UAF shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member. Specific duties of the Administrative Committee in its obligation to fully prepare the agenda and materials for efficient operation of the Senate are:

1. Receive reports from the president of the Senate, the Provost, and, as deemed timely, other individuals, on issues of current and future importance to the Senate;

2. Accept and review the motions of standing and permanent committees, and from members of the Administrative Committee;
3. Make certain that the motions are ready for Senate action to the maximum degree possible, and if not, refer them back for further work and/or direct them to other relevant committees that may not have considered the motions;
4. Move the motions to the Senate's agenda;
5. Review and approve other items of the Senate's agenda, as deemed necessary;
6. Review reports of all committee work in progress; and
7. Discuss other issues, which may or should lead to later committee and senate actions.

In addition,

8. Within the scope of authority granted by the Senate at the last meeting of the spring semester, the Administrative Committee will represent the Senate from the close of the last Senate meeting in the spring until the opening of the first Senate meeting of the fall semester; and
9. At the first meeting in the fall semester make a report of all actions carried out in the name of the Senate since the last meeting in the spring semester.

10. THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE SHALL OVERSEE THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS.

-
-
-

E. The standing and permanent committees of the Senate are:

STANDING

1. The Curricular Affairs Committee will deal with curricular and academic policy changes on all levels except the graduate level.

In addition to the non-voting ex officio member(s) appointed by the provost, the committee may add non-voting ex officio members for one-year terms as deemed necessary.

2. The Faculty Affairs Committee shall review issues dealing with faculty prerogative and recommend policy changes to the Faculty Senate. Issues of faculty prerogative include academic freedom, faculty ethics, research and creative activity, and legislative and fiscal issues that may impact faculty concerns at the university. The committee will act as a faculty advocate with legislators and candidates. In its concern for fiscal issues the committee shall monitor budget appropriations to the university and evaluate any notice to the faculty of financial exigency. In performing these duties, the committee will coordinate as necessary with the relevant officers (and/or their representatives) of the extant collective bargaining units who serve as non-voting members of the Senate and ex-officio members of this committee.

THE COMMITTEE WILL ALSO ACT AS A POOL TO BE DRAWN UPON TO ACT AS THE UNITED ACADEMICS REPRESENTATIVES TO THE FACULTY APPEALS BOARD. THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE WILL APPOINT, FROM THE COMMITTEE, TENURED MEMBERS OF THE UNITED ACADEMICS BARGAINING UNIT WHO WILL SERVE ON THE PARTICULAR APPEALS BOARD. IF NO QUALIFIED FACULTY MEMBERS ARE AVAILABLE WITHIN THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,

THE MATTER WILL BE REFERRED TO THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT FOR APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY SENATORS TO THE FACULTY APPEALS BOARD.

3. The Unit Criteria Committee will review proposed unit criteria for evaluation of faculty submitted by the various peer-review units of UAF, and to work with the heads of those units (or their designees) to ensure that their criteria are consistent with criteria defined in the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations "Blue Book". The committee will also review proposed changes to the "Blue Book."

To ensure that perspectives from across UAF are represented, membership will consist of faculty senators, with one member drawn from each of the following schools/colleges: CLA; CRA/CES; CSEM; SFOS; Engineering; and one from SNRAS, SoEd, or SOM.

PERMANENT

1. The Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee will include ten faculty members. The Dean of the Graduate School, Director of the Library, the University Registrar, and two graduate student, are non-voting ex-officio members. The committee will be responsible for the review and approval of graduate courses, curriculum and graduate degree requirements, and other academic matters related to instruction and mentoring of graduate students. The committee will also have responsibility for oversight, review and approval of all professional degree courses and programs including 500-level courses. The committee will advise the Dean of the Graduate School and the Provost on administrative matters pertinent to the operation and growth of graduate studies at UAF, including financial and tax-related issues and dealings with other universities.

2. The Student Academic Developmental and Achievement Committee will include one representative from each of the following units of the College of Rural and Community Development: Bristol Bay Campus, Chukchi Campus, Interior-Aleutians Campus, Kuskokwim Campus, Northwest Campus, and the Community and Technical College. One or more of these should be from rural campus student services. The committee will also include one representative from the Department of Developmental Education; two at large representatives from the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics: one from the Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, or Physics), and one from Math; one from the College of Liberal Arts English Department; and one each from Rural Student Services, the Academic Advising Center, and the Student Support Services Program.

The Student Academic Developmental and Achievement Committee shall consider policies concerning student development and retention. This committee will function as a curriculum review committee for all developmental education courses and other courses facilitating student progress.

3. The Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee will be composed of faculty members and a representative from the Office of Faculty Development to be selected by the Provost. This committee will deal with faculty and instructional development and evaluation.

[[4. The Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee shall be composed of two tenured faculty members, elected from each college/school and confirmed by the Faculty Senate.

Faculty appeals will be dealt with in accordance with the appropriate union contract.

The committee will act as a pool to be drawn upon to act as the United Academics representatives to the Appeals Board. The chair of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight committee will select, from the committee, members of the United Academics bargaining unit who will serve on the particular Appeals Board.

Committee members shall oversee the process of evaluation of academic administrators.]]

4[[5]]. The Curriculum Review Committee evaluates proposed substantive undergraduate course and program additions, changes, and deletions submitted by the appropriate school/college curriculum committees. Among the topics of its review are number and duplication of courses, credit assignment, establishment of need for new programs, and resource impacts of curricular changes. Decisions of the Curriculum Review Committee may be appealed to Curricular Affairs by the department submitting the proposal. The Committee shall be composed of the chairs of the college/school curriculum councils, the University Registrar or the Registrar's designee, and shall be chaired by a member of the Curricular Affairs Committee.

5[[6]]. The Core Review Committee reviews and approves courses submitted by the appropriate school/college curriculum councils for their inclusion in the core curriculum at UAF. The Core Review Committee coordinates and recommends changes to the core curriculum, develops the process for assessment of the core curriculum, regularly reports on assessment of the core curriculum, monitors transfer guidelines for core courses, acts on petitions for core credit, and evaluates guidelines in light of the total core experience. This committee will also review courses for oral, written, and natural science core classification.

The committee shall be composed of one faculty member from each of the core component areas: (Social Sciences, English, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Communication, and Library Science) and one faculty member from a non-core component area. Membership on the committee will include an undergraduate student, and representatives from the colleges specifically tasked with core assessment.

6[[7]]. The Committee on the Status of Women. Membership will consist of nine people, two of whom will be a senator, the others to be elected at large from among UAF faculty.

The purpose of this committee is to monitor the status of women faculty at UAF and to work proactively for gender equity.

Such actions will include, but are not limited to: Maintaining lists of women faculty with hire, tenure and promotion dates; Organizing and supervising surveys on the status of women and assessing the cultural climate of the university as it pertains to women; Recommending policy to address the needs of women faculty; Supporting mentoring of women, both new and mid-career faculty, including running workshops on mentoring, promotion & tenure, negotiating techniques and other forms of faculty development identified as necessary; Addressing family-work issues, such as child care, parental leave, spousal/partner hire; Coordinating with other campus and university groups which deal with women's and gender issues; and any other issues which would help women to achieve equity at UAF.

7[[8]]. The Research Advisory Committee. The Research Advisory Committee consists of up to ten voting members, a chair and a co-chair, along with at least one ex officio member who is the vice chancellor research. The committee exists to review the issues of researchers at the University of Alaska Fairbanks and to provide reports, recommendations, and resolutions to the UAF Faculty Senate on behalf of the UAF research community. The Research Advisory Committee will provide a connection between the faculty and the UAF vice chancellor for research, and advise the VCR on developing productive relationships with the different research facilities across UAF.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Grade Appeals Policy of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section III. Procedures, subsection B, Item 4. This amendment shall reassign the Senate responsibilities with respect to participation on grade appeals review committees.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: This motion is put forth as a result of dissolution of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

CAPS and **Bolded** – Addition
[[]] = Deletion

4. A [[The dean will appoint a]] 5 member review committee **WILL BE APPOINTED AS FOLLOWS** [[composed of the following]]:

- a. **THE DEAN SHALL APPOINT** one non-voting tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the course was offered (other than the instructor of the course). This individual shall serve in an advisory role.
- b. Two tenure-track faculty members from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the course was offered **SHALL BE APPOINTED. ONE OF THESE MEMBERS SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE DEAN. THE OTHER SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT. THIS PERSON SHALL BE A MEMBER OF THE FACULTY SENATE (INCLUDING ALTERNATE MEMBERS), IF AVAILABLE.** [[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 course was offered. **THIS PERSON SHALL BE A MEMBER OF THE FACULTY SENATE (INCLUDING ALTERNATE MEMBERS). THE SENATE MEMBER SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT.** [[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 dean, will be a non-voting student representative.
- e. The campus judicial officer or his/her designee shall serve as a nonvoting facilitator for grade appeals hearings. This individual shall serve in an advisory role to help preserve consistent hearing protocol and records.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions (other than assignment of grades) of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section III. Procedures, subsection B, Item 2. This amendment shall reassign the Senate responsibilities with respect to participation on grade appeals review committees.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012

RATIONALE: This motion is put forth as a result of dissolution of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

CAPS and **Bolded** – Addition
[[]] = Deletion

2. A [[The Provost will appoint a]] 5 member review committee **WILL BE APPOINTED AS FOLLOWS** [[composed of the following]]:

- a. **THE PROVOST SHALL APPOINT** one non-voting tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the decision was made. This individual shall serve in an advisory role. This faculty member shall not be the individual(s) against whom the appeal is directed.
- b. Two tenure-track faculty members from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the decision was made **SHALL BE APPOINTED. ONE OF THESE MEMBERS SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE PROVOST. THE OTHER PERSON SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT AND SHALL BE A MEMBER OF THE FACULTY SENATE (INCLUDING ALTERNATE MEMBERS), IF AVAILABLE.** [[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. **THIS PERSON SHALL BE A MEMBER OF THE FACULTY SENATE (INCLUDING ALTERNATE MEMBERS). THE SENATE MEMBER SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT.** [[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.

ATTACHMENT 183/16

UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee and the Curricular Affairs Committee

RESOLUTION:

[Note additional wording in second sentence.]

The UAF Faculty Senate respects the goals of, but nevertheless rejects joining “Complete College America.” Instead, the UAF Faculty Senate urges the Alaska State Legislature, [the Governor’s Office,] and the administration of the University of Alaska to support and encourage programs that recognize Alaska’s considerable regional diversity and are tailored to address the goals of Alaska’s students, rather than to bind Alaska to a rigid set of one-size-fits-all national education rules. Our best strategy is to provide support, preparation, and access to programs and degrees without any real or implied penalty for length of time to degree completion and without compromising the quality of our programs or individual classes.

