

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #208
Monday, September 14, 2015 – 1:00 - 3:00 PM
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I. Call to Order – Debu Misra
A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (16)	SKYA, Walter (16)
ALLMAN, Elizabeth (16)	TILBURY, Jennifer (17)
BARNES, Bill (16)	TUTTLE, Siri (17)
BOLTON, Bob (17)	WEBER, Jane (16)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (17)	WILDFEUER, Sandra (16)
CARROLL, Jennie (17)	
CASCIO, Julie (16) – Zoom audio	
CHERRY, Jessica (17)	Members Absent:
COLLINS, Eric (17)	GIFFORD, Valerie (17)
CUNDIFF, Nicole (17)	MCDONNELL, Andrew (16)
DIERENFIELD, Candi (17)	PETERSON, Rorik (17)
DISTEFANO, Diana (16)	RICE, Sunny (16)
FARMER, Daryl (17)	YARIE, John (16)
HAMPTON, Don (17) – Zoom audio	
HANKS, Cathy (16)	
HARDY, Sarah (17)	
HARNEY, Eileen (17)	
HARTMAN, Chris (16) – Dejan Raskovic	
HORNIG, Joan (16)	Others Present:
JOLY, Julie (17)	Chancellor Powers; Provost Henrichs,
LAWLOR, Orion (16)	President Jim Johnsen; Dean Paul Layer
LUNN, Lisa (17)	Alex Fitts; Anita Hartmann, Cindy Hardy
MAHONEY, Andrew (16) – Chris Fallen	Chris Coffman; Katie Boylen; Mike Earnest;
MAIER, Jak (17)	Mara Bacsujlaky; Faye Gallant; Ginny Kinne
MAXWELL, David (16) – Falk Huettmann	Caty Oehring; Carol Gering; Mark Herrmann
MCCARTNEY, Leslie (17) – Steve Hunt	Denise Wartes; Mike Sfraga; Kris Racina
MEYER, Franz (17)	Robert Shields; Kayt Sunwood
MISRA, Debu (16)	(There were >35 guests – not all could be named.)
MOSER, Dennis (16)	
NEWBERRY, Rainer (17)	

B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #207

Meeting minutes for #207 (May 2015) were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to approve the 2014-2015 degree candidates
2. Motion to amend UAF natural science requirement for UA transfer of credit

B. Motions Pending: *None*

III A. President's Remarks – Debu Misra

President Debu Misra welcomed all the new and returning senators, as well as the many guests from the public at the back of the ballroom. He acknowledged Jayne Harvie as the Governance Office coordinator. He welcomed Interim Chancellor Mike Powers and Provost Susan Henrichs, and mentioned the pending arrival of UA President Jim Johnsen.

Debu summarized the three main tenets of the Academy which Faculty Senate needs to uphold: 1.) academic freedom and responsibility; 2.) shared governance; and 3.) tenure and due process. The Faculty Senate will need to work within the framework of these tenets this year. Through shared governance, we develop mutual respect and trust within the university community. Decisions are made with all parties at the table, and though not all parties share the same authority, they each have a say and this develops trust and acceptance of the decisions made.

As an engineer, he believes in building. In the current budget situation, everyone hears about cuts. He wants faculty to think outside of the box when it comes to budget cuts, and proactively bring things that can build and strengthen the university to the attention of the university administration (the provost, the vice chancellor for research, and the chancellor). We need to work as a team and provide our input to the administration on matters pertinent to the core mission of the university so that we can maintain and improve the quality of research, teaching, and outreach and service.

This year Debu wishes to engage with the public of Fairbanks and the interior areas served by UAF. It's easy to become slowly detached from the public we serve, but we need to be engaged. There will be public comment periods during both hours of the meeting. If we listen to the input from the public, our elected representatives in Juneau will in turn listen to us.

He spoke about the need to define the role of Faculty Alliance vis-a-vis Faculty Senates. This has been a gray area. This year with Cécile Lardon's leadership at Faculty Alliance, we will try to look at the objectives that we want to accomplish over the year and how we disseminate these roles clearly.

Items which Faculty Alliance addressed during 2014-15 were mentioned, as follows:

- Dual Enrollment Policy for High School Students
- Minimum Baccalaureate Standards
- Protection of Minors regulation
- Core UA values
- Credit hour policy
- System-wide standard LMS use: syllabus, goals, grades
- GER coordination

GER Math coordination
GER English
Common Calendar
Common student satisfaction survey
Career and college readiness definition
Student code of conduct
WICHE Passport
Faculty regent position at BOR
Furlough policy and faculty
Faculty salary survey
System-wide +/- grade policy alignment

Anyone with an interest in any of these items may feel free to contact President Misra or Chair Cécile Lardon for more information.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Orion Lawlor

Orion stressed his agreement with President Misra that communication is a huge way to strengthen our connections with the community and improve relationships with legislators.

He related to the fact that we don't get the word out widely enough on everything that is being done at the university. He's working on telepresence robotics, and there's a lot of opportunity for collaboration across the state. He mentioned the Research Review document as another point of communication and the need to get the word out. (A web link is included in the agenda and hard copies are at the back table). He worked with the committee on this report, and was struck by the incredible variety of research taking place here. He realized how much is going on at the university that even he had not been aware was taking place.

He will continue to think about how we can improve our internal and external communications as a way to build connections both within and without the university (e.g., prospective students, their parents, the public, etc.). He sees this as a big priority this year.

IV A. Interim Chancellor's Remarks – Mike Powers

Chancellor Powers summarized the events which took place over the summer that led to his taking on the role of interim chancellor, and shared about five goals he will work on during the next ten months.

The first goal is to help advance and support the national search for a permanent chancellor.

The second goal is to support the development of the budget for FY17 (with key capital projects being engineering and deferred maintenance). Those items will take quite a bit of strategy and work across the system.

The third goal is to support a culture of safety and personal responsibility as related to the unfolding Title IX issue. The Title IX issue is sweeping colleges and universities across the country.

The fourth goal is to build strong ties in the community and continue to build on the incredible ties that were built by Brian Rogers. President Johnsen will reach out to the rural campuses, and he may go to some which the President doesn't get to; but, as interim chancellor he will focus largely on the business ties, legislative contacts, and ties to civic and arts groups in Fairbanks which he already has built over the last 30 years in Fairbanks.

