MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #197
Monday, March 3, 2014
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. at the Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – David Valentine

A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (14)	RADENBAUGH, Todd (15) – (audio)
ALBERTSON, Leif (14) – (audio)	SHORT, Margaret (15)
BAKER, Tori (14) – (audio)	VALENTINE, Dave (14)
BERGE, Anna (15)	WEBER, Jane (14)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (15)	WEBLEY, Peter (14)
CEE, Vincent (14)	WINFREE, Cathy (15)
CONDE, Mark (15)	YARIE, John (14)
COFFMAN, Chris (15)	YOUNG, Jessie Cable (15)
COOK, Christine (14) (2nd hr.: **Phil Patterson**)	ZHANG, Xiong (14) – **Rorik Peterson**
DAVIS, Mike (14) – (audio)	Members Absent:
DUKE, Rob (15) – (audio)	BARNES, Bill (15)
F ALLEN, Chris (15)	CHEN, Cheng-fu (14)
FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)	DEHN, Jonathan (15)
GIBSON, Georgina (14)	MEYER, Franz (15)
GUSTAFSON, Karen (14)	WINSOR, Peter (14)
HAN, Xiaoqi (15)	
HARDY, Sarah (15)	Others Present:
HEALY, Joanne (15) – (audio)	Chancellor Rogers
HORSTMANN, Lara (15)	Provost Henrichs
JOHNSON, Galen (15)	Mark Herrmann
JOHNSTON, DUFF (14)	Cindy Hardy
JOLY, Julie (15)	Brad Krick
KIELLAND, Knut (14) – **Falk Huettmann**	Eric Madsen
LARDON, Cécile (15)	Alex Fitts
LOVECRAFT, Amy (15)	Linda Hapsmith
MCCARTNEY, Leslie (15)	Libby Eddy
MISRA, Debu (15)	Dani Sheppard - Athletics
MOSER, Dennis (14) – (audio)	Joy Morrison
NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)	Carol Gering
SHALLCROSS, Leslie (15) – (audio)	Martha Mason

B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #196

The minutes for meeting #196 were approved with the added note to President Valentine's remarks indicating the actual target goal amount identified by the Budget Options Group.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:
   1. Motion to amend graduation walk-through policy
   2. Motion to approve a new Minor in Leadership

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – David Valentine

David noted there were still some open seats at some units for the Faculty Senate elections. He urged senators to talk to their constituents and encourage their participation. He and Cécile have drafted a memo that will be sent to units needing to provide some extra motivation.

Nominations for Outstanding Senator of the Year (OSYA) Award are now open. David noted that names should be submitted to Cécile. [A nomination form has been set up online and a link to that sent out to the Faculty Senate members.]

With regard to the recently formed Summit Team (comprised of the UA President, the three chancellors and the three provosts) Faculty Alliance has been in contact to advocate for an early and active voice with the team. David wanted Faculty Senate to be aware of the productive communications.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Cécile Lardon

Cécile reported that both of the ad hoc committees formed by Faculty Senate have turned in their reports. One committee looked at faculty joint appointments, and the other at interdisciplinary collaboration. Gary Kofinas, chair of the Interdisciplinary Issues committee, will report to the Senate today. These reports are good starting points for further discussion and generating feedback, and future Faculty Senate actions.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

[Note: The Chancellor's remarks were preceded by the Provost's, and followed Brad Krick's report on Staff Council.]

Chancellor Rogers spoke about the budget process. He was in Juneau recently, and noted the difficult process this year given the state's revenue picture. The Governor had approved half of our pay raise money, a little bit of fixed costs, but had taken away $14.9 million. The House finance subcommittee reduced it further by $1 million. He credited supporters in Juneau who helped hold the line to only another $1 million reduction from the Governor's budget.

The Alaska Senate is not so bent on reductions. He hopes we'll see a couple of increments added back in the Senate, setting the stage for a conference committee somewhere in between the two. The best predictor is what the Governor comes in with, and this is what is expected on the operating budget side.

On the capital side, the entire Legislature sees the combined heat and power plant as a recognized need this year, although they haven't figured out how much to fund and what the funding mechanism might be. The funding for the engineering building is still in play; and, several research initiatives in the capital budget will potentially be funded. There's a hearing this week in the House on the operating budget. Public testimony will be taken--there is a two-minute per person time limit.

As we plan for upcoming budget year, the first stage accomplished by the Budget Options Group has gathered ideas from the university community. Their report is now at the Planning and Budget Committee. He mentioned a couple of caveats about the options by BOG: these are not priorities nor are they recommendations; but, rather are cost estimates of potential ideas which have been proposed. We have a very different fiscal picture coming than what we've had in recent years. His reaction is one of concern rather than panic. The State appears to be on a glide path down on the budget rather than going over a cliff on reductions, which makes them easier to take in smaller pieces. He expects the PBC will hear from university constituencies and develop some new options that weren't there coming out of BOG, and the state will not do the cliff reductions that have been seen in other states.

In a state with $50 billion in the savings account and $16 billion in the checking account, and no personal income tax, it's hard to think about the kind of reductions we're facing. We're actually in pretty good fiscal shape, notwithstanding the high level of concern in Juneau. But, it is true, absent additional oil production, that operating money will run out in coming years. We need to be prepared for some challenging decisions that will be made in the next few years.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

The Provost provided an update from the February Board of Regents meeting. The Master of Music in Performance program was approved, and the Master of Arts in Music program was deleted. The merger of the School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences with the Cooperative Extension Service was approved. The new unit is called the School of Natural Resources and Extension (SNRE).

The statewide science plan was approved. This plan is required by the infrastructure building program of the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR), as well as some state legislation passed several years ago. The process was led by Vice President Dana Thomas and Lt. Governor Mead Treadwell, along with Vice Chancellor for Research Mark Myers. All three universities participated in developing the plan, as well as committee members from state government and industries. As soon as it's available, the Provost will provide a web link that can be accessed from the Faculty Senate home page.

The Provost described the ongoing UAF budget process. The Budget Options Group (BOG) spent some time identifying ways in which to meet the budget gap between the amount of state revenue received in the past and the lesser amount that will likely be received for FY15. Their report has gone to the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) which is chaired by Provost Henrichs and Vice Chancellor Pat Pitney. The charge to PBC is usually to evaluate increment requests that will be put forward through the Board of Regents to the legislature. However, this year their broader mandate is to evaluate the options put forth by BOG for spending less and increasing revenue. PBC recommendations will go to the

Chancellor's Cabinet. The PBC will meet for the next six weeks. Information will be posted on the web site of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).
http://www.uaf.edu/finserv/omb/budget-planning/
[The above link has been copied to the Faculty Senate home page, also.]

Mike D. asked about the significance of the options put forth by BOG, and what the next step is for faculty involvement. The Provost responded that the BOG documents contain both options and information on estimates of possible savings paired with pros and cons about each option. The BOG documents and a pathway for input of ideas to save money or increase revenues will be provided on the OMB web site. [See link above.] PBC will continue to consider new ideas by this means, though BOG's work is finished.

David reminded Faculty Senate that he and Cécile both serve on the Planning and Budget Committee. Input they received from faculty during the BOG meetings has been taken to PBC. There are an additional three seats on PBC which are also filled by faculty. Faculty may feel free to pass any ideas on to them.

Debu M. asked if the BOG document included any of the vertical cuts that had been mentioned by the Chancellor last semester. The Provost responded that it would be best to look at the document as a whole because it carefully presents both potential pros and cons about the options being put forth. The document is not advocating any particular reductions, but rather analyzes them to provide information to the PBC so they may move forward. Debu asked what the priority for BOG to look at was: cost savings, or increasing revenues. The Provost responded that both were looked at by BOG. However, one challenge to note is, while it might be speculated how much revenue an idea can generate, it's mostly indeterminate for many ideas. There are some revenue increases that are fairly straightforward, such as pushing harder for a market-based approach to increasing tuition, for example, since UAF lags well behind its peer institutions with regard to tuition rates for baccalaureate programs.

Debu commented to David that alternates are being told they may not run for representative seats on Faculty Senate. David will follow up and clarify.

V Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Brad Krick

Brad reported that Staff Council is paying attention to the budget situation. While they were not a part of the Budget Options Group, they did submit ideas to the Office of Management and Budget. They're also looking forward to participating in the Planning and Budget Committee.

The Staff Council presence at the December BOR meeting was mentioned. They had about 125 people show up to support the employee tuition waiver benefit during Public Comment. Brad thanked David and Cecile for the resolution passed at Faculty Alliance in support of the tuition waiver benefit.

In the February Board of Regents report, there is a tuition waiver follow-up. It included information that the waiver brings in $1 million in the form of student fees to UA. A 2012 survey of higher education institutions mentions that 96% of institutions have tuition benefits for employees, and about 84-88% include the dependents of employees.

B. ASUAF – Brix Hahn

No report available.

C. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

No report was available.

