

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #198  
 Monday, April 7, 2014  
 1:00 p.m. – 3:10 p.m. at 109 Butrovich Building

I Call to Order – David Valentine

A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (14)	MOSER, Dennis (14) - audio
ALBERTSON, Leif (14) – audio	NEWBERRY, Rainer (14)
BAKER, Tori (14) – ABSENT?	RADENBAUGH, Todd (15)
BARNES, Bill (15)	SHALLCROSS, Leslie (15) - audio
BERGE, Anna (15)	SHORT, Margaret (15)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (15)	VALENTINE, Dave (14)
CEE, Vincent (14) – <b>Wendy Croskrey</b>	WEBER, Jane (14)
COFFMAN, Christine (15)	WEBLEY, Peter (14)
CONDE, Mark (15)	WINFREE, Cathy (15)
COOK, Christine (14)	YARIE, John (14)
DAVIS, Mike (14) - video	ZHANG, Xiong (14) – <b>Rorik Peterson</b> - audio
DEHN, Jonathan (15)	
DUKE, Rob (15)	Members Absent:
FALLEN, Chris (15)	CHEN, Cheng-fu (14)
FOCHESATTO, Javier (14)	CABLE, Jessie
GIBSON, Georgina (14)	JOLY, Julie (15)
GUSTAFSON, Karen (14)	WINSOR, Peter (14)
HAN, Xiaoqi (15)	
HARDY, Sarah (15)	Others Present:
HEALY, Joanne (15) - audio	UA President Pat Gamble
HORSTMANN, Lara (15)	Vice President Dana Thomas
JOHNSON, Galen (15)	Provost Henrichs
JOHNSTON, DUFF (14)	Libby Eddy
KIELLAND, Knut (14) – <b>Falk Huettmann</b>	Cindy Hardy
LARDON, Cécile (15)	Brad Krick - audio
LOVECRAFT, Amy (15) - audio	Eric Madsen
MCCARTNEY, Leslie (15)	Linda Hapsmith
MEYER, Franz (15)	Carol Gering
MISRA, Debu (15)	Casey Byrne

B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #197

Minutes for meeting #197 were adopted as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to reaffirm unit criteria for the School of Management
2. Motion to reaffirm unit criteria for the Department of Music
3. Motion to reaffirm unit criteria for the Graduate Program in Marine Science and Limnology
4. Motion to recommend amending the UAF Regulation for Emeritus Status
5. Motion to amend academic probation policy
6. Motion to revise non-UA transfer courses for Perspectives on the Human Condition

B. Motions Pending: None

III A. President's Remarks – David Valentine

David mentioned two actions taken by the Board of Regents at their meeting last week. They adopted a common academic calendar across the UA system, and they passed a resolution to have a common set of General Education Requirements (GERs). These will be of tremendous interest to the entire faculty at the three universities in the coming year. To that end, David noted that instead of the usual leadership rotation, he has been elected to chair the Faculty Alliance (FA) next year. He anticipates a challenging year as FA begins addressing the common calendar, and the common GERs. He also announced that the General Education Learning Outcomes Committee (GELO, a subcommittee of FA) has produced a common set of learning outcomes that are based upon the LEAP learning outcomes which UAF Faculty Senate adopted in 2011. These two sets of outcomes will be posted side by side on the Faculty Senate google discussion group for comparison and feedback. Faculty Senate will be asked at the May 5 meeting if they are willing to adopt the new learning outcomes as proposed by GELO.

Debu M. asked if there will be a chance to review the GELO learning outcomes before the May 5 meeting and David reiterated his comment that they will be posted for comparison via the FS discussion group.

With regard to the alignment of the academic calendar across the system, Mike D. asked if start and end times for classes will be included. He's had students who've experienced difficulty with this since UAA has a 50-minute class schedule and UAF has 60-minute class schedule. David responded that the BOR motion includes class times as well as semester start and end dates, and semester winter breaks and spring recesses.

Ken A. asked David to talk about the process by which this new calendar will be created, and how courses that are less than a semester in length (e.g., 7-week courses) will be affected. David responded that normally the academic calendar is the purview of the faculty and so Faculty Alliance will need to take the lead and work with the three Faculty Senates toward alignment. There will need to be a lot of

discussions about what this will mean (e.g., being out of synch with the school districts, and the length of spring breaks).

Amy L. asked why calendar alignment is being done. She doesn't know of any other university systems in other states that coordinate class times across the state. David noted that several regents have a vision of one university and this motion moves the system closer to that vision. Amy asked if this action can be debated or if UAF can refuse to act upon it. David responded that because it's a motion, we must comply with it. The GER resolution, on the other hand, doesn't carry the force of BOR policy. However, it would likely go badly for the universities if they do not make a good faith effort to move in the direction of aligning calendars. Amy asked what David meant by "go badly" and if he was referring to funding levels. He responded that all kinds of things were possible, but deferred to the Provost for further comments.

The Provost reiterated that a resolution by the Board of Regents expresses their intent and desire for action; but, it doesn't have the same force as policy. The options available for responding to the Board's policy on the academic calendar include simply doing what the Board wants us to do; or, do what the Board wants us to do, but in a way that aligns with our own goals for the university as well – finding middle ground or a win-win solution. The option of becoming active resisters to the policy is another possibility, but one which has not worked well for other institutions where it has occurred. Her own opinion is that active resistance would be a tremendous waste of time and energy for both faculty and the administration. She would like to see forward movement to find a solution that will satisfy both the faculty and the Board of Regents. She acknowledged it will be difficult and challenging, but noted the need to project ourselves as a very worthy and competent institution before potential students and our constituents who inform our legislators. It's not just about having a conflict with the Board of Regents but what that makes the university look like in terms of those who fund us. Regarding the question about what the Board can do to us if we refuse, there are potential consequences in terms of what budgets they put forth to the legislature, or whether or not they approve any new programs, centers, or other initiatives.

Amy asked if anyone knew of examples of other state systems that have all their units on the same time schedule. The Provost said she would look into it; but noted that, as has often been said, Alaska is different from other states. One of the issues is that we have a small population that is widely dispersed throughout the state. Ideally, in order to best serve that population, we would offer more of our course offerings by distance delivery. The move to a common calendar is to facilitate more synchronous offerings by video conference or other technologies, not just asynchronous online courses.

David added some comments about general education learning outcomes, noting there are other ways to view the resolution by the Board of Regents. Faculty could choose to take a more minimal view of general education learning outcomes in terms of what they mean for the university system; and, additional learning outcomes could be addressed in degree requirements, for example.

Debu M. asked the Provost if the Board of Regents consulted with any faculty before passing the motion regarding the academic calendar. He recalled faculty comments about the potential hardships that would be caused by this from a prior Faculty Senate meeting when the Chancellor spoke about the issue. The Provost responded that the Board did hear some testimony and received written communication about potential problems. However, they chose to do what they did because they believe it's in the best interests of the university as a whole. They know there will be problems for individuals, but they believe the benefits will outweigh the costs.

Anna B. urged administration to also consider what actions the university can take to alleviate the hardships that will be caused for staff, faculty and students with the academic calendar change.

David commented that this serves as a reminder of the importance of being involved in shared governance, as well as highlighting for Faculty Senate the importance of doing the best job possible.

B. President-Elect's Remarks – Cécile Lardon

Cécile passed on making comments because of the heavy agenda for the meeting, except to note there will be a lot of important issues to be addressed by Faculty Senate in the coming year as she takes on the presidency.

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers was unable to attend the meeting due to a campus emergency.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs recapped the process underway by the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC). In February the PBC received the input compiled by the Budget Options Group (BOG) containing potential ways the university could save money and reduce costs. Many of the ways have to do with eliminating activities or services currently being offered, which would not be painless in light of the fact there is approximately a \$12-14 million budget gap to address. They are reviewing the BOG options as well as some additional options they solicited when the PBC was convened. Subcommittees within the PBC are assessing the potential savings, pros and cons, impacts on other university units and entities, and impacts on future revenue. Their reports are due this week and will go to the vice chancellors responsible for the areas being addressed. The vice chancellors will then have the opportunity to respond. PBC will then finalize their recommendations which will go forward to the Chancellor's Cabinet.

PBC has established some working principles for their activities. The Provost will make weekly reports about the PBC process. The committee's work is projected to be finished toward the end of April. A final summary report will be made available online. Current and future information is/will be posted online at: <http://www.uaf.edu/finserv/omb/budget-planning/>

V Guest Speaker: UA President Pat Gamble

President Gamble noted recent developments coming out of Juneau regarding university funding. The senate very surprisingly added a chunk of capital money into the budget for the heat and power plant and the engineering buildings (although it's possible this could change between now and the 20th). It looks like a modest amount of money will come to UAF for the engineering building in Fairbanks, a chunk will go to the Anchorage engineering building, and a huge chunk will come to Fairbanks for the power plant. It looks like they're trying to get most of that off the table all in one year ("clearing the decks" as he likes to call it) so they don't face the same situation next year between the heat and power plant and the engineering buildings. There will probably be some residual money next year to finish off the engineering building in Fairbanks. There is also some deferred maintenance funding included, and \$12.5 million for buying diesel fuel if the power plant fails in Fairbanks. The President shared that he's wondering what happens to the \$12.5 million if the plant doesn't fail. But, at least on the capital side it's good news, though not a "free lunch." There are some heavy payment burdens that come back to the

university, though the state picks up the biggest chunk by far. The potential \$4 million in savings realized by having a new power plant will go back into paying debt service.

FY15 will be very tight, and the budget allocations to the three universities still need to be figured out. That will start to happen this week. In the past they were sharing growth, but with declining budgets, where to proportionately address the shortfalls is a much harder task. The Summit Team has had some discussions and the preference on the part of the chancellors is to make the allocations on a proportional basis.

In just five more months they will start building the FY16 budget. Based on current information, the future budget situation looks the same for the foreseeable future. It won't change until the state starts getting more revenue from oil coming through the pipeline. Oil is where the money is. The gasline just helps stabilize the cost of energy so it doesn't go up as fast (and helps put a lot of people to work). But, until more oil comes out of the ground and goes through the pipeline and the state gets its royalty share, then all one can hope for are the stock market and the permanent fund. So, our budget is going to go down, probably flatten out, and it's up to us to figure out where it's possible to get additional revenue. Cost cutting and savings can only go so far. The revenue model depends upon student growth to work.