The fifth goal is to prioritize and focus on the key things he can help the vice chancellors accomplish. They have put together a briefing book with five top goals in each of their respective areas. The longer-term future goals they have established comprise over 200 projects. He invited emails from the faculty if there are any subjects they want to have included. Chancellor's Cabinet will be working on the prioritization and he will keep Faculty Senate apprised of their work.

Chancellor Powers shared some of his personal background and interests, noting he and his family have always been part of a university town. From his background in hospital administration and familiarity with shared governance in that context, he spoke about being an advocate of shared governance on the Board of Regents where many have more of a business background. He understands the value of shared governance in the decision-making process. He invited faculty to contact him, introduce themselves, and expressed his desire to learn and be involved with their activities on campus.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs welcomed faculty back. The year will be challenging, but also provides the opportunity to show that we can be successful in spite of circumstances that are less than ideal.

It's very likely we'll be facing further budget reductions by the legislature over the course of this year and into the budget for FY18. How we deal with the coming reductions will be very important to the university's success. The approach of using program reviews engenders a lot of publicity, much of it less than positive, making how we reduce our budget an adversarial process. She would prefer that we work together toward dealing with the budget reductions in a way that reduces expenditures or increases revenues program by program, unit by unit. She'll be working with the deans and involving faculty to see what can be done in those areas. We can't continue to do everything being done now with less money. That's a path to doing everything less well. To continue doing great things as a university, we need to strategically identify where we need to make our investments and where we need to devote our efforts.

She recalled the tough times during the '90s, and thinks we can handle the reductions more successfully than during that time. The "better year ahead" was a long time coming during the '90s. She hopes to work with everyone on adjusting to today's budget realities in a way that's sustainable for the future which will benefit from new state investments should they come our way, but that doesn't depend on us hoping and waiting for a better day that too long in coming.

C. Interim VC for Research – Larry Hinzman

No remarks were available from VC Hinzman who was traveling.

D. Members' Questions/Comments

Donie B. asked for an update on the UAF power plant. President Johnsen responded that the project is underway and all is good. Chancellor Powers also stated the project is on schedule and has full support.

The comment was made from the public that UAA recently shut down its sustainability program, so the efforts to be leaders in this area fall on UAF. The question was asked about how this role is perceived in light of the new plant being coal-powered.

Provost Henrichs stated that the coal plant was the only affordable choice for UAF. Natural gas appeared attractive, but Fairbanks doesn't have a reliable supply of that available yet. With our extreme winters, an interruptible supply of gas is not an acceptable alternative. However, the plant design is versatile, and it will be able to burn natural gas should that prove a better alternative in the future. This

plant will also be able to handle biofuels. If there were another affordable alternative they would have chosen it.

Vice Chancellor Mike Sfraga commented about the robust UAF sustainability effort. UAF students have voluntarily taxed themselves to provide Fairbanks funds to the program. They have and will continue to reach out to UAA and UAS to coordinate efforts. The student initiative here in Fairbanks has been influential in, for example, adding solar panels to the SRC and the engineering buildings. He reiterated the goal of the student program here to reach out to UAA and UAS to coordinate efforts.

V Public Comment

Robert Shields, president of the Sustainable Campus Action Force, spoke about the Spark energy innovation competition. Spark is a non-profit that works with students in this national competition to encourage the creation of student-led businesses that are focused on energy innovation. Mr. Shields mentioned that the last budget cut removed the ability of the power plant to burn biofuels because it took out the conveyor belt and hopper funding. We have the technology; now we need the leadership. As a student, he is frustrated with the Students' Initiative for Renewable Energy Now (SIREN) fee that forces him to pay for the coal plant. That fund was originally set up to help the university diversify from coal, yet five years we have less than 1% progress. He believes that the strong coal interest locally is slowing down progress. He urged Faculty Senate to become more informed on this important issue for UAF, the rural campuses and the state as a whole. He provided his email address: rshields@alaska.edu

VI Guest Speaker: UA President James Johnsen Topic: UA: Serving Alaska in Challenging Times

President Johnsen commented on the tremendous strengths he is seeing across the university system, including fantastic faculty. Measured in terms of citations in academic journals, this university leads the world in arctic research. He, along with the chancellor, provost and Board of Regents, are absolutely committed to making sure that continues to be the case as they go forward. The single most valuable resource we have is people, particularly our faculty, and the staff who support them, as they deliver education to our students.

He mentioned how powerful it is to see what even a small team can do when there is communication and collaboration between a university and its community, using the community college at Valdez as an example of this fact.

He confirmed that we're certainly facing another year of fiscal pressure, and mentioned a phone call he had just that morning with the Governor's Office where he learned of their expectations for the university budget. Despite their guidance, he said they are going to proceed with the budget to the Regents this week that does not assume any reductions. They are pressing forward with a very modest and responsible budget developed in close cooperation with the chancellors, provosts and vice chancellors. The budget will go to the Regents for approval in November, and then moves on to the governor and the legislature. The budget to the Regents assumes compensation increases, fixed cost increases, a small set of academic initiatives, and completion of the engineering building which is critical not just to Fairbanks, but to Anchorage as well.

He noted we have cost structures that are high here, and they will work hard to creatively bring those cost structures down. The escalation of benefit program costs (10 percentage points this year alone from last year) is unsustainable.

He's also concerned about public optics and our reputation. We must focus on our strengths and take action proactively. There's simply no compromising in areas such as safety and Title IX issues.

Delaying to do the right thing is unacceptable. We must do the right thing, whether it takes reallocating funds or finding private funds to accomplish it.

With the opening up of the arctic, the coming decades are a door opening for this university to continue to lead the world in arctic research – not just physical research but also in adaptation and in the social sciences and other areas. This is critically important to us.

We have an important opportunity to improve productivity. We've got to think of as many ways as we can to enhance service to our students and to our constituents. He will be considering the use of discretionary funding to jump start and strengthen some initiatives in that direction. UAF, in particular, has done some process improvement on the administrative side of the house and he will probably invest some money to enhance that. It won't be limited to the administrative areas, but will also include other parts of the university as well as Anchorage and Juneau.

Teacher Education is a huge priority for the university right now. Even with three schools of education across the system, they are filling only 25% of the teacher vacancies in the state each year.

