UAF Governance

Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee

Members 2011-2012

Helpful info for Conveners

Julie Cascio, CES (13)
John Gimbel, CNSM (12)
Joshua Greenberg, SNRAS (13)
Marianne Kerr, CES (13)
Knut Kielland, CNSM (13)
Peter Knoke, CEM (12)
Patrick Marlow, SoED (13)
Jerry McBeath, CLA (13)
David Mollett, CLA (12)
Thomas Zhou, SOM (13)

Ex officio:
To be confirmed in Fall 2011.

2011-12 Meetings

Meeting schedule to be determined.

Guidelines for Group A and Group B Administrator Reviews

- **Guidelines for Group A Administrator Reviews**
- **Guidelines for Group B Administrator Reviews**

These guidelines were established by Faculty Senate Policy. For background and copies of the motions, see the **Faculty Senate Policies page** under Evaluation of Administrators (FS Meetings #111, #115, #138 and #143).

Jayne Harvie – 20 August 2011, Saturday 16:18

The **University of Alaska Fairbanks** is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer and educational institution and is a part of the **University of Alaska** system.
your footer
For questions or comments regarding this website, contact **fystaff@uaf.edu**

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATORS (GROUP A)

1. Within the first three weeks of the Fall Semester the Supervisor of the Administrator to be reviewed will appoint an Ad Hoc Administrator Review Committee consisting of five members, at least three of whom must be faculty. (It is recommended that staff be included on the ad hoc committee as appropriate.) The chair of the committee shall be appointed from the Faculty Senate. One of the three faculty shall be appointed from the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee.

   In the case of evaluation of the Dean of the Graduate School, the Provost will appoint an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of two faculty drawn from the UAF Faculty Senate's Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee, one Dean/Director, one member of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee, and a student representative from the Graduate Student Organization.

   The Ad Hoc Committee will solicit input from all relevant constituencies on- and off-campus, including faculty, staff, and students. This may be accomplished through various instruments, e.g., a standard questionnaire completed anonymously and returned to the Committee Chair.

2. The Administrator to be evaluated will prepare a narrative self-evaluation of activities performed during the three-year period (academic years) prior to the year of evaluation or since the last evaluation. This narrative should include reflections about how adequately s/he has fulfilled responsibilities of leadership consistent with his/her own performance expectations and those of faculty, staff, and students in the unit. Major or otherwise significant accomplishments should be highlighted. Any issues raised in the last evaluation should be referenced with a view to what progress has been made on those items. Finally, the self-evaluation should identify a limited set of reasonable goals for the unit over the next three years, with some discussion about specific strategies that may be undertaken through his/her administrative leadership.

3. The Ad Hoc Committee will interview a select sample of faculty, staff, students and others as relevant for further evaluative comments about the Administrator's performance.

4. The Ad Hoc Committee will interview the Administrator either in person or by conference call. The interview shall proceed on the basis of a set of questions which reference the Administrator's self-evaluation, the results of returned questionnaires, and the interviews of faculty, staff, and students.

5. The Ad Hoc Committee will prepare an evaluative summary, and submit its report to the Provost or Vice Chancellor (in the case of evaluation of Deans/Directors), or to the Chancellor (in the case of evaluation of the Provost or Vice Chancellor). The Ad Hoc Committee shall work as expeditiously as possible in completing its report and submit it to the Provost, Vice Chancellor or Chancellor as the case may be by March 15 of the Spring Semester.

(a) At a date to be set by the Provost or Vice Chancellor, the Provost or Vice Chancellor shall meet in joint conference with the Ad Hoc Committee and the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee for final review, recommendations, and disposition of the Administrator's evaluation. The supervisor of the administrator will thereafter provide his/her formal evaluation taking into account the Ad Hoc Committee's report.