President Gamble shared an example from Arizona where deep cuts affected the state university system. But they are now recovering and also growing. One of the things they did concerned the Maricopa County Community College which they changed to address business workforce training. The college has 265,000 students and only gets \$8 million from the state – a pittance. First, they marketed themselves to companies, asking what employers needed. Then, they built training courses around the specific demands from companies who needed workforce development. He believes the University of Alaska could compete in the workforce development market if it chose to do so, and this would help meet a need for increased revenues.

He reiterated that the only other direction to take, once all cost efficiencies and savings are exhausted, would be personnel cuts. Going in this direction starts with not filling vacant positions, then perhaps retirement incentives. Every organization he's worked with, including the Department of Defense, uses these strategies in times of cut-backs. The way to get out of that to the greatest degree possible is to look for ways to earn revenue. Stock market investments and overhead coming from research will not make up the needed difference. It's also not possible to raise tuition high enough every year to make up the difference. What to do is a big question mark right now. People who've been here 10-12 years or less have only experienced the university getting more funding from the state and haven't worked during times of budget cuts. There's not a lot of expertise for working through this problem, though a lot of people are thinking it through and trying. We've got to relearn what people did the last time and adapt.

These times generate a lot of frustrations. We have wonderful programs and great students. The faculty are passionate about their programs and loyal to them. Work done by Provost Henrichs clearly showed that the last time the university went through big cuts, it took years to recover from the effects. We've tried to make that point to the legislature. He stressed that we can't go down there and be shrill, talk louder or beat on the table -- it just doesn't go over well at the legislature and it won't work. Everything is an expense to them right now whether it's programs for children, social or health programs, or education. We'll keep working with the legislature. Right now our stock is high and the university gets nothing but compliments based on what is coming out of this university system. The credit goes to the programs and the students. The students speak highly of the university before the legislature. To keep our credibility, the university needs to come up with ways to raise revenue. Any and all ideas for doing so are invited.

The President noted the university still has a real advantage (for its size) with the amount of research brought in. He encouraged research efforts to continue strongly and encouraged PIs to keep doing what they're doing. He said niche areas are where we can specialize and no one can compete with us.

He asked for a show of hands of who listened to the BOR meeting. There were just a few. He described how the voting went on the proposed amendment to the resolution (which failed) and the original resolution concerning the General Education Requirements (GERs) which was passed. He said he's not the least little bit worried about a vote. He looks for the message in the vote, which is one you'd expect from the Board. They want steady progress forward on the matter. He assured everyone that shared governance will be involved and they won't rush the important decisions.

He expressed his appreciation for what the Faculty Senates and Faculty Alliance are doing, and stressed the importance of keeping focused in tough times. We can work through the tight budget times; the sky is not falling in. He mentioned transcripts from the BOR meetings are available.

Jane W. asked about possible plans for RIP (retirement incentive programs). Based on the President's answer, he heard "RIF" – reduction in force. He said none are planned for FY15. During FY15 they will look at position vacancies. Hiring freezes will be left up to the chancellors and provosts. He also noted that with adjuncts, you can throttle up (hire more) or down (hire less), so adjuncts will be looked at first before other types of employees. There are a lot of alternates before one has to consider a RIF which would eliminate an entire program. He does not see that happening from the system level.

Cécile, who has served on the BOG and the PBC and has an understanding of the budget challenges, commented about the need for a research university to be independent from its funding sources. She asked if the President perceives a red line that wouldn't be crossed in terms of being dependent upon certain funding sources (citing the example of going to companies and developing workforce training for them). President Gamble clarified that his comments pertained to two-year programs and the community colleges. He doesn't see the research and tenured faculty going out to market workforce training. He also doesn't see the community campus (two-year programs) turning into four-year programs; noting that the roles and missions need to be clear between the community campus and the four-year degree programs. He shared the example of the corporate program development that was done for Alyeska as something which the community campuses could consider pursuing. He also noted that two-year programs should look at alignment with four-year programs, but those efforts are a hand off to the four-year programs, not growth into becoming four-year programs at the community campus level.

David asked the President at what point is raising tuition going to be considered to meet some of the costs of programs that otherwise might need to be deleted. The President responded that there are two ways to do it: price or volume. By raising the volume (numbers of students), the price of tuition can be kept down. Right now, however, we're down about a thousand students graduating from high school, and you can't raise the tuition cost on a captive audience when the numbers are going down. Raising tuition is not a sustainable solution in this situation. Tuition raises are not off the table, but they do not solve the ongoing problem of rising costs. Tuition raises only work for one year. The university has to cover a grand total of about \$17 million each year in increased costs. Raising tuition alone doesn't solve that problem; it's a failed model. Having said that, he does predict we'll see some tuition raises in the next five years. But, the process will involve everybody before those tuition raises happen.

Mike D. commented that students are concerned whether or not the programs they're interested in are going to be here in the years ahead. The President responded that those types of program concerns are

the domain of the chancellors and provosts. He noted this kind of concern is a common one even outside of Alaska. The program review process takes into account the numbers of students enrolled. Were a program to be discontinued, students would be notified ahead of time and efforts to communicate clearly about the program review process would help minimize the number of students caught in situation like that.

The President thanked the faculty for their time and for all that they do for the university. Things are going well across the system in terms of accolades coming back to the university. UAF has great accomplishments, and prospects for continued success have never been better in spite of the budget tightening. He hopes we won't lose people because they get discouraged. Loyalty is needed in seeing the university through this tough time. He invited faculty to contact him with questions or to discuss issues. He invited their ideas and suggestions, but reminded everyone that the one idea that won't be effective right now is to bug the legislators in a shrill or demanding manner.

## VI Governance Reports

### A. Staff Council – Brad Krick

Brad announced that a week and a half ago, Staff Council passed a resolution asking the Chancellor to bring bullying-awareness training to UAF. It's been done for statewide and is being rolled out at UAS. They would like it to be made available to all supervisors by July 1<sup>st</sup> and for all employees by December 31<sup>st</sup> of this year.

He noted the topic of the academic calendar would be good to take up at the System Governance Council. He also expressed support for the resolution concerning geographic salary differentials contained in the Faculty Senate agenda. This topic was discussed last year with the Staff Alliance compensation group and he had followed up by talking to UA HR about it, also.

### B. ASUAF – Brix Hahn

No report was available.

### C. Athletics – Dani Sheppard

No report was available.

### D. UNAC – Falk Huettmann

Falk noted the concern of the Union about the budget situation. He also commented on the need to be aware that the budget concerns extend to the state as a whole, and to arctic research. The question is really about how the burden is distributed and shared across the state. From an academic perspective, he noted that research scientists vote with their feet. There needs to be wider awareness of this, and he feels there should be stronger pushback to the legislature.

### UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane shared news about the UA Choice health plans. There is a \$600 rebate that is available to employees, and their spouses or FIPS, who participate in the Healthyroads wellness program. To get the rebate employees fill out a personal health assessment and submit biometric screenings. It will be available with open enrollment.

Cécile commented that the data from the surveys and biometric screenings stays with the company and is not shared. However, it's been reported that participants start getting really annoying phone calls from the company, and Cécile asked Jane if she knew anything about it. Jane didn't, and suggested that the question be asked of the director of benefits. However, regarding Amy's question from the last meeting, Jane reiterated that all survey and biometric screening data is stored by the Healthyroads company and none of the information comes back to the university.

## BREAK

### VII Old Business

- A. Motion to confirm the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award, submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee (Attachment 198/1)

The selection committee received several worthy nominations, and picked Franz Meyer to receive this year's award. The announcement was greeted with a hearty round of applause. The motion to confirm Franz as Outstanding Senator of the Year was passed unanimously.

- B. Election of President-Elect for 2014-15, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 198/2)

Donie Bret-Harte and Debu Misra both accepted their nominations and submitted personal statements of interest.

Jon D. commented on a concern he had about not concentrating all of our voices and power in one place. He asked Debu if he wins his bid for the presidency of United Academics and this election for Faculty Senate, how he will balance the two roles. Jon expressed his concern over the different missions of the union and the senate and whether there might be a possible conflict.

Debu responded that he has not won the United Academic election yet. He would have to take it under serious consideration where to put his efforts, however, if he did win both elections. He would also want the input of others. He reiterated that he had given thought to the separate roles and that they must be seriously considered.

A secret ballot election was held, and Debu Misra was elected as the 2014-15 president-elect of the Faculty Senate. [The actual announcement occurred toward the end of the meeting.]

- C. UAF Faculty Senate Election Results (Attachment 198/3)

David asked the current members of the senate to remind the newly elected members that they will meet at the end of the last May meeting once the "old" senate has adjourned.

### VIII New Business

- A. Motion to reaffirm Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures Unit Criteria, submitted by Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 198/4)

Chris Coffman brought the motion to the floor, noting that only minor changes were made to bring the criteria in alignment with the CBA.

There were no objections and the unit criteria for the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures were approved.

B. Motion to create new IT Committee of the Faculty Senate, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 198/5)

David noted that one of the reasons for proposing this new committee is that they are getting more requests for faculty to weigh in on technical issues. Two recent examples are the electronic course evaluation system, and the learning management system issues. Therefore, it would be very useful to have a faculty committee in place to consider these types of questions and issues. The motion would create a permanent committee (not all the members would necessarily be senators).

A member asked what problems this committee is going to solve. David responded that one of the most immediate problems is the one looking at the options for learning management systems (LMS). OIT has been searching for alternative systems because the costs of Blackboard are rising. A strong and coherent faculty voice is needed when a new LMS is selected.

A vote was taken and there was unanimous approval to create the new Information Technology Committee.

C. Motion to endorse the Electronic Course Evaluation Report Results, submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee (Attachment 198/6)

Franz M. reminded everyone that this report had been discussed with Eric Madsen at the last Faculty Senate meeting. The report summarizes the findings of the ad hoc committee which has been looking at various software packages for electronic course evaluation over the past year. The report contains the recommendation to move toward an electronic system; and one of the systems in particular clearly stood out above the others to meet UAF's needs. The motion also recommends the formation of a workgroup to move the process forward. Franz also mentioned a handout with information about the estimated cost savings, provided today from the Provost's Office. The workgroup will also look at potential cost savings and how a new system would be implemented. Franz encouraged the Senate to endorse this motion.