The UA Foundation Board of Trustees recently met with the BOR. Both Boards committed to enhanced private fundraising. UAF has done very well under the leadership of Brian Rogers in this area. Much of private money comes from the corporate sector which is able to take advantage of a tax credit allowed in Alaska. We need to move out and touch base with our alumni and do a much better job of raising funds. To this end there will be an integrated campaign across the university system over the next couple of years, partly taking advantage of the gift we have which is eight years of 100th-year anniversaries (including the rededication of the Cornerstone of 1917; the territorial legislature's naming of the university; the naming of the first building on campus in 1918 or 1919; the first operating budget; the first students walking onto campus; and the first graduate in 1923).

The President noted he will be meeting with student leaders to talk about tuition later today. Our undergraduate tuition is just 80% of the western states' median undergraduate tuition. Regarding raising tuition, they're looking at two options: 1.) differentiating tuition between the lower division and the upper division and the graduate level; and 2.) using just one number across the board. It will need to be tied directly to the projected shortfall that is expected. While advocating for the budget, they have to be realistic and plan for a contingency budget that considers the likely reductions out of the legislature. They will have a proposal to the Board in November for AY17 tuition. In addition to that, they'll be looking at programmatic special or differential tuition based on cost, enrollment, opportunity upon graduation and other considerations. Vice President Dan White is leading a system-wide team to develop those criteria and then evaluate where it makes sense to utilize it. He noted that the School of Management has instituted this type of tuition, and they have not suffered any enrollment decline at all.

The UAF Chancellor search is a critical priority. Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services (Kari Burrell) has been charged with providing President Johnson with a plan for the national search. They plan an inclusive search that will include faculty, staff, and community members on the search committee. They will likely engage a national firm to provide support. The plan is to conclude the search late next spring, and the plan includes bringing finalists to the campus.

Collaboration and communication are critically important right now and in the coming year. There are difficult decisions to be made that will take courage. In the end, we may not like the outcomes of the decisions that are made, but better decisions will be made with involvement, inclusion and consideration. He encouraged confidence in spite of these tough times. We are the state's fiscal plan. UA faculty, staff and students are part of the solutions to the state's many challenges.

BREAK (Taken at 2:00 PM)

VII Invited Comments: Anita Hartman, HR Director
Topic: Employee Engagement

Anita provided a brief overview of the employee engagement initiative. During these lean budget times, a lot is being asked of our people. We need employee engagement because it speaks to the goals we heard described by President Johnsen and Chancellor Powers during their remarks, including improved safety, increased commitment, and improved organizational performance. The numbers of employees are down through layoffs, contract non-renewals, decisions to retire or resign, contract reductions and involuntary furloughs. And those who remain have taken on extra work and responsibilities.

Anita described the glass door rating metrics and its effects on the three universities. She noted UAF was adversely affected in the ratings. Two of the metrics over which there is not much control are compensation and benefits, and career opportunities. Metrics which are more under our control and that we can address include culture and values, worklife balance, and aspects of senior management. The employee engagement initiative is for one year and is funded out of a foundation grant. It will address the three metrics mentioned. The schedule is ambitious and they wish to show impacts soon. To facilitate this, a survey will go out to 2800 of UAF's 3500 employees. They wish to include faculty responses in the survey, including adjuncts, term, and temporary faculty.

Their consulting contractor is DecisionWise, nationwide experts in employee engagement. They have the anchor questions already developed. DecisionWise will come to campus around November and there will be on-site debriefing and data analysis. There will be an action plan - leadership development workshop. From this they will develop unit-specific action plans. They also plan to address the needs of faculty who have joint appointments.

Disaggregated data will be available to those who could benefit from it; e.g., the Committee on the Status of Women, or the faculty unions. The data would also be helpful to address employee engagement for groups such as rural employees and those who telecommute from out of state.

Anita provided her contact information. She can be reached at x7700, and her email address is amhartmann@alaska.edu. She stressed that there will be opportunity for senate leadership to be involved in the onsite debriefing and workshop and bring information back to the Faculty Senate about the results of this effort.

- VIII Adoption of Consent Agenda
- A. Resolution in Support of Allowing Candidates for Promotion, Tenure, or Comprehensive Review to Opt for Open Meetings, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 208/1)
 - B. Motion endorsing 2015-16 Faculty Senate Committees, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 208/2)

Debu introduced the consent agenda. It was passed by the members with no objections.

- IX New Business
- A. Motion to approve Unit Criteria for the Justice Department, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 208/3)

Mara B., Unit Criteria Committee chair, introduced the motion, which is old business carrying over from the previous academic year.

With no objections, the motion to approve unit criteria for the Justice Department was passed unanimously.

X Discussion Items

A. Implementation of May '15 Core/GER Resolution

B. Proposed Motion to replace O and W requirements

submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 208/4)

Jennie C., Curricular Affairs Committee chair, introduced the discussions. She described the history of the Core / GER resolution that was passed last May, about moving forward to develop “bucket lists” of courses to fulfill the Perspectives on the Human Condition (PHC) requirements of the UAF Core Curriculum. While, as yet, there is no agreement between the three universities on this approach by UAF, our current approach of having a very specific list of courses which fulfill the UAF PHC requirements is glaringly different from the other two institutions. CAC will work on the bucket lists and the goal is to bring a motion to the Faculty Senate by February.

Rainer N. commented about the charge to the three universities to align the GERs by the Board of Regents, reiterating that what UAF does now with PHC required courses is very different from the other two. Moving in the direction of bucket lists will move us toward alignment. Rainer noted the other two universities are aware of intended action by UAF.

Cathy H. commented that this approach will make UAF more similar to UAA. Instead of a very specific list of required courses, students will be able to choose from a variety of courses. There may some specific points of difference with the other universities; they will just be about specific courses and not our approach.

Orion L. noted that the efforts to address the GERs have been ongoing for many years. He recalled that Dana Thomas started the ball rolling on the GERs over eight years ago. He spoke about his own experience as a former UAF student, providing the example of having to take one particular art course versus taking another he chose to take. The experiences were vastly different, with the art course he chose to take being a much more positive experience. He likes the idea of having the buckets lists which will give students more course choices and potentially better experiences in those courses.

Dennis M. confirmed Orion's comments about how long this process has taken, noting that this is why the Faculty Senate passed the resolution last spring in order that new senators would be more informed about the ongoing effort. Jennie noted that this effort builds on the work that the General Education Revitalization Committee (GERC) has done.

Diana D. asked what the timeline is for the common core for all universities. Rainer clarified that the BOR didn't actually say the universities must have identical GERs. But, the goal is that they will be more similar to one another than they are now.

