

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Jayne Harvie
474-7964 fysenate@uaf.edu

For Audioconferencing:

Toll-free #: 1-800-893-8850
Participants PIN: 1109306

AGENDA

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #165

Friday, March 5, 2010

1:00 p.m. – ~3:15 p.m.

201 O’Neill Building (SFOS Conference Room)

- | | | | |
|------|-------|--|---------|
| 1:00 | I | Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn | 5 Min. |
| | | A. Roll Call | |
| | | B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #164 | |
| | | C. Adoption of Agenda | |
| | II | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions | 0 Min. |
| | | A. Motions Approved: none | |
| | | B. Motions Pending: none | |
| 1:05 | III | Public Comments/Questions | 5 Min. |
| 1:10 | IV | A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn | 10 Min. |
| | | B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill | 10 Min. |
| 1:30 | V | A. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs | 10 Min. |
| | | <i>Chancellor's remarks are rescheduled for 2:15 PM.</i> | |
| 1:40 | VI | Governance Reports | 5 Min. |
| | | A. Staff Council – Martin Klein | |
| | | B. ASUAF – Todd Vorisek | |
| | | C. UAFT/UNAC | |
| 1:45 | VII | Guest Speaker | 15 Min. |
| | | A. Erin Trochim, Graduate Student | |
| | | Topic: Organizing the graduate students, and plans for an orientation. | |
| 2:00 | BREAK | | |
| 2:10 | VIII | Announcements | 5 Min. |
| | | A. Outstanding Senator of the Year Award (OSYA) – Nominations are open. Two volunteers sought for selection committee. Guidelines are at back table, and online at:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#165 | |
| | | B. Feedback from Faculty Senate being sought by NWCCU on proposed revisions to NWCCU eligibility requirements. Handout at back table, and online at:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#165 | |
| | | C. Promotion & Tenure Workshop on April 23, 2010 - Handout | |

2:15 Min.	IX	A. Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers	10
2:25	X	New Business	20 Min.
		A. Motion to Extend Terms of Faculty Senate President and President-Elect (Attachment 165/1)	
		B. Motions to amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws, submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachments 165/2-165/9, Bylaws Handout)	
		C. Leave Share Resolution, submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women (Attachment 165/10)	
		D. Motion to amend the Mandatory Placement Policy, submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee (Attachment 165/11)	
		E. Motion to Reaffirm ANLC/ANLP Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 165/12)	
2:45	XI	Discussion Items	15 Min.
		A. UA Presidential Finalists – Jon Dehn	
		B. Peer Observation Form for Seminars – Josef Glowa (Attachment 165/13) http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/09-10_senate_meetings/index.html#165	
		C. Update on Follett Bookstore meetings – Ken Abramowicz, Jane Weber	
		D. Update on the Core/LEAP discussions – Falk Huettmann	
		E. Update on CIRTS Report – Jon Dehn http://www.uaf.edu/chancellor/administration/advisory/cirts/	
		F. Update on the Academic Master Plan – Jon Dehn	
3:00	XII	Committee Reports	10 Min.
		A. Curricular Affairs – Falk Huettmann, Ken Abramowicz	
		B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds (Attachment 165/14)	
		C. Unit Criteria –Brenda Konar (Attachment 165/15)	
		D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Alex Fitts (Attachment 165/16)	
		E. Core Review – Latrice Laughlin	
		F. Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry	
		G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks	
		H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowa (Attachment 165/17)	
		I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Rajive Ganguli	
		J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy	
		K. Ad Hoc Committee: Advisory Research Committee –Roger Hansen	
3:10	XIII	Members' Comments/Questions	5 Min.
3:15	XIV	Adjournment	

ATTACHMENT 165/1
UAF Faculty Senate #165, March 5, 2010
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to vote on the extension of the terms of the President and President Elect (Jon Dehn and Cathy Cahill) for one year.

Effective: Immediately

Rationale: The University of Alaska Fairbanks is at a unique point in its history, with a new Chancellor, a new approach to administration, accreditation compressed into two years and under a new set of guidelines, and upcoming financial challenges. Stability in Senate leadership for a single year could be an opportunity to establish a strong voice for the faculty in shared governance and provide consistent feedback to an administration facing difficult choices.

President's Statement to the Faculty Senate:

I am honored by the motion to extend the term of my Presidency and Cathy Cahill's term as President-Elect. It is not without trepidation that President-Elect Cahill and I consider this, but we are both at times in our careers when it is possible for us to continue in our current Faculty Senate roles for another year and felt that, given the unprecedented overturn of administrators across the UA system and our intimate knowledge of the statewide issues such as the Academic Master Plan that could have a major impact on the faculty of UAF, it would be irresponsible of us not to offer our services to the Senate for another year.

The University of Alaska Fairbanks is at a crossroads with a new Chancellor, a search for a new President, overturn and restructuring in administration, a compressed plan for accreditation, looming financial challenges and the effects of changes across the system, including a new academic master plan and administrative overturns in our partner MAUs. In the past, the rapid overturn in faculty leadership has led to a gradual attrition in the faculty's traditional role in governance. A typical one-year term is effective for day-to-day efforts, but most of the current issues facing faculty governance are multi-year in scope. This is a chance for faculty to provide stability in the UAF system during this overturn and to increase our roll in UAF governance. We can reestablish a strong voice in critical matters of policy that affect us all.

There are many matters that will need our attention this year: keeping up with accreditation, conducting core and graduate program revitalization, establishing links to the legislature in coordination with our other governance groups and positioning UAF to best withstand the coming challenges. I'd like to specifically address one matter here: the role of the faculty in developing the Academic Master Plan. This plan has broad implications system-wide, and will have profound effects on our day-to-day operations. As envisioned by the Board of Regents, this plan will help allocate resources, determine which programs are approved, and define which campuses can offer what type and level of degrees. The Board-approved charge contained a process for input from the

Faculty Senates at all campuses; yet to date, more than a year after the plan was drafted (currently at version 21), this has not been done. Consistency in Senate leadership is an opportunity to keep the Faculty voice in a plan that has far reaching effects on important faculty responsibilities such as which classes we teach, what programs we develop, and what degrees we can confer to our students. Both President-Elect Cahill and I are intimately familiar with the plan, the charge, and this process. If you retain us, we will continue our fight to involve the faculty in guiding the university towards what is best for our students, and our missions of teaching, research and service in the Academic Master Plan. A new President-Elect would be at a disadvantage in this critical stage of the plan's development.

This is but a single example, and there are many others, of why continuity in Faculty Senate leadership is very important at this moment, and I admit that I have a strong desire to see them through. This position has a steep learning curve, and by the time one has figured it out, there is little time to implement meaningful, long-lasting change in concert with the Senate. It too easily becomes "can I put out this fire?" instead of "can I create a lasting change?" I could not ask for a more capable President-Elect, and I hope to pass the Presidency to President-Elect Cahill not with a list of unfinished business, but with a chance for her to take new directions without the burden of what is left undone.

Thank you for your consideration.

SECRET BALLOT

___ YES, the terms of the president and president-elect shall be extended for one year.

___ NO, the terms of the president and president-elect shall not be extended for one year.
Nominations for president-elect shall be opened, with voting to take place at the April 5 meeting.