D. UNAC – Falk Huettmann
UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane W. reported that the Joint Health Care Committee met last Friday. The new wellness program vendor, Healthyroads, will start in a week. Information will be coming to everyone about the new program.

Health care plan changes coming in FY15 (starting this July) were mentioned. The family out-of-pocket maximums for the 750 Plan and High Deductible Health Plan (HDHP) on the prescription benefit will be increased to $1,700. The dental preventive benefit will increase to 100% for the HDHP and the Consumer Directed Health Plan (CDHP). In FY15, there will no longer be any exclusions to pre-existing conditions regardless of age (currently, it's 19 years or younger). There will be a reduced health rate in FY15 if you and spouse fill out a personal health assessment and complete biometric screenings by June 30.

David asked how much the discount would be for those who fill out the health assessment and do biometric screening. Jane said it would amount to $50 per month, or $600 per year total. Cécile asked who owns the assessment and biometric screening data and where it's stored. Jane did not know, but said it isn't shared with the health plan or anyone at the university. Amy L. asked Jane to find out who owns the data and what they do with it.

VI Public Comment

Karen G. read a statement, as follows:

> I'd like to let you all know that I am very disappointed to inform you all that a non-academic program in this university has been given preference over an academic program in the last three weeks. This has been done with the administration's full knowledge and condoned by the administration. I believe this is a sad day for our academics at the university. Unfortunately, this situation is about our students that are losing out of being able to perform at their highest quality because of this choice. I am, however, very happy to report that if something is done about this situation within the next day that it can be changed and that this will greatly affect our students in their performance.

David asked Karen if she had a specific recommendation for Faculty Senate. Karen responded that she recommended that the administration review the choice they made in this matter and make a different decision than they've already made.

Several senators requested more context to better understand the statements. Karen explained that her class, a wind ensemble, has had a musical performance scheduled long in advance. A teaching assistant has been pulled from the performance at the last minute to do a non-academic (UAF sponsored) activity – a pep band performance for an athletic event. The decision to pull the student out of the class concert, Karen stated, was made with the knowledge of administration and the support of the Music Department Chair. Karen has not spoken directly with the student, but another faculty has informed her that the student will be participating in the pep band rather than the class concert.

Provost Henrichs noted that the TA is split between the wind symphony and the pep band. Unfortunately, there has been a time conflict with the scheduled concert and the Governor's Cup hockey game. The Provost clarified that in her view, this conflict is a matter to be resolved between faculty and the Music Department. She does not see it as a matter where she will intervene, and acknowledged that she does not have all the information or facts. The department needs to settle the matter.

David asked Karen if there was something specific she would like Faculty Senate to do. She responded that she wanted to make them aware of the matter and that department policy is not being upheld which says academic class matters take precedence over those that are nonacademic.

VII Old Business

A. Call for nominations: Outstanding Senator of the Year Award
Nominations due by March 24, 2014.

B. Call for nominations: Faculty Senate President-Elect
Personal Statements due by March 26 [not April]; nominations close at April 7 meeting.

David encouraged folks who are interested to submit their nominations and share their personal statements by March 26. The election is at the April 7 meeting.

Jane Weber nominated Debu Misra. David reminded Debu about submitting a personal statement if he accepts the nomination. Debu responded he will need to consider the nomination before accepting it right now.

Ken A. and David clarified that nominations will be accepted right up to the election at the April 7 meeting. (Personal statements, if prepared, should be submitted by March 26 for inclusion in the April agenda.)

C. Joint Report from the FDAI Committee and the Electronic Course Evaluation Workgroup –Eric Madsen, Franz Meyer (Handout of Draft Report)
Posted at: www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2013-14-fs-meetings/#197

Eric Madsen presented the report on behalf of the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee and the Electronic Course Evaluation Workgroup. He and Franz have been co-chairing this effort. Over the past two years they examined 12 systems for electronic course evaluations, and this year they winnowed that down to four systems. One particular system stood out very clearly over the others. One of the reasons it stood out was that it provided for a hybrid system using both electronic and paper course evaluations, in case there were students without electronic means to complete evaluations (e.g., in the field or other remote locations).

It had been suggested to the committee that they do a side-by-side comparison of the systems. They have chosen not to do so, however, because it's not practical outside of a face-to-face discussion. If they post this type of information more broadly, then a company may come back later and say their information wasn't presented fairly or in the right light, and they wished to avoid that possibility. Instead, they've highlighted the strengths of the systems they're recommending without getting into anything that might be construed as denigrating any systems.

A request had been made to show a video today; however, the company only has a 47-minute online demo. A link to that is included in the report which has been posted on the Faculty Senate Meetings page, at today's (March 3) meeting section:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2013-14-fs-meetings/#197

With regard to the important concern about response rates, obviously the quality of the system is relevant (no one wants to use a clunky system). But, with regard to response rates, it's less a function of the system used than it is the institution deploying them. What are our attitudes toward response rates and how do we present that information to students? Do instructors tell students that it's something that's important to them personally and how they use the feedback?

Another concern is cost. Eric noted that his information indicates the cost would be about the same or a little less than the current system. Provost Henrichs added that the new system has an initial cost that is higher than the annual cost; however, averaged over five years the total is 20% cheaper (at least in one of the options presented to her). While the cost amounts to small savings on an annual basis, there is also substantial savings on staff time to be considered. It takes about two weeks to process the paper forms just in her office. And, there is the time spent processing the paper forms at each of the units, which can be 30-40 hours at the large colleges. Filling out the paper forms in the classroom is an additional time commitment.

Cécile commented that this new system is very flexible, allowing questions to be added at the university, department or instructor level. She sees a benefit in this flexibility which would allow programs to do assessment and outcomes evaluation partly by querying students at the end of their courses. Eric noted that in the case of extreme responses to questions, the system will open text boxes to allow for further comments to be added. The system also allows instructors to poll students for feedback during the semester on a continuous basis.

David mentioned there will be an online discussion for Faculty Senate on this topic. Feedback is needed to help develop an action for the April Faculty Senate meeting to hopefully adopt the committee's recommendation. This meeting invites discussion which is intended to continue online.

Mark C. noted the student anonymity with paper-based systems and asked whether students are tracked in an electronic system. Eric responded that all student responses are kept anonymous. Even in the class forum (continuous polling) feature where students and the instructor can see everyone's comments, all are kept anonymous. Comments from individual students to faculty are still available. And comments from co-taught courses can be sent to each of the appropriate faculty.
START AT 48:29
Susan mentioned there's a lease option and a vendor option – purchase option costs more at the outset, but less over time. The company will provide full hosting if we desire. (ERIC)

Debu: UAA has an electronic system. Debu feels students don't give a true course evaluation – they're evaluating instructors. Poor response rates are given at UAA. Will this be included in the faculty evaluations?

Eric: Mark Fitch – helpful conversation with Pres.-elect at UAA – part of the problem is the system they went with. Partial surveys can't be accepted in their system. There is a set base set of questions they're stuck with.

Susan: Questions will relate both to the instructor and to the course. She agrees that there needs to be a representative sample of responses from students. The use of eval. In the P and T process is subject to the judgment of all involved in the evaluation of the scores / surveys. With the new system, we should do all we can to get feedback. If during the transition the response rates are low, those responsible for evaluations should take that into account.

Chris Coffman: streamline outcomes assessment sounds interesting. If data can't be disaggregated from feedback to individuals, it's worth reflecting – listen to her statement for details.

Ken: is there a list of schools using this system so faculty could call up colleagues and ask them how it's working. Eric will make a list available. Eric encouraged senators to read the report.

VIII New Business

A. Motion to reaffirm unit criteria for the School of Management, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment #197/1)

David proposed that all three unit criteria sets be voted upon together. Chris noted the SOM submission and commented about their review. She noted the Music criteria with minor proposed changed. The third, GPMSL, had minor edits to formatting and the program name. Recommends adopting all three.

David commented about the depth of review at Unit Criteria. Debu commented about members bring up language issues in the Unit Criteria Template. Javier commented that elements in the last one reviewed had elements that didn't apply to the school. David summarized that the template is another matter.

Cécile: asked for concerns in the existing template: send them to her.

Todd R. called to question.

No objections; all three carried unanimously.

B. Motion to reaffirm unit criteria for the Department of Music, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment #197/2)

C. Motion to reaffirm unit criteria for the Graduate Program in Marine Science and Limnology, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment #197/3)

D. Motion to recommend amending the UAF Regulation for Emeritus Status, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment #197/4)

David brought the motion to the floor and explained the small change being made. No objections were made and the motion carried unanimously.

BREAK

VIII New Business – continued

E. Motion to amend academic probation policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment #197/5)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor and explained the reason for the change – to reflect what is actually happening. Get the change in the catalog; but also a new and improved policy will be brought forward to the Senate.

Amy feels strongly about this. Feels it is being used as she had a student who turned their career around because they took advantage of the policy and followed it. Having a plan is important and works. Where is the process falling apart? Why: there is no mechanism in place to prevent a student from registering without a plan. The dean part is where it's not happening – deans don't have the plans.