Mark C. asked about implementation of an electronic system in the classroom. Franz said that classroom implementation is now possible via smartphones. They can also be done in computer labs. There are also ways to optimize participation through incentivizing the use of electronic evaluations. Franz noted that one of the reasons the workgroup has endorsed the system they chose is because the company is invested in getting students to use it by means of incentivizing their participation. They offer active participation from the company side, also. If the company sees reduced participation they will actively contact the university and offer solutions for increasing participation. They also believe strongly in educating students about making their voice be heard and using course evaluation as a tool to do so.

Debu M. asked if this system is for evaluating instruction, or for getting the opinion of students. If it's for gathering the opinions of students, calling it an *evaluation* is misleading. He asked for the word *evaluation* to be replaced with *opinion of instruction*. Franz responded that the questions on the form can be the same as the ones we have now – their purpose would be unchanged. David interjected that the current system is no longer called “student opinion of instruction” – it's called an instructional assessment system.

With regard to Rainer's question in the online discussion group, Franz noted that the system supports use of both paper and electronic evaluations. There is a wide range of options for phasing in the new system. It's pretty flexible. The workgroup should address how they want to phase it in.

Falk asked about how this system will be used in terms of promotion and tenure. Franz noted that to some degree the interpretation of the results is independent of the technology itself, but agreed with Falk that the workgroup can address the use of the system in the process of faculty evaluation.

Ken A. asked if the vote today is to approve the use of the system, or whether they would consider using a pilot program of the system first. Franz clarified motion is to move the workgroup's recommendations forward to the Provost's Office. Part of those recommendations is to do a pilot first. Eric Madsen commented that the company has two main models for implementing the system. One model is a pilot with up to three projects (a project being an instance; for example: a field base course with both paper and electronic evaluations and a classroom course with both paper and electronic evaluations would total four projects). The pilot is hosted on the company's server and after it's done, the company keeps the data. The other option is to implement the full system, which comes with a money-back guarantee. The pilot and the full implementation both serve the same purpose under these terms.

The Provost clarified that the motion today asks for a vote about endorsing the report, which is a recommendation to her office to establish the workgroup to pursue some of the questions being raised and to engage with the vendor in some kind of pilot or assessment. But it's not a commitment to continue with this system if it doesn't work out. It would not have to come back before the Faculty Senate in order to stop its use if it doesn't work out.

Falk asked if the system includes eLearning. Franz said that the system does technically include eLearning. One advantage with the system is we would have one integrated system for all the different types of courses we offer.

A vote was taken and the motion endorsing the recommendations of the electronic course evaluation report was passed unanimously.

D. Resolution urging Board of Regents to Adopt Salary Geographic Differential, submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 198/7)

One of the Faculty Affairs Committee (Galen Johnson?) summarized the intent of the resolution. The cost of living at rural campuses has increased disproportionately to other campuses over the last decade. There is Board of Regents policy which states that geographic differentials may be established by university regulations and be based upon the most recent State of Alaska geographic differential study. Furthermore, there is a statement in the regulations that geographic salary differentials in the university system are based on the most current State of Alaska geographic differentials study and the UA President will adjust the listings as necessary. By means of the resolution the Faculty Senate urges the President to adopt the salary differentials recently adopted for state employees which are from the 2008 McDowell study. David reiterated that this is a resolution and is directed to the UA President urging him to do what regulation empowers him to do with regard to setting geographic differentials for salaries.

Todd R. commented that those at Dillingham are certainly aware that their geographic salary differential is lower than other agencies who work there.

David clarified that there is a report that basically sets differentials in the cost of living across the state, and everyone is supposed to be gauged according to that. He also noted the University Regulation contains old data from mid-90s [see R04.05.060], and this resolution would ask that the differentials be updated for the university.

A vote was taken on resolution and it was passed unanimously.

#### IX Discussion Item

- A. Proposed changes to Department Chair Policy, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 198/8)

David noted that there had been a motion concerning changes to the department chair policy planned for this meeting. However, during discussions with the Chancellor about it, they learned he would veto it in its present form. The main reason why it would be vetoed is because the changed policy mentions two unions by name, and policy should not do that. He asked that the Faculty Affairs Committee further modify the proposed policy changes to remove the union names and bring it back for the May meeting. In the meantime, the Faculty Senate is invited to look at it and provide feedback to FAC Chair Knut Kielland and/or to David and Cécile.

Jane W. asked why the changes to remove union names weren't made to the original proposed motion. David explained that it had gotten too close to the meeting and they simply ran out of time. Rather than make a hash of it, they wanted to proceed more carefully and make sure it was ready for prime time.

Debu asked for an email discussion about this proposed motion. David agreed that could happen.

Donie asked if the motion were an attempt to streamline department chair election procedures across the units. David responded that over time, practices within departments have taken precedence over the policy and this is an attempt to assert overarching policy.

#### X Guest Announcement

- A. Amber Cagwin, Coordinator, Dean of Students' Office  
Topic: Review of the Student Code of Conduct

Amber Cagwin was present representing the statewide committee which was convened to review the student code of conduct. The committee now has some proposed revisions to the code for which they would like faculty feedback (as well as feedback from the entire university community). Cards are on the back table with a web URL giving more information about the proposed changes. They will review the feedback they receive and then put together a version for General Counsel to review. In the fall, they will bring the revised code to the Chancellor's Cabinets. From there it will go forward to the Board of Regents.

<http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/deanofstudents/StudentJudicialServices/code-of-conduct-review/index.cfm>

The web site is hosted at UAA, but the effort has involved all the university system.

#### XI Public Comment

No public comments were made.

#### XII Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements

A. General Comments/Announcements

David announced that Debu Misra won the election for 2014-15 president-elect. He congratulated Debu and thanked Donie for her willingness to run for the office. Debu thanked everyone and commented his shoulders are already feeling the heavy weight.

B. Committee Chair Comments

Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 198/9)

Faculty Affairs – Knut Kielland, Chair

Unit Criteria – Chris Coffman, Chair (Attachment 198/10)

Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 198/11)

Jane reminded everyone of the April 25 promotion and tenure workshop to be held in 109 Butrovich. Flyers are available at the back table and at the Faculty Senate web site.

Core Review Committee – Miho Aoki, Chair (Attachment 198/12)

Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair

Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair  
(Attachment 198/13)

Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair  
(Attachment 198/14)

Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair  
(Attachment 198/15)

Research Advisory Committee – Peter Winsor, Chair

3:10 XIII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:18 PM.

ATTACHMENT 198/1  
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014  
Submitted by OSYA Selection Committee

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the nomination of Franz Meyer for the 2013-2014 Outstanding Senator of the Year Award.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The selection committee has carefully reviewed the nominations according to the award criteria, and forwards the nomination of Franz Meyer as Outstanding Senator of the Year for confirmation by the Faculty Senate. Procedure stipulates that a simple majority vote of the Senate shall confirm the nomination, and a formal resolution shall be prepared for presentation to the recipient at the May meeting.

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to affirm the election of M. Syndonia Bret-Harte as the Faculty Senate President-Elect for 2014-2015.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: A single nomination has been accepted for the President-Elect position. Unless further nominations are made and accepted, a secret ballot election need not be held. A simple majority vote will suffice.

\*\*\*\*\*

Personal Statement – M. Syndonia Bret-Harte

I am an Associate Professor with a joint appointment in the Department of Biology and Wildlife and the Institute of Arctic Biology. I earned my Ph.D. from Stanford University, and first came to UAF as a postdoctoral fellow with F. Stuart Chapin, III in 1998. After becoming a research assistant professor in the Institute of Arctic Biology in 2003, I was promoted to Associate Professor and moved into a tenure-track position in 2009. I was awarded tenure in 2013. My research focuses on the interactions between arctic plant species and nutrient cycling in tundra ecosystems, and the response of arctic vegetation to climate change. I am the Principal Investigator on the Cooperative Agreement with NSF that funds the base operations of the Toolik Field Station, and have extensive responsibilities in the management and oversight of that facility. I currently teach scientific writing for graduate students and plant biology for undergraduates in the Department of Biology and Wildlife.

I was first elected to the Faculty Senate in 2006, and represented research faculty until 2009. Following my transition to tenure-track faculty in 2009, I served as a faculty senate alternate from 2009-2011, and as a senator representing the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics from 2012 to present. I served on Faculty Affairs Committee for 3 years, and on the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee (GAAC) for 5 years. I have served as Chair of GAAC and a member of the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee for the last 2 years. In 2013, I also served as the Faculty Senate's representative on the SNRAS-CES Merger Structure Committee. I have also served on various other university committees, am the co-Chair of the Toolik Steering Committee, and engage in professional service including proposal review, panel service for NSF, and manuscript review for journals.

Several challenges face the Faculty Senate in the next two years. First, the projected declines in the university budget are likely to create both difficult choices and perhaps, opportunities. While many decisions concerning responses to changes in the budget are not under the control of the Faculty Senate, it is important for faculty to have a seat at the table while options that might affect them are discussed, and to be able to advocate for our priorities. Second, rapid changes are occurring in the environment for higher education both nationally and in Alaska, and it is important that UAF faculty play a lead role in

shaping the university's response to these changes. Some current issues and efforts include continuing the revitalization of the general education requirements at UAF, achieving greater alignment between the curricula among different campuses in the UA system without compromising UAF standards, and intelligently serving student needs as distance education becomes a more prominent component of instruction.

The current Senate leadership has done an excellent job of creating good channels of communication between the UAF administration and the Senate. I would like to build on this work to continue to engage constructively with the administration, and empower faculty to be informed, critical participants in shared governance. If elected, I will listen to your ideas and solicit your help.