ATTACHMENT 165/2 – Motion A
UAF Faculty Senate #165, March 5, 2010
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs and Administrative Committees

MOTION:
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection A (page 13). This amendment updates a reference to one of the faculty unions in the Bylaws.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010

RATIONALE: The Bylaws refer to one of the faculty unions as ACCFT, or Alaska Community Colleges' Federation of Teachers. The name of this bargaining unit was changed in 2008 to UAFT, or University of Alaska Federation of Teachers.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

- A. The membership of the Faculty Senate, hereinafter referred to as "Senate," shall consist of approximately 41 members plus one non-voting presiding officer. Approximately 35 members shall be elected by and from the faculty and will have voting privileges. Six non-voting members will be selected by and from other university constituencies as follows: one non-graduate student and one graduate student selected by the ASUAF; one professional school dean and one college dean selected by the Deans' Council; one staff representative from the registrar's office; and one additional staff member selected by the Staff Council. If the staff representative from the registrar's office is APT, the second staff member must come from the classified staff ranks. If the staff representative from the registrar's office is classified, the second staff member must be APT. Three additional non-voting members will be selected by and from the unions as follows: one elected official each from United Academics-AAUP/AFT, **UAFT** **[ACCFT]**, Adjunct (United Academics)-AAUP/AFT.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, existing subsections B.1 and B.7 (page 13). This amendment addresses inconsistencies in the treatment of research institutes for the purpose of Faculty Senate representation.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010

RATIONALE: The current Bylaws make provision for the research institutes in apportionment calculations for Faculty Senate representation, but they do so with the assumption that the research institutes will not qualify for separate representation. Instead, the research institutes are collected into a “conglomerate group,” as would be done with any schools and colleges that were too small to qualify for representation. However, based on 2008-2009 reapportionment calculations, several research institutes at UAF are now large enough to qualify for separate representation. The proposed amendments to the Bylaws acknowledge this, remove the assumption that the research institutes are too small for representation, and treat them in the same way as the schools and colleges.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

1. A unit is a single school or college **OR RESEARCH INSTITUTE**, or a collection of schools and/or colleges or collection of research institutes (see item **5 [[7]]**).

5 [[7. All schools or]] SCHOOLS, colleges AND RESEARCH INSTITUTES whose representation under item **4 [[5]]** is zero **MAY FORM A CONGLOMERATE GROUP FOR THE PURPOSE OF JOINT REPRESENTATION AS A SINGLE UNIT, IF TOGETHER THEY QUALIFY FOR REPRESENTATION UNDER ITEM 4. IF THEY DO NOT QUALIFY AS A CONGLOMERATE GROUP, OR IF THEY DO NOT CHOOSE TO BE REPRESENTED AS A GROUP, THEN EACH UNIT SHALL JOIN WITH A REPRESENTED SCHOOL, COLLEGE OR RESEARCH INSTITUTE.**

[[shall be grouped into the conglomerate group and this group shall be treated as a single unit for purposes of the computation of item 5. If a unit which would have been grouped in the conglomerate group decides instead that the unit would be better served by joining with another school or college, it may do so upon the mutual agreement of those units.]]

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsections B.2 through B.5 (page 13). This amendment removes the use of Full Time Faculty Equivalents (FTFE) in reapportionment calculations for Faculty Senate representation.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010

RATIONALE: The current bylaws for Faculty Senate reapportionment specify that each faculty member with at least a 75% faculty appointment will be counted as 1 Full Time Faculty Equivalent (FTFE), and those with less than 75% faculty appointment must be counted as a fractional FTFE calculated by their actual appointment divided by 75%.

The Bylaws specify this calculation in terms of hours of annual academic appointment. These data are not stored electronically anywhere at UAF, and they change annually with faculty workloads. Obtaining the data for this calculation requires a large investment of time and effort, as they must be compiled manually from faculty appointment letters. This procedure was followed for the 2008-2009 reapportionment calculation. The result was that this labor-intensive adjustment for faculty with less than 75% appointments made no difference in the apportionment of Senate representation among the units. With this amendment, the FTFE adjustment will be dropped from the reapportionment calculation and faculty will qualify for representation simply by holding academic rank or special academic rank.

Furthermore, dropping the use of FTFE adjustments, and instead counting each qualifying faculty member as one whole individual, helps to bring the apportionment procedure in line with the voting procedure in which each qualifying faculty member has one whole vote.

Regarding the new section numbers, note that a new section B.3 is proposed in a separate motion on split appointments.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

B. Representation shall be by academic or research unit **AND BASED ON THE NUMBER OF QUALIFYING FACULTY** **[[and based on the number of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE)]]** in each unit as described below.

....

2. For representational purposes only, a **QUALIFYING** faculty member shall be defined as one who holds academic rank or special academic rank.

[[3. Each faculty member whose annual academic appointment equals or exceeds 1560 hours will be considered 1 FTFE.]]

[[4. Each faculty member whose annual academic appointment is less than 1560 hours

will be considered a fractional FTFE with the fraction being the number of hours of annual academic appointment divided by 1560.]]

- 4 [[5]]. Each unit will elect the number of representatives to the Senate equal to the number of **QUALIFYING FACULTY** [[FTFE]] in that unit divided by the total **NUMBER OF QUALIFYING FACULTY AT UAF** [[FTFE]], multiplied by 35 and rounded to the nearest integer.

...

C. Election Procedure

...

3. Units with full-time permanent faculty based on other than the Fairbanks campus should elect Senate representatives in a number that is at least equal to the proportion of the non-Fairbanks based **QUALIFYING FACULTY** [[FTFEs]].

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection B.4 (page 13). This amendment changes the way split appointments are handled in reapportionment calculations for representation on the Faculty Senate.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010

RATIONALE: This amendment would drop the use of split appointments to adjust faculty counts for individual units in reapportionment calculations. The change would help to make the reapportionment procedure much less labor-intensive, with minor effect on the outcome.

At present, the Geophysical Institute (GI), the International Arctic Research Center (IARC), and the Institute of Arctic Biology (IAB) are now represented in a Research Institutes “conglomerate group.”

In reapportionment calculations using 2008-2009 data, under the current Faculty Senate Bylaws, the GI and IARC would each qualify for separate representation regardless of whether split appointments are taken into account. IAB would qualify for the minimum representation by 2 senators and the representation of CNSM would decrease from 6 to 4 senators. In addition, a new “conglomerate group” emerges, composed of INE, UAA CHSW/SON, ARSC, OFC, and the Museum. This new group would be represented by the minimum 2 senators, increasing the size of the Senate by 2 members.

In contrast, with this amendment that drops consideration of split appointments, IAB would have only 2 faculty with primary appointments in IAB in 2008-09 (and none in 2009-10). Of the 38 qualifying IAB faculty in 2008-09, 35 had appointments split with CNSM, 1 had an appointment split with SNRAS, and 2 had 50-67% research faculty appointments in IAB without an academic appointment elsewhere. IAB would not qualify for separate representation, CNSM would retain its 6 senators, and the new “conglomerate group” would not form, as it depends on the existence of split appointments.