Rainer reiterated a new plan would be worked on next year. David suggested leaving "will" – but Amy not satisfied by that alone. Chris asked more about the situation. Provost noted that it's in the hand of the advisor to make "will" or "should" happen. There is no central checking mechanism in place.

Rainer noted the catalog deadline; and coming changes. Amy feels the catalog does no harm, left as it is. She would rather vote on a package and not just change this one for the deadline. Mark C. asked for data on whether this process has helped students. Susan said that specific study has not been done, though overall, graduation rates are going up.

Exchange with Peter Webley.

Vice Provost Fitts gave some background on the motion. Came from the Registrar. She noted there's nothing in the motion that changes the relationship of the student with their advisor. Karen supported the change to using the word "should" – since it is not always happening. Mark C. commented that "will" imposes another layer on the student to jump – changing to "will" makes it easier for the student.

David asked for a vote: Vote by hand and verbal aye/nay online: 18 ayes and 13 nays. Motion passed.

F. Motion to revise non-UA transfer courses for Perspectives on the Human Condition, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment #197/6)

Rainer brought the motion to the floor and talked about the data they have now. PHC portion of core gives the most problems. GERs change is still a year or more away. Change now would benefit over 500 students in the meantime – he gave specifics for how this would be true.

Amy: she asked department chairs were consulted. Rainer said "no." Chris C. about the GERC and the Core Review Committee and their view on this: Rainer said their views were not obtained. Chris's concern: HIST 100X and some of the other courses have a diversity component. Opens up transfer more broadly (so broadly) that this element of the core will be lost. David noted that when GERC comes to the Senate, this will change. Her point is that this is premature. Dean Herrmann said the deans support this, and explained why this is a big deal for SOM. They support the motion. Take a holistic view. This accommodates online transfer students, also. BEM will benefit, as will other programs. He portrayed the financial side of the picture and why he supports it. Amy responded for her constituents and why they can not support this. Her colleagues feel that any other course does not fulfil what was intended.

Rainer made a statement about the ultimate goal of students educating themselves.

Cécile: encouraged a more holistic look at the core: to introduce students to diversity and other goals – there are many ways to get to that goal. Each university has chosen a way to do this. We don't all do

this in the same way: but same outcomes: critical thinking, sense of history and diversity and different personal experiences. One single course is not an indicator of what we wanted them to learn.

Ken: BOR gen ed requirements are very broad. GERC's direction is also very broad and similar to this. Lara H. supported what Cécile had said. Donie: asked if passing this will let a student take the course online in lieu of taking these requirements. Rainer: yes, but it's more expensive. A rationale student probably wouldn't do that.

Anna B. feels profoundly uncomfortable with this idea. We have certain expectations of students. Core means a certain set of expectations. Has had problems with transfer students. Where's our opportunity to or ability to shape the student experience? Rainer stressed that we already do this with UAA. Lara H. said we're not the only university that offers its' take of the core.

Libby E. spoke in support of making it easier for transfer students. Trend of being more liberal with the GERs and UA regulation intentions. Students are being creative now with circumventing it.

Show of hands: Motion carried with 24 ayes and 5 nays.

IX Guest Speakers

A. Frances Isgrigg, Director, Environmental Health, Safety and Risk Management
Topic: Safety Training

Frances acquiesced to being postponed.

B. Gary Kofinas, Interdisciplinary Issues Faculty Committee
Report: Interdisciplinary Education and Research at the University of Alaska Fairbanks: Prospects and Challenges
Posted at: http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/

OPEN UP ON THE DISCUSSION SITE.

Gary presented the report via powerpoint. Mentioned chair Craig Gerlach.
Diversity of people serving on the committee.

Mentioned that on Wednesday he and the Dean of Grad School are having a lunch with interdisc. Students to talk with them about their experiences.

Javier's comment and Gary's response. Check recording for details.

X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

Jane mentioned the café on mentoring.

B. Committee Chair Comments
Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 197/7)
Faculty Affairs – Knut Kielland, Chair
Unit Criteria – Chris Coffman, Chair (Attachment 197/8)
Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 197/9)
Core Review Committee – Miho Aoki, Chair (Attachment 197/10)

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair
(Attachment 197/11)
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair
(Attachment 197/12)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair
(Attachment 197/13)
Research Advisory Committee – Peter Winsor, Chair

3:00 XI Adjournment 3:06 PM adjourned

ATTACHMENT 197/1
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the School of Management.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014
Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The Unit Criteria Committee reviewed the unit criteria which were submitted by the School of Management. Minor revisions were agreed upon by the SOM faculty representatives and the Unit Criteria Committee, and the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

****

UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY: INITIAL APPOINTMENT, PERIODIC REVIEW, RE-APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE AND SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT UNIT CRITERIA STANDARDS AND INDICES

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND REGENTS CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY DEVELOPED FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE FACULTY IN THE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE SCHOOL'S FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO AND CLARIFICATION OF UAF REGULATIONS. THESE UNIT CRITERIA ARE FOR USE IN THE ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY AS WELL.

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.
EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR TENURE/PROMOTION

A. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," Chapter IV, ***AND SOM UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND INDICES***, 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.

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 **WILL DEMONSTRATE SOME, BUT NOT NECESSARILY ALL, OF THE FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS IN AN INDIVIDUAL YEAR:**

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;

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, 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. DISSEMINATE NEW IDEAS TO THE STUDENTS RESULTING FROM RESEARCH AND OTHER MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES, SUCH AS CONSULTING AND SERVICE ON REVIEW PANELS;

I. MENTOR STUDENTS, UNDERGRADUATES AS WELL AS GRADUATES, IN QUALITY RESEARCH ACTIVITIES;

J. ENGAGE IN ADVISING STUDENTS.

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:

b. narrative self-evaluation, ***WHICH PROVIDES*** **A CLEAR STATEMENT OF TEACHING OBJECTIVES AND A SELF ASSESSMENT OF HOW THOSE OBJECTIVES ARE MET. EXAMPLES MAY INCLUDE STUDENT PROGRESS, REPRESENTED BY IMPROVEMENTS IN EARLY AND LATE SEMESTER PROJECTS, OR OTHER MECHANISMS THAT CAN DOCUMENT IMPROVEMENT, AND AN INVENTORY OF SKILLS LEARNED SELECTED FROM INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS' WORK**.

c. peer/department chair classroom observation(s).

d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials.

e. **A CLASS PRE TEST AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SEMESTER OF NO MORE THAN TEN QUESTIONS FOLLOWED BY A POST TEST OF SIMILAR FORMAT AT THE END OF THE SEMESTER TO ASSESS STUDENT LEARNING.**

f. DOCUMENTATION OF SCORES FROM ANY NATIONALLY NORMED COURSE-SPECIFIC EXAM.

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 be demonstrated through, but not limited to:

a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings 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.

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, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics.

e. 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.

k. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.

l. 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.

SPECIFIC SOM CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH PERFORMANCE:

FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR, IT MAY BE SUFFICIENT FOR A FACULTY MEMBER TO DEMONSTRATE RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY SINCE THE TIME OF LAST PROMOTION OF AT LEAST SIX JOURNAL ARTICLES THAT ARE EITHER SINGLE OR DOUBLE BLIND REFEREED, OR PUBLISHED IN AN EDITORIALLY REVIEWED JOURNAL OF RECOGNIZED QUALITY. ALTERNATELY, A FACULTY MEMBER MAY PUBLISH FIVE SUCH JOURNAL ARTICLES AND TWO PAPERS PUBLISHED IN LESSER FORMAT, SUCH AS PAPERS AND PROCEEDINGS. HOWEVER, A FACULTY MEMBER MAY NOT RECEIVE CREDIT MORE THAN ONCE FOR A PAPER THAT IS ESSENTIALLY THE SAME CONTENT. THOSE THAT PERFORM SIGNIFICANT PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY AND ATTAINMENT OF PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION AS A CONDITION OF ACCREDITATION MAY CONSIDER A DETAILED PROFESSIONAL/INDUSTRY WORK REPORT OR DOCUMENTATION OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF A PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATION, SUCH AS C.P.A., C.F.A., OR SIMILAR ACCREDITATION.

ALL FACULTY MEMBERS MUST DEMONSTRATE AN INDEPENDENT AND COHERENT RESEARCH AGENDA. EVIDENCE OF THIS CAN INCLUDE SOLE AUTHORED PAPERS OR A CONVINCING RECORD OF INITIATION OF INDEPENDENT RESEARCH. TO DEMONSTRATE A CONSISTENT FLOW OF RESEARCH, A FACULTY MEMBER WHO HAS COMPLETED WORK BEFORE ARRIVING AT THIS UNIVERSITY CAN COUNT NO MORE THAN THREE PAPERS TOWARD PROMOTION IF THOSE PAPERS WERE PUBLISHED WITHIN SIX YEARS OF THE DATE THE CANDIDATE PETITIONS FOR PROMOTION.