(b) For Review of the Provost or Vice Chancellors - At a date to be set by the Chancellor, the Provost or Vice Chancellor and the Chancellor shall meet to discuss the Ad Hoc Committee's evaluation of the Provost or Vice Chancellor. During this meeting the Chancellor and Provost or Vice Chancellor shall identify performance priorities for the next review period. The Chancellor shall meet in joint conference with the Ad Hoc Committee and the UAF Faculty Senate's Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee to summarize his evaluation.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #143 on April 9, 2007:

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to modify the "Guidelines for the Evaluation Process for Administrators" (Senate Meeting #115, 2003):

Group B Administrators:

In addition to being reviewed annually by his/her immediate Supervisor, "Group B" administrators are to undergo a 3-year comprehensive review. At a time designated by the Supervisor during the fall semester of the academic year of comprehensive review, the "Group B" administrator will submit a self-evaluation report to his/her Supervisor. The self-evaluation shall include: (1) comments on the annual performance evaluations; (2) a summary of his/her notable activities/accomplishments in the previous years; and (3) a statement of relevant goals/objectives relative to assigned or planned administrative duties for the upcoming years. The Supervisor's evaluation shall include faculty and/or staff opportunity for comment on the "Group B" administrator's performance. Comments received shall be referenced in anonymous and aggregate summary in the written evaluation provided to the "Group B" administrator. The Supervisor will include, as part of the written evaluation, an appended workload assignment and/or statement of performance expectations for the "Group B" administrator for the subsequent review period. A copy of the Supervisor's review, along with a summary statement of the process used to assure faculty/staff input into the evaluation, will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office by March 15 of the academic year the "Group B" administrator is scheduled for review. The Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee shall review the written evaluation in performance of its oversight function in administrator review.

The following criteria will be used to determine which administrators are placed on or removed from the "Group B" list. As vacancies and appointments occur, changes to the list shall be determined annually by the Provost in consultation with the Faculty Senate President.

- "Group B" administrator responsibilities must be administrative in nature. ("Group B" administrators must not be Union members, UNAC or ACCFT).

- "Group B" administrators report to "Group A" administrators. ("Group A" administrators report to the Chancellor, Provost, or a Vice Chancellor.)

- "Group B" administrators supervise faculty and are involved in faculty performance reviews.

legislators and candidates. In its concern for fiscal issues the committee shall monitor budget appropriations to the university and evaluate any notice to the faculty of financial exigency. In performing these duties, the committee will coordinate as necessary with the relevant officers (and/or their representatives) of the extant collective bargaining units who serve as non-voting members of the Senate and ex-officio members of this committee.

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

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

PERMANENT

FROM FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS

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

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

The Student Academic Developmental and Achievement Committee shall consider policies concerning student development and retention. This committee will function as a curriculum council review committee for all developmental education courses and other courses facilitating student progress. Discipline based developmental education courses and courses facilitating student progress will be reviewed by the appropriate college curriculum council before submission to this committee for review and coordination.

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

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

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

1/2

contract.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Appeals

(EXCERPT)

Grade Appeals Policy

SEE THE REVISED DEADLINES for Appeals of Academic Decisions, including Grade Appeals (Meeting #157 - March 2, 2009).

The following is a complete copy of the Grade Appeals Policy as passed by the UAF Faculty Senate at its Meeting # 56 (March 20, 1995) and amended at its Meeting #61 (February 5, 1996), Meeting #80 (May 4, 1998), Meeting #89 (September 27, 1999), and Meeting #109 (May 6, 2002).

I. Introduction

The University of Alaska is committed to the ideal of academic freedom and so recognizes that the assignment of grades is a faculty responsibility. Therefore, the University administration shall not influence or affect an assigned grade or the review of an assigned grade.

The following procedures are designed to provide a means for students to seek review of final course grades alleged to be arbitrary and capricious. Before taking formal action, a student must attempt to resolve the issue informally with the instructor of the course. A student who files a written request for review under the following procedures shall be expected to abide by the final disposition of the review, as provided below, and may not seek further review of the matter under any other procedure within the university.