## 2014 FS Election Results

### College of Liberal Arts

Representatives	Alternates
Arts & Communication – <b>Brian Cook (16)</b>	Arts & Communication – Karl Knapp (15)
English & Humanities – Chris Coffman (15)	English & Humanities – <b>Alicia Hall (16)</b>
Language & Culture – Anna Berge (15)	Language & Culture – <b>Patrick Plattet (16)</b>
Social Sciences – Amy Lovecraft (15)	Social Sciences – Chanda Meek (15)
Applied & Distance Program – J. Rob Duke (15)	Applied & Distance Programs – Vacancy
At large – <b>Diana Di Stefano (16)</b>	At large – Wendy Croskrey (15)
At large – <b>Walter Skya (16)</b>	

### Libraries

Leslie McCartney (15)	Elizabeth Humrickhouse (15)
<b>Dennis Moser (16)</b>	

### College of Natural Sciences & Mathematics

Representatives	Alternates
<b>Elizabeth Allman (16)</b>	Ataur Chowdhury (15)
Mark Conde (15)	<b>Falk Huettmann (16)</b>
Donie Bret-Harte (15)	Brian Rasley (15)
<b>Cathy Hanks (16)</b>	Vacancy (16)
<b>David Maxwell (16)</b>	
Franz Meyer (15)	
Margaret Short (15) – Going on Sabbatical; remainder of term to be filled by <b>Rainer Newberry</b>	

### College of Rural & Community Development

Representatives	Alternates
Bill Barnes (15) – UAF CTC	Diane McEachern (15) - KUC
<b>Barbara Blake (16) - DANSRD</b>	<b>Joshua Peter (16) – UAF-CTC</b>
Galen Johnson (15) – UAF CTC	<b>Sandra Wildfeuer (16) - CRCD</b>
Todd Radenbaugh (15) - BBC	
<b>Jane Weber (16) – CRCD</b>	
Cathy Winfree (15) – UAF CTC	

### College of Engineering & Mines

Representatives	Representatives
<b>Chris Hartman (16)</b>	<b>Jenny Liu (16)</b>
<b>Orion Lawlor (16)</b>	Rorik Peterson (15)
Debu Misra (15)	

## 2014 FS Election Results

–continued

### **School of Natural Resources and Extension**

School of Natural Resources & Agriculture\*

Representatives Alternate(s)

Julie L. Joly (15) **John Yarie (16)**

**David Valentine (16)**

Cooperative Extension Service\*

Representatives Alternate(s)

**Julie Cascio (16)** **Mara Bacsujlaky (16)**

Leslie Shallcross (15)

\*Reference Bylaws, Sect. 1 (Article III Membership) subsection E.

### **School of Education**

Representatives Alternate(s)

Joanne Healy (15) Phil Patterson (15)

**Joan Hornig (16)**

### **School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences**

Representatives Alternates

Sarah Hardy (15) **Brian Himelbloom (16)**

**Andrew McDonnell (16)** Vacant (15) *A.M. now a rep*

Lara Horstmann (15)

**Allison “Sunny” Rice (16)**

### **School of Management**

Representatives Alternates

**Ken Abramowicz (16)** Charlie Sparks (15)

**Ping Lan (15)**

### **Geophysical Institute**

Representatives Alternate(s)

Jonathan Dehn (15) Gerhard Kramm (15)

**Andrew Mahoney (16)**

### **Int’l Arctic Research Center**

Representatives Alternate(s)

Jessie Cable Young (15) **Jessica Cherry (15)**

**Georgina Gibson (16)** (one-year term)

Chris Fallen (15)\*

\*Finishing elected term. (ARSC is  
now at GI)

---

ATTACHMENT 198/4  
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014  
Submitted by Unit Criteria Committee

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures.

EFFECTIVE:     Fall 2014  
                  Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE:     The Unit Criteria Committee reviewed the unit criteria which were submitted by the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. The unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

\*\*\*\*\*

**UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY AND DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES & LITERATURES UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND INDICES**

*THE FOLLOWING IS AN ADAPTATION OF UAF AND BOARD OF REGENTS' CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, PRE-TENURE REVIEW, POST-TENURE REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY ADAPTED FOR USE IN EVALUATING THE FACULTY OF THE FOREIGN LANGUAGES & LITERATURES DEPARTMENT. ITEMS IN BOLDFACE ITALICS ARE THOSE SPECIFICALLY ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S FACULTY, AND BECAUSE THEY ARE ADDITIONS TO UAF REGULATIONS.*

**CHAPTER I**

**Purview**

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

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

These regulations shall apply to all of the units within the University of Alaska Fairbanks, except 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 DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND INDICES*, evaluators may consider, but shall not be limited to, whichever of the following are appropriate to the faculty member’s professional obligation: mastery of subject matter; effectiveness in teaching; achievement in research, scholarly, and creative activity; effectiveness of public service; effectiveness of university service; demonstration of professional development and quality of total contribution to the university.

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

#### Bipartite Faculty

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

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

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

#### B. Criteria for Instruction

A central function of the university is instruction of students in formal courses and supervised study. Teaching includes those activities directly related to the formal and informal transmission of appropriate skills and knowledge to students. The nature of instruction will vary for each faculty member, depending upon workload distribution and the particular teaching mission of the unit. Instruction includes actual contact in classroom, correspondence or electronic delivery methods, laboratory or field and preparatory activities, such as preparing for lectures, setting up demonstrations, and preparing for laboratory experiments, as well as individual/independent study, tutorial sessions, evaluations, correcting papers, and determining grades. Other aspects of teaching and instruction extend to undergraduate and graduate academic advising and counseling, training graduate students and serving on their graduate committees, particularly as their major advisor, curriculum development, and academic recruiting and retention activities.

##### 1. Effectiveness in Teaching

Evidence of excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through, but not limited to, evidence of the various characteristics that define effective teachers. Effective teachers

- 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.

## 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.

***FACULTY IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES ARE REQUIRED TO TEACH ALL LEVELS OF THEIR LANGUAGE, AND OFTEN HAVE UNUSUALLY HIGH TEACHING LOADS. THUS, EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING IS THE DEPARTMENT'S HIGHEST PRIORITY. EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH AND SERVICE CANNOT COMPENSATE FOR AN INSUFFICIENT TEACHING RECORD.***

***UNTENURED FACULTY MEMBERS WILL HAVE A YEARLY PEER TEACHING OBSERVATIONS, EITHER BY THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR OR ANOTHER FACULTY MEMBER. STUDENT OPINIONS OF INSTRUCTION WILL ALSO BE CONSIDERED WHEN ASSESSING A CANDIDATE'S TEACHING RECORD. THE CANDIDATE MUST ADDRESS CONSISTENTLY LOW STUDENT OPINIONS OF INSTRUCTION IN HIS OR HER SELF-NARRATIVE.***

## C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

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

disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere.

### **1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity**

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

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

### **2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity**

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

- a. Books, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles, proceedings and other scholarly works published by reputable journals, scholarly presses, and publishing houses that accept works only after rigorous review and approval by peers in the discipline.

***ALL PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS SHALL BE CONSIDERED SIGNIFICANT. THIS INCLUDES NOT ONLY THE WRITING OF JOURNAL ARTICLES AND BOOK CHAPTERS BUT ALSO ANY PEER-REVIEWED TRANSLATION OF ARTICLES, BOOKS OR JOURNAL VOLUMES, AS WELL AS CONTRIBUTIONS TO TEXTBOOKS AND OTHER PEDAGOGICAL RESOURCES.***

- 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.

***PRESENTATIONS AT CONFERENCES ARE ENCOURAGED AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED VALID PROFESSIONAL RESEARCH ACTIVITY. HOWEVER, TRAVEL FUNDING EITHER FROM THE UNIVERSITY OR OUTSIDE SOURCES IS OFTEN UNAVAILABLE. THE CANDIDATE SHOULD ADDRESS THE FREQUENCY OF CONFERENCE PRESENTATION AND AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING IN HER/HIS NARRATIVE STATEMENT.***

- 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. PUBLICATIONS IN FOREIGN JOURNALS ARE STANDARD IN THE DISCIPLINE. CANDIDATES WILL SUPPLY A TRANSLATION OF THE TITLE OF ANY WORK IN A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH AND ARE ENCOURAGED TO PROVIDE AN ABSTRACT IN ENGLISH AS WELL AS A DESCRIPTION OF THE JOURNAL.***

#### **D. Criteria for Public and University Service**

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

##### **1. Public Service**

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. It includes all activities which extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic activity that involves planning with clientele and delivery of information on a continuing, programmatic basis. It may also be informal, individual, professional contributions to the community or to one's discipline, or other activities in furtherance of the goals and mission of the university and its units. Such service may occur on a periodic or limited-term basis. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- a. Providing information services to adults or youth.
- b. Service on or to government or public committees.

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

***l. TRANSLATION OF DOCUMENTS FOR THE PUBLIC***

**2. University Service**

University service includes those activities involving faculty members in the governance, administration, and other internal affairs of the university, its colleges, schools, and institutes. It includes non-instructional work with students and their organizations. Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

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

i. Mentoring *OF FACULTY*.

j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

*k. OUTSIDE REVIEWER ON THESIS COMMITTEES.*

**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.

ATTACHMENT 198/5  
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014  
Submitted by Administrative Committee

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the UAF Faculty Senate, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E., Permanent Committees, to create a new Information Technology Committee.

EFFECTIVE: AY2014-15

RATIONALE: The creation of this new committee supports the need for UAF Faculty Senate to be able to address information technology issues and needs affecting all aspects of faculty work at this university. The Office of Information Technology has also expressed its willingness to work with such a committee in addressing needs and issues (e.g., criteria and strategies for addressing standards for a UA course management system).

\*\*\*\*\*

**BOLD CAPS** = Addition  
[[ ]] = Deletion

**UAF Faculty Senate Bylaws, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E.:**

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

...

PERMANENT

**9. THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE WILL ADDRESS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ISSUES AND NEEDS AFFECTING ASPECTS OF WORK FACULTY ENGAGE IN. THEY WILL ALSO BE THE RECOGNIZED COMMITTEE TO WORK WITH REQUESTS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (OIT).**

**MEMBERS SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT. TO HELP ENSURE THAT PERSPECTIVES FROM ACROSS UAF ARE REPRESENTED, MEMBERSHIP WILL CONSIST OF AT LEAST FIVE REPRESENTATIVES, WITH NOT MORE THAN ONE FROM EACH OF THE SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, INSTITUTES OR LIBRARIES. REPRESENTATIVES FROM OIT AND E-LEARNING SHALL BE EX OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. THE COMMITTEE CHAIR MUST BE AN ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE FROM FACULTY SENATE.**

ATTACHMENT 198/6  
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014  
Submitted by Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**MOTION:**

The Faculty Senate moves to approve the main recommendation formulated in Sections 3.1 – 3.3 of the report on “Assessment of Electronic Course Evaluation Technology and its Applicability to the University of Alaska Fairbanks – Stage 2: AY 14,” submitted to the Faculty Senate in March 2014 jointly by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement (FDAI) Committee and the Electronic Course Evaluation Workgroup.