D. Criteria for Public and University 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 of faculty.

j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

K. PARTICIPATION IN STUDENT RECRUITING.

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.

SPECIFIC MANAGING CRITERIA FOR SERVICE

A. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR; POSITIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO SCHOOL AND OR UNIVERSITY MATTERS, EFFECTIVE PROFESIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PUBLIC, AND/OR EFFECTIVE SERVICES TO THE PROFESSION ARE EXPECTED.

B. PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF LEADERSHIP IN THE SERVICE AREA IS EXPECTED. SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL AND/OR UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS SUCH AS COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP OF UAF FACULTY SENATE SERVICE, A UNION COMMITTEE, OR ASSOCIATED COMMITTEES ARE EXPECTED. EFFECTIVE APPLICATION OF SERVICE INCLUDES PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE PROVIDED TO PROFESSIONAL OR PUBLIC ORGANIZATIONS SUCH AS BUSINESS SOCIETY LEADERSHIP, REVIEWING PROPOSALS, REFEREEING MANUSCRIPTS, AND EDITING FOR PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OR PUBLICATIONS.

4/30/07.
1/29/2014

****

ATTACHMENT 197/2
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve as revised the Unit Criteria for the Department of Music.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014
Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The Unit Criteria Committee reviewed the unit criteria which were submitted by the Department of Music. 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 MUSIC 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 __MUSIC___ DEPARTMENT. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S/S' 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

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.

TEACHING COMPONENTS OF MUSIC PERFORMANCE FACULTY MAY INCLUDE STUDIO TEACHING, CHAMBER MUSIC COACHING, LARGE ENSEMBLE DIRECTING, AND CLASSROOM COURSES.

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;

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, 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. INVITATIONS TO GIVE LECTURES OR MASTER CLASSES AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

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.

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:

They must occur in a public forum.

They must be evaluated by appropriate peers.

They must be evaluated by peers external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.

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:

MUSIC FACULTY ARE EXPECTED TO CONSISTENTLY PERFORM IN THEIR AREAS OF EXPERTISE. THE STATURE OF THE PERFORMANCE VENUE OR THE LEVEL OF REVIEW IN ATTAINING THE PERFORMANCE WILL BE CONSIDERED.

a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings 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.

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, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics.

e. Performances in recitals, ***COMPETITIONS, CONFERENCES,*** or productions, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges ***OR INVITATIONS. SOLO, CHAMBER, OR LARGE ENSEMBLE PERFORMANCES ARE ALL ACCEPTABLE RESEARCH COMPONENTS.***

f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate. ***THE LACK OF FORMAL PRESS REVIEWS SHOULD NOT REFLECT NEGATIVELY ON THE RECORD OF THE FACULTY 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 ***OR CREATIVE ARTISTRY***.

k. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.

l. 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.

RESEARCH CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WILL INCLUDE SIGNIFICANT PERFORMANCES/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES AT THE STATE OR NATIONAL LEVEL.

RESEARCH CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF FULL PROFESSOR WILL INCLUDE SIGNIFICANT PERFORMANCES/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES AT THE NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL LEVEL.

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:

Providing information services to adults or youth, ***INCLUDING OUTREACH WITH LOCAL SCHOOLS, SCHOOL PERFORMANCES, PARTICIPATION IN UAF OUTREACH EVENTS, AND MASTER CLASSES FOR PRE-COLLEGE STUDENTS.***

Service on or to government or public committees.

Service on accrediting bodies.

Active participation in professional organizations.

Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

Consulting.

Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.

Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.

Training and facilitating.

Radio and TV programs, newspaper articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media.

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:

Service on university, college, school, institute, or departmental committees or governing bodies.

Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance for specific projects.

Service as department chair or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college/school.

Participation in accreditation reviews.

Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.

Service in support of student organizations and activities.

Academic support services such as library and museum programs.

Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.

Mentoring.

Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

Professional Service

Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.

Active participation in professional organizations.

Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.

Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings.

Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

ADJUDICATIONS AT MUSIC CONTESTS OR FESTIVALS AT LOCAL, STATE, NATIONAL, OR INTERNATIONAL.

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.

ATTACHMENT 197/3
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Graduate Program in Marine Science and Limnology.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014
Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The Unit Criteria Committee reviewed the unit criteria which were submitted by the Graduate Program in Marine Science and Limnology. Minor revisions were agreed upon by the program representatives and the Unit Criteria Committee, and the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

****

UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY: INITIAL APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND SABBATICAL LEAVE AND GRADUATE PROGRAM IN MARINE SCIENCE AND LIMNOLOGY, INSTITUTE OF MARINE SCIENCE, GLOBAL UNDERSEA RESEARCH UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS (BOR) CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY DEVELOPED FOR USE IN EVALUATING FACULTY WHO TEACH PRIMARILY IN THE GRADUATE PROGRAM IN MARINE SCIENCE AND LIMNOLOGY (GPMSL), AND ARE APPOINTED WITHIN THE SCHOOL OF FISHERIES AND OCEAN SCIENCES (SFOS) TO THE INSTITUTE OF MARINE SCIENCE (IMS) UNIT. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO GPMSL FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS. THESE UNIT CRITERIA ARE FOR USE IN THE ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY AS WELL.

CHAPTER I

Purview

The University of Alaska Fairbanks document, "Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," supplements the Board of Regents 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 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 or schools and colleges, and directors when appropriate, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit shall establish 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 outlined in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," Chapter IV***, AND GPMSL UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND INDICES,*** 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.

TEACHING IS AN IMPORTANT MISSION OF ALL SFOS TENURE-TRACK FACULTY; TEACHING IN SFOS IS NORMALLY CONDUCTED THROUGH EITHER THE GRADUATE PROGRAM IN MARINE SCIENCE AND LIMNOLOGY (GPMSL), THE UNDERGRADUATE

MINOR IN MARINE SCIENCE, OR THE FISHERIES PROGRAM. THE MAJOR TEACHING ACTIVITIES OF MOST GPMSL FACULTY ARE CLASSROOM/LABORATORY/FIELD INSTRUCTION AT THE GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL. IT ALSO INCLUDES ADVISING GRADUATE STUDENTS ON THEIR THESIS AND DISSERTATION RESEARCH. GRADUATE CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION OFTEN REQUIRES EFFORT DISPROPORTIONATE TO THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED. THE NORMAL EXPECTATION FOR FULL-TIME (9 MONTH) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY IS 6 CREDITS PER YEAR. FACULTY CAN REDUCE CLASSROOM TEACHING TO A MINIMUM OF 3 CREDITS PER YEAR WITH EXTERNAL FUNDING BUY-OUT. FOR FACULTY WITH DIFFERENT WORKLOADS, THE EXPECTATION FOR FORMAL TEACHING IS TO BE ADJUSTED PROPORTIONATELY IN ACCORDANCE WITH ANNUAL WORK LOAD STATEMENTS.

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 and clientele diversity;

d. emphasize regular feedback to students and reward student learning success;

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, 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.

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.

PERFORMANCE AS MAJOR ADVISOR IS EVALUATED BASED ON DEGREES COMPLETED UNDER THE FACULTY MEMBER'S SUPERVISION, SINCE EACH REPRESENTS A MAJOR INVESTMENT OF FACULTY TIME.

HOWEVER, IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT DEMAND FOR GRADUATE DEGREES IS NOT UNIFORM ACROSS DISCIPLINES, AND LIMITED AVAILABILITY OF STUDENTS MAY LIMIT A FACULTY MEMBER'S ACTIVITY IN GRADUATE ADVISING.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR REQUIRES THAT AT LEAST ONE M.S. GRADUATE DEGREE HAS BEEN COMPLETED, OR ONE Ph.D. STUDENT HAS MADE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS TOWARDS COMPLETION UNDER THE FACULTY MEMBER'S SUPERVISION AS MAJOR ADVISOR IF THE FACULTY MEMBER'S WORKLOAD INCLUDES TEACHING. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR REQUIRES THAT AT LEAST TWO GRADUATE DEGREES (M.S. OR PH.D.) HAVE BEEN COMPLETED UNDER THE FACULTY MEMBER'S SUPERVISION AS MAJOR ADVISOR IF THE FACULTY MEMBER'S WORKLOAD INCLUDES TEACHING. ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF PERFORMANCE QUALITY INCLUDES PUBLICATION OF PEER- REVIEWED JOURNAL ARTICLES OR BOOK CHAPTERS BASED ON THE ADVISED STUDENT'S THESIS OR DISSERTATION RESEARCH; STUDENT PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS; AWARDS TO STUDENTS; AND STUDENT SUCCESS IN INITIAL EMPLOYMENT AFTER GRADUATION.

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 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 be demonstrated through, but

not limited to:

a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings 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.