II. Definitions

A. A "grade" refers to final letter grades A, B, C, D, F, and Pass. The I (incomplete) designates a temporary grade, for one year

d. The request must detail the basis for the allegation that a grade was improper and the result of arbitrary and capricious grading and must present the relevant evidence.

2. It is the responsibility of the department chair to formally notify both the instructor who issued the grade and the dean of the unit's college or school that a request for a review of grade has been received.

3. If the instructor of the course is also the department chair, the Dean of the College will designate another department chair within the college to act as the department's representative for all proceedings. If the instructor of the course is also the Dean of the College, the Provost will designate another Dean within the University to act as the college's monitor of all proceedings.

4. The dean will appoint a 5 member review committee composed of the following:

a. One non-voting tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the course was offered (other than the instructor of the course). This individual shall serve in an advisory role.

b. Two tenure-track faculty members from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the course was offered. If available, one of these two members will be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

c. One tenure track faculty member from outside the college or school in which the course was offered. If available, this member is to be selected

from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

d. The fifth member to be appointed by the dean will be a non-voting student representative.

e. The campus judicial officer or his/her designee shall serve as a nonvoting facilitator for grade appeals hearings. This individual shall serve in an advisory role to help preserve consistent hearing protocol and records.

5. The committee must schedule a mutually agreeable date, time and location for the appeal hearing within 10 working days of receipt of the student's request.

a. During this and subsequent meetings, all parties involved shall protect the confidentiality of the matter according to the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and any other applicable federal, state or university policies.

b. Throughout the proceedings, the committee will encourage a mutually agreeable resolution.

c. The mandatory first item of business at this meeting is for the committee to rule on the validity of the student's request. Grounds for dismissal of the request for review are:

1) This is not the first properly prepared request for appeal of the particular grade.

2) The actions of the instructor do not constitute arbitrary and capricious grading, as defined herein.

3) The request was not made within the policy deadlines.

Appeals Policy For Academic Decisions

(EXCERPT)

Other Than Assignment of Grades

SEE THE REVISED DEADLINES for Appeals of Academic Decisions, including Grade Appeals (Meeting #157 - March 2, 2009).

I. Introduction

The University of Alaska is committed to the ideal of academic freedom and so recognizes that academic are a faculty responsibility. Therefore, the University administration shall not unduly influence or affect the review of academic decisions that are a faculty responsibility.

The following procedures are designed to provide a means for students to seek review of academic decisions alleged to be arbitrary and capricious. These academic decisions may involve non-admission to or dismissal from any UAF program that were made by a department or program through the department chair, or involve pass/fail decisions by a committee of faculty on non-course examinations (such as qualifying, comprehensive or thesis examinations) or satisfactory/unsatisfactory evaluations on student reviews (such as the annual review of graduate student performance). Before taking formal action, a student must attempt to resolve the issue informally. A student who files a written request for review under the following procedures shall be expected to abide by the final disposition of the review, as provided below, and may not seek further review of the matter under any other procedure within the university.

II. Definitions

A. As used in the schedule for review of academic decisions, a class day is any day of scheduled instruction, excluding Saturday

1. This formal review is initiated by the student through a signed, written request to the Provost.

a. The student's request for formal review may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and available from the Office of the Provost.

b. By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the formal review of the decision, and that the university's administration including the college dean/director can not influence or affect the outcome of the formal review.

c. The request for a formal review must be received no later than 10 days after the student has learned the outcome of the informal review (IIIA4).

d. The request must detail the basis for the allegation that the decision was made on a basis other than sound professional judgment based upon standard academic policies, procedures and practices.

