AGENDA
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #192
Monday, September 9, 2013
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1:00 I Call to Order – David Valentine 4 Min.
   A. Roll Call
   B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #191
   C. Adoption of Agenda

1:04 II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions 1 Min.
   A. Motions Approved:
      1. Motion to approve the list of 2012-2013 degree candidates
      2. Motion to approve continuation of the PhD in Mathematics and DMS PhD Revitalization Plan
      3. Motion to approve a new Minor in Dispute Resolution
      4. Motion to discontinue the Minor in Leadership and Civic Engagement
      5. Motion to approve the Fisheries Division Unit Criteria
      6. Motion to amend the grading policy for C-
      7. Motion to approve a new Graduate Certificate in Science Teaching and Outreach
   B. Motions Pending: None

1:05 III A. President's Remarks – David Valentine 10 Min.
   B. President-Elect's Remarks – Cecile Lardon

1:15 IV A. Chancellor’s Remarks – Brian Rogers 15 Min.
   B. Provost’s Remarks – Susan Henrichs

1:30 V Guest Speaker: Dean Mark Herrmann
   Topic: Differential Tuition
   Questions / Comments 5 Min.

1:45 VI Old Business 10 Min.
   A. Recap of Action by Administrative Committee concerning Sun Star sexual harassment issues (Attachments 192/1, 192/2)

1:55 VII New Business 5 Min.
   A. Reaffirmation of Resolution in Support of Allowing Candidates for Promotion, Tenure, or Comprehensive Review to Opt for “Open” Meetings – submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 192/3)

2:00 BREAK
2:10 VII New Business - continued 15 Min.
B. Motion amending Bylaws to create new Faculty Senate Administrator Review Committee – submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 192/4)
C. Motion to approve Guidelines for the Review of Group A/B Administrators – submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 192/5)

2:25 VIII Discussion Items 20 Min.
A. General Education Revitalization – Jonathan Rosenberg (Handout)
   See report: www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/meetings/2013-14-fs-meetings/
B. Status of Learning Management System Project – David Valentine

2:45 IX Governance Reports 5 Min.
A. Staff Council – Brad Krick
B. ASUAF – Ayla O'Scannel
C. UNAC – Tony Rickard
   UAFT – Jane Weber

2:50 X Public Comment 5 Min.

2:55 XI Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements 5 Min.
A. General Comments/Announcements
B. Committee Chair Comments
   Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Convener
   Faculty Affairs – Knut Kielland, Convener
   Unit Criteria – Chris Coffman, Convener
   Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 192/6)
   Core Review Committee – Miho Aoki, Convener
   Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
   Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Convener
   Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Convener
   Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Convener
   Research Advisory Committee – Chair to be named

3:00 XII Adjournment
Faculty Senate Administrative Committee

Special Meeting – May 10th, 2013

Summary Notes

Committee Members Present: Cécile Lardon (chair), David Valentine, Rainer Newberry, Cindy Hardy, Syndonia Bret-Harte, Kayt Sunwood (for Jane Weber)

Guests: Sine Anahita, Don Foley, Mae Marsh, Robyne

This meeting was scheduled in response to a Faculty Senate Resolution (see May meeting) charging the committee to address issues of sexual harassment on campus. Sine Anahita had brought the issue to the Senate in response to two articles in the Sun Star (both April issues, one was in the Fun Star issue).

Summary of Sine Anahita’s argument: Both articles, plus the image and the title (a play on sexual slang for a woman’s genitals) accompanying the Fun Star article were offensive and created a hostile work environment. They constitute sexual harassment. Faculty and students have a right to an environment free of sexual harassment. This falls under Title IX and could create problems for the university.

Robyne provided information as the faculty advisor to the Sun Star, particularly background and context information for the two articles in question. The second article grew out of a class project that wanted to bring light to the kinds of negative exchanges and postings on social media, especially a Facebook page named UAF Confessions.