THE PRIMARY EVIDENCE OF HIGH RESEARCH QUALITY IS PUBLICATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS IN RESPECTED, NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS OR PEER-REVIEWED BOOKS OR BOOK CHAPTERS. IN EVALUATING SUCH PUBLICATIONS, QUALITY, AS JUDGED BY GPMSL/SFOS FACULTY PEERS, IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN QUANTITY.

SECONDARY EVIDENCE OF RESEARCH SUBSTANCE AND QUALITY CAN INCLUDE PUBLICATIONS THAT ARE NOT PEER-REVIEWED, SUCH AS FINAL CONTRACT REPORTS, DATA REPORTS, AND WEBSITES.

b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas, these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.

SECONDARY EVIDENCE OF RESEARCH SUBSTANCE AND QUALITY CAN INCLUDE EXTERNAL FUNDING FROM SOURCES KNOWN FOR RIGOROUS PEER OR ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW OF PROPOSALS.

IN ADDITION TO OBTAINING EXTERNAL FUNDING, SUPPORT AND TRAINING OF RESEARCH PERSONNELS, SUCH AS POST-DOCTORAL SCHOLARS AND TECHNICIANS THROUGH EXTERNAL GRANTS IS HIGHLY VALUED.

c. Presentation of research papers before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.

d. Exhibitions of art works at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by peers**,** juries, recognized artists, or critics.

e. Performance 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.

k. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.

l. 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.

m. ***Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.***

FACULTY APPLYING FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE MUST PRESENT EVIDENCE OF HIGH-QUALITY CONTRIBUTIONS IN RESEARCH. FOR A FULL-TIME (9-MONTH) WORKLOAD, THE MINIMUM EXPECTATION FOR AWARD OF TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR IS A SUSTAINED PUBLICATION RECORD AVERAGING ONE PER YEAR, WITH A MINIMUM OF SIX. THE MINIMUM EXPECTATION OF PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR IS A SUSTAINED PUBLICATION RECORD AVERAGING ONE PER YEAR, WITH A MINIMUM OF TWELVE. TYPICALLY, AT LEAST HALF OF THE PUBLICATIONS AT EACH PROMOTION LEVEL WILL BE FIRST-AUTHORED BY THE CANDIDATE OR BY A GRADUATE STUDENT, UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT, POST-DOCTORAL SCHOLAR, OR TECHNICIAN UNDER THE CANDIDATE'S DIRECT SUPERVISION. IT IS THE CANDIDATE'S TOTAL PUBLICATION RECORD, REGARDLESS OF AFFILIATION, THAT IS CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING THESE COUNTS.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is 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 assume a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service."

TO BE CONSIDERED IN PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS, PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES MUST BE RELATED TO THE FACULTY MEMBER'S UNIVERSITY POSITION. SOME GPMSL FACULTY HAVE PART-TIME ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS THAT PROVIDE SERVICE TO A NATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE THE SERVICE PORTION OF THEIR WORKLOAD. THE PROPORTION OF WORKLOAD ASSIGNED TO FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES AND TO UNIVERSITY, PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE IS OUTLINED IN THE ANNUAL WORKLOAD STATEMENT.

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 that 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 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. ***VOLUNTARY*** consulting ***IN THE FACULTY MEMBER'S AREA OF EXPERTISE 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 or trade journal 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, 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, ***OR PROGRAM.***

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 ***JUNIOR FACULTY***

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 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.

FOR GPMSL FACULTY, EVIDENCE OF HIGH-QUALITY PERFORMANCE MAY INCLUDE (1) EVALUATION LETTERS FROM PEERS, ADMINISTRATORS, OR OTHERS WITH DIRECT KNOWLEDGE, (2) SPECIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS AS REPORTED IN THE SELF-EVALUATION AND/OR ACTIVITY REPORTS, AND (3) EVIDENCE OF REPEATED REQUESTS FOR THE FACULTY MEMBER TO PERFORM NEW OR EXPANDED SERVICE ACTIVITIES. SUCH REQUESTS ARE STRONG EVIDENCE FOR QUALITY PERFORMANCE.

FACULTY APPLYING FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE MUST PRESENT EVIDENCE OF QUALITY SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS. FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND TENURE, SERVICE IN AT LEAST TWO OF THE THREE CLASSES OF SERVICE (PUBLIC, UNIVERSITY, PROFESSIONAL) IS NORMALLY EXPECTED. FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR, FACULTY SHOULD DEMONSTRATE AN EXPANDED SERVICE CONTRIBUTION, NORMALLY INCLUDING SERVICE AT THE NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL LEVEL.

ATTACHMENT 197/4
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Regulation for Emeritus Status as follows:

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: These changes provide clearer instructions for routing nominations in order to facilitate their handling and delivery to the review committee.

****

CAPS = Additions
[[ ]] = Deletions

A. A full-time faculty member who has already attained the rank of full professor and who has retired after a minimum of ten years at the University of Alaska immediately prior to retirement may be honored through appointment as professor emeritus. Nominations for conferring emeritus status originate with the appropriate dean in consultation with the faculty, or with the faculty. If the nomination originates with the faculty, it shall be the appropriate peer review committee. Recommendations [[are]] **WILL BE** forwarded to the campus promotion committee **BY THE PROVOST'S OFFICE** to be evaluated on the basis of the criteria for promotion to the rank of full professor with the added caveat that the position of professor emeritus is the highest honor that is bestowed upon a retiring faculty member. The committee's recommendations will be made to the Provost who will then forward his/her recommendations to the Chancellor whose decision is final and non-reviewable.

. . .

Note: the full UAF regulation is published online at:
http://www.uaf.edu/provost/classes/emeriti-nomination-proces/

ATTACHMENT 197/5
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the academic policy regarding undergraduate probation.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014

RATIONALE: While an academic plan is an important tool for students on probation, the current policy is neither being followed nor enforced. The dean and advisor may still impose additional conditions on probation students, including the preparation of an academic plan, but the requirement that one be filed before a student is allowed to register is confusing and difficult to enforce. A comprehensive review of probation policies is currently underway.

****

Current *UAF Catalog* language from the online version, page 51:

PROBATION
Undergraduate students -- Students whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after each fall and spring semester will be put on academic probation. Students on probation may not enroll in more than 13 credits a semester, unless an exception is granted by the appropriate dean. Probation may include additional conditions, as determined by the dean of the college or school in which the student's major is located. Students on probation will be referred for developmental advising/education and/or to an advising or support counseling center. The student will work with an academic advisor to prepare an academic plan for achieving a higher GPA; the advisor is responsible for forwarding this plan to the appropriate dean. A student on probation will not be allowed to register unless the academic plan is on file. Removal from probation requires the student's cumulative and semester GPAs to be at least 2.0.

CAPS = Additions
[[ ]] = Deletions

Proposed *UAF Catalog* policy language:

PROBATION
Undergraduate students -- Students whose semester and/or cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 after each fall and spring semester will be put on academic probation. Students on probation may not enroll in more than 13 credits a semester, unless an exception is granted by the appropriate dean. Probation may include additional conditions, as determined by the dean of the college or school in which the student's major is located. Students on probation will be referred for developmental advising/education and/or to an advising or support counseling center. The student [[will]] **SHOULD** work with an academic advisor to prepare an academic plan for achieving a higher GPA**.** [[; the advisor is responsible for forwarding this plan to the appropriate dean. A student on probation will not be allowed to register unless the academic plan is on file.]] Removal from probation requires the student's cumulative and semester GPAs to be at least 2.0.

ATTACHMENT 197/6
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to allow the UA Regulation definition of general education requirements (R10.04.040) to be applied when determining which transfer courses may be used to meet UAF's Perspectives on the Human Condition (PHC) core requirements.

Effective: Fall 2014

Rationale: Students transferring to UAF who do not have an AA, AS, or a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution outside the University of Alaska system do not receive core waivers and their transfer courses are evaluated on a course-by-course basis using the Non-UA Table of Substitutions (page 37 of the 2013-2014 UAF catalog). This results in many transfer students receiving very little UAF PHC credit for transfer courses they have taken to meet general education requirements.. These courses transfer as elective credit. This motion seeks to make it possible for transfer students, who have taken general education classes in good faith at other institutions, to receive a more liberal review of these transfer courses and receive more credits which will meet UAF PHC requirements, based on the BOR definition of general education requirements. We further note (a) these proposed transfer regulations are fully in line with the proposed changes in UAF's General Education requirements, (b) the changes in UAF's General Education requirements will not take place until (at earliest) school year 2015-2016, (c) based on numbers of transfer students with typical transfer courses (approximately 1327 students per academic year) at least 500 students would benefit from this proposed change, and (d) the Registrar, the Provost, and the Dean of General Studies strongly support this proposal.