Motivation

- The entire faculty, staff, and administration of the University of Alaska Fairbanks support measures to increase the ability of students to make use of UAF's educational opportunities.
- We note that 40 percent of incoming UAF students are non-traditional, enrolling after a gap of more than one year after high school graduation. A significant number of UAF students hold jobs, are raising families, and juggle a number of other life concerns while attempting to earn a degree, making graduation in four years as a measure of "success" an unrealistic ideal, yet their graduation after a longer time period is a major accomplishment and success for them.
- A large percentage of students enrolled at UAF transfer in or out at some point, complicating both one-size-fits-all program design and quantitative measures of student completion rates.
- The UAF Faculty Senate holds that no student should be denied the experience of higher education that meets the student’s own definition of success or learning goals, and holds that we should be celebrating the graduation of all our students, not just those who are able to graduate the fastest.
- The University of Alaska Fairbanks should continue to work towards finding better ways to provide accessibility and flexibility for ALL our students to realize their educational goals.
- The one-size-fits-all approach of Complete College America is not appropriate for our student body. The University of Alaska Fairbanks is in the best position to evaluate the needs of its own students and determine ways to meet those needs.
- Complying with the additional reporting requirements of Complete College America would be an additional, unproductive burden on university resources.

Background and Discussion

The Complete College America program was initiated in 2009 by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in an effort to enlist state governments, principally the governors, to reform higher education. The program now has additional foundation sponsors. Its goal is to increase completion rates for a “college degree or credential of value” from ~40% to ~60% by 2020. It recruits governors and state legislatures to its cause, seeing the universities and colleges themselves as the impediment to reform. At present, 30 states have joined this program, adopted its goals, and pledged to follow its requirements.

The stated national problem is insufficient completion of higher education degrees in the context of an increasing need for workers with post-secondary education. Specific problems cited are a national ~40%

graduation rate in college degree and certificate programs, increasing time-to-degree, increasing student debt which grows with time-to-degree, and persistent attainment gaps for traditionally underrepresented populations.

The premise of the Complete College America program is that best practices/essential steps for increasing completion rates have been identified, but that recalcitrant colleges and universities are invested in current practices and will not change unless paid or forced to do so. State governments, in contrast, have a vested interest in actual success of students and higher education, and also have a great deal of leverage over public colleges and universities. CCA recommends that state governments should force change by requiring their public higher education institutions to adopt these best practices/essential steps. In other words, the idea is to shift higher educational policy-making away from the educational institutions and governing boards (e.g., Board of Regents) to the state legislative and executive branches which would be more responsive to the needs of the state and its students. From the CCA document “The Path Forward”:

- “Institutions have strong incentives to shape reporting to mask failure and avoid confronting problems. States are much more likely than individual institutions to share and publish data to drive reform.”
- “States are the best positioned to ensure reform across systems and campuses by setting goals, establishing uniform measures, and monitoring progress. They can also serve as the most efficient clearinghouses of best practices, allowing for rapid scaling of successful reforms.”
- “Higher education attainment is inextricably linked to future economic success. State leadership will ensure stronger linkages between each state’s economic needs and higher education delivery.”

The Complete College America program issued the 2011 publication *Time is the Enemy*, which primarily advocates for full-time rather than part-time enrollment as a way to decrease time-to-degree, increase graduation rates, and decrease student debt. It also criticizes “excessive course-taking” and remedial coursework as factors that discourage students or hinder students’ ability to complete degrees.

The Complete College America program also issued the 2012 publication *Remediation: Higher Education’s Bridge to Nowhere*. The main theme of this publication is that most students who start in remedial classes ultimately do not graduate, and therefore remediation does not work and represents a dead end for students. It asks “Can an ‘open access’ college be truly open access if it denies so many access to its college-level courses?” Their research “shows that students who skip their remedial assignments do just as well in gateway courses as those who took remediation first.” The report advocates either mainstreaming these students in full-credit courses with intensive tutoring support or redirecting them to “high-quality career certificate programs that embed extra help in the context of each course and lead to jobs that pay well.”

From the CCA document “Structure and New Models”:

“New models are needed to significantly increase the number of students completing and completing on time. **This is systemic reform.** While colleges can implement these approaches differently, focusing on different programs and/or segments of the student population, colleges should be encouraged to **be responsive to all of these principals, not pick and choose among them.**” (emphasis in the original)

The specific recommendations range from the mundane to quite dramatic. The full list is many pages long. Below are examples (some are paraphrased):

- Replace semesters with 4-8 week terms, “with fewer courses per term and fewer weeks away from school between the terms.”
- “Utilize year-round attendance; no summers off.”
- Require a prescribed set of courses and course sequencing for each program to reduce the complexity of registration, course selection, and the need for course advising.
- “Compress classroom instruction to reduce seat-time requirements and allow students to proceed at an accelerated pace.” Classroom instruction is to be supplemented by other resources, e.g., online technology.

- “Embed remediation” in regular courses.
- "Require a certain number of credit hours be taken through online courses."
- "Offer prior learning assessments that allow students to demonstrate mastery of college-level content and test out of and/or earn credits for demonstrated mastery."
- "Require formal, on-time completion plans for every student upon enrollment, updated annually."
- "Require that students transferring with associate degrees have junior-level status at the four-year universities."
- “Enact credit caps of 120 credit hours for a Bachelor’s degree and 60 credit hours for an associate degree so students do not earn excessive numbers of credits to complete a degree (allow exceptions only when necessary to maintain program accreditation).”
- “Charge students more for taking excess coursework of more than 12 additional credit hours beyond the credit caps...” [120 credits]

Some of the practices discussed by CCA are already in place in Alaska. For example, students who complete general education requirements at any of the three MAUs (UAA, UAF, UAS) can transfer to another MAU with that completion recognized. This is UA Regents’ Policy. Other CCA practices are currently under discussion at UAF. One is the possibility of allowing students to demonstrate mastery of college-level content and waive certain general education (core) requirements, in order to allow students greater flexibility in selecting courses and designing their education while ensuring the intended learning outcomes.

However, some of the CCA requirements would directly contravene educational policies at UAF and systemwide. CCA requires a cap of 120 credit hours for Bachelor’s degrees. In the UA system, Regents’ Policy sets 120 credits as the minimum, not the maximum. Half of UAF’s bachelor’s degree programs currently exceed 120 credit hours, including some of its most prominent and successful undergraduate programs. Examples: Education 130 credits, Alaska Native Studies 130 credits, Earth Science 130 credits, Engineering and Mining programs 131-135 credits. There is necessarily a balance between the number of credits/courses to meet the intended learning outcomes for a degree, and the investment of time and resources this requires from both the university and the student. Undergraduate engineering programs nationwide have a higher course requirement and less room for electives than other majors; this is driven by the technical requirements of engineering, and for CCA to arbitrarily mandate that engineering programs (for example) must cap credit requirements at 120 credits would not be in the best interest of our engineering graduates, potential employers, or the State of Alaska. While engineering programs are accredited and might fall under the exception allowed by CCA, they serve as an easily understood example. Other programs also have discipline-specific reasons for their course requirements.

The Complete College America program is designed to interfere in a major way in the design of education programs in colleges and universities. It is deliberately designed as an inflexible, one-size-fits-all program in order to prevent states or higher education institutions from picking and choosing among what it sees as an essential set of prescribed practices. This structure is an attempt to remove options and to direct the educational system from outside, to reorient it toward a specific set of priorities and “uniform metrics.”

Like Complete College America, No Child Left Behind sets an ambitious goal for an educational system and imposes a rigid structure and set of requirements to force institutions to adopt its priorities and approaches. For Alaska, many of its provisions are impractical, counterproductive, and distract from other, locally developed solutions that would be more effective. They also crowd out educational experiences that are not deemed to be “essential.” Similarly, the Complete College America program would eliminate much flexibility and choice both in terms of how UAF adapts to a changing world and changing needs of its students, and in terms of options that the students themselves have at UAF.

UAF needs to be able to respond to the needs and goals of its own students, without being constrained by mandates developed for students elsewhere. Ultimately, our priority is to graduate well-prepared students, and we will continue to be proactive in looking for good solutions for our students and our university.

ATTACHMENT 183/17
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

UAF Faculty Senate
Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate Faculty180 versus ActivityInsight software packages

April 23, 2012

Committee: Ken Abramowicz (SOM), Cathy Cahill (CNSM), Chris Fallen (IARC), Karen Gustafson (CLA), Karen Jensen (CLA), Orion Lawlor (CEM), Andrew Metzger (CEM), Elisabeth Nadin (CNSM), Jennifer Reynolds (SFOS), Margaret Short (CNSM).

Report prepared by Jennifer Reynolds.

Committee purpose and composition

UAF is interested in adopting an electronic system for faculty annual activity reports in order to address two needs: (1) Institute an efficient and effective system for faculty performance reviews; and (2) Collect and aggregate data for describing and evaluating performance of UAF as a whole and units within it. Use of an electronic system and database for university reporting should also benefit faculty by reducing the number of times faculty need to prepare lists of publications, outreach activities, undergraduate research, etc. for university reporting needs. The concept of an electronic faculty activity report system has been discussed several times since 2004. A set of criteria and issues defined by faculty in those previous discussions is appended to this report.

The two software packages currently under consideration by UAF are Faculty180 (by Data180) and ActivityInsight (by Digital Measures).

This ad hoc committee is composed of Faculty Senate members who attended demonstrations and question/answer sessions for one or both software packages, and can evaluate them on behalf of the Faculty Senate. These faculty were asked whether each software package was acceptable; if both are acceptable, then which is preferred; and what criteria or issues should be considered in choosing between ActivityInsight and Faculty180. Each company gave two presentations, 0.5 hour and 1.5 hour versions. The preferences of faculty who attended the long versus short presentations were consistent. The main difference was their confidence in their evaluations and the level of detail in their comments.

Overview of recommendations

The clear preference was for Faculty180. In a binary choice between Faculty180 and ActivityInsight, seven people preferred Faculty180 and one preferred ActivityInsight. All who expressed an opinion found Faculty180 to be “acceptable.” There was notable opposition to ActivityInsight.

Instead of ActivityInsight, the second ranked choice was to stay with the current system that uses Word documents. Note that this was not offered as an option in the survey but four people brought it up anyway. Two people strongly preferred the Word format over either electronic option, and two ranked Word and Faculty180 nearly equal with a slight preference for one or the other.

	Faculty180	ActivityInsight	Word
Acceptable?	yes = 7, no = 0	yes = 4, no = 4	
Preferred electronic system?	7	1	
First choice overall	5	0	3
Second choice overall	1	1	1

Pro-Faculty180:

Most common remarks: Faculty180 has better client support, lower cost, better design. Has ability to import publications databases.

“As busy faculty, I’d prefer Faculty180 for its ability to directly import citations; ActivityInsight data entry still seems very tab-heavy.

As a software developer, I also like the notion that Faculty180 is open source, and seems willing to let us make our own changes.”

“In general, I thought the Faculty180 package was designed better, and the ability to automatically populate a publications list relieves the biggest concern I had about ActivityInsight.”

“Positive reaction. This seems well-designed and works for both input and report generation. It’s designed by faculty, not software engineers – this probably explains why the design appeals to UAF faculty (and administrators, I hope.)

