

**MINUTES****UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #64**

MONDAY, MAY 13, 1996

WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

I The meeting was called to order by President Heyne at 1:35 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Alexander, B.  
 Bandopadhyay, S. (Ogbe, D.)  
 Bischak, D.  
 Biswas, N.  
 Braddock, J.  
 Carlson, R.  
 Craven, J.  
 Creed, J.  
 Curda, L.  
 Hallsten, D.  
 Heyne, E.  
 Illingworth, R.  
 Jennings, M.  
 Juday, G.  
 Lynch, D.  
 McBeath, G.  
 McFadden, T. (Tumeo, M.)  
 Morgan, J.  
 Nance, K.  
 Perkins, M.  
 Pippenger, M.  
 RaLonde, R.  
 Schatz, M.  
 Seifert, R.  
 Summerville, S.  
 Swazo, N.  
 Thomas, D.  
 Walworth, J

Members Absent:

Beget, J.  
 Gerlach, C.  
 He'bert, M.  
 Kelley, J.  
 Layer, P.  
 McLean-Nelson, D.  
 Reynolds, J.  
 Wade, C.  
 Weingartner, T.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gregory, G.  
 Keating, J.  
 Layral, S.  
 Wadlow, J.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wheeler, C. - President, ASUAF  
 Hedahl, G. - Dean, CLA  
 Tremarello, A - Director, A&R

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

1 graduate student  
 Alexander, V. - Dean, SFOS  
 Scholle, M. - President, UAFSC

B. The minutes to Meeting #63 (April 22, 1996) were approved as corrected. There was an error in Don's report to the Senate on the April Regents meeting. The proposed facility near Auke Bay is to be a Fisheries and Ocean Science Facility. Don apologies to colleagues in Southeastern and in the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences.

C. The agenda was approved as distributed via e-mail.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions approved:

1. Motion to recommend the adoption of a policy on evaluating educational effectiveness.

B. Motions pending: none

III Remarks by Chancellor Joan Wadlow -

The Chancellor spent a few minutes talking about the alternative assignment list. The Chancellor received a suggestion a few months ago that we observe at UAF the minimum enrollment levels for course that are taught. We do have some courses with less than the minimum. This led to the idea that maybe faculty ought to know what are some of the needs at UAF that are not being met that might be alternative assignments if someone's class didn't enroll the minimum number. In most instances the department chair or the school dean would be the one to come up with some sort of alternative assignment. There might be plenty of them available in the unit, but she also thought that there might be some opportunities throughout the whole university that faculty might not be aware of. This are real needs that will have to be addressed. She saw it as a list that might have some appeal to some faculty. She would be delighted to see the list grow from suggestions from the faculty. Suggestions from the Provost's subcommittee will also serve to augment whatever ideas the departments have for alternative assignment when classes don't meet the minimum enrollments.

Commencement weekend was glorious. The renewal of housing has begun. There was a nice reception for the honorary degree recipients. Commencement went smoothly, thanks to the efforts of a lot of people. As we send these students away with their certificates and degrees, and as we look to fall 1996, we need to replace them. So once again the major subject that is so time consuming for all of us is the matter of enrollment at UAF. We have taken a lot of steps and faculty have done marvelous things in establishing contacts with high school students, lecturing in their classes, meeting them in different ways, and mentoring. The telethon has been very productive, new types of publications have been praised by the readers. Our retention rate is improving and that is due primarily to our efforts on campus. There are a lot of promising signs for fall's enrollment, however, at this point the number of students who are enrolling is still lagging behind. UAF might still have level enrollment, but there is a lot more work to do and this will require a major effort on the part of a lot of us. The Chancellor is not pleased with the most recent figures regarding the percentage of students who enrolled at UAF in the fall of 1996 relative to the number of high school graduates in the state. One of the predictors we have of how many students we might get and how well we are doing is to look at the historical rate or percentage we get from the graduating classes of that year. It dropped in the fall of 1995 and so we have to work on that also. The Chancellor is eager to receive ideas.