Mae Marsh, Director of the Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity (D&EO), had contacted the Sun Star editor after the Fun Star edition appeared and was invited to write a letter to the editor – which she did. In response to both pieces she has communicated with UA General Counsel, the police chief, and others. The attorneys told her that neither article was illegal, although the image violated copyright and has since been removed. Marsh has appointed a Title IX Coordinator, and D&EO is preparing training materials on Title IX. Her office has also initiated training for faculty, staff, and students, as well as the production of brochures and posters related to sexual harassment.

Don Foley, Dean of Students, had participated in many of the same discussions and meetings as had Mae Marsh and agreed with her assessment and actions. Foley suggested that the timing of the Sun Star articles at the end of the semester constrained what could be done immediately. He would like to talk about the issues proactively in new-student orientation and in classes in the fall.

Kayt Sunwood had an additional issue with the Fun Star piece as it included a fake quote attributed to her. She is concerned with reports from people who say they looked her up on Google and thought this was a legitimate quote. Dr. Sunwood felt the continuing appearance of this false “quote” online
constitutes harassment and belittlement of the Women’s Center and Women’s Center Manager’s position at UAF.

The committee then discussed the issue without the guests. While everyone agreed that the Fun Star article was offensive and that some of the things posted on UAF Confessions were offensive, hostile, threatening, and even illegal there was no clear agreement on what the response of the Faculty Senate should be. The committee decided on the following action items:

1. David Valentine, on behalf of the Senate, will send a letter to the Sun Star editorial board requesting to remove the Fun Star article from the website and to redact the names of the students whose posts are included in the second article.
2. We will ask Don Foley to have UAF removed from the title of the UAF Confessions website.
3. We will provide a brief report to the full Senate in the fall outlining our actions. A resolution on the responsible use of social media and a condemnation of sexual harassment could follow.
4. In the meantime, the summary will be distributed to the committee, guests, as well as the Provost and Chancellor. In the fall we will also inform the full Senate and all faculty.
MEMORANDUM

June 7, 2013

TO: The UAF Sun Star Editorial Board

FROM: David Valentine, President
       Cecile Lardon, President-Elect
       UAF Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Articles from April 2013

We are writing to let you know about complaints we recently received about two articles appearing in April editions of the UAF Sun Star, and, because they may adversely affect the educational environment at UAF, to request that they be deleted from the Sun Star website or redacted.

The first complaint concerns the April 2 “Fun Star” article about construction of a new vagina-shaped building on the UAF Campus. We understand that the article was a satirical spoof and in large part a reaction to a phallic focus of prior years’ “Fun Star” editions. However, the women who brought the complaint to us reported that they saw both the article and the accompanying picture as perpetuating a “rape culture” through depiction of women in a very vulnerable position and thereby compromising their learning environment. Dr. Sine Anahita, Associate Professor of Sociology, reported that her class objected to the picture depicting the proposed building with a woman’s legs spread as if for a gynecological exam. Dr. Kayt Sunwood, Manager of the UAF Women’s Center, objected to the made-up quote attributed to her concerning the world being “a giant penis building”; she felt sexually harassed when people reported searching for her name online. Seeing this “quote” online led them to believe Sunwood had uttered these words.

The second complaint concerns the April 23 article, “UAF Confessions harbors hate speech”, which included several screen shots from a publicly accessible Facebook account, “UAF Confessions”. The screen shots included the full names of several people who were either being discussed or were the discussants themselves. We understand that one named person, Liz Wallace, specifically authorized reprinting of her name. We also understand that this Facebook page is highly public, so commenters have no expectation of privacy. Nevertheless, the complainants argued that including the names in the Sun Star article reached a different public and in a more permanent way. Whereas at least one of the comments has since been removed by the moderator and all the others have essentially scrolled into oblivion, the Sun Star reproductions preserve into perpetuity the identities of those who were unfortunate or foolish enough

UAF is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer and educational institution
to appear ephemerally on UAF Confessions. We are not convinced that inclusion of names in the screen shots is justified, and ask that you redact the on-line article so that the names are no longer legible.