Input: They have worked on methods for making data input efficient, especially pulling in from other databases. There are streamlined approaches for entering activities that do not change much from year to year – an option to “copy ongoing activities” within a specific category (e.g., committee memberships) and then edit that. For publications, 95% of standardized, online databases use one of two formats and Faculty180 software can import from either format. Existing UAF internal databases such as the GI publication database could be fed in automatically using a script that Data180 would write for that purpose. (Whatever the source, the ingested data need to be “cleaned up” by hand.) I can envision UAF and Data180 populating the (new) publication database using public sources, the GI publication database, etc., and faculty would then do error-checking and check for completeness. This would be enormously efficiency compared to manually entering everyone’s publications.

Other features: There is apparently some kind of existing grants tracking capability that Faculty180 is planning to develop further, that will have expanded fields for roles of investigators, how the \$ is split among investigators, etc. The administration can ask faculty to flag activities of certain types. A possibility for UAF would be a flag for Arctic-related activities, or research involving undergraduates. There are popup “help” boxes that enable administrators to provide convenient guidelines for what should be entered in specific fields.

Reports: Report formats can be created and edited by the user (university, unit staff, faculty). User has ability to correct data errors directly in the report screen, without going back into a data input screen. (This is a handy, user-friendly option.) Reports have nested data, and you can drill down from a summary level to the desired level of detail. Seems very useful for administrators trying to characterize something accurately.”

“Preferable for the following reasons: The user interface for Faculty180 appears self-explanatory and easy to learn. The prefilling of fields from the previous year’s report for things like committee membership, so you only need to modify instead of re-entering data. The specified pull dates for the Banner data fields means that if you override a Banner error in your edits, that it does not get written over by bad data. The ability of the program to upload references from standard publication databases is very desirable (and ActivityInsight 5 years after claiming this was a priority still had not incorporated this feature). I can think of a lot better things to do with my time than enter my pubs! We can split projects between PIs and Co-PIs so everyone gets credit for their efforts. It appears to be very easy to add and modify fields to account for specialized accreditation and other factors not currently requested in the software (very adaptable). The staff was comprised of true academics who understand the need for faculty to do reporting quickly and easily and what things are important for promotion and tenure.

Overall, I just had the feeling that the Faculty180 folks understood and would respond to faculty and our needs far better than the ActivityInsight folks.”

Anti-Faculty180:

“While Faculty180 appears functional and could meet our needs, I believe adoption of Faculty180 is risky. With only five employees (including the owners), there are too many things that could go wrong. ...inherent risks that are always present in a small start-up organization (e.g., illness of one key employee). The ability of Data180 to deal with problems (e.g., hacker attacks, problems with periodic upgrades, unexpected complications as hardware technology develops) is much less than an organization with 40 employees. ...I sure hope we don't roll the dice on an organization with only five employees.”

Pro-ActivityInsight:

“It appears to be a well-developed software package that has a full-size organization that will back it up. ...a proven organization that has been fully evaluated by some of the best schools in the nation and selected. ActivityInsight has an organization of 40 employees standing behind the software and Digital Measures appears to be able to take care of any problems that arise. ... In my opinion, the ability to deal with unforeseen circumstances and constant software and hardware changes make adoption of ActivityInsight clearly preferable to adoption of Faculty180. ...a much higher level of service.

...the annual labor cost (both implementation and annual operation, and all people involved...systems, administrative, and faculty) will likely FAR exceed the direct expenditure for acquisition of either software. I expect the cost of implementing ActivityInsight to be lower.”

Anti-ActivityInsight:

The most widespread concern was its inability to import publications lists.

“I was very disappointed...their user interface was awkward and clunky and would represent a hefty amount of additional work for me... In particular, the representative's position seemed to be that the benefit to me would be the automatic generation of a CV – after I typed in all the contents of my CV, it would automatically create a CV. Not helpful.”

“Why would they program a publication tracking system that can't download from Web of Science, or other databases? There's no reason for faculty to do data entry! Citations are pretty easy files to transfer between systems.”

“During the ActivityInsight demonstration the representative stated that ActivityInsight is designed for *institutional reporting of data*. Not stated was that ActivityInsight apparently is not designed for *faculty reporting of data*.”

“I am not impressed with the ActivityInsight software from Digital Measures. That company still has not set up a capability for importing data directly from existing publication databases. UAF asked about this issue in 2008, and I am sure that other universities have also asked. Nevertheless, in 2012 Digital Measures is selling the same basic software as in 2008 with some cosmetic updates and (I think) enhanced ability to edit entries. UAF should not expect significant software improvements in the future with this company.”

The ActivityInsight software is designed from the point of view of administrators who want to produce reports. Perhaps that is why this company has so many universities signed up – i.e., the decisions at those universities were made by administrators. A direct quote from the company representative: ‘The beauty of the system is not in the input, it's in the type of reports you can run.’

The flip side is that from the viewpoint of those who would be entering data (the faculty), the system is not efficient or user-friendly. Example: For publications, the software requires hand-entered, very detailed citation data. The company rep said the reason was to enable output in many styles and formats. ...When we remarked on the disadvantages of manual data entry, especially for busy faculty, he acknowledged this and said the company

recommends employing administrative assistants to key it in. ...

Again, I am not impressed. Digital Measures has had many years to build an automated system and has not done it. (Their engineers are supposedly working on something that will be ready for beta testing no sooner than the end of the year – this is “vapor-ware.”)

My understanding was that in ActivityInsight, the report templates must be created by Digital Measures on our behalf and uploaded for our use. In Faculty180, templates can be created that way or users can assemble their own report in a custom format that they create and save using Quicklinks. (I’m not sure how much flexibility this has; it is probably modular.) So in this sense ActivityInsight is less flexible and user-friendly for reporting.

Because it is proprietary software, UAF would not be able to do any developments or improvements on its own initiative, but would be dependent on Digital Measures. Example: they still haven’t implemented an automated way to bring in publications.

Their example for Teaching activities mixed confidential and non-confidential data fields in the report. This suggests to me that they are not sensitive to this issue.

The biggest problem is that the ActivityInsight software would increase (not decrease) the time and effort needed for faculty to report activities. And this is because the software is poorly designed, not because there is some intrinsic reason why it cannot be made efficient and user-friendly.”

Overall:

“...neither package has much to offer me...I find it easy to fill out the AARs that are just Word documents, and both of the proposed packages will add to my work. But I’ve become fairly well convinced that some automation, some package, will benefit UAF greatly, so my resistance level has diminished considerably.”

“My vote for now is that we stay with the current Word reports for activities. We use the ca. \$60K that we don’t spend to hire someone to pull out numbers that the deans think are relevant. It would be important for the University to decide what numbers they think are the most important.

...It’s impressive that they have so many and such high-caliber institutions participating, but I just see this as the further industrialization of higher education. ...

...I am still fundamentally against keeping numbers in these types of systems. They seem generally inflexible and as someone in our Senate meeting pointed out, when we reach the point where it’s all a numbers game, we start to lose something.”

“As discussed at both meetings, I believe it’s imperative that any fields that are populated automatically by the ‘winning’ software package need to be modified by the end-user. If Banner makes occasional mistakes, we need to be able to fix them when we create our AAR and the fixes have to stick. (If information is ‘pushed’ at a later date it needs not to overwrite information that we are sure is accurate.)” (Refers to publication lists as well as Banner data.)

“I strongly oppose adopting ActivityInsight. I do support doing a trial of Faculty180, and UAF should also contact some of the other universities that currently use it and ask how it’s working for them. Hopefully, using Faculty180 would be more efficient for everyone than the current system – but we will need to be conscious of the “potential pitfalls” listed in the summary from 2004-2009 and structure UAF use of the system accordingly.”

“From a faculty-user point of view, ActivityInsight is usable but may cost more faculty-time than the current UAF AAR Word-document system. Faculty 180 is usable and may have some advantages over the current system. ... I have heard no requests *from faculty* for new AAR software. Therefore, any choice of faculty annual activities reporting software *should do no harm* (to faculty).

...if provided a binary choice between ActivityInsight and Faculty180, then I would strongly prefer Faculty180.

If the choice is between Faculty180 and the current Word-document AAR system at UAF, then I would have no strong preference for either system, but lean toward the UAF system that already works well with Microsoft Office-based workflow. ...

I am primarily concerned about the impact on the time and effort required for faculty to complete Faculty Annual Activity Reports. Not addressed here are concerns shared with some faculty regarding the need for any such software at all and vague second-order effects (i.e. unintended consequences). I suggest that Faculty180 be adopted on a trial basis, preferably on a representative sample of faculty, before adopting it campus-wide.”

“I just wonder if instead of working toward a replacement of the paper system, we’re holding onto too many “traditions” we no longer really need. Like the online timesheet project, are there functions that can simply be dropped, or done in a better way? I’m all for simplifying, if at all possible, reducing rather than increasing administrivia.”

“While I see the potential benefits to UAF’s central administration in terms of cost savings to generate their reports, the labor costs are essentially being shifted outward throughout the university (staff and faculty). It may end up being more like the past decision to eliminate textbooks from the UAF bookstore to eliminate a central budgetary deficit, which ignored the enormous shipping costs that were shifted to students and the unmeasured costs (both to students and faculty) of reductions in student learning and the overall effectiveness of our education institution when many students didn’t have books until 2-4 weeks after classes started.

I totally understand the administration’s desire to adopt one of these packages to facilitate their goal of generating reports. I don’t believe, however, that adoption of either package is conducive to either the process of evaluating faculty or to the long-term effectiveness of UAF. I believe that implementation of either package will have similar effects to the 60 percent tuition kickback to departments (with the obvious reward structure it institutionalized while giving no consideration to the potential effects on the rigor and quality of the courses being offered and the inherent long-term effects on our graduates). Short-term administrative cost reductions are often achieved at the cost of long-term organizational effectiveness. ...

The last paragraph (i.e., Potential pitfalls...) in the PDF document is the most important. Annual activity reports are for faculty evaluation purposes. I have not heard one thing related to this in the discussions related to the evaluation of these software packages. I understand that I may be in the minority here, but I feel that the current system works best for faculty evaluation purposes. (Dana explicitly stated in meetings that this was an option.) I would be very surprised if adoption of one of these new systems doesn’t push UAF more in the direction of generating numbers and line items and less in the direction of what I believe is UAF’s major academic strength...the close working relationship between faculty and students and a focus on quality of output rather than only numbers generated. Misuse of data in the annual activity reports is also an issue that I am very concerned about.”

FOR REFERENCE

Criteria and Issues 2004-2009

UAF faculty have stated in the past that we are open to the concept of an electronic system for faculty annual activity reports, as long as it meets certain criteria. Following is a summary of criteria and issues based on documents from the UA Faculty Alliance and UAF Faculty Senate in 2004-2009.

Any software for electronic activity reporting should:

- Be a convenient, automated process for creation, review, revision and communication of faculty activity reports.
- Reduce the time and effort invested by faculty in reporting activities to the university.
 - By eliminating the need for faculty to report specific activities multiple times
 - By populating some reporting fields automatically
- Encompass the full range of faculty activities.