2. The Provost will appoint a 5 member review committee composed of the following:

a. One non-voting tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the decision was made. This individual shall serve in an advisory role. This faculty member shall not be the individual(s) against whom the appeal is directed.

b. Two tenure-track faculty members from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the decision was made. If available, one of these two members will be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

c. One tenure-track faculty member from outside the college or school in which the decision was made. If available, this member is to be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #143 on April 9, 2007:

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to modify the "Guidelines for the Evaluation Process for Administrators" (Senate Meeting #115, 2003):

Group B Administrators:

In addition to being reviewed annually by his/her immediate Supervisor, "Group B" administrators are to undergo a 3-year comprehensive review. At a time designated by the Supervisor during the fall semester of the academic year of comprehensive review, the "Group B" administrator will submit a self-evaluation report to his/her Supervisor. The self-evaluation shall include: (1) comments on the annual performance evaluations; (2) a summary of his/her notable activities/accomplishments in the previous years; and (3) a statement of relevant goals/objectives relative to assigned or planned administrative duties for the upcoming years. The Supervisor's evaluation shall include faculty and/or staff opportunity for comment on the "Group B" administrator's performance. Comments received shall be referenced in anonymous and aggregate summary in the written evaluation provided to the "Group B" administrator. The Supervisor will include, as part of the written evaluation, an appended workload assignment and/or statement of performance expectations for the "Group B" administrator for the subsequent review period. A copy of the Supervisor's review, along with a summary statement of the process used to assure faculty/staff input into the evaluation, will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office by March 15 of the academic year the "Group B" administrator is scheduled for review. The Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee shall review the written evaluation in performance of its oversight function in administrator review.

The following criteria will be used to determine which administrators are placed on or removed from the "Group B" list. As vacancies and appointments occur, changes to the list shall be determined annually by the Provost in consultation with the Faculty Senate President.

- "Group B" administrator responsibilities must be administrative in nature. ("Group B" administrators must not be Union members, UNAC or ACCFT).

- "Group B" administrators report to "Group A" administrators. ("Group A" administrators report to the Chancellor, Provost, or a Vice Chancellor.)

- "Group B" administrators supervise faculty and are involved in faculty performance reviews.

A current list of both "Group A" and "Group B" administrators follows.

"Group A" Administrators (report to Chancellor, Provost or a Vice Chancellor)

Braddock	Joan	CNSM	Dean
Barnes	Brian	IAB	Director
Henrichs	Susan	Graduate School	Dean
Huesmann	James	Library	Dean
Joseph	Bernice	CRCD	Vice Chancellor
Hinzman	Larry	IARC	Director
Jonaitis	Aldona	Museum	Director
Lewis	Carol	SNRAS	Dean
Madsen	Eric	SOED	Dean
Marr	Wayne	SOM	Dean
Morrow	Phyllis	CLA	Dean
Reichardt	Paul	Provost	
Sharpton	Virgil "Buck"	Vice Chanc. for Research	
Smith	Roger	GI	Director
Wiesenburg	Denis	SFOS	Dean
Williams	Frank	ARSC	Director
Vacant/Acting		CEM	Dean

"Group B" Administrators (report to the above "Group A" administrators)

Allee	Brian	SFOS Sea Grant	Director
Castellini	Michael	SFOS IMS	Assoc. Dean
Caulfield	Rick	TVC	Director
Christie	David	SFOS GURU	Director
Connor	Billy	CEM, INE	Director
Cullenberg	Paula	SFOS MAP	Program Leader
Foote	Victoria	RC Health Programs	Director
Happ	George	IAB, INBRE	Program Dir.
Haugen	Lee	NWC	Director
Horner-Miller	Barbara	ARSC	Assoc. Dir.