Provost Henrichs talked about BOR request that three universities align Math and English courses, an effort that is well underway and almost completed. The other part of the BOR's instruction is that a plan be developed to align the rest of it. The bucket list approach being spoken of today is positive progress toward alignment. In her opinion, achieving uniform course buckets among the universities (to which all three were in agreement that GERs were fulfilled) would most likely be an acceptable outcome to the BOR. She encouraged Faculty Senate to pursue this.

Jennie brought up the next discussion item concerning the Communication requirement and related learning outcomes plan which would replace O and W courses. She described the proposed motion and

the desire for it to be passed at the October meeting. She and CAC members want feedback here at the meeting today or via email for CAC to discuss at its meetings.

Elizabeth A. commented that her Department of Math and Statistics is opposed to the motion. They feel the old system of O and W was working great. They do not like item 3 in the proposal: “Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities.” They feel it’s virtually impossible in their discipline. They also do not like the idea of having another plan to draw up, nor how it would be assessed.

Rainer responded that one of the problems with the O and W requirement is that it took the responsibility off of the bulk of faculty members. The objective of this revised plan is to engage the bulk of faculty that teach undergraduates into the whole question of what is best for each undergraduate in terms of improving their oral and written skills.

Nicole C. commented that the School of Management has discussed this, and she has no qualms about the proposal. She feels SOM is ready to draw up a plan and form a committee to facilitate it. Personally for her, item 3 on the proposed motion regarding translating disciplinary content was one of her favorites in the proposal.

The question was asked whether or not UAA and UAS have something similar to this. Rainer answered no; which the Provost reiterated. She noted that this proposal concerns a part of upper division requirements, so it’s not a part of the GERs and UAF can choose to do this or not.

Donie B. shared that the Biology and Wildlife Department faculty have mixed impressions, particularly about potentially weakening the common standards for skill in writing.

Debu noted that CEM had a similar discussion, but they were more in favor of the motion because it recognized that communication skills include electronic media, art, pictures and graphs.

Elizabeth A. reiterated her support for the O and W requirements and can’t imagine awarding a bachelor’s degree without a specific writing requirement, in particular.

Jamie C. asked for plan examples for Faculty Senate to look at, and more information on how this will be operationalized before it goes up for a vote.

The question was asked about whether one-time committees would be involved, or regular permanent committees. Rainer responded that the responsibility would lie with the individual departments and would be reviewed at each school and college.

Ken A. noted the lack of real assessibility with the Os and Ws by university-wide committees in the past. They reviewed the syllabi, but the actual success of the learning was not being assessed. Because of its specialized accreditation, School of Management has been assessing learning outcomes as opposed to simply focusing on inputs. Getting into assessment at SOM was scary at first; but it’s a strong system that works. Its strength is in providing faculty with a better way to know what is working and what isn’t. Programs are held more accountable for the outputs – a point that is important with accreditation. When something isn’t working it can be addressed. With the old system, the lack of really knowing what was and wasn’t working meant problems couldn’t be addressed.

July J. agreed with Ken’s comments, but expressed concerns that there would be no criteria followed and no oversight at the university-wide level. Thus, there would be no guarantee that a school or college passed a robust program for this. Jennie C. mentioned there is a proposed assessment committee which Vice Provost Fitts has put forward.

Alex F. spoke about her proposal for an assessment team comprised of faculty from each school and college and members from Faculty Senate. This university-wide committee would provide broad oversight by looking at the general plans from the schools and colleges and making sure they met assessment standards. Closing the loop of assessment would happen at the program level with student learning outcomes assessment.

Debu stressed this effort is not just for accreditation, but is important to the educational benefit of the students and their future employability.

Donie commented that the issue of assessing how well it works is not directly coupled to moving to the Communication designation. One could say they were assessing how well the O and W work and have a process for that. It comes down to whether or not you think there should be a university-wide requirement that students have training in “Os and Ws” (however they are assessed), or leave it up to each department to decide what communication requirement is most appropriate for their students.

Rainer recapped possible amendments to the proposed motion for the next meeting, and took a straw vote on the motion as amended. The straw vote indicated that the majority approved the amended proposal, with some opposed (approx. 4), and some in need of more information to make a decision (approx. 4 or 5).

XI Public Comment

Sarah Stanley (English Dept. faculty and GERC member) observed that the main sticking point she heard in the previous discussion concerned the outcome about translating disciplinary content. She hopes for more conversation and mentioned changing the 200-level writing course to address that need in various programs. She invited faculty to discuss this with her at the English Department.

XII Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Faye Gallant

Faye introduced herself and mentioned Nate Bauer is the vice president this year. Over the summer, they had great success in fixing some major gaps in the university regulation with the Leave Share program and family leave donations. Other issues Staff Council will address include the chancellor search; improving staff performance evaluations; implementing the approved creation of an annual volunteer day to strengthen ties with community; mentoring for staff; cleaning up their bylaws; and setting their 2016 schedule to align with Faculty Senate.

Debu mentioned it is a pleasure to work with Faye and that she is also chairing both Staff Alliance and the UAF Governance Coordinating Committee.

B. ASUAF – Mathew Carrick

A report was not available from ASUAF.

C. UNAC – Chris Coffman

Chris is the new org VP as well as faculty at the English Department. She thanked Debu for his past service as org VP, and thanked Sine Anahita and Tim Wilson for their past service in providing union reports to Faculty Senate. She noted the current CBA is posted at the union’s web page (unitedacademics.net) and the statewide labor relations site. She is happy to assist with answering any questions members may have.

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane did not have anything to report from UAFT, but mentioned that the Joint Health Care Committee (JHCC) will hold its first meeting on the 25th of September. She'll provide an update at the next meeting.

UNAD – Katie Boylen

Katie is the new vice president of United Adjuncts. She has been an adjunct in the English Department since fall of 2013. The union has recently filled seats that were vacant for a long time. Sally Rafson will be the regional secretary; Steve Becker will serve as the statewide secretary. Their next meeting dates are September 25-26, when they will discuss their constitution, set goals and strategies, and start addressing the contract which comes up in a couple of years. This past spring they surveyed over 200 UAF adjuncts and got 76 responses. Key findings included the following: 40% of adjuncts want better pay; 40% desire institutional respect; 23% have 2-4 years of service; 20% have 8-10 years of service – which is a large percentage that suggests a long-term commitment to the university. 7% of adjuncts rely upon their adjunct pay as the sole source of their income, and 8% lack of health insurance. Please talk to her if anyone has further questions about survey results.

D. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

A report was not available from Athletics.

XIII Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

Jane W. announced the annual Women Faculty Luncheon to take place on September 22nd.

B. Committee Chair Comments

Curricular Affairs – Jennifer Carroll, Chair

Faculty Affairs – Chris Fallen, Chair

Unit Criteria – Mara Bacsujlaky, Chair (Attachment 208/5)

Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 208/6)

Core Review – Kathy Arndt, Convener (Margaret Short and Andrew Seitz, Co-Chairs)

Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry, Chair

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Sandra Wildfeuer, Chair

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Convener (Attachment 208/7)

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair

Research Advisory Committee – Jessica Cherry, Convener

FY2015 UAF Research Review Report: Copies available at the back table, and online: <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/15-16-rac/>

Information Technology Committee – Julie Cascio, Chair

XIV Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:57 PM

Background:

The following resolution was first passed at Faculty Senate Meeting #146 in November 2007, and was endorsed by a letter distributed to the UAF faculty in Fall 2008. Since then the Provost has annually provided this resolution to all Faculty Review Committees. The Faculty Senate reaffirmed this resolution at Meeting #176 in September 2011, Meeting #184 in September 2012, and Meeting #192 in September 2013, and Meeting #200 in September 2014. For academic year 2015-2016, the Administrative Committee submits an updated resolution to the Faculty Senate Meeting #208 on September 14, 2015

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the members of Faculty Committees are called upon under the concept of shared governance to provide professional review of other faculty candidates undergoing Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Review (Pre and Post-tenure),

WHEREAS the faculty portion of the review process must be fair and reasonable in order to maintain the reputation of the University, and the integrity of the academic process,

WHEREAS open and transparent Committee deliberations facilitate fair and reasonable review,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly requests that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an “open” meeting, and that “mandatory closed” meetings be avoided, including during the 2015-16 review cycle.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty Committee meetings are “open” at the request of a candidate and are consistent with all other relevant UAF rules and procedures.
2. Open meetings provide strong incentives for fair and reasonable review, including the oversight of the candidate.
3. The Committee can query a candidate for clarification of the file, which will greatly reduce the number of false assumptions and errors during deliberation.
4. Open meetings are educational—candidates who opt to attend their review have the opportunity to learn about academic traditions and practices.
5. Attendance can reduce candidates' anxiety, and make them feel like a part of the process.

ATTACHMENT 208/2
UAF Faculty Senate #208, Sept. 14, 2015
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to endorse the 2015-2016 committee membership as attached.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: New Senate members' preference for committee selection were reviewed and weighed against membership distribution from schools and colleges.

2015-2016 Faculty Senate Committees

Standing Committees

Curricular Affairs Committee

Ken Abramowicz, SOM (16)
Jennifer Carroll, CRCD (17) - Chair
Eric Collins, SFOS (17)
Cindy Hardy, SADAC Liaison - ex officio
Eileen Harney, CLA (17)
Joan Hornig, SOE (16)
Cathy Hanks, CNSM (16)
Jenny Liu, CEM (16)
Lisa Lunn, CNSM (17)
Rainer Newberry, CNSM (17)
Patrick Plattet, CLA (16 – Alternate)

Faculty Affairs Committee

Elizabeth Allman, CNSM (16)
Andy Anger, CRCD – CTC (17 - Alternate)
Nicole Cundiff, SOM (17)
Chris Fallen, GI (17 - Alternate) - Chair
Valerie Gifford, SOE (17)
Joshua Greenberg, SNRE (17 – Alternate)
John Heaton, CLA (17)
Julie (Jak) Maier, CRCD (17)
Leslie McCartney, LIB (17)
Walter Skya, CLA (16)

Unit Criteria Committee

Mara Bacsujlaky, CES (16 – Alternate) - Chair
Bob Bolton, IARC (17 – Alternate)

Unit Criteria Committee - continued
Carrie Green, SOE (17 – Alternate)
Chris Hartman, CEM (16)
David Maxwell, CNSM (16)
Sarah Hardy, SFOS (17)
Alexander Hirsch, CLA (17 – Alternate)
Sunny Rice, SFOS (16)
Jennifer Tilbury, CRCD CTC (17)

Permanent Committees

Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

Gerri Brightwell, CLA (17 – Alternate)
Bernard Coakley, CNSM (17 – Alternate)
Candi Dierenfield, CES (17)
Diana DiStefano, CLA (16)
Brian Himelbloom, SFOS (16, Alternate)
Steven Hunt, LIB (17 – Alternate)
Franz Meyer, CNSM (17) – Convener
(Additional membership from at-large.)

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

Donie Bret-Harte, CNSM (17) – Convener
Michael Daku, CLA (non-senate member)
Daryl Farmer, CLA (17)
Don Hampton, GI (17)
Sean McGee, SOM (non-senate member)

Graduate Academic & Advisory - continued
John Yarie, SNRE (16)
Additional Faculty members to be named
Graduate Student member(s) to be named

Research Advisory Committee

Jessica Cherry, IARC (17) - Convener
Jamie Clark, CLA (17 - Alternate)
Larry Duffy, CNSM (17 – Alternate)
Kris Hundertmark, IAB (non-senate member)
Andrew Mahoney, GI (16)
Andrew McDonnell, SFOS (16)
Dennis Moser, LIB (16)
Dejan Raskovic, CEM (17 – Alternate)
Gay Sheffield, SFOS (17 – Alternate)

Information Technology Committee

Judith Atkinson, CRCD (non-senate member)
Bill Barnes, CRCD - CTC (16)
Julie Cascio, CES (16) – Chair
Falk Huettmann, CNSM (16 – Alternate)
Rorik Peterson, CEM (16) – Co-Chair
Siri Tuttle, CLA (17)
OIT member - ex-officio
eLearning member - ex-officio
Additional faculty members to be named.

Committee on the Status of Women

Elected membership
Diana DiStefano, CLA (16 – CSW term & senator)
Mary Ehrlander, CLA (16 – CSW term)
Ellen Lopez, CANHR (17 – CSW term)
Erin Pettit, CNSM (16 – CSW term)
Megan McPhee, SFOS (16 - CSW term)
Derek Sikes, CNSM (17 – CSW term)
Jane Weber, CRCD (CSW term & senator) –
Convener

Core Review Committee

(Elected membership: year in (#) refers to term on this committee only. Senate membership is not required.)