The UAF Sun Star is not answerable to the UAF Faculty Senate, and we harbor no conceit that we can demand the changes we request. Even if we could, such an undertaking might raise real and important concerns about freedom of speech and of the press. Faculty at UAF cherish academic freedom, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech. We understand and honor the Sun-Star's rights to these freedoms as well. We see our requests as in line with our mutual goals for a vibrant campus newspaper with high standards for journalistic excellence that serve the educational interests of the UAF community.

If you would like to discuss these requests further, please contact David Valentine at dvalentine@alaska.edu or (907) 474-7614.

UAF is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer and educational institution
Background:

The following resolution was first passed at Faculty Senate Meeting #146 in November 2007, and was endorsed by a letter distributed to the UAF faculty in Fall 2008. Since then the Provost has annually provided this resolution to all Faculty Review Committees. The Faculty Senate reaffirmed this resolution at Meeting #176 in September 2011, and at Meeting #184 in September 2012. For academic year 2013-2014, the Administrative Committee submits an updated resolution to the Faculty Senate Meeting #192 on September 9, 2013.

RESOLUTION

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

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

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly requests that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an “open” meeting, and that “mandatory closed” meetings be avoided, including during the 2013-14 review cycle.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty Committee meetings are “open” at the request of a candidate and are consistent with all other relevant UAF rules and procedures.

2. Open meetings provide strong incentives for fair and reasonable review, including the oversight of the candidate.

3. The Committee can query a candidate for clarification of the file, which will greatly reduce the number of false assumptions and errors during deliberation.

4. Open meetings are educational—candidates who opt to attend their review have the opportunity to learn about academic traditions and practices.

5. Attendance can reduce candidates' anxiety, and make them feel like a part of the process.
MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the Faculty Senate Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E, to establish the Faculty Administrator Review Committee (FARC) as a Permanent Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: One of the responsibilities of the discontinued Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee was to approve the processes used to review Group A and B administrators. Without this committee the responsibility falls to the Administrative Committee. Approximately 5-6 administrator reviews need to be completed per year. The reports are due in March which, of course, is a particularly busy time for the Administrative Committee. The newly formed Faculty Administrator Review Committee would take on that oversight function while also providing some structure and support to the individual Ad Hoc Administrator Review Committee chairs.

BOLD CAPS = Addition
[ ] = Deletion

Faculty Senate Bylaws, Section 3, Article 5: Committees, subsection E:

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

...  

PERMANENT

...

8. THE FACULTY ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE (FARC) WILL FACILITATE THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS IN GROUPS A AND B. THIS WILL INCLUDE ENCOURAGING THE TIMELY COMPLETION OF ALL REVIEWS AND RESULTING LETTERS, AS WELL AS PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF EACH REVIEW TO THE PROVOST, CHANCELLOR, VICE-CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH, OR OTHER SUPERVISOR IN MARCH. THE FARC WILL ALSO APPROVE THE PROCESS WHICH EACH AD-HOC ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE UTILIZES.
THE FACULTY ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE SHALL BE COMPOSED OF THE CHAIRS OF ALL INDIVIDUAL AD-HOC ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEES PLUS ONE FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATIVE APPOINTED BY THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT WHO SHALL CHAIR THE COMMITTEE. THE AD-HOC ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIRS MAY, BUT DO NOT HAVE TO BE, MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE.
MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the Guidelines for the evaluation process for administrators (Groups A and B) to reflect the establishment of the Faculty Administrator Review Committee as a Permanent Committee (FARC) of the UAF Faculty Senate.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The guidelines need to be formally updated to reflect the establishment of the Faculty Administrator Review Committee.

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 members must be faculty, AND AT LEAST ONE MUST BE ON THE FACULTY SENATE (INCLUDING ALTERNATES). (It is recommended that staff be included on the ad hoc committee as appropriate.) The chair and one other member of the committee shall be appointed from the Faculty Senate (including alternates).]

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 other Faculty member (including alternates), one dean/director, and a graduate student representative.