****

Proposed Revision to Perspectives on the Human Condition section of the Non-UA Table of Substitutions:

Perspectives on the Human Condition	**Transfer Courses**
HIST F100X--Modern World History ECON/PS F100X--Political Economy ANTH/SOC F100X—Individual, Society and Culture	introductory courses in different social sciences
ENGL/FL F200X--World Literatures	an introductory course in the humanities
ART/MUS/THR F200X, HUMS F201X, ANS F202X--Aesthetic Appreciation	an introductory course in the arts which does not stress skills acquisition
BA F323X, COMM F300X, JUST F300X, NRM F303X, PHIL F322X, PS F300X--Ethics (Values and Choices)	an upper-division course in ethics, or, with approval of the philosophy department, a lower-division course in ethics

ATTACHMENT 197/7
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for 27 January 2014 1-2 pm Kayak Room

Present: Rainer Newberry, Chair; Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy; Dennis Moser; Margaret Short; Libby Eddy; Alex Fitts; Doug Goering; Linda Hapsmith; Stacey Howdeshell; Holly Sherouse; Caty Oehring; Jayne Harvie
Absent: Rob Duke; Todd Radenbaugh; Sarah Hardy

1. Approve Minutes of last meeting
Minutes for 13 January 2014 were approved as submitted.

2. GERC update via Jonathan Rosenberg + Cindy Hardy
Cindy Hardy provided an update for the GERC. They have reviewed input from CRCD, Geology and Geophysics, CAC, and others. David Valentine, FS President and former member of the committee, met with them to talk about changes to GERs in the University regulations. David has been involved in discussions with Faculty Alliance and the General Education Learning Outcomes Committee (GELO).

Feedback can still be submitted to Jonathan and/or Cindy. CNSM will be responding as a unit; and Doug G. mentioned that CEM will be discussing proposed changes very soon. Doug will see if the topic of GERs (existing and proposed changes) can be added to the agenda for Dean's Council.

Cindy mentioned the interest in this topic of the faculty involved with the AAS and Certificate degrees.

3. OLD BUSINESS
The motion was discussed after approval of the Minor in Leadership. We attempted to find the best wording. It was agreed that data needs to be added to support the motion. Discussion will continue.

Motion to Revise Non-UA Transfer of Courses

Motion:
To allow the UA Board of Regents' definition of general education requirements (R10.04.040) to be applied when determining which transfer courses may be used to meet UAF's Perspectives on the Human Condition (PHC) core requirements.

Rationale:
Students transferring to UAF without an AA, AS, or a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution outside the University of Alaska system do not receive core waivers and their transfer courses are evaluated on a course-by-course basis using the Non-UA Table of Substitutions (page 37 of the 2013-2014 UAF catalog). This results in many transfer students receiving very little credit which will meet UAF PHC core requirements. This motion seeks to make it possible for transfer students, who have taken general education classes in good faith at other institutions, to receive a more liberal review of

these transfer courses and receive more credits which will meet UAF PHC requirements, based on the BOR definition of general education requirements.

From Current Non-UA Table of Substitutions, 2013-14 UAF Catalog - http://www.uaf.edu/catalog/current/admissions/transfer_placement_chart3.html

Found on p. 37 of the paper 2013-14 UAF Catalog

TABLE OF SUBSTITUTIONS: NON-UA INSTITUTIONS

This table describes courses accepted by transfer to UAF, from institutions outside the University of Alaska system, which may substitute for UAF's core curriculum. Students transferring from either UAA or UAS should consult UA System 2012 - 2013 Table of Substitutions, or visit www.uaf.edu/admissions/undergrad/transfer/.

Perspectives on the Human Condition	
HIST F100X--Modern World History	a Western or non-Western civilization course at the 100- or 200-level (lower division), excluding individual national histories
ECON/PS F100X--Political Economy	a course in U.S. or comparative political economy, or U.S. economic history or macroeconomics at the 100-level or higher
ANTH/SOC F100X--Individual, Society and Culture	an introductory course in anthropology at the 100- or 200-level (lower division), an introductory-level course in sociology or lower-division social problems course, or a course in cross-cultural psychology
ENGL/FL F200X--World Literatures	an introductory or lower-division course in world or comparative literature
ART/MUS/THR F200X, HUMS F201X, ANS F202X--Aesthetic Appreciation	a history or appreciation course in art, theatre or music at the 100-level or above
BA F323X, COMM F300X, JUST F300X, NRM F303X, PHIL F322X, PS F300X--Ethics (Values and Choices)	an upper-division course in ethics, or, with approval of the philosophy department, a lower-division course in ethics

Proposed Revision to Perspectives on the Human Condition section of the Non-UA Table of Substitutions:

Perspectives on the Human Condition	**Transfer Courses**
HIST F100X--Modern World History ECON/PS F100X--Political Economy ANTH/SOC F100X—Individual, Society and Culture	Introductory courses in different social sciences
ENGL/FL F200X--World Literatures	An introductory course in the humanities
ART/MUS/THR F200X, HUMS F201X, ANS F202X--Aesthetic Appreciation	an introductory course in the arts which does not stress skills acquisition
BA F323X, COMM F300X, JUST F300X, NRM F303X, PHIL F322X, PS F300X--Ethics (Values and Choices)	an upper-division course in ethics, or, with approval of the philosophy department, a lower-division course in ethics

- **HIST F100X, ECON/PS F100X, ANTH/SOC F100X fall into the category of Social Sciences under BOR General Education Requirements**
- **ART/MUS/THR F200X fall into the category of the Arts under BOR General Education Requirements**
- **ENGL/FL F200X fall into the category of the Humanities under BOR General Education Requirements**

Board of Regents Policy & Regulation (Excerpts) R10.04.040. General Education Requirements.

A. Categories for the Common Core of General Education Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees…

5. Humanities
   Courses that fulfill this requirement are those that provide the student with an introduction to the visual arts and performing arts as academic disciplines as opposed to those that emphasize acquisition of skills. General humanities courses introduce the student to the humanistic fields of language, arts, literature, history, and philosophy within the context of their traditions.
6. Social Sciences
   Courses that fulfill this requirement are broad survey courses which provide the student with exposure to the theory, methods, and data of the social sciences.

B. Credit Distribution for the Common Core of the General Education Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees…

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…	
Total	34 credits minimum

4. New Business: Proposed Minor in Leadership

CAC approved the new minor with some edits: Change "Liberal Arts" to "Communication"; and, put in actual course titles in the "track" for "Outdoor Leadership."

The meeting was quietly adjourned in the hush of minds' wheels gaining traction over the grit of weighty topics. Possibly the calm before the storm.

Curricular Affairs Committee

13 January 2014 **MINUTES** 10 am – noon, CCR

Present: Rainer Newberry; Cindy Hardy; Margaret Short; Dennis Moser; Todd Radenbaugh (audio); Alex Fitts; Libby Eddy; Caty Oehring, Holly Sherouse, Casey Byrne, Linda Hapsmith

The meeting consisted of a discussion of various aspects of the proposed General Education Requirements, as set forth by GERC. Our objective was to create a document summarizing the committee's reactions to the proposal. After 98 minutes of discussion, the Chairperson was delegated to write up the various thoughts and send them out for revisions. The statement below is the final version sent to GERC.

A Statement to the General Education Revitalization Committee, a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate's Curricular Affairs Committee, from the Curricular Affairs Committee

The original impetus behind modifying UAF's core requirements was to make the core as a whole easier to assess for UAF's accreditation efforts as well as to modernize courses as needed. We very much appreciate the time and effort you have put into developing a proposed new GER. We agree entirely with your efforts to offer more options to the 'perspectives on human conditions' section of the current core. However, we believe that the system you propose will be more complicated—not easier—to assess and contains inherent flaws that need more than minor modifications. We unanimously feel that the proposed GER needs considerable modification before it should be brought to the Faculty Senate. We sincerely regret taking this stand, but feel that doing so is in the best interests of our students and faculty. We give three major recommendations below.

1. We do not like the proposed attribute system. (One member's comment: 'makes my head swim'.) We feel it is complicated, cumbersome, difficult to implement, and will require numerous faculty committees to approve and oversee courses. We urge you to find a simpler and less faculty-intensive means to accomplish your goals. One possibility is (e.g., G&G dept. comments) a defined short list of courses that meet the social science, humanities, and arts requirements and also possess characteristics (e.g., diversity) considered desirable.

2. As you know, the proposed GER for social science, humanities, and arts courses will require significant modification of the BOR General Education regulations before they can be implemented. We would be happy to forward proposals for such changes to the Faculty Senate but wish to first see some evidence that such changes are necessary. In particular:
(a) do the social science faculty as a group (or at a minimum, the heads of social science departments) feel it is in our students' best interests to allow them to satisfy the social science requirement by taking <u>any</u> two social science courses, <u>at any levels, in any fields</u>? Do they feel that the current restriction to 'broad overview' and to 'two different fields' does our students a disservice?
(b) do the humanities faculty as a group (or at a minimum, the heads of humanities departments) feel that easing the BOR requirements for 'introductory level' humanities courses is necessary or desirable?
(c) do the Arts Faculty (heads of departments) feel that requiring 'theory and practice' (e.g., eliminating art or music or theater or film appreciation or history courses) is a necessary change? Is it the intention of the GERC proposal to do this? If not, the GERC proposal needs clarification and modification.