The amendment specifies that in the case of evenly split appointments, for apportionment purposes the faculty member is to be counted in the tenure-granting unit. This is in accord with the concept that faculty should be represented in the unit of the primary appointment, as the rank of faculty with this type of split appointment is set by the tenure-granting unit and thus it may be seen as the primary unit. This is also in accord with a separate proposed amendment to section C.2, stating that faculty with evenly split appointments will vote in the tenure-granting unit.

NOTE: The difference between *Version 1* and *Version 2* is relevant to tenure-track faculty with split appointments in which the fraction of the appointment in a research unit is greater than 50%. In 2008-09, seven faculty with split appointments in CNSM and IAB had 62-75% of their appointments in IAB. Seven others had split appointments with 25% in an academic unit and 75% in the Museum. Thirteen had split appointments with 25% in an academic unit and 75% in GI.

Under Version 1, the reapportionment procedure adheres more closely to the actual division of effort by the faculty member for the year in which reapportionment takes place. The primary unit is considered to be that in which the faculty member has the greatest fraction of his/her appointment, regardless of whether it is in an academic or research unit. IAB still would not qualify for separate representation, but in this version the faculty with > 50% appointment in IAB would be counted in IAB rather than in an academic unit, and would vote with whatever unit IAB decided to affiliate with (i.e., GI, IARC, CNSM, etc.). Note that this procedure would require details of appointments for all faculty with split appointments. This would require less effort than the current procedure, in which details are required for all UAF faculty, but more effort than Version 1.

Under Version 2, these faculty would be counted in the tenure-granting unit, even though the majority of their appointment in any given year may be in a research institute. The justification for this is twofold. First, the appointment may change from year to year, and the information on each faculty member's appointment is not readily available; thus it is desirable to avoid using these details for reapportionment. Second, an appointment in a tenure-granting unit may be considered the primary appointment on the grounds that it determines the faculty member's rank.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

VERSION 1

3 [[4.]] FACULTY WITH SPLIT APPOINTMENTS WILL BE COUNTED ONLY IN THE UNIT OF PRIMARY APPOINTMENT OR, IN THE CASE OF EVENLY SPLIT APPOINTMENT, IN THE TENURE-GRANTING UNIT. [[Each faculty member whose annual academic appointment is less than 1560 hours will be considered a fractional FTFE with the fraction being the number of hours of annual academic appointment divided by 1560.]]

VERSION 2

3 [[4.]] TENURE-TRACK FACULTY WITH SPLIT APPOINTMENTS WILL BE COUNTED ONLY IN THE TENURE-GRANTING UNIT. RESEARCH FACULTY AND OTHER QUALIFYING FACULTY WITH SPLIT APPOINTMENTS WILL BE COUNTED ONLY IN THE UNIT OF PRIMARY APPOINTMENT. [[Each faculty member whose annual academic appointment is less than 1560 hours will be considered a fractional FTFE with the fraction being the number of hours of annual academic appointment divided by 1560.]]

ATTACHMENT 165/6 – Motion B8
UAF Faculty Senate #165, March 5, 2010
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs and Administrative Committees

MOTION:
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, existing subsection B.8 (page 14). This amendment addresses the frequency of reapportionment for the purpose of Faculty Senate representation.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010

RATIONALE: The current bylaws require reapportionment “for the elections held in even numbered years or upon two-thirds vote of the Senate.” Reapportionment every two years is deemed excessive because the distribution of faculty among units at UAF does not change significantly over two-year time periods. In practice, reapportionment seems to have been conducted at 5-10 year intervals. This motion will change the Bylaws to specify a 7-year interval, and will synchronize the reapportionment process with UAF accreditation reviews in order to make use of the data on faculty distribution that is compiled for that purpose by the Provost’s Office. The alternate provision for reapportionment upon a 2/3 vote of the Senate is retained.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

6 [[8]]. Re-apportionment will be done **IN THE YEAR OF ACCREDITATION REVIEW OF UAF, EXPECTED TO BE EVERY SEVEN YEARS,** **[[for the elections held in even numbered years]]** or upon two-thirds vote of the Senate.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection C.1 (page 14). This amendment addresses the procedure for election of representatives from research institutes to the Faculty Senate.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010

RATIONALE: The current Bylaws are written with the assumption that the research institutes will not qualify for separate representation on the Faculty Senate. Instead, they are grouped into a “conglomerate group.” The Bylaws specify that elections for Faculty Senate representatives for the research institutes are to be held by the Senate office. This provision is reasonable because there is no central organization or administrative office for such a collection of research institutes. However, several research institutes are now large enough for separate representation on the Faculty Senate. Each of them has the same organizational ability to run internal elections as the academic units have. This amendment removes the assumption that research institutes will not have separate representation, and specifies that all individual units represented on the Faculty Senate, i.e., research institutes as well as schools and colleges, are responsible for their own elections and election procedures. The Senate office will continue to have responsibility for elections by any “conglomerate groups.”

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

C. Election Procedure

1. Election shall be **CONDUCTED** by the **REPRESENTED** **[[academic]]** units, or **BY** the Senate office for **ANY CONGLOMERATE GROUPS, [[the research institutes]]** to provide representatives to the Senate according to Article III of the Senate Constitution. Elections and election procedures are the responsibility of the units, subject to the following:

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, subsection C.2 (page 14). In reference to election of representatives to the Faculty Senate, this amendment addresses the voting procedure for faculty with split appointments (in multiple units).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010

RATIONALE: For the purpose of faculty representation on the UAF Faculty Senate, this change brings the election procedure into alignment with the procedure for reapportionment. In reapportionment, faculty with split appointments will be counted in a single unit. This motion changes the election procedure so that faculty vote in that same unit.

NOTE: Selection of *Version 1* or *Version 2* should match the selection for section B.4 (now B.3) in a separate motion.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

VERSION 1:

C. Election Procedure

...

2. A faculty member may vote for Senate representatives in only one unit. That unit must be the unit of primary appointment or, in the case of evenly split appointment, the **TENURE-GRANTING UNIT** **[[unit of the faculty member's choice]]**.

VERSION 2:

C. Election Procedure

...

2. A faculty member may vote for Senate representatives in only one unit. **FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, THAT UNIT MUST BE THE TENURE-GRANTING UNIT. RESEARCH FACULTY AND OTHER QUALIFYING FACULTY MUST VOTE IN THE UNIT OF PRIMARY APPOINTMENT.** **[[That unit must be the unit of primary appointment or, in the case of evenly split appointment, the unit of the faculty member's choice]].**

BYLAWS of the
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
FACULTY SENATE

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

- A. The membership of the Faculty Senate, hereinafter referred to as "Senate," shall consist of approximately 41 members plus one non-voting presiding officer. Approximately 35 members shall be elected by and from the faculty and will have voting privileges. Six non-voting members will be selected by and from other university constituencies as follows: one non-graduate student and one graduate student selected by the ASUAF; one professional school dean and one college dean selected by the Deans' Council; one staff representative from the registrar's office; and one additional staff member selected by the Staff Council. If the staff representative from the registrar's office is APT, the second staff member must come from the classified staff ranks. If the staff representative from the registrar's office is classified, the second staff member must be APT. Three additional non-voting members will be selected by and from the unions as follows: one elected official each from United Academics-AAUP/AFT, **UAFT** **[[ACCFT]]**, Adjunct (United Academics)-AAUP/AFT.