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 Senate FACULTY Administrator REVIEW Committee (FARC) for final review, recommendations, and disposition of the Administrator’s evaluation. The specifics of the content of the report of the Ad Hoc committee shall not be discussed if the Administrator’s supervisor deems that inappropriate under Board of Regents’ Policy P04.01.062. and Alaska Statute. In particular, the Administrator must give written consent for the specific content to be discussed. However, the FARC [[Administrative Committee]] shall be provided information on the process followed by the ad hoc committee, excluding the names of persons interviewed unless they have waived confidentiality. 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 (or other administrator reporting directly to the Chancellor) and the Chancellor shall meet to discuss the Ad Hoc Committee's evaluation of the Provost (or other administrator reporting directly to the Chancellor). During this meeting the Chancellor and Provost (or other administrator reporting directly to the 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 FARC [[Administrative Committee]] to summarize the evaluation process. The specifics of the content of the Ad Hoc Committee evaluation shall not be discussed if the Chancellor deems it inappropriate under Board of Regents' Policy P04.01.062. and Alaska Statute.

The following statement is included with guidelines when distributed to units:

**P04.01.062. Confidentiality of Personnel Records.**

**A.** Dates of present and past employment with the university, position title, type of employment, campus, and salary are public information. The university adopts the policy of AS 39.25.080 so that all other personnel records, including but not limited to applications, leave records, home address and telephone number, performance evaluations and disciplinary matters, relating to any
past or present employee of the university are not public records and are not accessible by the public. Personnel records will be released only under the following circumstances:

1. upon receipt of written authorization from the employee, former employee, or applicant, as directed in the authorization;
2. to the employee’s supervisors and to university supervisors to whom the employee or former employee has applied for promotion, transfer or rehire;
3. to a state agency authorized by statute to review such university documents upon receipt of a subpoena issued by a competent authority and upon execution of an agreement that confidential information will not be made public;
4. upon receipt of an order of a court of competent jurisdiction;
5. for internal university operations, to persons having a need to know as determined by the regional personnel officer or the custodian of the record.

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

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 opportunities 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 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 Senate FACULTY Administrator REVIEW Committee shall review the evaluation process in order to perform their 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.
Committee on the Status of Women,
Minutes Friday, August 30, 2013; 11:30-1:00 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Diana Di Stefano, Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Ellen Lopez, Derek Sikes
Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Shawn Russell, Nilima Hullavarad, Megan McPhee, Jenny Liu

1. Women’s Center Advisory Board
   Women’s Center has been realigned under University and Student Advancement. More information to follow about a physical relocation. Advisory committee recommended the Women’s Center Director be a full time, salaried position. Chancellor added $5000 for programming.

2. Women Faculty Luncheon, October 1, 2013, 12:30 to 2:30
   Joan Braddock will be speaker. Diana, Derek, Ellen, Kayt, Mary, Jane and Amy will go early to help set up. Ellen, Derek and Kayt will help stuff envelopes.

3. Conversation Cafes
   Attendance could be better. Pick end of day times. 2 hours. Less structured. Kayt, Mary, Nilima and Ellen will be on committee. Draw on the topics of the luncheon. Advertise at the luncheon. This committee will choose a fall date and maybe a spring date. Put 3x5 cards on tables at luncheon for suggestions for topics.
   - Fall: Two weeks after luncheon. Follow up topic from luncheon.
   - Spring big event: Topic: Mentoring.

4. Ex officio representative
   Michelle Bartlett. Derek will ask Michelle if she wants to continue on this committee.

5. Chairs
   Ellen has offered to co-chair this committee. Amy will do notes. Derek will be back up.

6. Other
   In light of the Sun Star activities this spring, they have been asked to change their policies. Faculty Senate asked the names (April 23 issue) and the satirical article (April 2 issue) be redacted.

7. Meeting Dates
   Wednesday 9:15-10:15 or Tues 2:00-3:00. We think Wednesdays’ work best.

Upcoming CSW meetings:
Wednesday, October 16, 2013, 9:15-10:15 am
Wednesday, November 13, 2013, 9:15-10:15 am
Wednesday, December 11, 2013, 9:15-10:15 am
Meeting was adjourned at 1:00 pm

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:
http://www.uaf.edu/ufagov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/