3. We feel that the single greatest deficiency that afflicts our baccalaureate students concerns their written communication abilities. The proposed GER does nothing to address such needs (e.g., additional or different courses to satisfy the "two written communication courses" requirement). Further, the proposed 'C' attribute dilutes and weakens the current 'W' requirement by allowing a variety of non-writing activities to substitute for writing. We feel that writing skills need to be more, not less, emphasized. We urge you to consult with ALL UAF faculty that teach W and that teach O courses for suggestions about modifying the current 'O' and 'W' requirements.

ATTACHMENT 197/8
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Unit Criteria Committee

UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES for Tuesday, January 21, 11:30-12:30
Chancellor's Conference Room (330 Signer's Hall)

Attendance: Chris Coffman, Christine Cook, Javier Fochesatto, Steve Sparrow, Torie Baker (audio), Leif Albertson (audio), Debu Misra (audio)
Absent: Mark Conde, Cathy Winfree

I. Housekeeping

1. Approval of Agenda – Added Permanent Meeting Time, but approved

2. Approval of Minutes from 12/3/13 Meeting. See attachment. - Approved

3. Permanent Meeting Time for Spring – this time works well for most; next month on Feb. 3rd is the face-to-face Faculty Senate meeting – face to face on Monday the 3rd from 11:30-12:30 works for all but not Debu; kept it on Feb. 4th from 11:30-12:30; Feb. 4th, 18th, March 4th, 25th, April 8th, 22nd, May 6th

II. School of Management: Reaffirmation of Existing Unit Criteria;
See attachments: Guest from the School of Management: Dr. Michael Davis
- SOM Criteria
- Minutes of 11/19/13 meeting detailing the committee's concerns

Effectiveness in Teaching-pg. 6: H--how would they document this section
Documenting teaching effectiveness; this has been out there for 5 or 6 years and no one has said anything, so this took them by surprise; account by narrative section on annual activities report, the first three criteria are demonstrated by looking at the IAS (questions 5, 12, and 13 get at those issues), F and G in criteria is obvious because faculty point out; Question – are there letters that come from other instructors? When they come up to evaluation they need to put two of three options – faculty critique of teaching (peer review), self-evaluation, student eval (IAS); Q – in the past, has anyone used the criteria H (DISSEMINATE NEW IDEAS TO THE STUDENTS RESULTING FROM RESEARCH AND OTHER MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES, SUCH AS CONSULTING AND SERVICE ON REVIEW PANELS); - only if they put in narrative self-evaluation; the department feels it has been working in the past and therefore they kept it the same

I-- mentor instead of mentoring-pg. 7 – ok with change to mentor

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and creative Activity
SPECIFIC SOM CRITERIA FOR REAEARCH PERFOMANCE: pg. 9
clearly describe the two tracks; formatting of paragraphs
Different from other schools because research is not as high – basically on published articles; the two tracks – 6 journal articles in referred journal, versus using journals and other activities such as research presentations and proceedings; that has been used for years as well – only concern is date published versus date accepted and faculty member decides that (really only different

options to measure that performance); Q – in other departments it is not about numbers but quality, so within your school is it the same as in other schools how they evaluate? There are schools that rank journals, but it really depends on the research nature of the college; here they are looking at research performance – making sure you are active and keeping current in the field, because teaching load is higher than in other research focused schools
B. Professor: look at language on line 5 "and" should it be "or" – ok with change to or
Now make changes in underline versus all caps; only changes implemented are the two grammatical changes

Debu motioned to move the criteria forward and have Chris C. review as chair and make sure the changes are implemented and she will move them forward to the Senate; Javier seconded; All approved on vote

III. Continued Discussion of Committee Bylaws
See attachments:
- Proposed Bylaws.
- "Quorum" from *Robert's Rules* – simple majority is what it states, but need to be present to vote (either face to face or by distance); if not a quorum, then should not proceed with an official meeting (anything transacted without a quorum is null and void); if unable to attend a meeting, then email Chris so she can determine if a quorum will be held (she will monitor for quorum) – if no quorum then the meeting will be cancelled; Discussion regarding if people are absent can they vote – at last meeting the group decided that no electronic voting after the fact; felt that the discussion was important and the vote should be taken during the meeting after discussion (no electronic voting); majority of the full membership (8) needs to be upheld to pass a vote

12:10pm – Christine moved to adjourn and Debu seconded

ATTACHMENT 197/9
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women,
Minutes Wednesday, January 22, 2014; 9:15 am to 10:15 am pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Jane Weber, Mary Ehrlander. Ellen Lopez, Michelle Bartlett, Diana Di Stefano, Shawn Russell

Members absent: Jenny Liu, Kayt Sunwood, Megan McPhee, Nilima Hullavarad, Derek Sikes

1. Women's Center Advisory Board

Will meet Friday, January 24. We moved to Wood Center. Need more room for library. A needs assessment was conducted. Advisory board made recommendations to the Chancellor. Some changes were made. Right now there is a social media survey being administered by a graduate student: How do people access the Women's Center?

2. Promotion & Tenure Workshop

April 25, 10 am to 12 noon. Jayne will reserve Butro 109, Board of Regents Conference Room. She will secure an alternate room as well. Same food. Faculty Senate pays for food. Panelists: Ellen: 4th year review, joint appointment, Sine: Bumps in the Road, Amy: Bipartite, in process, Mary: Full Professor, long term planning, Steffi: Science, Recent Tenure, Roxie: Service, Bi-partite and Karen Gustafson: Music, Recent Tenure.

3. Fall 2014 Luncheon Speaker

Date not set. But it will be Tuesday. Maybe 9/30 or 10/7. Speaker brainstorm: Melanie Arthur, Alex Fitts, Jane Kavarr (local Judge), Gayle Garrigues, Marilyn Romano. BRAINSTORM IDEAS FOR NEXT MEETING.

4. Conversation Café on Faculty Mentoring: Why we need it?

March 11, 1:00 to 3:00 pm. Costs Wood Center. Is this the best venue? Beverage service $21 per gallon, $14 per gallon. Include cups, stirrers, etc. Get waiver for cookies, etc. Idea: get student groups to do it as a fundraiser. Goal: 50-60 people. Ellen is working with Jayne Harvey. Parking for CTC faculty. 5 tables (8 people each). Brainstorm topics:

1. Formal vs. informal mentoring.
2. What I wish a mentor would have told me.
3. Mentors outside your department.
4. How to be a good mentor.
5. Definitions/Best Practices in mentoring.
6. When mentoring goes sour.

5. Upcoming CSW meetings:

9:15 to 10:15 am: February 26, March 26, April 16.

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/13-14-csw/

ATTACHMENT 197/10
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Core Review Committee

Core Review Committee
Minutes from December 6, 2013 Meeting

Voting members:
Miho Aoki (Chair), Jennifer Schell, Jean Richey, Walter Skya, Xiangdong Zhang
Phone Andy Seitz, Tyson Rinio

Nonvoting members:
Stacey Howdeshell, Caty Oehring

1. Meeting minutes from November 22nd meeting
   The committee approved the meeting minutes from November 22nd.

2. GERC update
   Miho proposed inviting the chair of GERC in the spring semester to increase communication between this committee and GERC about core/general education assessment. Jean will bring this to GERC.

3. Core Course Petitions
   The committee reviewed seven core course petitions. There would be more petitions from graduating students before the end of the semester. The committee will review and vote over email if any petitions have to be processed in this semester.

4. Revising the Faculty Senate Bylaws on the committee Miho brought draft version of revised committee bylaws. The most of the changes are in the membership and voting policy area. The committee members agreed that including CRCD faculty member as a voting member of the committee is a good idea. The committee also discussed the meeting quorum. Also the draft includes a quorum number: 5 voting members. The committee did not feel that the certain number of the voting member must be from core component areas. Miho brought up possibility of including voting policy via email in case the committee cannot meet quorum.

5. Lower division core credit transfer policy change update
   Caty and Miho reported the summary of discussion happened in the Faculty Senate meeting on December 2nd. Miho also asked questions about the proposed transfer policy about ART/MUSIC/THR 200X.

6. Oral and Writing Intensive Course Assessment
   Miho will send draft email letters to the committee members who reviewed the syllabi in the week of December 9th. Miho briefly went over the courses Walter reviewed. Jean brought her review result in hard copy.

7. The committee will decide the meeting time for the next semester in mid January

ATTACHMENT 197/11
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Minutes of the SADA Committee
Jan 17, 2014

Attending: Gordon Williams, Alex Fitts, Sarah Stanley, Cindy Hardy, Curt Szuberla, Sandra Wildfeuer, John Creed, Brandon Uzzell

Committee logistics: According to our new committee definition, which still needs to be approved, we will need another CLA person. We will ask Dean Todd Sherman to find a faculty member who is available to come to SADA.