EFFECTIVE: Spring 2014

RATIONALE: In late summer 2012, Provost Henrichs asked Eric Madsen to facilitate a campus-wide discussion about electronic course evaluation systems. In response to this request and in cooperation with the FDAI committee, an Electronic Course Evaluation Workgroup was formed in fall 2012 that has since been analyzing electronic course evaluation technology specifically in light of its applicability to UAF. In careful and intensive evaluation of all involved factors, the workgroup has formulated a three-part recommendation that was presented to and discussed by the Faculty Senate during its meeting in March 2014. With this motion we ask the Faculty Senate to formally approve this recommendation (listed below) in order to allow the process to move forward to the next step.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RECOMMENDATION REGARDING ELECTRONIC COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEMS**

as stated in in Sections 3.1 – 3.3 of the report on “Assessment of Electronic Course Evaluation Technology and its Applicability to the University of Alaska Fairbanks – Stage 2: AY 14”:

**Part 1: The electronic-Course Evaluation Workgroup recommends that UAF should move to an electronic course evaluation system**

Paper-based course evaluation systems are costly to deploy, retrieve, and store; they demand large amounts of personnel time; data-analysis is inefficient; refining questions to make them more meaningful is difficult; and security is problematic. In viewing the system demonstrations and questioning the presenters, the workgroup was mindful that electronic course evaluation systems present their own versions of some of these same challenges and introduce others. Throughout the process, we considered as separate questions: Should UAF move to an electronic course evaluation system? Is there an electronic course evaluation system that adequately addresses concerns and offers enough advantages to make a transition worthwhile?

After analyzing the capabilities of state-of-the-art electronic course evaluation technology and assessing the pros and cons of electronic means of course evaluation, the workgroup recommends that UAF should move to an electronic course evaluation system.

**Part 2: The Electronic-Course Evaluation Workgroup recommends eXplorance/Blue Course Evaluations**

Based on an initial analysis of 12 e-course evaluation systems and a consecutive more detailed assessment of 4 finalist systems, the workgroup determined that the eXplorance/Blue system met all of the electronic course

evaluation features important to UAF and addressed more of those considerations or addressed them more adequately than the other systems considered.

**Part 3: A workgroup should be formed by the Provost and Faculty Senate Leadership to help design, oversee, and evaluate a pilot of eXplorance/Blue that is appropriate for UAF**

To capture all relevant input, this workgroup shall include representation from faculty, staff (incl. the Office of Information Technology), and administration. The Faculty Senate shall be represented through at least one representative of the FDAI committee. To preserve the expertise collected throughout the course of this study, the membership of this new workgroup should show some overlap with the membership of the outgoing Electronic Course Evaluation team.

ATTACHMENT 198/7  
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014  
Submitted by Faculty Affairs Committee

**RESOLUTION:**

**Whereas** the State of Alaska in 2008, contracted the McDowell Group to do an extensive study on the cost of living for state employees that live in urban and rural communities across the state; and

**Whereas** the Alaska Department of Administration used the McDowell study to address pay equity and implemented the recommendations regarding salary differentials for state employees; and

**Whereas** University of Alaska has not updated its own salary differential for the faculty and staff in many years; and

**Whereas** the University of Alaska Fairbanks has many employees that live in areas of the state where costs have increased significantly; and

**Whereas** the current pay differential in place by the University does not reflect the true costs of living for the employees that work for the University in a number of communities in Alaska; and

**Whereas** the effects of this disparity in pay equity has made it difficult for UAF to recruit and retain employees in many of our communities; and

**Whereas** the Board of Regents Policy states in P04.05.060:  
*Geographic differentials may be established by University regulations and be based on the most recent state of Alaska geographic differential study; and*

**Whereas** the UA Regulation states in R04.05.060:  
*Geographic salary differentials in the university are based on the most current State of Alaska geographic differentials study...The president will adjust the listings as necessary,*

**Therefore be it resolved,** that the UAF Faculty Senate goes on record urging the UA President to adopt the salary differential recently implemented for state employees (from the McDowell 2008 study) for the staff and faculty of the University.

CAPS and **Bolded** – Additions  
[[ ]] – Deletions

## **UAF Department Chair Policy**

The following is a description of the role and duties of the department chair, and procedures for the election of department chairs at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. The size and composition of departments and programs are defined by each individual college and school.

### **I. ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR**

- A. The department chair [[is the administrative and academic officer of the department and as such]] has the primary responsibility [[and authority]] for: (1) leadership in developing high quality academic programs which fulfill department, college, and university objectives; (2) leadership in the implementation of college and university policies and programs at the department level; (3) leadership in developing resource requests and an appropriate departmental budget; and (4) service on the college/school executive committee.
- B. The department chair is first a faculty member. The department chair is primarily a teacher-scholar serving as a leader of his/her department colleagues. The department chair is a role model for faculty responsibility.
- C. The department chair is responsible for providing mechanisms and processes for members' participation in discussion and decision making within the department. All members of the department should be informed of these mechanisms and processes. Regular meetings should be held for purposes of communicating information, discussing issues, and making decisions on department matters.
- D. The department chair is [[expected]] **REQUIRED** to communicate faculty perspectives and concerns to the administration and other segments of the community as appropriate. The department chair is the primary spokesperson **FOR** the faculty of the department. The department chair will also [[convey]] **BE REQUIRED TO CONVEY** administration views and concerns to the faculty.

### **II. DUTIES OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR**

The department chair is responsible, either directly or by delegation, for performance of at least the specific duties enumerated below (the duties are not prioritized) which shall be performed in accordance with the extant collective bargaining agreements on the role and status of department chairs.

- A. Academic Programs

1. Initiate, plan, oversee implementation of, and review the preparation and offering of the academic program, after appropriate involvement of members of the department and consultation with the dean.
2. Ensure interdepartmental coordination and cooperation.
3. Take leading role in ensuring academic program quality.
4. Ensure reports are prepared as needed. Ensure that course [[schedule]] **SCHEDULES** are prepared in a timely manner.
5. Ensure catalog is current.
6. Supervise departmental office and ensure that files and records are maintained.
7. Keep the dean informed of departmental and faculty activities. Act as a liaison with the University community.

#### B. Personnel

1. Coordinate [[and evaluate]] professional activities of all members of the department, to include providing guidance to faculty concerning expectations regarding promotion and tenure. [[Request and obtain faculty activity reports as appropriate to this process]].
2. Provide recommendations for appointments, [[promotion]], sabbatical leaves, [[tenure]], and release of faculty after consultation with members of the department.
3. Review and recommend to dean/director workloads **IN CONSULTATION WITH AND** as proposed by faculty members.
4. Take lead role in departmental faculty and staff recruitment and retention.
5. Provide for the management and supervision of support staff.
6. Appoint appropriate committees within the department.
7. Facilitate support for faculty teaching, research and service activities.
8. Function as spokesperson and advocate for the department, both within and outside the University community.

#### C. Students

1. Administer the departmental student advisement program and counsel students.
2. Recruit students in cooperation with other members of the department and the dean.
3. Act on student petitions.

4. Provide for the management of student assistants.
5. Address student concerns as appropriate.

D. Budget, Inventory, Facilities, Etc.

1. Initiate resource and budget requests with justifications.
2. Maintain fiscal control of departmental budgets.
3. Ensure upkeep of equipment and facilities assigned to the department.

### III. ELECTION AND TERMS OF SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

A. Departments Involved

The procedures will apply to every unit that is considered a department.

B. Eligibility to Vote

All full-time faculty members holding academic rank who are affiliated with the department are eligible to vote. **THOSE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE MUST BE REPRESENTED EITHER BY UNITED ACADEMICS (UNAC) OR BY UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FEDERATION OF TEACHERS (UAFT)** [[Visiting faculty who are in an academic rank position are eligible to vote]].

A full-time faculty member currently holding academic rank is affiliated with a department if:

[[1) the chair of that department evaluates the faculty member or;]]

[[2))] **1)** the chair of [[the]] **THAT** department reviews the faculty member's workload agreement.

C. Eligibility to be Nominated and Serve as Department Chair

Only tenured members of a department who are eligible to vote are eligible to be nominated and serve as department chair. [[Only in exceptional circumstance,]] Where the majority of the department faculty feel that options are severely limited, [[should there be deviation]] **THEY MAY ELECT TO DEVIATE** from this policy.

D. Procedures for Elections

1. By March 15, those faculty in the department who are eligible to vote will establish a list of nominees for department chair. The names of the nominees will be placed on an official secret ballot for the department and distributed from the dean's office to those faculty eligible to vote.
2. Faculty members eligible to vote but who are absent because of sabbatical leave, leave of absence, or for other official reasons will be provided with an absentee ballot.

3. Secret ballots are to be cast and the person receiving a simple majority of the votes cast will be elected. In the case of a tie which cannot be resolved by the voters, the dean shall select the department chair from those faculty involved in the tie vote.

4. If no nominee receives a simple majority of the votes, a run-off election of the top two nominees shall be held immediately under the same procedures outlined above. The deadline for accepting ballots for the run-off election will be the last working day prior to April 15.

5. Departments and the provost will be notified of election results by May 15.

#### E. Term of Elected Department Chair

A department chair shall serve for a term of two years, beginning July 1, following his/her election. The department chair may continue in the position indefinitely by a simple majority of the voting faculty of the department.