Johnson	Clara	IAC	Director
Karulkar	Pramod	DPP, OEM	Director
Labelle-Hamer	Annette	GI Remote Sensing (ASF)	Director
Madison	Curt	CDE/IL	Director
McLean	Deborah	BBC	Director
Mitchell	G. Allen	AFES	Assoc. Dir.
Mohatt	Gerald	IAB, CANHR	Director
Pete	Pinney	CES	Interim Director
Pete	Mary	KUC	Director
Pullar	Gordon	CRCD, DANRD	Director
Saito	Linc	CC	Director
Vacant/Acting		SFOS, FITC	Director
Smoker	William	SFOS Fisheries	Director
Sugai	Susan	IARC	Assoc. Dir.
White	Daniel	CEM, INE	Director
Whitledge	Terry	SFOS, IMS	Director

EFFECTIVE: Fall Semester 2007

RATIONALE: Because of the lack of uniform and consistent review of Group B administrators, the need for adequate criteria for identification of administrators in this category, the need to assure annual as well as comprehensive review with faculty/staff input, and the need to diminish Faculty Appeals & Oversight direct control of the process, the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee proposes revision to the process as stipulated.

****

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #138 on September 18, 2006:

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to modify "Guidelines for the Evaluation Process for Administrators" (Senate Meeting #99, February 5, 2001; amended Senate Meeting #111, October 28, 2002) to include (1) the Dean of Libraries and (2) the Vice Chancellor for Research in the "Group A" list of administrators.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The Vice Chancellor for Research supervises research faculty via various institute directors, while the Dean of Libraries supervises library faculty. Both positions make budgeting decisions affecting faculty and staff at UAF. These responsibilities are consistent with those of the "Group A" list of administrators. They are therefore hereby added to that list for administrator review.

****

Group A Administrators

Provost
Executive Dean, College of Rural and Community Development
Dean, School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Dean, School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences
Dean, Graduate School
Dean, College of Engineering & Mines
Dean, School of Management
Dean, School of Education
Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Dean, College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics
Dean of Libraries
Vice Chancellor for Research

****

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #115 on April 7, 2003:

MOTION:
======

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the administrator review guidelines (passed at Meeting #99, February 5, 2001) to establish a timeline and process for Group "B" administrators and to add Director of the Museum to the Group "B" list.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The current administrator evaluation process defined two groups of administrators, Group "A" and Group "B". Group "A" administrators are being reviewed by the established process. However the Group "B" review process was not well defined in the original motion. Under this motion, the process for Group "B" administrators is less involved than for Group "A", and relies on the Faculty Appeals and Oversight committee to run the process. The Director of the Museum is at the same administrative level as other Group "B" administrators but was not included on the original list and should be included in the review process.

****

Process for Evaluation of Group "B" Administrators

Campus/Program Directors in Group "B" (as listed below) are to be reviewed annually by their immediate Supervisor. On July 1st, Group "B" Directors shall submit a report/evaluation form to their Supervisor on the previous year's activities/accomplishments and include goals for the upcoming year. The performance of the Director under review shall be ranked 'Satisfactory' or 'Unsatisfactory'.

On a 4-year cycle the evaluation shall be more extensive. By October 15 the Campus/Program Director being reviewed will submit a vita, position description, brief self-evaluation and past annual evaluations to the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee (FAOC), who will conduct the review. The FAOC may form a subcommittee or subcommittees of 3 or more faculty from FAOC to conduct the review and report back to the committee as a whole. If appropriate, a staff member from the Campus/Program Director's unit may be added to the subcommittee.

The FAOC shall set procedures for soliciting input from all relevant constituencies on- and off- campus including faculty, staff and students based on the Director's performance during the previous three years. This will be accomplished through a standard questionnaire completed anonymously and returned to the Ad Hoc Director Review Committee chair and through interviews with a select sample of faculty, staff, students and relevant others, if appropriate, and may include an interview with the administrator being reviewed.

The FAOC will prepare an evaluative summary, and submit its report to the Director's Supervisor by March 1.

At a date to be determined by the Supervisor of the Director under review, the Supervisor shall meet in joint conference with the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee to share his/her preliminary evaluation of the Director under review. The Supervisor will then complete the review process.

Supervisory Administrators may add additional administrators to this review list (for review in the 2007-2008 cycle), with approval from the Faculty Senate.