Terms shall be for two years and staggered, with approximately one-half of the Senate elected each year.

- B. Representation shall be by academic or research unit **AND BASED ON THE NUMBER OF QUALIFYING FACULTY** **[[and based on the number of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE)]]** in each unit as described below.
1. A unit is a single school or college **OR RESEARCH INSTITUTE**, or a collection of schools and/or colleges or collection of research institutes (see item **5** **[[7]]**).
 2. For representational purposes only, a **QUALIFYING** faculty member shall be defined as one who holds academic rank or special academic rank.
 - [[3. Each faculty member whose annual academic appointment equals or exceeds 1560 hours will be considered 1 FTFE.]]**

VERSION 1:

- 3** **[[4.]]** **FACULTY WITH SPLIT APPOINTMENTS WILL BE COUNTED ONLY IN THE UNIT OF PRIMARY APPOINTMENT OR, IN THE CASE OF EVENLY SPLIT APPOINTMENT, IN THE TENURE-GRANTING UNIT.** **[[Each faculty member whose annual academic appointment is less than 1560 hours will be considered a fractional FTFE with the fraction being the number of hours of annual academic appointment divided by 1560.]]**

VERSION 2:

- 3** **[[4.]]** **TENURE-TRACK FACULTY WITH SPLIT APPOINTMENTS WILL BE COUNTED ONLY IN THE TENURE-GRANTING UNIT. RESEARCH FACULTY AND OTHER QUALIFYING FACULTY WITH SPLIT APPOINTMENTS WILL BE COUNTED ONLY IN THE UNIT OF PRIMARY APPOINTMENT.** **[[Each faculty member whose annual academic**

appointment is less than 1560 hours will be considered a fractional FTFE with the fraction being the number of hours of annual academic appointment divided by 1560.]]

- 4 [[5]]. Each unit will elect the number of representatives to the Senate equal to the number of **QUALIFYING FACULTY** [[FTFE]] in that unit divided by the total **NUMBER OF QUALIFYING FACULTY AT UAF** [[FTFE]], multiplied by 35 and rounded to the nearest integer.
- [[6. A faculty member having appointment split between units shall be included in each unit in proportion to the respective appointment for the computation of item 5.]]
- 5 [[7. All schools or]] **SCHOOLS**, colleges **AND RESEARCH INSTITUTES** whose representation under item 4 [[5]] is zero **MAY FORM A CONGLOMERATE GROUP FOR THE PURPOSE OF JOINT REPRESENTATION AS A SINGLE UNIT, IF TOGETHER THEY QUALIFY FOR REPRESENTATION UNDER ITEM 4. IF THEY DO NOT QUALIFY AS A CONGLOMERATE GROUP, OR IF THEY DO NOT CHOOSE TO BE REPRESENTED AS A GROUP, THEN EACH UNIT SHALL JOIN WITH A REPRESENTED SCHOOL, COLLEGE OR RESEARCH INSTITUTE.** [[shall be grouped into the conglomerate group and this group shall be treated as a single unit for purposes of the computation of item 5. If a unit which would have been grouped in the conglomerate group decides instead that the unit would be better served by joining with another school or college, it may do so upon the mutual agreement of those units.]]
- 6 [[8]]. Re-apportionment will be done **IN THE YEAR OF ACCREDITATION REVIEW OF UAF, EXPECTED TO BE EVERY SEVEN YEARS,** [[for the elections held in even numbered years]] or upon two-thirds vote of the Senate.
- 7 [[9]]. Each unit will have at least 2 representatives.

C. Election Procedure

1. Election shall be **CONDUCTED** by the **REPRESENTED** [[academic]] units or **BY** the Senate office for **ANY CONGLOMERATE GROUPS** [[the research institutes]] to provide representatives to the Senate according to Article III of the Senate Constitution. Elections and election procedures are the responsibility of the units, subject to the following:

VERSION 1:

2. A faculty member may vote for Senate representatives in only one unit. That unit must be the unit of primary appointment or, in the case of evenly split appointment, the **TENURE-GRANTING UNIT** [[unit of the faculty member's choice]].

VERSION 2:

2. A faculty member may vote for Senate representatives in only one unit. **FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, THAT UNIT MUST BE THE TENURE-GRANTING UNIT. RESEARCH FACULTY AND OTHER QUALIFYING FACULTY MUST VOTE IN THE UNIT OF PRIMARY APPOINTMENT.**

[[That unit must be the unit of primary appointment or, in the case of evenly split appointment, the unit of the faculty member's choice]].

3. Units with full-time permanent faculty based on other than the Fairbanks campus should elect Senate representatives in a number that is at least equal to the proportion of the non-Fairbanks based **QUALIFYING FACULTY** **[[FTFEs]]**.
4. Units with faculty who teach in associate, certificate, or noncredit programs should elect representatives in proportion to such faculty.
5. Units with senior faculty should elect associate and full professors as Senate representatives in a number that is at least equal to the proportion of such faculty.
6. Units with graduate programs should elect at least one graduate faculty member.
7. Each unit shall elect at least half as many alternate representatives as representatives.

ATTACHMENT 165/10
UAF Faculty Senate #165, March 5, 2010
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

RESOLUTION

The Committee on the Status of Women urges UAF and UA to amend the leave-share policy in order to permit the sharing of sick leave for pregnancy, childbirth, adoption, family and elder care.

Effective: Immediately

Rationale: The leave-share program allows employees to voluntarily transfer hours from their unused sick leave balance to the sick leave balance of an employee with a qualifying medical condition. While currently leave-share is an excellent example of what UAF is already doing right to support its employees, pregnancy, childbirth, adoption, family and elder care are excluded from the leave-share program. The ability to accept leave hour donations in these instances could be particularly helpful to those whose partners are also UAF employees. Expanding the leave-share program to include pregnancy, childbirth, adoption, family and elder care for any employee who qualifies for Family Medical Leave would be a meaningful way for UAF to demonstrate its support of employees with families and an aid to recruitment and retention of both faculty and staff.

UAF's Work Life Balance Committee formally supports this resolution.

ATTACHMENT 165/11
UAF Faculty Senate #165, March 5, 2010
Submitted by the Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate moves to [[adopt]] **AMEND THE 2010-11 CATALOG TO REFLECT** a two year placement test expiration and revise the following UAF catalog statement [[in paragraph three]] under the Mandatory Placement heading on page 32, as indicated:

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

Mandatory Placement

Students who do not meet basic skills standards in reading, writing and mathematics must complete appropriate Developmental Education courses. Such students may not enroll in 100-level or above courses that depend on these skills until they have satisfactorily met the exit criteria of the appropriate Developmental Education course(s).