#### F. Department Chair Disputes, Vacancies, and Recall

1. If an action of the department chair is appealed by a simple majority of the eligible voting members of the department and the issue cannot be resolved within the department, the matter shall be referred to the dean for arbitration. If necessary, the dean will refer the matter to the Provost.
2. If the department chair's position becomes vacant due to unexpected prolonged leave, illness, death, resignation, or other circumstances, the dean shall appoint a department faculty member **OR ANOTHER ELIGIBLE TENURED FACULTY MEMBER** to act as department chair. **THE TENURED FACULTY MEMBER APPOINTED BY THE DEAN TO ACT AS DEPARTMENT CHAIR MUST BE REPRESENTED EITHER BY UNITED ACADEMICS (UNAC) OR BY UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FEDERATION OF TEACHERS (UAFT)**. An election to fill this position will be held the following April 15.
3. The department chair shall appoint an acting department chair whenever their absence from the department is for a period of less than two months. If this absence extends beyond two months, the procedure defined in Section F. 2. above is to be followed.
4. Election of a new department chair may be requested by petition to the dean signed by three-quarters of the eligible voting members of the department or by the petition of the Dean to the department approved by 3/4's of the voting members of the department. After the election by the faculty [[and ratification by the Dean]], the new department chair will take office immediately and serve the unexpired term.

#### G. Acknowledgement for Department Chair Duties

A Department chair's duties may be acknowledged through release time, remuneration, and/or their service component of their faculty duties. Any acknowledgement must be agreed upon between the Department chair and the Dean and must be consistent with UAF and Board of Regent's policies and extant Collective Bargaining Agreements.

**Curricular Affairs Committee  
Meeting Minutes 10 March 2014**

1-2 pm Kayak Room

Present: Rainer Newberry, Chair; Ken Abramowicz; Rob Duke (audio); Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy; Sarah Hardy (audio); Dennis Moser; Jonathan Rosenberg; Margaret Short; Todd Radenbaugh (audio); Casey Byrne; Libby Eddy; Alex Fitts; Doug Goering; Linda Hapsmith (audio); Stacey Howdeshell; Jayne Harvie.

**1. Minutes for the 10 February meeting were approved as submitted.**

**2. GERC update via Jonathan Rosenberg ± Cindy Hardy**

Jonathan reported that Ilanna Kingsley has been appointed to the GERC as the representative from the Library. They have been talking about reinstating the LIB F101X course as a core requirement or as a prerequisite for English required courses.

Feedback from CEM regarding the Communication attribute was received and found to be helpful. More is needed in the "C" attribute concerning writing. They have been discussed adding a diversity component in the Foreign Language courses.

Alex F. and Annie A. are working on assessment materials for capstone courses.

GERC will have a revised report to the Curricular Affairs Committee by March 21. CAC will discuss with goal of bringing the report to the March 28 Administrative Committee and as a discussion item at the April 7 Faculty Senate meeting (potentially with voting action at the May meeting). It was noted that the report is still fluid at the Administrative Committee.

**3. Report by Sine Anahita RE her experimental 'less compacted' Wintermester course of Dec 2013-Jan 2014**

Sine spoke about the 3-credit, 5 week, SOC F100X core course she taught over winter break at the invitation of UAF-CTC. She had four students, three of whom were students at other colleges, but home for the break. Those three finished the course early.

Difficulties encountered getting face-to-face meetings. Ultimately they didn't happen and instead the course became exclusively electronic, with late-night facebook-based discussions, reviewed the next morning by Sine. Linda H. mentioned having staff work over the hard closure could be a barrier to teaching more courses in this fashion. Sine thought this format worked better than the highly compressed version, but recognized that the students were highly motivated and taking the course out of interest. She thought teaching in this format bear further experimentation.

**4. Report by Dean Alex Fitts RE efforts to restructure and improve the UAF probation policies**

Alex described a three-tier warning system which includes early warnings to students who are struggling in courses (via the Early Warning Program), probation, and academic disqualification, with the objective of having an action plan for the Faculty Senate next October or November.

There was much discussion on various aspects of the current procedures for student probation and how they can be problematic. The committee was in general agreement with the concept of the three-tier system, especially as it will become a more automatic in notifying students, faculty and the registrar's office.

**The committee will meet in two weeks on March 24. The plan is to receive the GERC report by Friday the 21<sup>st</sup> and discuss it on the 24<sup>th</sup>.**

It looks like Dennis M., Ken A. might be able to continue next year, pending their unit elections. Cindy H. (SADAC Chair), Sarah H. and Todd R. will continue next year on Faculty Senate.

**Despite general disinclination to adjourn, the meeting was halted about 2:08 pm when the next group arrived to use the meeting room.**

-----  
**Curricular Affairs Committee**

Meeting Minutes for 10 February 2014 1-2 pm Kayak Room

**1. Approve Minutes of last meeting**

Minutes for January 27 were approved as submitted.

**2. GERC update via Jonathan Rosenberg ± Cindy Hardy**

The Provost brought up several issues both before & during the last Fac Senate Meeting. She set up a meeting with the Chairmen of GERC and CAC, the Fac Senate President, and the Vice Provost, in which she discussed means to move forward. Either Jonathan or Rainer or Alex or all three will discuss her suggested strategies, including unified math/Engl requirements.

The meeting described above took place. GELO announced that alignment of Math and English placement is in the works. GERC will be refining their proposal in response to this effort.

GERC is beginning its effort to respond to feedback it has received. The feedback has been mixed concerning the new attributes. The "C" attribute (for Communication) needs clarification. One suggestion was to implement the plan in incremental steps, but GERC prefers to put forth a comprehensive proposal.

Timing of student feedback on the proposal will probably occur closer to the completion of the proposal, after the current administrative hurdles are dealt with. GERC will decide when to tackle the issue of getting student feedback.

Vice Provost Alex Fitts will follow up on how the effort toward common Math and English placement will be coordinated by statewide between the three universities. CAC wants to know who takes the next step and what that is to be.

Fall 2015 is the goal for accomplishing this unification effort for Math and English placement.

**3. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. One more time:**

**Motion to Revise Non-UA Transfer of Courses**

The Committee talked about the need for some back-up data on how many students would benefit now from this proposed change, even though it might only be for a year or so until the new General Education Requirements are in place. Prior to 2005-06 (when this table became more rigid) the transfer system was much more broad.

**-- here's the wording we agreed to at the last meeting. Proposed Revision to Perspectives on the Human Condition section of the Non-UA Table of Substitutions:**

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

We need a strong justification, with some data. The Provost seems to strongly support this. Would it be wrong /unwise for us to ask her to make a public statement in support???

**B. Unified UA Calendar – is it coming our way???**

**Presumably we'll know better after the Febr BOR meeting. If the BOR do mean business, how do we go about negotiating with UAA & UAS???** Not to be settled today.

There was a brief discussion about the origin of this idea and how to proceed. It will take an effort by each of the three faculty senates.

**4. New Business**

**Probation policy revision. Plans are afoot to significantly modify the probation policy next fall. In the meantime, Dean (and Vice Provost) Fitts has asked CAC to consider the motion listed on the next page.**

Curricular Affairs Committee passed the following motion with some additional revisions. The final revision is shown just below:

**PROBATION**

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

----- Older proposal below--

**MOTION:**

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

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014

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

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**PROBATION**

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

**CAPS** = Additions

[[ ]] = Deletions

**Proposed *UAF Catalog* policy language:**

**PROBATION**

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

-----

The meeting was adjourned rather quietly as everyone tiptoed around the specter of *uniform* universities.

ATTACHMENT 198/10  
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014  
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

**UAF FACULTY SENATE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES: Tuesday, February 18, 11:30-12:30** Kayak Room Participants' PIN: 5336747

Present in the room: Xavier, Mark, Chris.  
Online: Steve, Cathy, Tori, Leif, Debu.  
Absent: Christine Cook.

Foreign Languages Representative: Joseph Josef Glowa

I. Housekeeping

1. Approval of Agenda

Approved

2. Approval of Minutes from 1/21/14 Meeting. See attachment.

Xavier : Has the calendar for permanent meetings been finalized?

Answer: Addressed in Item 1(c).

Question: Have we got a list of criteria that we will be discussing this semester?

Answer: That is a question for Jayne.

II. Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures: Reaffirmation of Existing Unit Criteria

Associate Prof. Josef Glowa attended as department representative.

Question: Are the criteria as presented changed from before?

Answer: No the department decided to keep them as before. The criteria do not specify precise numbers for publications, translations etc – which was deemed appropriate for a CLA school. Department is considering revising the criteria for scholarly works and service to the community, but that is in progress. Again the trend will be to avoid specific numbers. Possibilities for scholarly work are becoming more complex with new media and internet etc. The Foreign Language department is renewing criteria now because it is mandatory – but they can resubmit them at any time. *Josef confirmed that all affected members reviewed and approved the criteria as presented to this committee.*

Xavier: Raised several questions regarding grammatical correctness of the criteria, but committee determined they are acceptable as written.

Xavier: Asked about how teaching is evaluated.

Josef: All untenured faculty in this department have an annual teaching evaluation by the chair.

Debu: New language in the CBA would preclude this practice. Specific problem is with making it an *evaluation* by the Department Chair. The Chair can perform a teaching observation, but not evaluation. (Only the Dean can evaluate; Chair or peers can only observe, not evaluate.)

Debu: Noted that IAS evaluation forms are mandatory. But again these students cannot evaluate; they can only provide opinion on instruction.

Debu: Asked (by way of follow up) what additional value do we get by adding language referring to student evaluation, when it is already mandatory?

Committee: Recommended that Josef take back to the department the language on student “input”, with a suggestion that this sentence be removed. All references to “student evaluation” should be replaced with “student opinion of instruction”.

Tori: Verified from checking the Provost’s web site that Debu’s concern (regarding who can *evaluate*) is legitimate.

Xavier: Criteria specify that low teaching evaluations must be addressed in self narrative. Questioned whether this should explicitly require that pathways to *improvement* be addressed. Committee felt that this is implied.

Debu: Suggested that word “judge” be replaced by word “assess”. This was thought to be a good idea, although it was determined that a change of this importance would need to be taken back to the department for approval, and then brought back to this committee.

Xavier: (Re page 6) Questioned why there are specifications relating to plants and animals?

Answer: These words are inherited from the relevant template.

Chris: (Re page 8, point (K). Question regarding outside reviewer on thesis committees. Shouldn’t this be regarded as teaching, not service?

Xavier: As an outside examiner it is more appropriate as service, whereas for a committee member it should be treated as teaching.)