- Integrate with existing technology (e.g., Banner, publication databases) to the greatest extent possible.
- Protect the security of personal information and confidential aspects of faculty performance reviews.
- Restrict access to approved personnel only, on a modular basis.
- Standardize definitions to the extent necessary for statistical analysis and university institutional performance evaluation (otherwise this is wasted effort).
- Have a user friendly interface for data entry.
- Have flexible structure for adding new types of information, i.e., non-standard workload items.
- Have a mechanism, process or system for error correction within UAF (e.g., for correcting erroneous entries populated from Banner).
- Have a mechanism for custom upgrades and updates in the future, as UAF needs change.

In addition, it would be desirable if faculty could use the system to create CVs, promotion and tenure packets, grant proposal information, and other custom reports.

In implementing such a system, the university should:

- Create policies regarding aggregation and appropriate use of the information.
- Include faculty in designing policies for access to the information.
- Collect essentially the same information as the current paper-based system, to avoid altering CBA-defined conditions of employment.

Potential pitfalls in any electronic system include security, incorrect data, proliferation of data requests by administration in response to the “ease” of an electronic system, and misuse of faculty data in a manner not in accordance with the purpose of annual activities reports and the collective bargaining agreements.

**Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for 7 March 2012**

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry (Chair); Jungho Baek; Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Cindy Hardy; Brian Himelbloom (audio); Diane McEachern (audio); Todd Radenbaugh (audio); Dave Valentine, Jun Watabe.

Voting Members absent: Anthony Arendt

Non-voting Members present: Donald Crocker; Libby Eddy; Carol Gering; Ginnie Kinne; Dana Thomas. Non-member Jayne Harvie took notes.

1. Approve minutes from previous meeting

Minutes for February 22 were approved as submitted.

2. Report from subcommittee: GERC - Alex Fitts

Alex provided a written report from the March 7 GERC meeting (copy attached), and described in more depth the issues being tackled by the committee.

3. Review of 4 new Minors

This is from the Dept of Geography, which currently lists a minor in ‘geography’

A. New Minor--[Geographic Information Systems \(GIS\)](#): 17 credits comprised of GEOG F111X, GEOG/GEOS F222 (new course - has been approved); GEOG F309; GEOG F338, and one course from among GEOG F435, GEOG F430, NRM F369, or GEOG F300; effective Fall 2012.

These three are from the Dept Geology and Geophysics, which currently has a minor in ‘geology’

B. New Minor - [Paleontology](#): 16-20 credits comprised of GEOS F101X, GEOS F112X; and three electives chosen from GEOS F315W, GEOS F322, GEOS F317O (new course), GEOS F453, GEOS F486 and GEOS F485 (new course).

C. New Minor - [Geospatial Sciences](#): 19 credits comprised of GEOS F101X, GEOS F112X, GEOS/GEOG F222 (new course), GEOS F225, GEOS F458, and GEOS F422; effective Fall 2012.

D. New Minor - [Geophysics](#): 21 credits comprised of GEOS F101X, GEOS F112X, GEOS F377O (new course), GEOS F318, GEOS F406, and GEOS F431; effective Fall 2012.

Note: Minors # A and C are similar, but certainly not identical. One MIGHT argue that they duplicate each other (might) but the cost of running a minor, especially one that will be practically never used, is tiny.

The committee briefly discussed the question about how many minors a program may have. Geology would have four minors, should all three of theirs be passed. Rainer noted that the Curriculum Review Committee did not take issue with that fact.

When asked why three minors would be offered, Rainer responded that why was not the issue, noting that the major degrees are not impacted by minors in terms of student enrollment.

Dana advocated in support of the new GIS minor, especially in light of the fact that the Geography program has a B.A. degree.

Dave V. observed that the proposed minors are already options in the existing major. Discussion followed on the similarities between the GIS minor and the Geospatial Sciences minor. Further discussion was postponed to the next meeting.

4. The new 'Directed Study' form

The committee examined the existing Individual Study approval form which had been modified at the Registrar's Office to include instructions and fields for the new category of Directed Study (just approved at the March 5 Faculty Senate meeting).

The committee members made many suggestions for modifying both the form fields and the instructions. Adding a line for the requisite Dean's signature was strongly suggested so that workload issues might be addressed.

The committee requested that a revised draft based upon their suggestions be brought to the next meeting for their review.

March 7, 2012
GERC update

GERC is currently discussing the Arts/ Humanities/ Social Sciences portion of the curriculum, weighing the needs to 1) comply with Board of Regents requirements; 2) incorporate some of the approved student learning outcomes into this area; and 3) make the core more flexible for all students, especially transfer students (while ideally cutting the number of required credits).

The Board of Regents require:

Humanities/Social Sciences (15 credits minimum)

- at least 3 credits in the arts
- at least 3 credits in general humanities
- at least 6 credits in the social sciences, from 2 different disciplines

- We are in agreement to require 3 credits of Arts from approved list that are "an introduction to the visual arts and performing arts as academic disciplines as opposed to those that emphasize acquisition of skills."
- Most agree to require Ethics (perhaps a choice between Ethics and a course involving community-based learning)- this fulfills the "civic engagement" learning outcome.
- Still to be decided: Social Sciences/ Humanities. Options that have been discussed include allowing any (s) or (h) class to count, or putting courses under different designators or lists like G for global or AK for Alaskan issues. Students would need to choose a certain number of credits from each list to meet both BOR requirements and

cover certain learning outcomes. We are not sure how to incorporate languages, other than as an option under general humanities.

Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes for 4 April 2012

Voting members present: Rainer Newberry (Chair); Jungho Baek; Retchenda George-Bettisworth; Cindy Hardy; Brian Himelbloom (phone); Diane McEachern (phone); Todd Radenbaugh (phone); David Valentine; Jun Watabe

Voting members absent: Anthony Arendt

Non-voting members present: Donald Crocker; Mike Earnest (phone); Libby Eddy; Carol Gering; Doug Goering; Lillian Misel; Dana Thomas

1. Approve minutes from previous meeting

The March 7 meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Report from subcommittee: GERC – David Valentine for Alex Fitts

David V. described the committee's progress to date. They have a draft core plan that has 34 credits of requirements, but there is still some controversy with it and discussion continues.

Rainer Newberry asked GERC to develop an end-of-year product for the Faculty Senate. David said he would take the request to GERC for the following:

1. prepare a summary of accomplishments to date (~1 page) for the next Curricular Affairs Committee meeting (4/18), which will be included in the subsequent meetings of the Senate Administrative Committee (4/25) and the full Faculty Senate, and
2. present an oral overview of accomplishments and plans at the next Faculty Senate meeting (5/7).

3. Report from subcommittee: (stacking): Anthony

(Postponed for future meeting; Anthony was not present at the meeting.)

4. Review and approval of 4 new Minors

From the Dept of Geography, which currently lists a minor in 'geography'

- A. Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

From the Dept. Geology and Geophysics, which currently has a minor in 'geology'

- B. Paleontology
- C. Geospatial Sciences:
- D. Geophysics:

Rainer's noted that minors A and C are similar, but certainly not identical. One MIGHT argue that they duplicate each other (might) but the cost of running a minor, especially one that will be practically never used, is tiny.

Questions were addressed regarding programs having multiple minors, and students in certain majors automatically acquiring a particular minor. Dana asked about three new courses in the Geology minors and the additional workload those might require. Rainer addressed the questions to everyone's satisfaction. All of the minors were approved.

5. Proposed Academic Calendars for review (well...at least the spring and fall semesters—wintermester is MESSY...Copies were attached to the agenda)

Two versions of the proposed academic calendars were furnished to the committee. One version only addressed dates for fall and spring semesters; while the other included Wintermester and Maymester dates along with Summer Sessions information. It was decided to consider the academic calendars for only the fall and spring semesters, as the calendar including ‘mesters and summer sessions presented some problems that would be too time-consuming to adequately address in this meeting only.

It was noted that only one course may be taken during a ‘mester; however, with overlap of Maymester and the start of the summer term, students would not be able to take courses starting in summer session I. Carol G. noted that this posed a problem for CDE as they are starting their summer term early so that summer courses are not compressed to less than 14 weeks. Students may earn up to 15 credits during the summer term and sign up for courses without their advisor’s signature. The overlap of Maymester, CDE, and summer session start dates presents problems. It also creates unintended loopholes for students to earn more than 15 credits without their advisor’s input.

The committee agreed to approve the proposed fall and spring calendars for 2014-15 and 2015-16. They agreed to pursue the other related issues separately.

6. PROPOSAL TO CHANGE DISQUALIFICATION AND PROBATION TO INCLUDE SUMMER

Discussion on this proposal was postponed since it was not as time-critical as other agenda items.

7. THREE Motions from Core Review Committee for consideration by CAC

Rainer gave some background on why Core Review had developed these motions. Over the years, there has been some significant “academic drift” from the original design and intent of many of the courses that are now failing the committee’s review of their “O” or “W” designators.

1. Motion#1:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the recommendation of the Core Review Committee that the lower-division communication requirement **and** the lower-division writing sequence that are specified in the Core Curriculum will all be prerequisites for all “W”, “O”and “O/2” designated courses.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012 and/or upon chancellor’s approval

RATIONALE: To remove inconsistencies in the requirements for lower-division communication and writing courses as prerequisites for all upper-division “W”, “O” and “O/2” designated courses.

Discussion on Motion #1 stalled with a question about the “**and**”(see above). The committee needs clarification about whether Core Review means both oral and written course prerequisites are required to take ANY upper division “O” or “W” course; or whether they mean the prerequisite appropriate to Communication for an upper division “O” course, and the prerequisite(s) appropriate to English for an upper division “W” course.

Submitted by Core Review Committee 19 March 2012 WITH RJ Newberry's suggested changes

2. Motion#2:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the recommendation of the Core Review Committee requiring a syllabus statement for Oral Intensive O and O/2 courses.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012 and/or upon chancellor's approval

RATIONALE: The Core Review Committee's assessment of W and O course syllabi has found that there is frequent confusion amongst some faculty members about the general and specific requirements for the three options of the oral intensive O designator and for the single O/2 designator. The inclusion of this statement in a course syllabus will make explicit the general course requirements for the O or O/2 designation and provide a reference location for the numerous specific requirements. Inclusion of this statement will make the syllabus requirement for the O and O/2 courses consistent with the existing syllabus requirement statement for Writing Intensive W courses, per Faculty Senate Meeting #109 on May 6, 2002. No new course requirements result from this action. These syllabus requirements should be added to the Faculty Senate's "UAF Syllabus Requirements."

Syllabus Statement Regarding the Oral-Intensive (O) Requirement

This statement, or a statement similar to it, MUST appear in the syllabus of each "O" or "O/2" course. Courses failing to provide this information jeopardize their continuing status as "O" or "O/2" courses.

"This course is designated as Oral-Intensive (O). This designation means that the "O" or "O/2" is evident in the course number on the syllabus (e.g., Education F452 O). The designation applies to upper-division courses. ORAL ACTIVITIES IN THIS COURSE WILL FOLLOW THESE RULES:

A minimum of 15 percent of the graded work in the O course (7.5 percent for "O/2") will be based on effectiveness of oral communications.

Students will receive intermediate instructor assistance in developing presentational competency.

Students will utilize their communication competency across the span of the semester, not just in a final project.