Our meeting schedule for Spring semester will be:
Feb 14, Mar 14, Apr 11, May 9 (if needed to wrap up business)
These are all Friday dates. Meeting times will be 10-11:30AM.

Learning Commons: Sarah spoke with Susan Bishop, development officer at Rasmusen Library, who didn't know there was a faculty motion to put a Learning Commons in place. We agreed to invite Suzan Hahn to our next meeting. Sarah reported that Susan B mentioned three learning commons proposals put forward in the library plans, one that cost no money (the dedication of a portion of the 3rd floor for use in tutoring and other student/faculty uses), one a $250,000 proposal (this would involve clearing out the third floor space and digitizing all periodical), and a third, involving extending the building onto the current patio would cost millions. We discussed the Chancellor's Gala as a venue for raising funds for the learning commons in support of students.

There was a subcommittee of SADA and the Library: Suzan Hahn, Cindy Hardy, Dana Greci, Amy Barnsley, and Reba Dupras--that met over several years and wrote up a proposal for the Library dean. Cindy will follow up with Suzan on the status of this project.

Obstacles to student success: Alex is working on a questionnaire that is going out to English 111X students, asking questions about how many hours students work, their use of Degree works and the Academic Advising Center, and whether or not they live on campus. This survey is going out now to students. We asked how SADA can help support the process. Alex noted that there's not much to do now until she sees what types of responses she is getting on the survey. Sarah noted that the survey is also part of a pilot assessment of English 111X, and is also looking at student writing.

Alex also informed us that there is a group meeting to talk about students on academic probation and academic recovery. This committee can track this information, and we can move things along to help with policy changes that come out of the committee process.

GERC: For the remainder of the meeting the committee discussed and drafted a response to the GERC proposal, which follows:

Response from SADA Committee
To GERC Proposal
January 17, 2014

Members of the SADA committee addressed the GERC proposal and had the following comments:

We are excited about the ability to have the GER outcomes clearly stated by means of the attributes and to have many courses fulfill these outcomes. This will give students more choice in fulfilling outcomes, rather than being limited in their course options. We believe that this will help with student retention. Furthermore, it fixes the problem of bottleneck courses that devolve into a dire experience for students. Once this proposal is enacted, courses that already have the content that applies to the attributes will come forward to adapt to the curriculum—and this will lead to the expansion of recognition of these courses as fulfilling Gen. Ed. requirements.

In general, we see that the proposal doesn't dilute the rigor of the Gen Ed program, but offers students multiple choices. This proposal will also allow students to double count classes, which will be a benefit to students taking elective credits. For students whose programs don't currently allow electives, it will encourage exploration and help with retention. Finally, it will put transfer students and current UAF students on the same footing. The current system is harder on our own students because they have a limited list of courses to pick from in comparison to the list of acceptable transfer courses. The new system will give more choices to our current students.

We note that this could involve a messy and frustrating transition for students, faculty, and staff. Students with old transcripts—re-enrolling students—may have additional criteria to meet, especially as courses required under the current Perspectives begin to go away or be offered less frequently. There will be some potential for confusion on the part of advisors and students based on increased choice and during the transition period. DegreeWorks will need to change to adapt to the new GenEd requirements, and the new attribute system will initially create a greater burden on the registrar's office, but the changes, overall, will be better for students.

Recommendations:

Expand current "h," "s," and "n" attributes to allow students greater choice in meeting these parts of the BOR requirements. Currently the "h" and "s" attributes are required only in the BA degree. More classes could fit under these attributes.

Solicit student input into this process—they are the ones who will be most impacted by this change.

Continue with work on the motion to change BOR requirements so that they better fit the GERC proposal. We are not sure where this motion stands at this point, but we would like it to go forward.

Develop a review structure for the attributes as subcommittees of the current Core Review committee. This would provide more committee service opportunities for junior faculty.

Continue discussion about the C attribute and the role of written and oral communication at UAF.

ATTACHMENT 197/12
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 23, 2014

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Mike Davis, Cindy Fabbri, David Fazzino, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Eric Madsen, Trina Mamoon, Madara Mason (guest from eLearning and Distance Education), Franz Meyer, Channon Price, Leslie Shallcross, Amy Vinlove
Excused: Joy Morrison
Absent: Bill Barnes, Mike Castellini

III. News and Notes

a. Discussion on review committee appointment procedures

Franz reported that due to time constraints, the topic was tabled at the last Administrative Committee meeting but that it would be discussed at their meeting tomorrow.

b. Mission statement

Franz has submitted our mission statement to Faculty Senate but has heard nothing back yet.

c. Possible name change for FDAI

Franz will reopen the discussion via email and requested that we all weigh in with our thoughts.

IV. Faculty Development Activities at eLearning & Distance Education

Madara Mason, invited guest, gave our committee some background on herself and what faculty development opportunities are available from eLearning and Distance Education. She explained that she works with Instructional Designers and that her team has a lot of experience with curriculum development, both with face-to-face and online classes. There is a Blackboard specialist available, and they can offer help for faculty creating video or audio files.

Their largest faculty development effort is iTeach. It is offered about three times per year as a 4- or 5-day class for eight hours a day. In it, they cover such things as Blackboard, Word Press, Google Apps, and creating classes from the ground up. Separate from their iTeach class, they have a website, iteachu.uaf.edu, which offers a lot of information that people from all over are using, not just UA faculty. The next iTeach is March 7, 10, 12, and 15 from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm each day. There is also one scheduled for May the week of the 19th – 23rd. There is an application process due to the fact that they can only take 18 people, but she reported that they are also doing some specialized iTeach presentations for departments wanting to set up more online classes.

Madara reminded us that they offer three hours of instructional course design for UA faculty for free. Anyone can email or call her to schedule a meeting with an Instructional Designer. Her team is also responsible for the weekly Teaching Tips and Blackboard Collaborate. Four times per semester they offer a Teaching Tips Live session. She will be presenting one soon on Google Apps.

Franz asked how eLearning and Distance Education are coordinating their efforts with the Office of Faculty Development. Madara explained that she tries to keep Joy informed of her schedule and vice versa, and said that Joy helps them get the word out to faculty on what eLearning has to offer.

Franz asked if most of their work is directed toward technique and using technologies. Madara reported that they do focus on pedagogy and backwards design by helping faculty hone-in on their "big idea". Franz asked how we can improve communication between eLearning and the FDAI committee. Kelly remarked that it seemed Joy was the connection between the two. Madara responded that while that is true, it is difficult to keep up with one another due to their busy schedules, so she relies a lot on hearing directly from faculty. Franz asked that Madara think about how our committee can help her.

V. Discussion on Electronic Course Evaluation Review Report

After a brief recap of what has been done so far, Franz informed us that he and Eric are currently writing up the Review Report. They would like to run it by our committee to review the recommendations put forth therein before submitting it to Faculty Senate. There will be two main pieces: 1) results of the working group; and 2) suggestions about implementing the recommendations. The final report will be submitted to Faculty Senate through the FDAI committee. Franz explained that this report will be more specific than last year's in that a recommendation will be made that UAF switch to a hybrid paper/online course evaluation system. He asked that when committee members scrutinize the report that we look to make sure all justifications of the recommendations are clear. Since the report will need to be completed by the end of February, the discussion will have to take place online. Eric stated that in addition to himself, Franz, Kelly and Andrea, other faculty, staff and administrators have joined in and been involved. Franz noted that the decision by the group was *really* clear. Eric said that all that is left to do is a cost proposal – this was not a consideration since cost should not drive the decision. Franz requested that any committee members that have suggestions about how to facilitate the online discussion should please let him know. There is a possibility that an audio-conference could be arranged.

VI. Other Business

Franz told us that Joy (who will return in February) asked us to provide her with some input regarding the "Speed Dating" model for helping researchers connect and collaborate. CP questioned whether people could really explain their research in 2 – 5 minutes. There was also some discussion on the name: does it sound too superficial? Due to time constraints we agreed to discuss it further at our next meeting.

VII. Upcoming events

a. Scheduling remaining FDAI meetings

We agreed upon the following dates – all Thursdays from 4:00 – 5:00 pm:
February 20, March 27, and April 24

IX. Adjourned at 5:02 pm.
Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 197/13
UAF Faculty Senate #197, March 3, 2014
Submitted by Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Minutes for 2/10/14:

Amy Lovecraft, Franz Mueter, Sophie Gilbert, Laura Bender, Elisabeth Nadin, Mike Daku, Christina Chu, Donie Bret-Harte, Holly Sherouse

I. Minutes Passed

II. GAAC reviewed the status of all of the outstanding course proposals and program changes. For most of them, we are waiting on faculty revisions.

III. GAAC passed **ANS F420 - Alaska Native Education (s)**

IV. GAAC discussed **MATH F6xx - Topics in Geometry** at length. Because this course has an undefined series of syllabi, it is difficult to review them.

V. Two new items, Program Change: **PhD - Mathematics**, and New Program: **Graduate Certificate in Resilience and Adaptation** were assigned for review at our next meeting.