Committee: Again this should be taken back to the department for consideration.

Mark: When criteria are up for mandatory renewal, is there a date by which all questions must be resolved?

Jayne: Ideally that same academic year. But pre-existing criteria can remain in effect until revisions are finalized.

Xavier: (Re point L, page 8) What type of translation tasks count?

Josef: The department does this a lot, based on community requests etc. There are many forms of such tasks, and they are considered a part of service.

See attachment:

- Foreign Language and Literatures Unit Criteria

### III. Continued Discussion of Committee Bylaws

See attachment:

- Proposed Bylaws.

Chris: Who should remove “track changes” entries (strikethroughs etc) after we discuss some proposed criteria? Chris suggested the units should “clean up” these items before the approved document goes forward to the full senate. But Mark noted that this means the document will be worked on by people other than the committee after the approval step. Mark suggested that we request both a “clean” and “marked up” copy of the proposed criteria. Cathy likes the idea of having both forms presented. Chris agreed that we will amend bylaws to specify this as a future requirement.

Tory: Questioned whether we could require changing from the existing “all caps” format for calling out changes to instead use underlining. Currently there is considerable uncertainty regarding whether we have the power to enforce such a large change, so for now we are keeping the “all caps” practice in place.

Xavier: Comment regarding notation: “SNRAS” is changing to “SNRE” and our language should reflect that.

Closing update: Various criteria that we have worked on are being brought forward to the full senate for consideration.

ATTACHMENT 198/11  
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014  
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

**Committee on the Status of Women,  
Minutes Wednesday, February 26, 2014; 9:15 am to 10:15 am pm, Gruening 718**

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Jane Weber, Mary Ehrlander. Ellen Lopez, Megan McPhee, Kayt Sunwood, Shawn Russell

Members absent: Jenny Liu, Nilima Hullavarad, Derek Sikes, Michelle Bartlett, Diana Di Stefano

1. Promotion & Tenure Workshop

501 IARC, Friday, April 25, 10 am to 12 pm, Roxie, Ellen, Sine, Amy, Mary, Stephi, Karen

2. Fall 2014 Luncheon Speaker

Tuesday, September 16. Margaret Thayer from recently retired curator of Chicago Field Museum of Natural History. Frequently posts in women in science. Travel will be paid for by museum. Kayt voiced concern that the speaker address a women's issue. Derek will talk to Margaret about her presentation.

3. Women's Center Advisory Board

Move to Wood Center will be done by July 1. Some of the board members meeting with chancellor in June about making the coordinator position 12 month, full time. Danielle Dirks is coming to Fairbanks on Thursday March 27, 7-9 pm Brooks gathering room. She will talk about activism on blowing the whistle on campus rape. Please share this information.

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

March 11, 1:00 to 2:30. Tables/ themes/ facilitators. Three topics. Ellen, Diana, Amy will be facilitators. A handout should be developed for each table. Objectives: Build community, have a voice on interesting topic, bring something away from the discussions. We will have handouts to Kayt by March 5. Bring 30 handouts.

1. Finding Mentors: The More the Merrier (Diana)

2. Mentoring: Best Practices (Amy)

3. Navigating Mentoring Relationships: What I Wish Someone Had Told Me (Ellen)

5. Summer faculty get-together. Maybe we can work with Michelle Bartlett to offer something.

6. Upcoming CSW meetings:

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

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/13-14-csw/>

ATTACHMENT 198/12  
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014  
Submitted by the Core Review Committee

**Core Review Committee  
Minutes from February 27, 2014 Meeting**

Voting members:  
Miho Aoki (Chair), Walter Skya, Jennifer Schell

Non-voting members:  
Caty Oehring, Allan Morotti, Holly Sherouse, Andrea Schmidt, Carol Murphrey (via phone)

1. Petitions

The committee reviewed two petitions. One of them was for petitioning a seminar course to be counted as a writing intensive course. The course was not a writing intensive course, but the instructor designed the syllabus to follow the writing intensive course designation guidelines. There was an attempt to make this course into a writing intensive course by the department in the past, but it was denied. Currently the course is repeatable for credits. The majority of the committee agreed that approving this and similar petitions would set a precedent. Miho has consulted Rainer Newberry about making this course into a writing intensive course. The department will try to make the course into a writing intensive course again by turning in the proposal with syllabi for each variation of topic.

2. Core Course Proposals

The committee reviewed revised ANTH/LING 435 and approved the proposal.

3. Meeting minutes from February 14th meeting

The committee edited and approved the meeting minutes from February 14th.

4. OW Course Assessment Spring 2014

Miho has requested but not obtained the list of courses from the CLA office, however, she is expecting to receive it in this week.  
update: Miho received the list on Feb. 28th.

5. Next meeting: Friday March 14th, 2014

---

**Core Review Committee  
Minutes from February 14, 2014 Meeting**

Voting members:  
Miho Aoki (Chair), Andy Seitz, Tyson Rinio, Walter Skya

Non-voting members:  
Caty Oehring, Allan Morotti, Holly Sherouse, Kevin Berry, Carol Murphrey (via phone)

1. Meeting minutes from January 31st meeting

The committee edited and approved the meeting minutes from January 31st.

About MATH 194 (X) Preparation for Calculus (trial course): The trial course cannot have "X" designation. Until the course turns into the regular course with a permanent course number, students have to petition to fulfill the core math requirement with this course. The committee discussed blanket approval for this course. The registrars office like to have the approval from the committee chair every semester. The chair can use the core petition form for this approval.

2. Petitions

There were no petitions to review in this meeting.

3. Core Course Proposals

The committee reviewed 2 new course proposals, ANTH 314 (W) and ANTH/LING 435.

4. OW Course Assessment Spring 2014

Miho has requested but not obtained the list of courses from the CLA office yet.

5. Meeting time for Spring 2014 semester

Two more meetings at the end of the semester (May 2nd and 7th) are proposed.

6. Next meeting: February 27th, 2014

ATTACHMENT 198/13

UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**The Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee (SADA)  
Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2014**

**Attending:** Gordon Williams, Cindy Hardy, Brandon Uzzell, Colleen Angiak, Sandra Wildfeuer, Sarah Stanley, Suzan Hahn (guest)

**Learning Commons:**

The committee invited Suzan Hahn, Head of Collections Services at the Rasmuson Library, to discuss progress on the Learning Commons project. This project resulted from a 2006 resolution originating with SADA and passed by the Faculty Senate. Suzan Hahn, Amy Barnsley, Dana Greci, Reba Dupras, and Cindy Hardy, met over a few years as a joint committee of SADA and the Library, and presented a proposal for a Learning Commons to the Library Interim Dean, and, later to the current Dean in 2011. We asked Suzan to give us an update on where this project stands.

Suzan reported that the learning commons is still on the library agenda, but that they are moving on it without funding and, thus, doing what can be done with the resources they already have. She reported that the following changes have been made or are in progress:

--The Microlab in room 301 is available to students when the room is not reserved for teaching or workshops. There are 25 computers in the Microlab.

--Individual study carrels, located on the 3rd, 5th, and 6<sup>th</sup> floors of the library, are available for grad students and faculty. They contain a desk and a book case. They are available to graduate students on a one-year basis; after that students need to resubmit the request. This prevents students holding unused carrels for years while others are waiting for a space. She also reported that there are carrels available for short-term use from 1 day to 2 weeks. These are available to grad and undergrad students.

--The library has improved electrical availability through added outlets along the outside wall of the 24-hour study area. She noted that in a recent study they found that every student brings three electronic devices with them to the library. The plug-ins are currently being well-used.

--The Library is repurposing the OIT helpdesk room and the office next to it. This could be a group study or conference room, and it can be reserved. She also noted that the joint conference room on the third floor has been unavailable for over a year, but it will be open again in a few weeks.

--Room 407, the former Sustainability Office is now available and seats 10-12. It can be reserved at the circulation desk, and the library will install whiteboards. (Note: the Department of Developmental Education has already begun to use this space for their Reading/Writing Lab).

--The Library is reviewing/revising their policies to make rooms and equipment more accessible for students and to make checkouts more accountable.

--They are upgrading equipment checked out at the Media Desk, such as laptops, and updating them.

Suzan also told us that she and the head of RIOS went to Atlanta to a library planning workspace workshop. They visited five libraries and gathered ideas such as self-checkout, organization of space, and quiet space. When they returned, they identified places on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor that are better suited for specific activities such as group study, social interaction, individual study, and quiet areas. They are working on getting more furnishings for

group study. The Library has been conducting a survey to keep track of how space is used. Suzan also shared with us a study done in 2005-2006 that recommended a building expansion to expand study areas and provide space for a project like the Learning Commons. At the time, the cost for building expansion was \$5million; now it would be much higher.

She also noted that the Biosciences Library will move into to the Rasmuson Library once they identify available space in Rasmuson.

She noted that various units around campus are already tutoring at the library.

The Alaska Native Language archive has moved to Level 2, so some of the Alaska books moved from level 2 to level 3. When the Biosciences Library moves in, their books will fit on level 5 and 6.

The Kayak Room will be updated with new glass whiteboard during spring break.

We asked if the library computer lab could go to free printing. Suzan will suggest free printing the week before finals.

We discussed the remodeling of Lola Tilly Commons and the availability of space there. Suzan told us that the Sustainability office has moved in there. We asked what is happening to the downstairs at Tilly, but it will need to be renovated once Dining Services has moved out to the new Wood Center space.

Suzan asked if we have seen the Bunnell Collaboration Nook –on the 3rd floor of the Bunnell Building. It has an open computer lab with nice couches, café seating, sectionals, and a counter with places to plug in.

We asked Suzan for a tour of the library spaces she had described, and, since we were in the Kayak Room, we were able to take a walk through. Some of the comments from our walk through discussion included finding locations for Supplemental Instruction group meetings, finding locations for free printing, and finding a coordinator to keep track of use of Learning Commons spaces and activities.

Cindy asked that committee members send her ideas on use of the available space for Learning Commons activities.