Michael Pippenger asked about the policy on minimum class size. The Chancellor indicated that she was given the policy promulgated by the former chancellor Howard Cutler. From her standpoint it is subject to review and revision. Keating indicated that he had surveyed deans, asking what their policies were in their different colleges. Most knew what the policy was and had different way of dealing with it. The current policy is 100-level courses have a minimum of 20 students, a 200-level course is 12 students, 300-level is 10 students, 400-level is 8 students, and graduate level is 6 students. These are under review by a subcommittee. Two senate members attended the last meeting. Ron Illingworth indicated that the policy was developed prior to the reorganization of the university system. What was appropriately decided for the Fairbanks campus at that time did not include what would be appropriate for the community colleges which are now the rural campuses of UAF. Any numbers should be appropriate for the rural classes and distance delivery classes.

Remarks by Provost Jack Keating -

Provost Keating indicated that the central equity committee should complete its work on Thursday and have those reports back to the faculty. The Provost has approved four of the units<sup>1</sup> policy for their merit reviews. The others are about ready to come in. The Provost is urging all the units to make sure all the work is done for both merit and equity before the contract period ends. The merit and equity raises will be retroactive to January 1 and may be a lump sum distributed prior to July 1.

The Forestry Program had a very interesting accreditation visit. Hopefully, it will be the first time they are accredited by the Forestry Accreditation.

Michael Pippenger asked about a policy or process for pay increases due to promotion. The Provost indicated that the Regents' policies is that one percent will be used to centrally fund promotions. However, the Regents asked to review their policy after it had been in place for one year. All of the policies the Regents are looking at concerning faculty have been pulled from the June agenda and will not be considered until after the election for the union. Eric asked for clarification on the benefits accompanying pay raises. The Provost indicated that the total salary and benefits would have to be paid out of the pool of funds.

#### IV Governance Reports

##### A. ASUAF - C. Wheeler, President

Catherine Wheeler, the newly elected President of ASUAF, gave the report. ASUAF reported an 11% voter turnout for the 1996 ASUAF presidential elections. The average voter turnout is between 5% and 15% and the 11% is the highest voter turnout in three years. They are, however, investigating ways to improve voter turnout and increase student involvement at ASUAF. They are constructing flyers and information boards to be posted around campus at the beginning of fall semester than explains what ASUAF does, where the activity fee money is spent, and how students can get involved. It will include information on how students can participate in ASUAF and campus activities even if they don't have a lot of time.

The Academic Affairs Committee of the ASUAF Senate is currently working on increased hours for the English Departments Writing Center during the last two weeks of the semester prior to final examinations. A bill will be presented to the ASUAF Senate in the fall (new fiscal year) to fund the additional 24 hours. The majority of the Senate is in favor of this proposal as it is of great benefit to the students and can be accomplished at a minimal cost. If this program proves successful, the ASUAF Senate will again fund increased hours for the Spring '97 semester.

Due to budget cuts within ASUAF there is no summer executive position this summer, however, Catherine will be in the office several times each week. If anyone needs to contact Catherine they can reach her through the ASUAF office number.

##### B. Staff Council -

No report was available, however, Don announced the Staff Council picnic on June 7th and the Carolyn Sampson Memorial Scholarship raffle. Tickets can be purchased from any Staff Council member.

## C. President's Report - E. Heyne

Eric indicated that his report was attached to the agenda and also included correspondence with Chancellor Wadlow.

## D. Faculty Alliance meeting - D. Lynch

Don's report was attached to the agenda. Don indicated that several significant items in the Alliance meeting included the major policies concerning faculty. These were not considered by the Statewide Academic Council because of the potential union vote. The Alliance also reported on the reorganization in Anchorage and Southeast. The working relationship in the Alliance have been quite excellent this year and he assumes they will continue. Phil Slattery from Sitka was elected spokesperson for the coming year. Eric Heyne indicated that Michael Jennings has agreed to stay on as the third Alliance member next year along with John Craven and Don Lynch.

## E. Report on the Western States Association of Faculty Governance Conference - M. Jennings

Michael Jennings attended the WSAFG Conference April 29-30, 1996 along with Phil Slattery, President, UAS Faculty Senate; Dennis Russell, President-elect, UAS Faculty Senate; and Pat Ivey, Statewide Governance. Topics of discussion at the conference included subjects such as Faculty Governance and Public Policy Outreach, Cyberspace Resources for Faculty, Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, Virtual University, Evaluation of Administrative performance, and Intellectual Property Policies. Phil and Dennis summarized the presentations in a report which was distributed as a handout. Mike indicated that most of the universities attending the conference did not have faculty development offices to assist faculty in developing multi-media delivery systems. Linkage to legislature--faculty at a number of western institutions have taken it upon themselves to deal directly with elected officials. Not in opposition to their administrations, but they frequently have different agenda items.