Students will receive instructor feedback on the success of their efforts at each stage of preparing their presentations. "

In addition, THE SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS APPROPRIATE FOR THE PARTICULAR 'O' OPTION REPRESENTED BY THE COURSE (FOUND AT <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course-degree-procedures/guidelines-for-core-desig/>) WILL BE LISTED.

David V. shared that GERC is reviewing models of the new Core, and one model has a lot of designators in it. The GERC has noted that one of the problems with designators is that there is no process "with teeth" to address those designators. He thinks GERC would like the motion.

Cindy H. noted the need for helping departments that offer "O" courses. Donald C. mentioned that the Communication Department offers to help departments on a regular basis, and Rainer and Dana concurred with that observation.

- Submitted by the Core Review Committee and the Curricular Affairs Committee
3. Motion#3: The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Faculty Senate Bylaws, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E, Permanent Committees.6. and to approve the Core Review Committee's authority to revoke O or W status (Oral intensive or Writing intensive designator) for classes following the second consecutive time that they fail to pass review by the Core Review Committee.
- EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012 and/or upon Chancellor's approval
- RATIONALE: Many classes with the O or W designator fail multiple assessments by the Core Review Committee. The appropriate Dean and Department Chair are then informed of the need to bring syllabi into conformity with the O or W guidelines, but often no changes are made. It is hoped that this will spur action.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Section 3 (ART V: Committees), subsection E., Permanent Committees:

6. The Core Review Committee reviews and approves courses submitted by the appropriate school/college curriculum councils for their inclusion in the core curriculum at UAF. The Core Review Committee coordinates and recommends changes to the core curriculum, develops the process for assessment of the core curriculum, regularly reports on assessment of the core curriculum, monitors transfer guidelines for core courses, acts on petitions for core credit, and evaluates guidelines in light of the total core experience. This committee will also review courses for oral, written, and natural science core classification. **IF THE COMMITTEE DETERMINES THAT A COURSE FAILS TWICE IN A ROW TO MEET O OR W GUIDELINES AS SPECIFIED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OR DOES NOT SUBMIT MATERILS TO BE REVIEWED, THE COMMITTEE SHALL HAVE THE POWER TO REVOKE O OR W DESIGNATORS FROM THAT COURSE.*** COMMITTEE ACTIONS MADE PRIOR TO MARCH 1 WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE IN THE NEXT YEAR'S CATALOG. DESIGNATORS WILL BE RESTORED AS SOON AS THE COURSE HAS BEEN REAPPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AS ONCE AGAIN CONFORMING TO O OR W GUIDELINES.

*AS FOUND AT: [HTTP://WWW.UAF.EDU/UAFGOV/FACULTY-SENATE/CURRICULUM/COURSE-DEGREE-PROCEDURES/GUIDELINES-FOR-CORE-DESIG/](http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/curriculum/course-degree-procedures/guidelines-for-core-desig/)

The committee shall be composed of one faculty member from each of the core component areas: (Social Sciences, English, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Communication, and Library Science) and one faculty member from a non-core component area. Membership on the committee will include an undergraduate student and representatives from the colleges specifically tasked with core assessment.

CAC discussed how this change to the Faculty Senate bylaws for the Core Review Committee would give the committee some teeth. David V. asked what some "what if" questions, such as what would happen if a course fails to submit materials to the committee (first failure) and then fails to pass a review when they do (second failure). The committee agreed that the by moving the phrase Rainer had added -- "OR DOES NOT SUBMIT MATERIALS TO BE REVIEWED" before the statement "FAILS TWICE IN A ROW" instead, the process would be clearer.

Generally, CAC liked the three motions from Core Review Committee. Some clean up of the questions and wording will occur for the next Curricular Affairs Committee meeting, when these will be voted upon.

7. COMPLETE COLLEGE AMERICA: THE COMPLETE SET OF ‘recommendations’

Rainer’s comments with the agenda:

Ugh. Makes ‘Leap’ actually look reasonable.... In the next 4 pages I include all the damn recommendations...many of which are up there with ‘all new hires and their dependents cannot use tobacco’. My suggested response, which would need to be cleaned up, modified, etc. and presented to the faculty senate as a resolution:

‘while the entire faculty, staff, and administration of UAF support measures to increase the ability of students to make use of UAF’s educational opportunities, the four pages of one-size-fits-all recommendations of the Complete College America group include those that range from mere platitudes to the ludicrous. We support the idea of making UAF a better educational experience for all, but REJECT joining Complete College America program. We urge other educational and decision-making bodies in Alaska to similarly support the intentions--but reject the specific program--of Complete College America.’

THE LIST BELOW IS COMPILED FROM THE “TIME IS THE ENEMY” DOCUMENT.
CAC’s discussion follows the list on page 8.

Shifting to performance funding requires implementing new funding models that tie funding to outcomes, thereby providing incentives for advancing and graduating students, not just enrolling them.

State appropriations typically are driven by enrollment with funding based on the number of students enrolled near the beginning of the academic term (also known as the census or count date). As a result, colleges have a financial incentive to boost enrollment at the start of the term, rather than make sure students successfully complete classes and earn degrees. Performance funding values outcomes (e.g., classes successfully completed, credentials awarded, etc.).

Strong policies and strategies should contain provisions to:

Keep the formulae simple and transparent.

Start with a small number of explicit, easy-to-understand measures that are laser-focused on completion and specific priorities for improvement.

Ensure that legislators and higher education officials support and fully understand the rationale and mechanics of performance funding formulae.

Ensure that the formulae contain mechanisms specific to all sectors so that each can "win" with respect to their mission and the populations they serve.

Appropriate funds toward the completion of a college certificate or degree.

Ensure performance funding measures represent the most critical data points to improve certificate and degree completion. Such measures should include:

- o Improvement in the number of annual certificates and degrees produced (not graduation rates),
- o Improvement in the number of "on-time" completions (graduation rates),
- o Improvement in the number of students successfully transferring from community colleges to four-year universities.

Level the playing field

- o Include incentives for completion gains among hard to reach populations (e.g., low income

students). Include incentives for college certificates and degrees that not only provide trained workers for current industry needs in the state, but also assist in attracting new employers to the state (e.g., STEM fields).

Appropriate funds for progression toward a college certificate or degree.

Provide funding based on the number of courses completed rather than attempted (or simply change the count date on the current enrollment formulae from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester).

Ensure performance funding measures represent the most critical data points to improve progression toward a certificate or degree. Measures should include:

- o Improvement in the number of students completing college credit bearing English and math courses within the first year,
- o Improvement in the number of students accumulating 15/30 credit hours within the first year, and
- o Improvement in the number of students returning each semester and year.

Establish a strong state commitment to creating and sustaining performance based funding.

Start with a modest percentage of performance funding of 5% or more, then compound it over time.

Designate both new money and, in hard times, budget cuts to colleges based on the same performance funding measures to ensure a cumulative effect.

Do not guarantee a “hold-harmless” provision - failure without consequences is not performance funding.

Significantly increasing college completion is possible only when states and institutions get serious about the problem of time. Strong policies and strategies should contain provisions to:

Set a strong student expectation that graduation is the goal.

Require formal, on-time completion plans for every student upon enrollment, updated annually.

Require all students to declare a major by the end of their freshman year.

Require classroom attendance be taken and recorded – at least during the freshman year.

Establish student incentives to attend college full-time (e.g., flat rate tuition for students taking 12 or more credit hours).

Link financial aid to successful progression toward a certificate or degree (e.g., continuous enrollment,

GPA, credits successfully completed).

Present part-time students with a full accounting of their financial aid package should they attend on a full-time basis (evidence suggests that such information can increase full-time participation).

Reduce unnecessary course-taking and the number of credits to degree.

Enact credit caps of 120 credit hours for a Bachelor’s degree and 60 credit hours for an associate degree so students do not earn excessive numbers of credits to complete a degree (allow exceptions only when necessary to maintain program accreditation).

Conduct credit audits annually to identify degree programs that exceed credit caps and require colleges to comply with the policy or petition for an exception.

Charge students more for taking excess coursework of more than 12 additional credit hours beyond of the credit caps (e.g., charging students out-of-state tuition for credits exceeding the caps) and/or reduce or eliminate state appropriations for credits that exceed the caps.

Create a common general education core to provide consistency and equivalency in course content and curricula.

Require a common lower-division college general education core.

Require common course numbering.

Establish a clear and effective student transfer policy.

Require transferability of the common general education core. Require the most frequently taken lower division undergraduate courses (e.g., 25 courses) to transfer statewide (a core transfer library can facilitate this).

Establish joint admission or guaranteed admission between the community colleges and the four-year universities for students completing the common college general education core.

Require that students transferring with associate degrees have junior-level status at the four-year universities.

Establish a comprehensive online course audit and advising system for students to ease transfer across colleges.

Adopt policies for alternative pathways for students to earn college credits.

Offer prior learning assessments that allow students to demonstrate mastery of college-level content

and test out of and/or earn credits for demonstrated mastery.

Require dual enrollment and/or Advanced Placement programs in every public high school and require colleges to give credit to students scoring a 3 or higher on AP exams.

Reduce seat time by integrating online learning in traditional course delivery.

Require a certain number of credit hours be taken through online courses.

Make better use of time by offering accelerated competency based courses.

Make better use of the whole school year by providing incentives to take summer classes, short courses over breaks and intensive courses.

Strong policies and strategies Relative to Remedial work should:

Divert students from traditional remedial programs.

- For students with few academic deficiencies:
 - o Place directly in college-level coursework.
 - o Provide co-requisite developmental education (including tutoring, self paced computer labs with required attendance, etc.)
- For students clearly needing remediation:
 - o Provide no more than one semester of remediation.
 - o Utilize an intensive focus, and an accelerated timeframe.
- For students with significant academic deficiencies:
 - o Provide alternate pathways to a career certificate or career-related credential.
 - o Embed remediation and adult basic skills into that instruction.

Clarify what constitutes readiness for success in the first year of college.

Recognize that current college placement assessments are not predictive and should be replaced by sharper diagnostic tools.

Establish early warning indicators (e.g., anchor assessments) for current high school students, signaling student readiness to begin college-level course work.

Provide twelfth grade courses designed to prepare students for college level math and English.

Establish a statewide approach to remedial education.

Limit remediation at 4-year universities to no more than one course. If a student cannot do college-level work after one remedial course, then he/she should be referred into a “passport program” at a community college with the understanding that the student will be readmitted to the 4-year college after successful completion of the English and Math requirements.

Align math requirements and student needs (e.g., only STEM students need a pre-Calculus curriculum, others are better served learning statistics and applied mathematics). Review all programs to determine the best math requirements for each program and align remediation accordingly.

Identify courses in which students can enroll while simultaneously completing remediation requirements (i.e., don't make students wait to start credit-bearing courses).

All students taking the placement exam ought to receive a testing guide, practice test and time to brush up on their skills.

Engage faculty with progression and completion metrics to reveal shortcomings and inform design of reforms.

Restructure delivery for today's students by developing new, shorter, and faster pathways to degrees and credentials of value.