**Next meeting:** Friday, March 14, 10-11:30 am.

ATTACHMENT 198/14

UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee  
Meeting Minutes for March 27, 2014**

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

II. Roll call:

Present: Bill Barnes, Cindy Fabbri, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Eric Madsen, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Channon Price, Leslie Shallcross, Amy Vinlove

Excused: Mike Castellini

Absent: Mike Davis

III. Report from Joy

Joy commended the Committee on the Status of Women for their March 11 Roundtable on Mentoring which was nicely done and well attended. Several roundtables were set up with a different mentoring topic to discuss at each table. Attendees moved around to each table to discuss the different issues and best practices in mentoring.

Five faculty members attended the recent Lilly West conference in California, and our own Amy Vinlove presented at the conference. Joy reported that most attendees felt they learned a lot and found it inspiring.

Libby Roderick, Associate Director of Faculty Development at UAA gave a well-attended talk regarding her co-authored book, *Stop Talking: Indigenous Ways of Teaching and Learning* on March 25. Joy has the URL for Libby's lecture and her Power Point slides. Joy is really working with her faculty development counterparts in Anchorage to bring more faculty development opportunities to UAF. She is going to UAA's Faculty Development Awards Breakfast on April 11 to determine if something similar could be done at UAF. In addition, she is looking into bringing a UAA theatre group to UAF to present skits on bullying in the classroom – which is a real problem for Anchorage faculty. C. P. asked if anyone knew what kind of bullying may be occurring on the Fairbanks campus, or who should know? Joy said she would ask Libby Roderick for more information on what UAA has compiled on their campus. Kelly mentioned that if UAF faculty members are experiencing bullying from students then Don Foley would be the person to ask for more information if faculty have reported the issue to him.

Joy informed us that the Research Schmooze is all set up for April 15 with a meeting room and computers. She also let us know that Bob Lucas will be leading workshops on Scholarly Writing and an Intro to Proposal writing on April 25 from 1:00 – 4:00 pm and all day Saturday, April 26 respectively.

There was a question regarding which faculty members are attending faculty development presentations. We wondered if Joy had a breakdown of the number of faculty from each department. Joy said she may do a breakdown by College for her annual report to the Provost and would share this with the FDAI Committee.

IV. Updates on Electronic Course Evaluation Report

Eric presented the Report findings to Faculty Senate and there was some discussion online afterwards. The goal now is to have Faculty Senate approve a motion to endorse the move to electronic course evaluations. C.P. moved that this be done and it was seconded. Franz read the draft of the motion, and after some discussion, we decided to clarify the three parts of the motion and change the order to 1) the ECE work group recommends that UAF move to electronic course evaluations; 2) the ECE work group recommends eXplorance/Blue as the new vendor; and 3) a new work group should be formed to design, oversee and evaluate a pilot of the new system to determine

methods for implementing it at UAF (summarized). Franz will revise the motion, email it to our committee and has asked that we respond electronically before noon tomorrow (Friday, March 28) so that he can take it to the Administrative Committee meeting later in the day. In addition, we voted that a second motion will be written recommending that Eric and Franz be included in the leadership of the new work group. Franz will email a draft of this to our committee in the near future.

#### V. Evaluation of Unit Peer Review Committee Criteria and Composition

Franz reported that the Unit Criteria Committee will take the lead on this issue, but they will inform him of their work so he may report updates to the FDAI Committee. While we felt the FDAI Committee should be involved, we also felt that as it was beyond our purview, we should not take the lead. Faculty Senate decided not to try to combine two committees to work on this issue. Joy suggested that of member of the Faculty Affairs Committee also be involved as well.

#### VI. Other Business

Amy shared some information with us from an interesting presentation she attended at the Lilly West Conference on some new software being developed at Cal Tech that allows students to become more involved with their professors' Power Point presentations via iPads. While the product is not ready for release yet, it does show much promise in encouraging students to add slides with questions or extra notes on them. Amy will forward the slides from the presentation to Franz who will in turn forward them on to our committee members.

We briefly touched on the budget challenge that UAF is facing. Franz told us that a committee has been formed to prioritize increment requests and evaluate/prioritize cuts to the budget. Latest developments regarding this topic will be provided during the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting.

#### VII. Upcoming Events

- a. Next FDAI meeting: 4-24-14 from 4-5:00 pm
- b. Administrative Committee meeting: 3-28-14
- c. Faculty Senate meeting: 4-7-14

#### VIII. Adjourned at 5:05 pm

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

-----

### **UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee Meeting Minutes for February 20, 2014**

I. Franz Meyer called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm.

II. Roll call:

Present: Bill Barnes, Mike Castellini, Mike Davis, Cindy Fabbri, David Fazzino, Andrea Ferrante, Kelly Houlton, Eric Madsen, Trina Mamoon, Franz Meyer, Joy Morrison, Channon Price  
Excused: Leslie Shallcross, Amy Vinlove

III. Report from Joy

After we welcomed Joy back, she informed us that she has sent out the OFD February agenda to all new faculty as well as to faculty that are still relatively new to UAF. She is cutting back on the number of the OFD emails by

sending out a monthly agenda to a filtered email list for specific groups of faculty. Joy reported that she is meeting with all new faculty during February – either face to face or via online.

Joy mentioned that the weekly Tuesday, 1:00 – 2:00 pm time slot is still being used for departmental meetings so some faculty are unable to attend the OFD's arranged presentations.

Joy reported that the Faculty Learning Communities formed last fall are going really well with 8 – 12 people in each of the six groups. She credits the facilitators with keeping up the momentum. Mike C. asked for a quick summary of some of the meetings Joy has sat in on. Joy responded that the groups meet for 90 minutes, and the members of the Learning Community that is looking at Flipping the Classroom all bought some kind of technology to use in their classrooms. After reading books on it and presenting their learnings during the fall semester, they have all implemented their various technologies in their respective classes this spring. Joy also noted that another FLC comprised mostly of CLA and Engineering faculty was currently meeting on how to write a good Annual Activities Report as just one of their topics.

Joy informed us that she has just signed another contract with Bob Lucas, so he will be coming to Fairbanks again.

Since UNAC has a new CBA there has been some confusion regarding their OFD funding. Joy reports that UNAC travel funding will be going to the Provost in the future.

The previously-titled Faculty Speed Dating event is now called a Research Schmooze and will take place April 15 on West Ridge from 1:00 – 2:00 pm. Joy has been working with the Office of Sponsored Programs to put the event together. They are hoping for 30 – 40 participants and have about 10 so far. Eric noted that the new electronic Annual Activities Reporting software, Faculty 180, allows faculty to search for research interests amongst their fellow faculty members. Joy indicated that she wants to learn about this so she can show faculty how to go about it. Eric said he would send out an email to the FDAI Committee with instructions. Franz mentioned that Madara Mason of eLearning and Distance Education did a similar Schmooze event to pair research faculty with instructional designers and has written up the results on their website. Joy opined that it would be a good idea to have someone from eLearning on our committee as a permanent member. We all agreed and Franz will let Madara know our next meeting dates/times for the remainder of the semester.

Joy informed us that she still meets with candidates for new faculty positions to let them know what UAF has to offer. C.P. indicated that if this interaction was a factor for new faculty accepting a position at UAF, then Deans and Directors should be made aware of the importance of this service offered by OFD.

Joy also let us know that faculty have been asking her when UAF will be switching to electronic course evaluations as they are tired of waiting so long for their results – which was a perfect segue for the next item on our agenda.

#### IV. Discussion on Electronic Course Evaluation Report

Franz explained that the report has two main components: 1) a summary of the work that has been done up to this point along with the recommendations of the workgroup that UAF switch to eXplorance/Blue as the new course evaluation vendor; and 2) recommendations on transitioning to a new electronic/paper hybrid system along with what kinds of side-effects may be encountered. He shared that he had received comments on the report draft from 5 – 6 FDAI members and would be sharing the progress of the report with the Administrative Committee at their meeting tomorrow. The plan is to present the finished report to Faculty Senate in March and propose a vote in April. If the Senate approves, the report will then go to the Provost. Joy asked if there was a plan for testing the recommended product. Eric answered that it is too early in the process to tell but presumably it would be tested by a college or department first. He also informed us that the company itself (eXplorance/Blue) has recommendations on how to begin the transition if UAF decides to make the switch.

## V. Discussion on Faculty Speed Dating Event

We already discussed this during Joy's report (see III above).

## VI. Other Business

Mike C. shared information regarding post docs: A new SFOS faculty member in Juneau is setting up a Post-Doctoral Development Session and would like to get the information out to all UA post docs and faculty. Joy said she will facilitate a meeting with the aforementioned faculty member when she comes to visit UAF.

Mike C. asked about the possible re-naming of our committee, and Franz informed us that we are waiting for the Administrative Committee to make their decisions regarding the proposed mission statements, after which we will again visit the discussion on a possible name change.

Franz indicated that the FDAI Committee was instrumental in bringing the issues some Peer Review committees were experiencing to the attention of Provost Henrichs. He said that the Provost agreed with our suggestion that FDAI be involved in the process of resolving the issues but that our committee should not lead the effort.

## VII. Upcoming Events

- a. Next FDAI meeting: 3-27-14 from 4-5:00 pm
- b. Administrative Committee meeting: 2-21-14
- c. Faculty Senate meeting: 3-3-14

## VIII. Adjourned at 5:10 pm

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 198/15  
UAF Faculty Senate #198, April 7, 2014  
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes for 2/17/14**

Attending: Christina Chu, Elisabeth Nadin, Laura Bender, Jayne Harvie, John Yarie, John Eichelberger, Mike Daku, Donie Bret-Harte, Amy Lovecraft, Vince Cee

I. Minutes from GAAC's meeting of February 10, 2014 were passed

II. GAAC passed the following course changes and proposals (some of these by email following the meeting):

**24-GPCh.:** Program Change: [PhD - Mathematics](#)

**3-GPCh.:** Program Change: **MS and PhD – Geophysics**

**7-GPCh.:** Program Change: [MS and PhD - Environmental Chemistry](#)

**12-GCCh.:** Course Change: [FISH F412/612 - Human-Environment Research Methods](#)

**47-GNC:** New Course: [BIOL F6xx - Advanced Immunology](#)

III. GAAC discussed [MATH F6xx - Topics in Geometry](#) further and also the proposed [Graduate Certificate in Resilience and Adaptation](#). Both of these proposals need modifications. The proposers will be contacted.