CLA:

Yelena Matusovich, Humanities (16)
Kevin Sager, Communication (16)
Burns Cooper, English (17)
Brian Kassof, Social Sciences (16)

Core Review Committee - continued
LIB:

Kathy Arndt, Library (17) – Convener
CNSM:
Larry Duffy, Science (16)
Larry is also an Alternate for CNSM (17)
Margaret Short, Math (17)
At-Large Representative:
Andrew Seitz, SFOS
College Reps:
Tony Rickard, CNSM
Kevin Berry, SOM

Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee

(Elected membership; year in (#) refers to term on this committee only. Senate membership is not required.)

Cindy Hardy, CRCD/DevEd –
--Cindy is also a CRCD Alt (17) and liaison to Curricular Affairs Committee for SADAC
Joe Mason, CRCD Northwest Campus
Eileen Harney, CLA – English (16)
Bill Howard, CNSM – Science (17)
Ben Kuntz, CRCD – Kuskokwim Campus
Jennifer Tilbury, CRCD CTC – Co-Chair
Jill Faudree, CNSM – Math (17)
Sandra Wildfeuer, CRCD – BBC/IAC - Chair
Representatives from Rural Student Services, Student Support Services, Academic Advising Center.

Curriculum Review Committee

Curriculum Council Chairs or Reps – Appointed membership to be confirmed for 2015-16

Rainer Newberry, Senator – Convener
SNRE: Julie Joly (17)
CRCD: Shawn Russell
UAF-CTC: Galen Johnson
SOE: Gary Jacobsen
CNSM: Jessica Larsen
SOM: Thomas Zhou (undergrad curriculum)
CLA: Trina Mamoon
CEM: Santanu Khataniar
SFOS Rep: Andres Lopez

List as of 09/09/2015

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for the Justice Department (CLA).

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The Unit Criteria Committee reviewed the unit criteria which were submitted from the Justice Department. With minor revisions, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

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

THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS' CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, PRE-TENURE REVIEW, POST-TENURE REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY ADAPTED FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE FACULTY OF THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'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 insofar 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 (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 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 are 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. *JUSTICE FACULTY MAY BE EITHER BIPARTITE OR TRIPARTITE.*

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:

- 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 *SUCH AS THOSE UNIQUELY SUITED TO ALASKAN COMMUNITIES*;
- g. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching;

H. ENGAGE IN DIVERSE INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES SUCH AS TEACHING AT RURAL OR BRANCH CAMPUSES, TEACHING DISTANCE DELIVERED COURSES AND TEACHING IN SUMMER SCHOOLS;

I. INVOLVE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN RESEARCH OR INTERNSHIP ACTIVITIES;

J. EFFECTIVELY MENTOR AND RECRUIT STUDENTS;

K. SUPPORT URSA INITIATIVES INCLUDING JOINT PROJECTS WITH STUDENTS, E.G., CASE STUDIES BY STUDENT PRACTITIONERS, FORCE MULTIPLIERS, AND MENTORING.

2. Components of Evaluation

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

- a. systematic student ratings, i.e. student opinion of instruction summary forms,
- and at least two of the following:
- b. narrative self-evaluation,
 - c. peer/department chair classroom observation(s) *OR OBSERVATIONS IN ALTERNATE INSTRUCTIONAL SETTINGS (E.G. ONLINE COURSES)*,
 - 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:

- a. They must occur in a public forum *UNLESS CONFIDENTIALITY IS REQUIRED BY LAW, UNIVERSITY POLICIES OR REGULATIONS, CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS OR PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS. HOWEVER, IF SUCH WORK CONSTITUTES A SUBSTANTIAL PART OF FACULTY RESEARCH EFFORT, THERE MUST BE PROVISION FOR B. AND C. TO OCCUR.*
- 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.

ACHIEVEMENT IN RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY INVOLVES THESE CHARACTERISTICS:

- *THEY REGULARLY IDENTIFY AND EXPLORE NEW RESEARCH PROBLEMS IN THE DISCIPLINE AND/OR CRITICALLY EXAMINE EXISTING RESEARCH PROBLEMS TO PROVIDE NEW INSIGHTS;*
- *THEY REGULARLY DEVELOP NEW METHODS, THEORIES OR APPROACHES TO RESEARCH PROBLEMS IN THE DISCIPLINE;*
- *THEY REGULARLY DEMONSTRATE GROWTH IN KNOWLEDGE OF THE DISCIPLINE OR GROWTH IN EMPIRICAL AND/OR CRITICAL RESEARCH ABILITIES;*
- *THEY REGULARLY PARTICIPATE WITH OTHER PRACTITIONERS WITHIN THEIR DISCIPLINE TO IDENTIFY REAL WORLD PROBLEMS AND POSE SOLUTIONS.*

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, *CASE STUDIES* 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. *CITATION INDEXES ARE NOT REGARDED AS RELIABLE INDICATORS OF STANDING IN JUSTICE, AND ARE NOT COMMONLY USED. A HIGH LEVEL OF CITATION MIGHT INDICATE A HIGH STANDING IN A FACULTY MEMBER'S FIELD. HOWEVER, A LOW LEVEL OF CITATION SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN TO INDICATE A LACK OF STANDING. THIS UNIT VALUES QUALITATIVE REVIEWS OF RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY.*
- 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.. POLICY EVALUATION, LAW REVIEW AND CASE STUDIES RESEARCH.

N. RESEARCH / PUBLICATIONS STEMMING FROM MANAGERIAL CONSULTATIONS INCLUDING PROBLEM DIAGNOSIS, POLICY DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION, SEMINARS TO SEED PRACTITIONER EXPERIMENTATION AND NEW PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION.

O. JOINT PROJECTS WITH STUDENTS THAT RESULT IN DISSEMINATION OF WORK PRODUCTS, E.G., URSA, CASE STUDIES FROM STUDENT PRACTITIONERS, FORCE MULTIPLIERS, OR MENTORING. THE PROVISIONS OF (C)(1)(A) APPLY TO JOINT PROJECTS.