Students without appropriate standardized test scores (such as ACT, SAT, ASSET or ACCUPLACER), advanced placement credits, transfer credits or prerequisite coursework must have UAF-approved placement test scores prior to registering for classes their first semester at UAF. **PLACEMENT EXAMS MUST BE TAKEN WITHIN TWO CALENDAR YEARS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE COURSE.** Students may not enroll in classes unless they meet the placement requirements. Placement into appropriate developmental or core classes must be done with the help of an academic advisor. Placement tests are available at every UAF rural campus as well as Testing Services, Academic Advising Center, Rural Student Services, Center for Distance Education and Northern Military Programs at Fort Wainwright, Eielson Air Force Base and Delta Career Advancement Center.

FOR PLACEMENT INTO ENGLISH F111X OR ANY DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH COURSE, STUDENTS MUST ALSO HAVE A SCORED WRITING SAMPLE SUCH AS AN SAT OR ACT WRITING SAMPLE, OR A UAF-GENERATED WRITING SAMPLE GIVEN ALONG WITH ASSET, COMPASS, OR ACCUPLACER OR OTHER PLACEMENT TESTS.

Students who enroll in a **DEVELOPMENTAL OR CORE** course without meeting the requirements [[will]] **MAY** be withdrawn from the course through the faculty-initiated withdrawal process. Prerequisite courses [[and/or placement exams]] must be taken within [[one calendar year]] **TWO CALENDAR YEARS** prior to the commencement of **DEVELOPMENTAL AND LOWER-DIVISION CORE MATH COURSES** [[the course]]. Students may not enroll in Perspectives on the Human Condition courses unless they meet the placement requirements for English F111X (including reading). Students may not enroll in Core science classes unless they have placement at DEVM F105 or above and placement into English F111X.

Effective: Fall 2010

Rationale: Placement test expiration periods are inconsistent across the UA system. Students attending different institutions within the system are confused by the differences. A common message is requested.

Furthermore, it is the hope of the SADA committee and the Developmental Math and Math faculty that this motion leads to Banner enforcement of prerequisites for math placement.

ATTACHMENT 165/12
UAF Faculty Senate #165, March 5, 2010
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Alaska Native Language Center (ANLC) and the Alaska Native Language Program (ANLP).

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010 and/or
Upon Chancellor's approval.

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted for review by the Alaska Native Language Center and the Alaska Native Language Program. With some minor revisions, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
REGULATIONS FOR THE
APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY
**ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGE CENTER (ANLC) AND
ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGE PROGRAM (ANLP) UNIT CRITERIA
STANDARDS AND INDICES**

This adaptation of the UAF and Board of Regents criteria for promotion and tenure is specifically designed for evaluation of Alaska Native Languages faculty and should also be used for annual evaluations. Items in boldface caps are added because of their relevance to ANLC and ANLP faculty and are additions and clarifications to the existing regulations.

CHAPTER I

Purview

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment

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

B. Academic Titles

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

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank

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

D. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

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

E. Following the Selection Process

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

F. Letter of Appointment

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

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

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

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

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

Bipartite Faculty

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

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

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

B. Criteria for Instruction

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities. **INSTRUCTORS OF ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGES OFTEN DEAL WITH STUDENTS IN SMALLER GROUPS. BECAUSE OF THE DEMOGRAPHY OF ALASKA NATIVES AND THE ENDANGERED STATUS OF ALL ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGES, INDIVIDUAL STUDY CLASSES ARE OFTEN THE ONLY MEANS OF PROVIDING CRUCIAL INSTRUCTION TO MEMBERS OF SMALL NATIVE GROUPS WHO HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO BECOME LINGUISTS AND LANGUAGE SPECIALISTS.**

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;
- g. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching.

h. DESIGN THEIR OWN CLASSROOM MATERIALS TO A MUCH GREATER EXTENT THAN IN MOST OTHER DISCIPLINES, SINCE PUBLISHED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGES ARE LIMITED.

2. Components of Evaluation

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

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

and at least two of the following:

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

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their

discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere. **THE MISSION OF ANLC PROVIDES FOR THE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVE LANGUAGE PUBLICATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF ALASKA AND NATIVE GROUPS IN PARTICULAR. THE ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGE CENTER'S PUBLICATION PROGRAM IS AN EFFECTIVE MEANS OF ACCOMPLISHING THIS GOAL AND IS VIEWED AS A REPUTABLE PRESS IN THE FIELD OF NATIVE AMERICAN LINGUISTICS. ANLC IS FOREMOST IN PUBLISHING IN ATHABASCAN WORLDWIDE AND FOREMOST IN ESKIMO-ALEUT PUBLISHING IN NORTH AMERICA. MANUSCRIPTS TO BE PUBLISHED ARE REVIEWED BY APPROPRIATE SPECIALISTS OUTSIDE THE INSTITUTION WHEREVER POSSIBLE.**

PUBLICATIONS INTENDED FOR THE PUBLIC AND ESPECIALLY THE NATIVE COMMUNITY OFTEN TAKE A DIFFERENT FORM FROM OTHER SCHOLARLY RESEARCH. THESE MATERIALS ARE EVALUATED BY THEIR INTENDED USERS IN LANGUAGE COMMUNITIES AND BY OTHER LINGUISTS AND LANGUAGE SPECIALISTS WHO PRODUCE SIMILAR MATERIALS. ANLC FACULTY ARE EXPECTED TO PRODUCE BOTH SCHOLARLY AND APPLIED PUBLICATIONS.

1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

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

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

2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

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

- a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline.
- b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas; these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.
- c. Presentation of research papers before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.

- d. Exhibitions of art work at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics.
- e. Performances in recitals or productions, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.
- f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.
- g. Citations of research in scholarly publications.
- h. Published abstracts of research papers.
- i. Reprints or quotations of publications, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.
- k. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.
- l. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.
- m. **GRAMMARS, DICTIONARIES, TEXTS, AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGES.**
- n. **OTHER MEANS OF DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ABOUT ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGES, SUCH AS MAPS, CD'S, AUDIO TAPES, VIDEO TAPES, AND WEB PAGES.**
- o. **THE DESIGN OF TEMPLATES FOR DICTIONARIES, GRAMMARS, TEXT COLLECTIONS, AND TEACHING MATERIALS APPLICABLE TO CLOSELY RELATED LANGUAGES.**

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." **BECAUSE OF ITS STATEWIDE MISSION, ANLC IS STRONGLY COMMITTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE TO ALASKA NATIVE COMMUNITIES.**

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.

1. TEACHING IN NOT-FOR-CREDIT SITUATIONS.

- m. **PARTNERSHIPS WITH NATIVE ORGANIZATIONS AND LANGUAGE PROGRAM SUPPORT, INCLUDING MATERIALS PRODUCTION AND TEACHER EDUCATION. EVIDENCE OF SUCH SERVICE INCLUDES ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF COMMUNITY LANGUAGE GOALS, SUCH AS WORKSHOPS AND NOT-FOR-CREDIT COURSES, NATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION, AND MATERIALS RESULTING FROM THESE ACTIVITIES.**

2. University Service

University service includes those activities involving faculty members in the governance, administration, and other internal affairs of the university, its colleges, schools, and

institutes. It includes non-instructional work with students and their organizations. Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

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

3. Professional Service

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

4. Evaluation of Service

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

WITHIN ANLC, EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE IS DEMONSTRATED BY

- a. SUSTAINED ENGAGEMENT AND COLLABORATION WITH LANGUAGE COMMUNITIES THAT RESULT IN LOCAL LEADERSHIP OR RESEARCH IN LANGUAGE EFFORTS,**
- b. PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS OF WORKSHOPS OR OTHER ACTIVITIES,**
- c. MATERIALS CREATED SPECIFICALLY FOR A WORKSHOP,**
- d. SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES OF MENTORING.**

E. Unit Criteria, Standards and Indices

Unit criteria, standards and indices are recognized values used by a faculty within a specific discipline to elucidate, but not replace, the general faculty criteria established in B, C, D, above, and in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV for evaluation of faculty performance on an ongoing basis and for promotion, tenure, 4th year comprehensive and diagnostic review (United Academics only), and post-tenure review.