New models are needed to significantly increase the number of students completing and completing on time. This is systemic reform. While colleges can implement these approaches differently, focusing on different programs and/or segments of the student population, colleges should be encouraged to be responsive to all of these principals, not pick and choose among them.

Strong policies and strategies to advance new models should include the following key principles:

Operate programs on block schedules - fixed classroom meeting schedules.

Offer classes during specified time blocks and be consistent from term-to-term.

Inform students of their full schedules not only for the duration of the term but for the duration of the full program, thereby increasing predictability in course offerings and student support services, and allowing students to better plan around work and family schedules.

Increase the ability for students to progress at a faster pace toward their certificate or degree.

Establish shorter academic terms (four weeks or eight weeks) with fewer courses per term and fewer weeks away from school between the terms.

Utilize year-round attendance; no summers off.

Ensure the ability of students to progress immediately to the next course without waiting for the next academic semester.

Implement an integrated program design that reduces the complexity of registration, course selection, and the need for course advising.

Prescribe the full set of competencies for each program up-front.

Enroll students once in a single, coherent program rather than signing up every term for individual, unconnected courses.

Compress classroom instruction to reduce seat-time requirements and allow students to proceed at an accelerated pace.

Supplement traditional classroom instruction with non-classroom based methods such as on-line technology.

Use competency-based instruction to allow students to proceed at an accelerated pace.

Establish student cohort enrollment to increase peer support and learning networks.

Group students in cohorts in the same prescribed sequence of classroom and non-classroom instruction.

Promote the emergence of in-person and online learning communities, which are widely acknowledged as effective strategies for improving retention and completion.

Embed remediation in the program.

Include remedial education directly within the college program curriculum so students develop stronger math and English skills as they build program competencies (using the program as context).

Supplement, as necessary, this embedded remedial instruction with additional support that is parallel to and simultaneous to the program rather than preceding it.

Define basic skill outcome expectations with rigorous assessment.

Increase transparency and accountability in advertising and counseling students to increase a student's ability to make an informed decision

Provide students with clear and consistent information about tuition, program duration, success rates, and job placement outcomes

Enable students to assess costs and benefits, see reasons for continued attendance, and make sacrifices necessary to achieve program goals

Hold programs accountable to rigorous and consistent external validation and national accreditation standards

CAC's discussion:

Cindy H. and Diane M. both expressed concerns about the data that was used in the "Time is the Enemy" document. Diane had gone to the publication's web site where data for each state is provided, and she had noted that the Alaska data excludes Alaska Natives in the numbers.

Rainer reiterated the need for Faculty Senate to make a statement about this program. The approach of "ignoring it and it may go away" is not going to work in this case.

Dana T. noted that there are now 92 metrics being used at PAIR from this program at the direction of President Gamble.

The committee was in complete agreement that this program reduces academic quality of programs. It does not look at important factors such as jobs numbers of our graduates. The actions proposed by the program actually weaken degrees and jeopardize developmental programs by essentially getting rid of them.

Dana T. mentioned an article in the Sun Star by Emeritus Professor Rudy Krejci, in which he proposes that a consultant be brought in from the renowned Finnish education system to help UAF.

Dana suggested that the committee look at Rainer's proposed statement (on page 4) with an eye to adding specifics to it. The statement will be discussed further at the next meeting on April 18.

ATTACHMENT 183/19
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Faculty Senate Unit Criteria Committee

Members: Karen Jensen, Cathleen Winfree, Vladimir Alexeev, Stefan Golux, Mark Hermann, Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Debra Jones, Perry Barboza

Annual Activities Report 27 April 2012

- Review of Criteria for College Engineering and Mines – one revision in August 2011. Completed September 2011 and approved by Faculty Senate at Meeting #176
- Review of Criteria for Art - three revisions between March 2011 and April 2012. Completed April 2012 and submitted to Faculty Senate for Meeting #183 – 7 May 2012
- Review of Criteria for Education - two revisions between January and April 2012. Completed April 2012 and submitted to Faculty Senate for Meeting #183 – 7 May 2012
- Review of Board of Regents policy 04.04 regarding conflicts and redundancies in February 2012
- Review of Criteria for Music - two revisions between February and September 2011. Meetings with Music faculty in March 2011 and February 2012. Revision is pending.
- Review of Criteria for Cooperative Extension – February 2012. Meeting with Cooperative Extension faculty in February 2012. Revision is pending.

ATTACHMENT 183/20
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women 2011-12 Annual Report

The Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) met monthly during AY 2011-12 concerning issues affecting women faculty at UAF.

CSW facilitated a “Brown Bag Lunch” series on topics of faculty interest held in various campus locations and via elluminate-live. The October event, “Having it All”, was sponsored in conjunction with the Women’s and Gender Studies Program, the UAF Women’s Center and the Office of Multicultural Affairs and Diversity. “Negotiating Workloads” with Deans Paul Layer and Johnny Payne and “Career Development Mapping” with Provost Susan Henrichs were held in Spring 2012. CSW will continue to organize these informal discussions with such topics as “Worklife Balance” in 2012-13.

In October 2011, CSW organized UAF’s seventh annual Women Faculty Luncheon, which was webstreamed for faculty who could not attend in person. Over one hundred women faculty attended this event with the founder of the Committee on the Status of Women, Professor of History, Emeritus Carol Gold giving a fantastic keynote address. We gratefully acknowledge the financial support for this event from the Office of the Chancellor. We are currently in the process of securing the funding and planning for the eighth luncheon scheduled for September 2012.

In Fall 2011, CSW invited Dr. Sine Anahita to discuss the data and statistics prepared by Institutional Research on salary equity at UAF. The data is now available on the website, “Towards Equity”.

CSW was assigned by the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee to review several of the sections of the Board of Regents Policy and Regulations. Changes were suggested to various sections including:

P04.01.020 – To improve the treatment of the term ‘discrimination’ to make it consistent with usage throughout the Policy and Regulations. To reduce redundancy this section was referred to from other sections rather than repeating the text.

P04.01.061 – To strike the requirement for prior written request by employees to view their files.

P04.02.024 – Should this section on ‘Consensual Sexual Relations’ be strengthened?

CSW is currently working on a proposal for a UAF Spousal Hire Policy. UAF has no such policy in place but having a policy and a corresponding budget is on the Chancellor’s list of goals for 2012 and on the Vision 2017 Plan. We are trying to update a 2003 Senate draft that was based on concerns of violation of fair hiring regulations and are looking at the AAUP best practice recommendations. CSW has invited Mae Marsh, UAF’s new Director of Diversity and Equal Employment to meet with us about a Spousal Hire Policy.

In April 2012, CSW again organized a two hour comprehensive tenure and promotion workshop, *Planning Strategically for Promotion and Tenure*. The workshop highlighted strategic planning for promotion and tenure and faculty attended both in person and via webstream. This extremely

useful workshop, which we facilitate annually, provides an informal venue for faculty to discuss strategies, file preparation, mentoring, effectively preparing for tenure and/or promotion, fourth year reviews, and other issues related to the T&P process for both United Academics and UAFT.

CSW has a permanent seat on the Chancellor's Diversity Action Committee (CDAC). This committee met monthly during AY 2011-12, and the CSW representative brought issues of equity to the attention of the committee.

In Progress:

- Discussion of the issue of term-funded and adjunct faculty, especially as these issues differentially affect women
- Gathering and analyzing historical data information with gender on time to tenure and promotions, rank, nonretentions and salary information for faculty at UAF for at least the last ten years – Is there a gender bias?
- Promotion workshop for Associate Professors moving to Full Professors
- Examining structural, rather than individual, issues contributing to women being “stuck” at the Associate Professor level
- Facilitating mentoring of new, mid-career, and senior women and allied men
- Strengthen liaison relationships with women staff members at UAF, the UAF Women's Center, and with faculty at the other MAUs
- UAF Spousal Hire Policy.

ATTACHMENT 183/21

UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for April 24, 2012**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:15 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Castellini, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Julie Joly, Joy Morrison, Alexandra Oliveira, Channon Price

Excused: Stephen Brown, Franz Meyer

III. Report from Joy

Joy is presenting a Fulbright Luncheon today and reports that UAF has an impressive number of three Fulbright Scholars. She is interested in asking Provost Susan Henrichs and Chancellor Brian Rogers to participate in the Fulbright International Educational Administrators Program.

Upcoming presentations include a Workshop on Scholarly Writing (Friday, 4-27-12) and an Introduction to Proposal Writing (Saturday, 4-28-12). Dr. Robert Lucas will present both of these, and Joy is happy to report that both presentations are full at 25 people each.

IV. Old Business

Joy feels that a survey regarding faculty development needs should still be administered through UNAC so it is independent of the OFD. Since UNAC wants to have a say in how their faculty development money is used, we feel it is necessary to have them administer the survey. While OIT has administered their own survey, it is focused on instructional technology which our committee feels is too narrow to suit our purposes. We discussed the possibility of having one person with online survey experience design the actual survey during a two-week overload at the end of our contract this year. Melanie Arthur was suggested as the ideal candidate. Mike suggested that the survey be in tune with our new direction of offering more tailor-made presentations each month to specific colleges. Another person in OFD – perhaps part-time – would be necessary to help handle the extra amount of work. Joy suggests someone with instructional design experience. Diane suggested that we give the survey designer some concrete guidelines such as a specific timeline and what should be included in the survey. The main goal of the survey is to help Joy determine our faculty development needs. A specific list of topics to choose from would be helpful. It was suggested that the survey be piloted over the summer in the School of Fisheries since their faculty are on twelve-month contracts.

V. New Business

Our committee membership will change next year as Josef and CP will be on sabbatical. Amy Barnsley (DEV/M/CRC/D) has expressed interest in joining our committee. Both Kelly and Diane indicated support stating that Amy has good energy and will be committed to attending our

meetings. Josef will ask at the next Faculty Senate meeting for others who are interested in faculty development, assessment and improvement. It was suggested that Josef write a short paragraph listing the duties of the FDAI committee chair. Kelly will continue her role detailing our meeting minutes.

VI. Our next meeting will be the second or third week in May. Josef will send out a Doodle poll so we can select days and times.

VII. Adjourned at 9:06 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

From: Josef Glowa, Chair
Re. FDAI Committee Year-end Report
Date: 4/23/2012

During the academic year 2011-2012, the FDAI committee continued to be an important forum for discussions of key issues relating to faculty development, assessment, and improvement of teaching and research. We had an active and successful year, attendance at our meetings was good, and most meetings were held with working quorums. Our committee's recorder was Kelly Houlton (her second year as recorder), who has done an outstanding job! We are very grateful for her thorough and timely processing of the meeting minutes. During our second meeting in October 2011, Josef Glowa was elected to serve as committee chair for another academic year. All members worked hard to achieve the following accomplishments.

Joy Morrison of the Faculty Development Office (OFD) provided monthly updates on her work. She organized New Faculty Orientation, with about 20 out of 36 new faculty participating. She expressed frustration regarding low faculty attendance at other development opportunities, so the committee discussed ideas and decided to address the issue and find ways to be more proactive in promoting the presentations offered by the OFD. Joy is also concerned about the continued cuts in her budget by the Provost.