P. PRESENTATIONS OF ORIGINAL RESEARCH LEADING TO NEW LEARNING AND PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS AT ACADEMIC AND PRACTITIONER CONFERENCES, SEMINARS AND TRAINING.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

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

1. Public Service

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative

activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. It includes all activities which extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing, programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, professional contributions to the community or to one's discipline, or other activities in furtherance of the goals and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis.

Examples include, but are not limited to:

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

L. ACTIVELY PARTICIPATING ON AND CONTRIBUTING TO THE WORK OF PUBLIC AND/OR GOVERNMENTAL BODIES.

M. APPLYING THEORIES OR FINDINGS OF THE DISCIPLINE IN PUBLIC SERVICE.

N. FIELD INSTRUCTION AND EXTENSION DELIVERY OF SKILLS TO ALASKA'S WORKFORCE.

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 NEW FACULTY*.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

K. EXHIBITING LEADERSHIP AND MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS ON THE DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE, OR UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS LEVELS AND/OR ON BEHALF OF STATEWIDE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.

L. ASSISTING IN THE DESIGN OF JUSTICE-RELATED COMMUNITY EFFORTS.

M. COORDINATING SPECIALIZED COURSE DELIVERY METHODS FOR STUDENTS IN RURAL ALASKA INCLUDING INTENSIVE ADVISING AND SUPPORT.

3. Professional Service

Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

- a. Editing or refereeing *REVIEWS, CASE STUDIES*, articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.
- b. Active participation in professional organizations.
- c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations *OR ORGANIZATIONS CLOSELY RELATED TO THE DISCIPLINE*.
- d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.
- e. Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings, *PRACTITIONER CONFERENCES AND SEMINARS AND OTHER NON-TRADITIONAL VENUES, E.G., NATIVE CORPORATION MEETINGS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CONFERENCES ATTRACTIVE TO PRACTITIONERS. ACADEMICS AND THE PUBLIC WITH THE INTENT OF DEVELOPING KNOWLEDGE AND RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES.*

f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

G. MANAGERIAL CONSULTATION WHICH MAY INCLUDE PROBLEM DIAGNOSIS, POLICY DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION, NEW PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION AND SEMINARS TO SEED PRACTITIONER EXPERIMENTATION.

H. DEVELOPING CONFERENCES ATTRACTIVE TO PRACTITIONERS, ACADEMICS AND THE PUBLIC, E.G., VILLAGES, LAW ENFORCEMENT AND OTHER JUSTICE PROFESSIONALS.

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 relevant means, e.g., appropriate letters of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY FACULTY SENATE AT THE MAY 2015 MEETING

WHEREAS, the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate recognizes the need to revise the Core Curriculum; and

WHEREAS, the Senate wishes to widen student choice in the university's general education; and

WHEREAS, the General Education Revitalization Committee has proposed a "classification list" system (lists of approved courses which fulfill arts, humanities, and social science general education requirements) to replace the current Perspectives on the Human Condition (PHC) courses;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that during the 2015-2016 academic year the UAF Faculty Senate will adopt a classification list system that will meet general education requirements in arts, humanities, and social sciences in lieu of the currently-mandated PHC courses, with the new system to take full effect as of the 2016-17 Course Catalog.

PROPOSED DISCUSSION ITEM FOR FAC SENATE SEPT 2015 MEETING

The Faculty Senate moves to replace the upper division Oral (O) and Written (W) requirement with the requirement that each degree program must satisfy the following Communications Learning Outcomes within the degree program:

UAF undergraduates will demonstrate effective communication when they are able to:

- Explain disciplinary content using a variety of modes of communication.
- Communicate to audiences in the discipline using appropriate disciplinary conventions.
- Translate disciplinary content to audiences outside the discipline, making disciplinary knowledge relevant to broader communities.
- Integrate feedback from others to enhance or revise communication.

Each baccalaureate degree program must submit a Communications Plan that demonstrates how students will achieve each of the learning outcomes as part of the requirements of the major or degree program. Not all courses or requirements need to support every outcome; however, all the outcomes must be met by the completion of the degree.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2016

RATIONALE: The GERC committee and Curricular Affairs, as part of their work to revise UAF's core requirements, propose replacing the current W/O designators with a requirement that students achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes that are integrated into each baccalaureate degree program and major.

1. The responsibility for ensuring that students achieve these Communications Learning Outcomes is being moved from the University level (via specific O and W courses) to the department level (via the requirements of the degree programs), and from a specific degree requirement (taking two Ws and one O) to a requirement that is achieved by the student completing the degree requirements associated with their program.
2. To ensure student achievement of these Communications Learning Outcomes, each department will demonstrate how their program addresses these learning outcomes by developing a Communications Plan that integrates communication into each degree or program, typically via a collection of lower and/or upper level courses and/or non-curricular degree requirements chosen to meet the needs of the particular program. This

should be done in such a way that all the outcomes are met somewhere in the courses required for the completion of a degree. The Communications Plan for each degree will describe the collection of courses (both in and possibly out of the department) and other requirements (if any) and how they contribute to meeting these outcomes.

3. Departments will submit the Communications Plan for each degree program as part of their SLOA plans, and subsequently, submit a short summary report addressing how the plan is working (and revising the plan as necessary). Once a department has submitted a plan, which will include a required path/collection of paths through the degree wherein students will achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes, then all students in that degree will achieve the Communications Learning Outcomes by virtue of satisfying the degree requirements of that program.

4. Committees will be formed within each school or college (and made up of at least 1 member) to regularly review communications plans submitted by programs.

5. An additional checkbox will be added to Major/Minor course change forms asking “Does this change affect Communications Outcomes Plans?”, so that departments are aware of the impact of potential changes.

6. Existing O and W designators will remain in place (if appropriate) for a period of 2 years from Fall 2016 to facilitate students under catalogs with O/W requirements.

7. Departments should submit as part of their Communications Plans a clarification for how they will handle the transition away from O/W designators for students who fall under a catalog prior to Fall 2016.

8. A web page (similar to the SLOA) will be established where communications plans are collected and disseminated across the university.

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE
April 28, 2015
2:30-3:30 PM
Chancellor's Conference Room

Attending:

Chris Coffman (chair), Chris Hartman, David Maxwell; Ping Lan and Sarah Hardy.