Unit criteria, standards and indices may be developed by those units wishing to do so. Units that choose not to develop discipline-specific unit criteria, standards and indices must file a statement stating so with the Office of the Provost, which shall serve as the official repository for approved unit criteria, standards and indices.

A unit choosing to develop discipline-specific criteria, standards and indices shall have such criteria, standards and indices approved by a majority of the discipline faculty. The unit criteria, standards and indices will be reviewed and approved by the cognizant dean who will forward the unit criteria, standards and indices to the provost. The provost will review for consistency with BOR and UAF policies and will forward these criteria, standards and indices to the Faculty Senate, which shall review and approve all discipline-specific criteria according to a process established by the Faculty Senate.

Unit criteria, standards and indices will be reviewed at least every five (5) years by the faculty of the unit. When reorganization results in a unit’s placement in another college/school structure, the cognizant dean, in consultation with the unit faculty shall review unit criteria, standards and indices and revise if warranted. Unit criteria, standards and indices approved by the Faculty Senate prior to a unit’s reorganization shall remain in effect until reviewed and revised. Revision of unit criteria, standards and indices must follow the review process established by the Faculty Senate. If the unit criteria, standards and indices are not revised, a statement of reaffirmation of the current unit criteria, standards and indices must be filed with the Office of the Provost, following the review.

Unit criteria, standards and indices, when developed by the faculty and approved by the Faculty Senate, must be used in the review processes by all levels of review. Their use is **NOT** optional. It shall be the responsibility of the candidate for promotion, tenure, 4th year comprehensive and diagnostic review (United Academics only), and post-tenure review to include these approved unit criteria, standards and indices in the application file.

F. Annual Evaluation of Non-tenured Faculty with Academic Rank

1. Process of Evaluation

There will be annual evaluations of all untenured faculty members holding academic rank. Each faculty member shall submit a professional activities report to the campus director or college/school dean according to a schedule announced by the provost. The annual professional activities report will be accompanied by a current curriculum vita.

The evaluations performed by the campus director or college/school dean shall include explicit statements on progress toward meeting criteria for tenure and promotion in their written evaluations. The dean's/director's evaluation shall reference the faculty member's workload agreement in commenting on progress. The director or dean shall provide a copy of a written evaluation to the faculty member.

In the case of a faculty member having a joint appointment, the dean will coordinate the review and recommendation with the director as appropriate.

G. Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Members

1. Frequency of Evaluation

- a) All tenured faculty at UAF shall be evaluated once every three years according to a schedule and process announced by the provost.
- b) For tenured faculty with joint appointments, the cognizant dean will arrange a review that assures that all appropriate administrators provide a written evaluation of the faculty member. The dean will inform the faculty member of these arrangements.

2. Annual Activities Report

All tenured faculty shall prepare a professional activities report annually and submit it to the dean or director according to a schedule announced by the provost.

H. Evaluation of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

Special academic rank faculty are appointed for a specified period of time. They are to provide evidence of effectiveness in their assigned responsibilities during the term of their appointment when requested by their college/school dean or institute director according to the process set forth by the provost.

1. Process of Evaluation

The college/school dean or institute director shall require an annual activities report of a faculty member who has an appointment renewed beyond the initial year of appointment. The review process outlined above for academic rank faculty shall apply. The optional process for the development and approval of the unit criteria, standards and indices as outlined above in Chapter III, E. shall also apply to the definition and evaluation of faculty in special academic rank positions.

The appointment to special academic rank shall terminate on the date specified in the letter of appointment, and implies no expectation of a subsequent appointment.

Peer Observation Worksheet for Seminar Teaching

Pre-observation

The peer observer and the instructor should meet in advance of the date of the class that will be evaluated to discuss the goals of the course and of the specific class period. The observer and the instructor should both be familiar with the evaluation worksheet before the observation takes place. The instructor may request that the observer pay particular attention to certain aspects of his/her teaching. This process is meant to be a partnership and a positive experience, which provides useful information to the instructor. The observation is to remain confidential between the observer and the instructor unless the instructor chooses to disclose the observer's comments.

Observation

1. INTRODUCTION

Suggested considerations:

- How does the session start? Is a topic introduced, are objectives stated, or is an agenda created?
- Does the instructor establish a climate of mutual respect and the appropriate intellectual level?
- Is there a sense of cohesiveness?
- What does the instructor do to gain attention and motivate students to participate?

Comments:

Actual form provides more space.

2. GROUP PROCESS MANAGEMENT

A. ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS

- Is active participation and group interaction encouraged?
- Does the instructor stimulate interest in the topic?
- What is the quality of the questions? Do they clarify and stimulate thought?
- Is there time for reflection (e.g., small silences)?
- How many students speak?
- Is the discussion dominated by a few individuals?
- Does the instructor defend students' right to take unpopular stances?
- Do any or all students appear to be withdrawn from the discussion?
- What were the most energetic moments? And what were the most listless?

B. RESPONSIVENESS OF INSTRUCTOR

- Does the instructor exhibit enthusiasm?
- Does the instructor respond to students' signals (verbal, nonverbal)?
- Does the instructor listen attentively to what students are asking or telling?

- Does the instructor respond to questions raised by students or elicit a response from the group?
- If the instructor talks a lot, why do you think this is?
- Does the instructor invite/encourage students non-verbally (e.g. gestures, facial expressions, nodding, smiling, etc.)?
- Does the instructor pressure students or put anyone on the spot?
- Does the instructor show appropriate humility (i.e. allow students to shine and share *their* discoveries)?

C. FOCUS OF DISCUSSION

- How does a topic emerge? Who is responsible for its emergence?
- Does the instructor keep the discussion on track?
- Does the instructor summarize key ideas periodically?
- Who initiates changes of direction? Are these always initiated by the instructor?
- Is there a sense of spontaneity?

D. STUDENT PREPAREDNESS

- How does the instructor deal with differences in preparedness for the class?
- How did the instructor handle interruption by latecomers? Irrelevant observations? Students without copies of the text? Those who hadn't done the preparation? Reluctance to carry out a specified task?

E. PACING OF DISCUSSION

- What did you notice about the pace of the seminar?
- How does the instructor deal with the multiple pacing needs of the students?

Comments:

Actual form provides more space.

3. CONCLUSION

- Does the instructor summarize key concepts?
- Is new material introduced?
- Does s/he provide closure or stimulate further thought ?
- Did something "happen" in the classroom?

Comments:

Actual form provides more space.

4. STRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT

- Was the learning task appropriately adapted to the group size?
- What kind of resources (visuals, handouts, cases, demonstrations) were used to promote discussion and interaction?
- Was the physical environment arranged to facilitate learning?

Comments:

Actual form provides more space.

5. OVERALL

a. STRENGTHS: (e.g. encourages active participation by..., positive feedback, encourages non-verbal actions, keeps discussion on track, allows students to *shine*, etc.)

Actual form provides more space.

b. Suggestions for Improvement: (e.g. give time for reflection, work on your non-verbal communication, make sure discussion is not dominated by few students, etc.)

Actual form provides more space.

Observation Notes

Time	Observations	Impressions/Questions
		<i>Actual form provides more space.</i>

POST-OBSERVATION

The observer will provide the instructor with specific, constructive suggestions and answers all questions. Misunderstandings concerning the observations made by the observer and the recollections of the instructor should be discussed and resolved before the observer provides the faculty member with the final report. Confidentiality is paramount throughout the entire process.

SOURCES

The above draft adapted ideas from the following sources:

"The Art of Discussion Leading: a class with Chris Christensen." Includes classroom scenes, reflections on teaching by Professor Christensen, and interviews with participants. VHS, 30 min.

A checklist for peer observation form The Higher Education Academy English Subject Centre, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey:

<http://www.english.heacademy.ac.uk/explore/resources/seminars/checklist.php>

A peer observation form used at the University of Washington School of Dentistry:

<http://www.dental.washington.edu/departments/restorative/pdfs/resources/PeerEvalSmSeminar2009-0425.pdf>

ATTACHMENT 165/14
UAF Faculty Senate #165, March 5, 2010
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

**Faculty Affairs Committee
Meeting on February 19, 2010**

Members present: Jane Allen (by phone), Mike Davis (by phone), Lily Dong, Kenan Hazirbaba, Cecile Lardon, Jennifer Reynolds, Roger Smith.

Promotion of Non-Represented Faculty: This was the Committee's third discussion of this topic. The Committee first focused on a threshold of faculty workload that would qualify someone to stand for promotion in faculty rank. FAC members recognized that the most common workload division for non-represented faculty, 49% faculty/51% administrative, is a device used to change the status of the faculty member. That workload is effectively the same as 50%/50% which does qualify for promotion review under the Collective Bargaining Agreement. FAC members agreed that faculty with a 49%/51% workload could qualify for promotion in faculty rank using the same performance criteria applied to 50% faculty. However, FAC members felt strongly, after three meetings on this topic, that people with less than half-time faculty duties should not qualify for promotion as faculty. FAC recognizes that the Provost and Chancellor have the authority to administratively promote these people, but FAC does not endorse this and will not play a part in it. Therefore, FAC declines to recommend any procedure for promotion of non-represented faculty that have less than 49% faculty duties.

FAC discussed the promotion procedure for non-represented faculty with at least 49% faculty duties. The guiding principles were that the procedure should be as close as possible to the procedure for represented faculty, and that it should avoid any conflict of interest that might arise in connection with the candidate's administrative duties.

The "normal" unit peer review committee may have potential conflicts of interest, and a different peer review committee is likely to be needed. In the absence of a formal procedure for promotion of non-represented faculty, the Provost has been appointing a peer review committee. FAC felt that this brought the Provost into the review process at too many levels, and instead recommended that the peer review committee be appointed by a dean or director from another unit, upon the request of the Provost. The minimum size of the committee and faculty rank of its members would be the same as for unit peer review committees for represented faculty. FAC specified four additional criteria:

- 1) The committee must include at least one person from the non-represented faculty member's unit. If a conflict of interest cannot be avoided here, then this person is to be appointed as a non-voting member. FAC felt that the presence of at least one person from the unit was necessary to advise the committee on topics such as unit criteria.
- 2) The committee may not include anyone supervised by the faculty member, except as described in (1).
- 3) Members appointed to this committee may not have any other type of conflict of interest, except as described in (1).
- 4) To the extent possible, the committee should represent the candidate's discipline and faculty work.

No change is needed for university-wide committee review, except to note that potential conflicts of interest must be avoided when the Faculty Senate and Provost select members of this committee.

FAC will forward its recommendation to the Administrative Committee of the Faculty Senate.

ATTACHMENT 165/15
UAF Faculty Senate #165, March 5, 2010
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

Unit Criteria Meeting

Feb 25 2010

1-200pm ONL 201

Attending:

Uta Kaden

Tim Wilson

Brenda Konar (chair)

Julie McIntyre (co-chair)

Andy Anger

Visiting Participant:

Larry Kaplan (ANCL/ANLP)

Old Business:

ANCL and ANLP: There was a discussion of how to review different ranks. ANCL/ANLP will continue this discussion but would like to proceed with their current criteria. The committee approves these criteria. They will be presented at next Faculty Senate meeting for approval. The committee would like to express their appreciation of ANCL/ANLP for taking the time to send a representative.

Natural Sciences: The new criteria have not been posted. This was not noticed until we started the review process during the meeting. We recommend that someone from Nat Sci attend our next meeting, when we have the new criteria. This seems to help the approval process.

Theatre: We still have comments and concerns with these criteria. We still feel that the authors misunderstand the purpose of the unit criteria. It is to help outside evaluators review their faculty and for new faculty to know what is expected of them. We do not feel that this is the current intent of this document. We would like to invite a representative from Theatre to the next meeting to help us review the criteria.

New Business:

None

ATTACHMENT 165/16
UAF Faculty Senate #165, March 5, 2010
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes for Monday, 22 Feb 2010
11-noon, Gruening 718

Members Present: Alexandra Fitts, Jenny Liu, Derek Sikes, Diane Wagner, Jane Weber, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen, Kayt Sunwood

Members absent: Janet McClellan, Elizabeth Allman

Alexandra prepared & passed out the agenda. Diane Wagner provided an update on the UAF Work Life Balance Committee (WLBC). D. Wagner stated the website will be improved to include more resources and links. Discussion of need for more accessible child care on campus which came from survey results. More survey information at next meeting. Idea mentioned to renovate house next to Bunnell House - which would be a fairly low cost way to greatly increase capacity for child care at UAF. Long term goal is to provide a modern child care facility for UAF students to learn about early child development and become trained to educate and care for young children.

1. Leave Share Resolution. Will go to the senate meeting March 5th. Latest draft dispersed to CSW committee by A. Fitts. Discussion on the costs of this change. Pool of leave share funds isn't infinite. It is not clear to CSW why there would be a net financial loss for UA since when leave share is tapped, regular salary is not, so there is no change in the amount of money spent in total. This discussion stemmed from a change in wording to the resolution that removed original phrasing regarding how this would be a "cost-effective way for UA to support employees with families." D. Wagner will follow through to try to determine why, exactly, this would not be a cost-effective change. If passed in the Senate meeting on the 5th it would then be out of CSW control, but we can still follow-through to keep an eye on its progress and implementation.

2. Brown Bag Lunches. At last BB lunch Kayt discussed topics with one attendee - fruitful discussion but would have preferred more attendees. Do we want another this semester? Probably not. SIB suggested inviting someone to draw a larger crowd. Worthwhile keeping these going? Yes.