OFD sponsored events during the academic year, for example, a presentation on undergraduate research by Barbara Taylor from the Office of Undergraduate Research and Scholarly Activity (URSA); a "Winning Teams, Winning Grants" workshop on collaborative grant writing; Lynn Lott's talk on how to use social media in teaching; and webinars, such as a series of presentations on Alaska Native education issues entitled "Indigenizing Education." Joy again brought Bob Lucas from the Institute of Scholarly Productivity to UAF to present workshops on scholarly writing and grant writing, April 27-28, co-sponsored with Vice-Chancellor of Research. She submitted other funding requests to United Academics and was awarded \$59,000.

Joy participated in an audio conference with United Academics, Statewide Labor Relations, and faculty development offices of UAA and UAS. She reported that while UAF employs 57 percent of the UNAC faculty, the union has decided to have each campus submit proposals for funding requests for faculty development. She noted that OFD received funding from United Academics after negotiations with UA Statewide, UNAC and all three MAUs. She attended the POD (Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education) conference in October, and she brought back several resources, including information on courses and curriculum design. Together with a group of UAF faculty, Joy attended the Alaska Society for Technology and Education (ASTE) conference in Anchorage. She attended several Apple

presentations and met with the Apple rep, and arranged for him to come up to Fairbanks. She reported that several UAF professors presented workshops at ASTE.

During her sabbatical in spring semester 2011, Joy discovered some interesting faculty development materials, for example, on Great Britain's Teaching Certificate program for university faculty. Joy was able to send eight new faculty members to the Lilly West Teaching conference in California, which took place in March. She gave two presentations on Fulbright Scholarship opportunities in spring.

The OFD has continued to successfully provide valuable support to UAF faculty. However, there is concern regarding low faculty attendance at various development opportunities throughout the year. Joy has therefore asked the committee to find ways to be more proactive in promoting OFD presentations. Over the past few months, our committee discussed various approaches and strategies. One suggestion, for example, was to have Provost Henrichs encourage faculty to attend a minimum of 8 faculty development sessions each year, an idea that did not find enthusiastic reception. Another idea was to develop a survey for UAF faculty to gauge their interest levels in upcoming session topics. We invited Melanie Arthur, the present UNAC VP, to talk with us about the development of more effective survey, as she has not only a lot of experience developing surveys, but also experience with our committee as a former member. Duff Johnston and Josef Glowa volunteered to speak with Cyndee West with UNAC about developing a survey that could be distributed by UNAC to their respective faculty. Generally, UNAC supports the move to commit faculty to a set number of faculty development presentations. The committee decided to take on the job of designing a list of topics to include on the survey. UNAC has not followed up on this.

However, it was Amanda Rosenberger's (Assistant Professor of Fisheries) list of thoughtful suggestions that inspired us to find a completely new approach. Joy shared Amanda's suggestions with the Deans, and their mostly positive responses led us to support a concept that would provide more tailor-made faculty development presentations to specific colleges each month. We are all thankful to Michael Castellini, who took the proposal outline for a school-by-school monthly personalized Faculty Development program to the Dean's Council. Everyone there was enthusiastic about the concept. The details still need to be worked out, but work on this new approach can already begin during the summer period.

We are all excited about this new approach and decided that a survey may not be the best way to achieve our goal, but rather to include some of our question areas into what we tentatively called Joy's "buffet" list. C.P. suggested that "buffet" could be used as an acronym for: Better Understanding Faculty-Focused Effective Training. The committee believes this approach addresses several important issues: irrelevancy, proximity, and scheduling (to an extent). However, Joy is concerned about lack of staff at OFD. She feels that these changes cannot be effectively made without additional staff in OFD in the form of a few faculty fellows for FY2013. These faculty could receive a one-course buy out and assist with tailored programs in each college. UAA has 3 full-time people in their faculty development office, as well as several faculty fellows.

In the fall 2011, the committee discussed the UAF Principal Investigator Frequently Asked Questions list (UAF PI FAQ), provided to us by the Research Advisory Committee. We gave critical input and assistance with distributing it to the faculty. Another review assignment dealt with the "BOR Policy and Regulations." Faculty Senate president-elect Jennifer Reynolds asked our committee to review and give critical feedback regarding specific sections of these policies and regulations. We discussed the difficulty of finding "red flags," since so much of the information is out of our committee's purview. Within the realm of our various experiences, however, we did not find any red flags and did not feel that any changes were necessary, but we were thankful for the opportunity to serve.

The committee plans to continue work in all the areas above, supporting the design of a new approach to faculty development, and further exploring other relevant issues involving the development, assessment, and improvement of our UAF faculty. We are working on strengthening a culture of faculty development at UAF, and we thank the members of the FDAI Committee for their dynamic input.

ATTACHMENT 183/22

UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012

Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

GAAC: Graduate Academic Advisory Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate

2012-04-27 Meeting Minutes & Year-End Summary Report

Voting Members: Orion Lawlor, Susan Renes, Lara Horstmann, Elisabeth Nadin, Chung-Sang Ng

Non-Voting: Laura Bender, Larry Duffy, Lillian Misel

For the 2011-2012 academic year, GAAC examined over 50 course and program change forms, often working with the submitting departments to address issues and resubmit paperwork. We used a Google Doc to keep track of status, notes, objections, and voting, which worked well. We will continue to work over the summer with a few post-deadline changes, and we expect to see resubmissions of a number of 1-credit construction management courses in Civil Engineering. More generally, GAAC's job is to enforce faculty senate policy and maintain UAF's institutional standards, but it is easy for this to devolve to following checklists of syllabus minutia. There is a fine line between maintaining rigor, and allowing instructors the freedom to design their courses.

GAAC spends a lot of time on these curriculum issues, but there are also a number of larger graduate policy issues we should address. These include:

- We could encourage good mentoring either via positive feedback, like a “GAAC Outstanding Graduate Mentor Award”; or negative feedback, via a “GAAC Badge of Shame in Graduate Student Neglect”. Nominations could be available online.
- Time and deadline management is important both for students and faculty. One approach some departments use is to have committees update the graduation timeline at every meeting; other departments are very hands-off, which has highly mixed results. Setting up a Google Calendar listing all graduate school deadlines would be useful both for students and faculty, at least those in the Google ecosystem.
- Running a training session for new graduate student mentors could improve things: the graduate staff would be willing to set this up. There's already an admin training session once per year, but people need to know about the session, and attend it.
- In addition to formal policy, a best practices document might help explain the responsibilities of graduate students and graduate mentors. In CS we have [10 steps to an MS degree](#); [SFOS](#), [SoE](#) and some other departments have similar documents. It might be useful for every department to have a document like this. A guide written by students might be more useful, covering apartments, parking, etc.
- It'd be useful to re-check the graduate thesis format handbook. Students need to learn how to use reference management tools like Endnote effectively, for example.
- TA/RA minimum salaries, and minimum fellowship levels, have not been updated in approximately five years. Some departments set higher levels, others effectively set lower levels by paying students for less than 20 hours per week.
- Graduate students have lots of issues about healthcare, child care, etc.
- GAAC should carefully analyze the results of the graduate student exit survey.
- Transferability of credit for graduate students is a recurring issue. More UA graduate courses are moving to electronic delivery to provide access statewide, which GAAC should monitor.

ATTACHMENT 183/23
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

**UAF Faculty Senate Research Advisory Committee Report
Academic Year: 2011 to 2012**

Chair: Peter Webley

Co-chair: Orion Lawlor

Additional Members: Sarah Hardy, Joanne Healy, Roger Hansen, Kris Hundertmark and John Heaton

Ex-officio member: VCR Mark Myers

Summary of work carried out by committee

The Research Advisory Committee (RAC) held monthly meetings for the academic year 2011 - 2012. At the first monthly meeting, Peter Webley was elected chair for the year and Orion Lawlor as co-chair. These were voted in with unanimous approval of the committee.

Frequently Asked Questions Document

During the previous year, the RAC had been working upon a Frequently Asked Questions document, with its development being led by Orion Lawlor. The document provides details for any new and current faculty on how to start to get funding, managing your budget, managing staff/students/CO-I's on a project and what is meant by Grant, Fund and Org numbers. Although, some of this information is passed to new faculty by others in their own department/institute it was felt this needed to be included within one document. This was completed and approved by the committee. The recommendation, after some discussion, was to pass this onto Faculty Development as a useful document for incoming faculty.

Statewide Research Plan

At the 1st meeting of the year, RAC had Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR) Mark Myers in attendance to discuss the statewide research plan. VCR Meyers spoke about the committee and the representation of UAF and UA on it. This statewide plan was being driven by EPSCOR for Alaska to have a statewide research plan will assist in the state becoming an NSF EPSCOR state. He spoke about three public meetings to be held. The full plan was due to be made in May 2012. VCR Meyers also spoke about a "wiring diagram" for UAF research, to understand how to improve cross-UAF collaborations. This could definitely make it easier for people on lower campus to work together with people on upper campus.

Major Research Instrumentation Grants

The major topic of discussion at RAC's October meeting was a discussion with VCR Meyers on Major Research Instrumentation (MRI) program. VCR Meyers stated that there is a need for 30% matching funds and these need to be from state or other funds. There can be 2 proposal where UAF is the lead and at the moment there is no formal process of how to find out if one can submit an application. There was a discussion to have a meeting where all interested parties could attend and Mark said that we would look into the VCR office to set this up. This meeting took place later in 2011.

Undergraduate Research and Scholar Activity

At the November 2011 meeting, the RAC invited Dr Barbara Taylor, the Director of the Undergraduate Research and Scholar Activity (URSA). The main questions for discussion was how URSA would aim to work with the current research ongoing at UAF and the current undergraduate and graduate students involved in research. Dr Taylor stated that the URSA's role is to help faculty to get funds for undergraduate support within UAF. Would like URSA to act as a office to match Undergraduate students with potential faculty. They will be a website that faculty and students could use to link to the URSA office. She'd like URSA to link faculty project ideas to the correct student. This would require some interaction between faculty, URSA office and student of interest to make sure all the relevant skills and requirements match. Further discussion is needed on how to include Dr Taylor in the RAC's duties, see future items for RAC.

Journal Open Access Policy

During the October 2011 Faculty Senate meeting, Flora Grabowska of the GI Library spoke on Open Access policy at UAF. Therefore, the RAC invited her to speak to the committee at its January 2012 meeting. Flora provided a detailed overview of what Open Access is and that every year there is Open Access week in October. Flora pointed out that if a paper is open access then there will be more citations than if it was kept in a 'Toll Access' journal. Flora pointed out that she was only advocating that UAF faculty, staff, students whom do submit to journals to be encouraged to make them open access papers. It was decided by the committee that it might be institute, department, college level advisement to researchers to aim to include papers for open access rather than a faculty senate statement or policy decision.

UAF Policy and Regulations document

The RAC committee worked on its required portions on the UAF Policy and Regulations document. in doing this, there was a long discussion on the Intellectual Property, Inventions and Patents sections. There was some thoughts on the rights of the university faculty/staff/student when they discover an invention or the ownership of the Intellectual Property. The outcome of this discussion was to provide feedback on the UAF Policy and Regulations document and aim to include someone from the UAF Office of Intellectual Property and Commercialization office to attend a future RAC meeting and have a discussion with the members.