Review Cycle: Every four years beginning with:

2003-2004

Director, Geophysical Institute
Director, Interior-Aleutian Campus
Director, Institute for Northern Engineering
Director, Cooperative Extension Service
Director, University of Alaska Museum

2004-2005

Director, Institute of Arctic Biology
Director, Bristol Bay Campus
Director, Tanana Valley Campus
Director of Fisheries Division, Juneau
Director, International Arctic Research Center

2005-2006

Director, Institute of Marine Science
Director, Chukchi Campus
Director of Library
Director, Northwest Campus
Program Chairman, Marine Advisory Program

2007-2008

Director, Kuskokwim Campus
Director, Fishery Industrial Technology Center, Kodiak
Director, Arctic Region Supercomputer Center
Director, Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its' Meeting #111 on October 28, 2002:

MOTION:
======

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Guidelines for the Evaluation Process for Administrators as follows:

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: This will clarify who appoints the chair of the review committee.

****

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

1. Within the first three weeks of the Fall Semester the Supervisor of the Administrator to be reviewed will appoint an Ad Hoc Administrator Review Committee consisting of five members, at least three of whom must be faculty. (It is recommended that staff be included on the ad hoc committee as appropriate.) The chair of the committee shall be appointed from the Faculty Senate BY THE SUPERVISOR OF THE ADMINISTRATOR TO BE EVALUATED. One of the three faculty shall be appointed from the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee.

   In the case of evaluation of the Dean of the Graduate School, the Provost will appoint an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of two faculty drawn from the UAF Faculty Senate's Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee, one Dean/ Director, one member of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee, and a student representative from the Graduate Student Organization.

   The Ad Hoc Committee will solicit input from all relevant constituencies on- and off-campus, including faculty, staff, and students. This may be accomplished through various instruments, e.g., a standard questionnaire completed anonymously and returned to the Committee Chair.

2. The Administrator to be evaluated will prepare a narrative self-evaluation of activities performed during the three-year period (academic years) prior to the year of evaluation or since the last evaluation. This narrative should include reflections about how adequately s/he has fulfilled responsibilities of leadership consistent with his/her own performance expectations and those of faculty, staff, and students in the unit. Major or otherwise significant accomplishments should be highlighted. Any issues raised in the last evaluation should be referenced with a view to what progress has been made on those items. Finally, the self-evaluation should identify a limited set of reasonable goals for the unit over the next three years, with some discussion about specific strategies that may be undertaken through his/her administrative leadership.

3. The Ad Hoc Committee will interview a select sample of faculty, staff, students and others as relevant for further evaluative comments about the Administrator's performance.

4. The Ad Hoc Committee will interview the Administrator either in person or by conference call. The interview shall proceed on the basis of a set of questions which reference the Administrator's self-evaluation, the results of returned questionnaires, and the interviews of faculty, staff, and students.

5. The Ad Hoc Committee will prepare an evaluative summary, and submit its report to the Provost (in the case of evaluation of Deans) or to the Chancellor (in the case of evaluation of the Provost or any other administrator who reports directly to the Chancellor). The Ad Hoc Committee shall work as expeditiously as possible in completing its report and submit it to the Provost or Chancellor as the case may be by March 15 of the Spring Semester.

   (a) At a date to be set by the Provost, the Provost or administrator's supervisor shall meet in joint conference with the Ad Hoc Committee and the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee for final review, recommendations, and disposition of the Administrator's evaluation. The supervisor of the administrator will thereafter provide his/her formal evaluation taking into account the Ad Hoc Committee's report.

   (b) At a date to be set by the Chancellor, the Provost and the Chancellor shall meet to discuss the Ad Hoc

Committee's evaluation of the Provost. During this meeting the Chancellor and Provost shall identify performance priorities for the next review period. The Chancellor shall meet in joint conference with the Ad Hoc Committee and the UAF Faculty Senate's Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee to summarize his evaluation.