3. Promotion and tenure workshop planning. Friday April 23rd. 10am-12pm, 109 Butrovich (Regent's Conference Room). Fliers are ready to post. Discussion of issue of open vs. closed meetings & 2007 resolution that default be 'open' but it seems most meetings since have not had the open option. The 4th year review this year had the open option. CSW will investigate - Jane will ask Sarah Lewis about this year's meetings. Three new panelists this year for the P& T workshop.

4. Upcoming elections. Jayne Harvie will send out nominations forms soon. Notify anyone who might want to join. Two open slots.

5. Next meeting date. Will do a Doodle poll.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:05; Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes

ATTACHMENT 165/17

UAF Faculty Senate #165, March 5, 2010

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

UAF Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement Committee Meeting Minutes for February 18, 2010

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:04 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Josef Glowa, Dana Greci, Kelly Houlton, James Huesmann, Marji Illingworth, Julie Lurman, Joy Morrison, Channon Price, Xiyu (Thomas) Zhou

Excused: Alexandra Oliveira, Larry Roberts

Guests: Sarah Lewis, Ron Illingworth, Susie Baird, Jane Allen

III. Report from Joy Morrison

Joy reported that although she had been on travel recently, the Office of Faculty Development [OFD] has sponsored several events already during this semester. She attended the AAC&U conference in Washington DC. Among the sessions which she attended, she noted the one on portfolios; she will be leading workshops in the future on this topic. There was also a session on the "Bologna process", a relatively recent development which is now the standard feature of current European college instruction. The strength and popularity of this method is having an impact on US higher education inasmuch as it is taking students from the US. She will also disseminate information about the Bologna method in the future.

While she was in DC, Joy also visited Anna Kertulla at NSF. Dr. Kertulla is working to increase the submission of grant applications in the social sciences for work related to arctic science. She wants to have a videoconference with UAF faculty, similar to what was held last year. Last year's videoconference with CLA faculty was very well run.

Future OFD events will include a repeat of the presentation on UAF libraries, to be held on the West Ridge at the request of faculty there. OFD has contracted with Academic Impressions for the upcoming Faculty Chair Development series. These workshops have been commissioned by A. Sukamoto and B. Behner in the Statewide Office. They will be held on five consecutive Friday mornings; each session will be two hours long. They will be archived and available the following Monday morning for those who miss a session. It is acknowledged that Faculty Chair training can be somewhat 'hit&miss', since the demands on chairs vary widely throughout the departments. The Provost, Associate Provost, and some Deans will be available on a panel discussion at the close of each session. The OFD encourages any faculty from within UA who are interested in leadership to join this workshop series. On March 2 and March 16, OFD will be presenting a repeat of the highly successful Barbara Millis workshop on classroom observation, which was videotaped live here two years ago. These will be held from 1-2 pm. Finally, Amy Kennaston from SOE will be presenting two workshops on instructional design and rubrics, which will be videoconferenced to all of UA. The dates of these workshops will be announced.

IV. Old Business

a) Use of online student evaluations of instruction. (This was the major piece of this meeting.) Sarah Lewis was invited by the committee to discuss the thinking and plans within the Provost's Office about the use of electronic methods of collecting student evaluations of instruction. They feel that such use is not only absolutely inevitable but essential to be able to satisfy the present requirements

of institutional accreditation. The Provost's Office recognizes that the Faculty Senate needs to be deeply involved, either through this committee or through a specially formed task force.

The present system of collecting student evaluations of instruction (IAS, supplied out of the University of Washington) does have an electronic collection option, but it is ten times as expensive as the present paper based collection system. It is recognized that shifting to a new supplier who can more competitively provide an electronic collection method will necessitate the use of a new instrument, with the loss for several years of the present comparative database. Such a change would provide the opportunity to apply the research results of J. Titus (CLA) and others which show that there are significant perceptual differences between faculty and students in the interpretation of the questions used on student evaluations of instruction, and hence in what the results of these assessments are actually saying. During past public forums on student evaluation of instruction, there was no negligible faculty interest in changing the instrument used for evaluations.

Recently, there was a presentation on the instruments used at other institutions. The Provost's Office wants the Faculty Senate to consider the different options. An alternative would be to engage this question within the Faculty Alliance, towards the goal of having a single set of instruments for all of the MAUs. Presently, UAS uses a set of instruments created in-house (which is widely acknowledged within the research community which studies such processes as rarely being either effective or meaningful), UAA uses the IDEA system (provided by an independent organization developed out of extensive research at Kansas State University), and UAF uses IAS. There are reasons (accreditation; faculty migration between MAUs; potential economies of scale) which indicate that it would be useful to have a common set of instruments statewide. Should the decision be made to work statewide with a single vendor, it was acknowledged that each MAU should have flexibility in the selection of instruments based on their identified needs.

A significant question for students in all classes, but particularly for those at remote sites and those who take distance classes, is the rate of student responses. Although the assertion was made that the use of electronic methods of collection will improve student response, it is not at all clear to various members of the committee that this will be true. Further, many students away from the main campus face infrastructural barriers which are difficult to surmount. There was expression of hope that systematic changes will improve response rates. It was agreed that faculty must have as little impact as possible on the actual administration of the assessment process since there is nothing to prevent the use of strategies which skew response rates. The use of electronic collection can give additional anonymization of students who participate in the process as well as removing vagaries based on faculty choice of when to administer assessment. Even so, it may be necessary to offer inducements to increase participation rates.

The committee was also encouraged to look at specific advantages and disadvantages of the use of paper-based collection methods relative to electronic collection methods. It was acknowledged that there are a variety of pressures on the administration to move to an electronic collection method, not limited to: past instances of the loss of paper forms after collection, provenance of paper forms, the cost of using paper-based collection, the requirement to produce electronic reports much more frequently. OFD will obtain some information kits from IDEA and will use resources through POD to identify other potential vendors, preparatory to discussions coordinated through the Faculty Alliance. Susie Baird volunteered the Kuskokwim campus as a pilot remote site to test electronically collected IAS surveys this semester. Sarah Lewis will identify the UAA coordinator for student assessment of instruction. It was suggested that for remote students, and especially for students who use the telephone to connect to classes, the use of telephone polling technology could improve response rates, and this question can also be investigated.

b) Discussion of the Seminar Observation template/form. The revised form circulated by email immediately before the meeting was approved unanimously. The chair will take it to the next meeting of the Administrative Council.

c) Faculty Forums for the Spring semester. The Office of Faculty Development will assist with promoting the upcoming Faculty Forum on “Academic Duty and Freedom”. It will be held Friday March 26, Noon to 1 pm, at Honors House. Thanks to James Huesmann, copies of Kennedy's book, “Academic Duty” will be on reserve at the Rasmuson Library.

V. New Business

The time allotted to the meeting elapsed before any new business (outside of the work cited above about electronic collection of student assessment of instruction) could be raised.

VI. Points of Order:

The next meeting of the FDAI committee will be March 16, 2010 (Tuesday) at 8 am, as many members are unable to attend a meeting held on the Thursday of that week.

Adjourned at 9:06 am.

Respectfully submitted by C. Price, with assistance from K. Houlton and M. Arthur.