Future items of consideration for Research Advisory committee

Intellectual Property and Commercialization - There is an IPC office within UAF and we should bring someone from this office to speak to RAC on the office and its role across UAF to benefit researchers. This might be a first item on the agenda for Fall 2012

More interaction with URSA - RAC spoke about adding Barbara Taylor as an ex-officio member and the RAC should discuss this in Fall 2012.

The 2012 Usibelli Award winners are:
Teaching: Dr. Debendra Das, Professor, Mechanical Engineering
Research: Dr. Sergei Avdonin, Professor, Mathematics
Service: Dr. Kenji Yoshikawa, Research Professor, Water Resources

Usibelli Award Nominees 2012

Category/Nominee	Title	Discipline	School/ Department
Teaching			
Das, Debendra	Professor	Mechanical Engineering	CEM
Kind, Denise	Instructor	Biology & Wildlife	CNSM
Misra, Debasmita	Associate Professor	Mining and Geological Engineering	CEM
Swarner, Keith	Associate Professor	Computer and Information Technology	UAF CTC
Research			
Avdonin, Sergei	Professor	Mathematics	CNSM
Bandopadhyay, Sukumar	Professor	Mining Engineering	CEM
Freymueller, Jeff	Professor	Geology & Geophysics	CNSM/GI
Sassen, Kenneth	Professor	Atmospheric Sciences	CNSM/GI
Service			
Cahill, Catherine	Associate Professor	Chemistry and Biochemistry	CNSM/GI
Lan, Ping	Professor	Business Administration	SOM
Tannehill, Linda	Professor	Extension	CES
Yoshikawa, Kenji	Research Professor	Water Resources	INE

ATTACHMENT 183/25
 UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012

2012 Emeriti Recipients

Name	Current Rank	Unit/Union	Title
Anderson, Clara	Director		Director of Interior-Aleutians Campus, Emerita
Blurton, David	Professor	CLA/UNAC	Professor of Justice, Emeritus
Dexter, Charlie	Professor	CTC/UAFT	Professor of Applied Business, Emeritus
Gabrielli, Ralph	Associate Professor	CRCD/UNAC	Associate Professor of Rural Development, Emeritus
Gharrett, Anthony	Professor	SFOS/UNAC	Professor of Fisheries, Emeritus
Jahns, Thomas	Professor	CES/UNAC	Professor of Extension, Emeritus
Keller, John	Professor	CNSM/UNAC	Professor of Chemistry, Emeritus
Leer, Jeffry	Professor	CLA/UNAC	Professor of Alaska Native Languages and Linguistics, Emeritus
Moses, Debra*	Associate Professor	CRCD/UAFT	Associate Professor of Developmental Mathematics, Emerita
Poole, John	Vice Chancellor		Vice Chancellor of University Advancement, Emeritus
Roberts, Larry	Associate Professor	CLA/UNAC	Associate Professor of Justice, Emeritus
Ruess, Diane	Associate Professor	CLA/UNAC	Associate Professor of Library Science, Emerita

*Posthumous Award

ATTACHMENT 183/26

UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012

2012-13 Faculty Senate Committees (Incomplete List; as of May 3, 2012)

STANDING COMMITTEES

(Faculty Senate members only)

Curricular Affairs

Retchenda George-Bettisworth, CLA (13)
Sarah Hardy, SFOS (13)
Diane McEachern, CRCD Kuskokwim (13)
Rainer Newberry, CNSM (14) – convener
Todd Radenbaugh, CRCD Bristol Bay (13)
John Yarie, SNRAS (14)
Karen Gustafson, CLA (13)

Faculty Affairs

Ken Abramowicz, SOM (13)
Mike Davis, CRCD Bristol Bay (14)
Chris Fallen, IARC (13)
Cecile Lardon, CLA (13)
Andrew Metzger, CEM (14) – convenor
Margaret Short, CNSM (13)
Karen Jensen, CLA (14)
Leif Albertson, CES Kuskokwim (14)

Unit Criteria (7)

Vladimir Alexeev, IARC (13)
Sukumar Bandopadhyay, CEM (13)
Cathy Winfree, CRCD CTC (13)
Javier Fochesatto, CNSM (14)
Christina Cook, SoEd (14)
Jeremy Mathis, SFOS (13)
CLA representative

PERMANENT COMMITTEES

(appointed by Faculty Senate)

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement

Stephen Brown, CES Palmer (13)
Izetta Chambers, SFOS Bristol Bay (14)
Kelly Houlton, CRCD/Dev Ed
Julie L. Joly, SNRAS (13)
Franz Meyer, GI (13)

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee

Donie Bret-Harte, CNSM (13)
Vincent Cee, CLA (13)
Lara Horstmann, SFOS
Wayne Marr, SOM (14)
Elisabeth Nadin, CNSM (13)
Chung-sang Ng, CNSM (13)

Research Advisory Committee (8)

Jon Dehn, GI – convener

John Heaton, CLA (13)

Joanne Healy, SoED (13)
Kris Hundertmark, IAB
Orion Lawlor, CEM (13)
Peter Webley, GI
Peter Winsor, SFOS (14)

Core Review (appointed)

CLA:

Derek Burleson, English (13)
(pending) Humanities
Sean Parson, Social Sciences (14)
Jean Richey, Communication (14)
Anne Christie, Library (13)

CNSM:

Latrice Bowman, Math (14) – chair
(pending) Science

College Reps:

John Craven, CNSM
Kevin Berry, SOM

Committee on the Status of Women (elected)

Diana DiStefano (14)
Mary Ehrlander, CLA (14)
Nilima Hullavarad, INE (13)
Jenny Liu, CEM (13)
Ellen Lopez, CANHR (13)
Megan McPhee, (14)
Shawn Russell, CRCD (14)
Derek Sikes, CNSM (13)
Kayt Sunwood, Women's Center
Jane Weber, CRCD (14) – chair, Senator

Student Academic Development & Achievement

Committee (appointed)

Nancy Ayagarak, CRCD Kuskokwim Campus
Lillian Anderson-Misel, Registrar's Office
Amy (Keith) Barnsley, CRCD/Developmental Ed
John Creed, CRCD Chukchi Campus
Dana Greci, CRCD/DevEd
Linda Hapsmith, Academic Advising Center
Cindy Hardy, CRCD/DevEd (13) – chair, Senator
Ginny Kinne, Academic Advising Center
Joe Mason, CRCD Northwest Campus
David Maxwell, Math/CNSM
Gabrielle Russell, Rural Student Services
Desiree Salvador, CRCD CTC
Curt Szuberla, Science/CNSM
Dave Veazey, Science/SNRAS
Sandra Wildfeuer, CRCD Interior Aleutians
Campus

OTHER COMMITTEES
(various methods of selecting members)

General Ed Revitalization Committee,
subcommittee of Curricular Affairs (**appointed**)
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/curricular-affairs-commit/ger-committee/>

Curriculum Review (**appointed**)
Rainer Newberry, CNSM, chair, Senator
Curriculum Council Chairs of the Schools and Colleges – to be updated in Fall 2012

2012 Faculty Senate Election Results as of May 3, 2012
New terms begin with the seating of new members on May 7 and continue through May 2014.

President: Jennifer Reynolds GURU/SFOS	President-Elect: David Valentine SNRAS
---	---

College of Liberal Arts

Representatives	Alternates
Arts & Communication – Vince Cee (14)	Arts & Communication – Jun Watabe (13)
English & Humanities – Duff Johnston (13)	English & Humanities – Michael Edson (14)
Language & Culture – David Henry (13)	Language & Culture – Alla Grikurova (14)
Library Science – Karen Jensen (14)	Library Science – Kathy Arndt (13)
Social Sciences – Cecile Lardon (13)	Social Sciences – John Heaton (13)
Applied & Distance Program – Retchenda George-Bettisworth (13)	Applied & Distance Programs – Jon (Rob) Duke (14)
At large – Stephen Golux (Fall 13)	At large – Vacancy
At large – Karen Gustafson (13)	

College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics

Representatives	Alternates
Javier Fochesatto (14)	
Donie Bret-Harte (13)	Brian Rasley (13)
Elisabeth Nadin (13)	Hui Zhang (13)
Rainer Newberry (14)	Vacancy
Chung-sang Ng (13)	
Margaret Short (13)	

College of Rural & Community Development

Representatives	Alternates
Mike Davis (14) – BBC	Theresa John (13) – IAC
Diane McEachern (13) – KUC	Jennie Carroll (14)
Cindy Hardy (13) – CRCD	Patty Merritt (14)
Todd Radenbaugh (13) - BBC	
Jane Weber (14) – CRCD	
Cathy Winfree (13) - CTC	

Cooperative Extension Service

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Stephen Brown (13)	Julie Cascio (14)
Leif Albertson (14)	

2012 Faculty Senate Election Results as of May 3, 2012 – continued

College of Engineering & Mines

Representatives	Alternates
Sukumar Bandopadhyay (13)	Debu Misra (13)
Orion Lawlor (13)	Vacancy
Andrew Metzger (14)	
TBD	

School of Natural Resources & Agriculture

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Julie L. Joly (13)	TBD
John Yarie (14)	

School of Education

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Joanne Healy (13)	Vacant
Christine Cook (14)	

School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences

Representatives (3)	Alternates (2)
Jeremy Mathis (13)	Sarah Hardy (13)
Izetta Chambers (14)	Tori Baker (14)
Peter Winsor (14)	

School of Management

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Ken Abramowicz (13)	Jungho Baek (14)
Wayne Marr (14)	Charlie Sparks (13)

Geophysical Institute

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Franz Meyer (13)	TBD
TBD	

Int'l Arctic Research Center

Representatives	Alternate(s)
Vladimir Alexeev (13)	Georgina Gibson (14)
Chris Fallen (13)	

ATTACHMENT 183/27
 UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
 Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt the following calendar for its 2012-2013 meetings.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

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

UAF Faculty Senate Meetings

Location is the Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom, unless otherwise noted in the meeting agenda.
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2012-2013-meetings/>

Fall 2012 Semester				
Meeting #:	Date	Day	Time	Type
184	Sept. 10, 2012	Monday	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
185	Oct. 8, 2012	Monday	1-3 PM	Face to Face
186	Nov. 5, 2012	Monday	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
187	Dec. 3, 2012	Monday	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
Spring 2013 Semester				
188	Feb. 4, 2013	Monday	1-3 PM	Face to Face
189	Mar. 4, 2013	Monday	1-3 PM	Video/Audio Conference
190	Apr. 1, 2013	Monday	1-3 PM	Audio Conference
191	May 6, 2013	Monday	1-3 PM	Face to Face

ATTACHMENT 183/28
UAF Faculty Senate #183, May 7, 2012
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to authorize the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate on all matters within its purview, which may arise until the Senate resumes deliberations in the Fall of 2012. Senators will be kept informed of the Administrative Committee's meetings and will be encouraged to attend and participate in these meetings.

EFFECTIVE: May 8, 2012

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