- I. Housekeeping
 - A. Selection of Note-Taker
Ping Lan
 - B. Approval of Agenda
Approved unanimously.
 - C. Approval of Minutes from 4/14/15 Meeting
Approved Unanimously with correction of a faculty name
 - D. Selection of Convener for 15-16
No selection was made. It needs to be assigned by the leadership of faculty senate.
 - E. Approval of Minor Wordsmithing to Bylaws
Approved unanimously.
- II. Justice Proposed Unit Criteria (Revised)

Approved unanimously with one condition—eliminate the duplication of certain language. In specify, to eliminate “CITATION INDEXES ARE NOT REGARDED AS RELIABLE INDICATORS OF STANDING IN JUSTICE, AND ARE NOT COMMONLY USED. A HIGH LEVEL OF CITATION MIGHT INDICATE A HIGH STANDING IN A FACULTY MEMBER’S FIELD. HOWEVER, A LOW LEVEL OF CITATION SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN TO INDICATE A LACK OF STANDING. THIS UNIT VALUES QUALITATIVE REVIEWS OF RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY” in 1 D in page 5, because the paragraph shows in page 6 as 2 G.
- III. Rules for Primacy of Unit Criteria
Committee members think that the academic unit criteria should weight more in tenure evaluation. It suggests that next committee to seek more inputs from joint-appointed faculty for dealing with the issue.

Meeting adjourned.

ATTACHMENT 208/6
UAF Faculty Senate #208, Sept. 14, 2015
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women

Minutes Monday, 11 May 2015, Eielson 304C, 10:30-11:00

Present:

Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Jenny Liu, Diana Di Stefano, Derek Sikes

Members absent: Erin Pettit, Michelle Bartlett, Ellen Lopez, Mary Erlander, Megan McPhee

Members on sabbatical: Amy Barnsley

1. Promotion / Tenure Workshop – Next year Megan McPhee will coordinate a video conference (& we'll be sure to invite Ginny Eckert again). Well attended, good questions. Ellen submitted the sign-in sheets to Jayne Harvie. Lots of research professor questions. The extra hour wasn't really necessary so return to 2h plan for next year.

2. Women's Faculty Luncheon - Sep 22

Alex Fitts has agreed to be the speaker.

3. Fall Conversation Café.

[Repeat of notes from last meeting:] "Ellen will bring cards to the Luncheon so that attendees can write ideas of topics they'd like to discuss at the next Conversation Café. Important to give people enough lead time, (plus reminders) so people can get it on their calendars. Tentatively set for Oct 20, date to be finalized so it can be announced at the luncheon."

Next meeting: doodle for next meeting.

Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes, These minutes are archived on the CSW website:
<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/14-15-csw/>

ATTACHMENT 208/7

UAF Faculty Senate #208, Sept. 14, 2015

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
May 5, 2015 Meeting Minutes**

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 3:59 pm.

II. Roll call

Present: Bill Barnes, Kelly Houlton, Duff Johnston, Chris Lott, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Channon Price, Leslie Shallcross

Excused: Diana DiStefano, Andrea Ferrante, Mark Herrmann, Brian Himelbloom, Joy Morrison, Amy Vinlove

Absent: Cindy Fabbri

III. Report by the Office of Faculty Development (report from Joy)

Joy is taking May off without pay in order to add more money to the OFD budget. She will be back in June.

IV. Report by UAF eLearning & Distance Education

Chris reported that eLearning & Distance Education will be moving to their new space starting June 15 and that everything is on track.

UAF eLearning addressed Faculty Senate at their meeting today to provide some myth-busting and ensure that faculty have a good understanding of the role that eLearning plays. Their role is to help faculty develop educationally sound online courses and advocate for appropriate workload releases during the developmental stage. Chris noted that although there is pressure for faculty to develop more online courses, the push does not come from eLearning; they are there to help facilitate and guide faculty members' efforts in these endeavours.

V. News on Electronic Course Assessment Implementation Committee (ECAI)

Franz reported in place of ECAI Chair Andrea Ferrante that the pilot for spring will finish tonight (Monday, May 4), and the final response rates will be available tomorrow. Currently the response rate is about 41%. At the last Administrative Committee meeting, Franz advocated to keep ECAI going for the next year in order to deal with various issues that arise from the spring pilot and the projected summer pilot. He requested that we forward any comments we hear regarding any confusion or issues (or positive comments) on to Andrea so ECAI can investigate and help smooth the transition to full implementation in the fall.

VI. Update on final FDAI bylaws

Franz reported that Faculty Senate tabled the vote on committee bylaws for fall since issues were raised regarding certain "inconsistencies" between the block of bylaws common for all committees and the

individual bylaws that each committee has under their control. While the Administrative Committee thought this was acceptable, the Faculty Senate disagreed. Unfortunately for now we are still somewhat in limbo. Franz asked that we read through the shortened version of our proposed bylaws and email any suggested wording changes on to him. He noted that we may request a special vote on having the FDAI bylaws included in the Faculty Senate bylaws since currently there is nothing.

VII. Short update on Faculty 180 review

Franz emailed a link to FDAI members to share with their various departments for providing feedback to the Provost's Office on Faculty 180. While the form has existed for a while, it has been largely unknown to faculty. He noted some concern that there is currently little faculty involvement regarding Faculty 180 and its related issues. For example, it is currently not possible for the faculty to "preview" their annual report in the exact format that is seen by their deans. Furthermore, it is unclear if the report that is seen by the deans is currently standardized. At the very least faculty should have the option to view exactly what their report will look like when others view the same report. To ensure consistency in content and formatting of the annual activity reports, more faculty involvement is strongly suggested by FDAI.

To communicate the FDAI's opinion on this issue to the Faculty Senate leadership, the following motion was proposed, seconded and carried with no opposition:

"The Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee strongly suggests that improved faculty involvement on the implementation of and reporting procedures within Faculty 180 be instituted".

VIII. Other Business

a. End of year notes

Franz requested that committee members send any comments on the annual FDAI report to him by Friday, May 8 so that he may fine-tune the report and send it on to Jayne Harvey. He sincerely thanked every committee member for their dedicated work on our committee and noted that both Andrea Ferrante and Kelly Houlton received Service Awards from Faculty Senate recognizing non-senators for their "behind-the-scenes" work on committees.

The FDAI Committee also thanked Franz Meyer for another year of excellent work as Chair of our committee.

IX. Upcoming Events

- a. Next FDAI meeting: September 2015
- b. Next Administrative Committee meeting: August 2015
- c. Next Faculty Senate meeting: September 2015

IX. Adjourned at 4:58 pm (Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.)