## V Public Comments/Questions - none

## VI Old Business

## A. Ratify motion to approved list of 1996 degree candidates, approved by Administrative Committee, May 3, 1996

The Administrative committee approved the motion at their May 3 meeting because the Senate would not be meeting prior to graduation. The motion was ratified by the full senate without any objections.

MOTION  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends to the Board of Regents that the attached list of individuals be awarded the appropriate UAF degrees pending completion of all University requirements. [Note: copy of the list is available in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.]

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: These degrees are granted upon recommendation of

the program faculty, as verified by the appropriate department head. As the representative governance group of the faculty, we are making that recommendation.

\*\*\*\*\*

## VII Discussion Items

### A. Evaluating Educational Effectiveness - D. Thomas

Dana Thomas recalled that on this agenda it was noted that the Chancellor has approved the recent policy on evaluating educational effectiveness. Dana gave a brief presentation that he made to the Board of Regents. Nationally, educational effectiveness is called student outcomes assessment. Outcomes assessment is a process of describing the effects of curriculum and instruction in order to improve performance of students, faculty, programs and institutions. The basic ideas is to collect information in some formal process and use that information for curricular reform. We have all been doing this over time in an anecdotal way, but what is needed at this stage is that we formalize it.

Evaluating educational effectiveness is an accreditation requirement and professional obligation. It should contain something useful to us in continuing improvement. Northwest Association has a suggested list of areas to be evaluated which includes: student information (demographics), mid-program assessment (Core Curriculum); end of program assessment; program review and specialized accreditation; alumni satisfaction and loyalty; dropouts/non-completers; and employment and/or employer satisfaction measures.

The specific requirements of the Northwest Association accreditation are in the proposed 1996 wording of sections 5.C.1, 5.C.2, and 5.C.3. The institution's process in evaluating its education programs are clearly defined, encompassed all of the institution's offerings, are conducted on a regular basis, and are integrated into the institution's overall planning and evaluation plan for the institution's assessment scheme as required by Commission policy 25-Educational Assessment, pages 57-61. All appropriate constituencies are involved in the process, but the faculty is central in developing, implementing, and evaluating the educational program. The institution provides evidence that its evaluation activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning. The institution identifies and publishes the expected learning outcomes for each of its degree and certificate programs. It demonstrates that students who complete their programs, no matter where or how offered, have achieved published learning outcomes.

The proposed policy in the UA system falls within the accreditation requirement standards. The only unique thing is that there is some coordination of the assessment practices among the three MAUs. "To improve the effectiveness of its educational programs and the fulfillment of its mission and objectives, each MAU will regularly undertake studies of the impact of its academic programs on its students and graduates. MAUs will describe achievements expected of their students and adopt reliable procedures for assessing those achievements, and will coordinate assessment practices among MAUs. An annual report on the implementation of assessment practices will be provided to the Board of Regents. Assessment outcomes will be used in program and institutional planning."

Assessment method examples include: placement of graduates; surveys of alumni and employers; standardized tests (such as engineering); exit interviews; student self-evaluation; and course embedded assessment (portfolio or capstone courses). Assessment methods are up to us.

There are four areas to be evaluated: student information;

general education requirements (CORE); certificate and degree programs; and out of class learning and student support services. The plan includes the following schedule. For student information, in the fall of 1996 a team of faculty and student support service staff will review currently available student information. They will suggest additions, deletions, and revisions of student information for use in educational reform and for meeting accreditation requirements. General Education Requirements include UAF's Core and is composed of five areas: communication (written and oral); quantitative reasoning and application; perspectives on the human condition; natural sciences; and library and information skills. The Core Review Committee is currently developing an assessment process for oral communications. Initial data will be conducted this spring and summer in COMM 131X. The completed process will include assessment conducted in UAF's required upper division oral intensive courses. Also in the fall of 1996 teams will begin to develop assessment processes for written communication and Library and Information Skills. In the fall of 1997 and 98 teams will begin to develop assessment processes for the remaining three Core areas. Certificate and Degree Programs: It is hoped that in the fall of 1996 six degree/programs assessment pilot projects will serve as models. UAF has approximately 70 certificate and degree programs. Existing assessment processes in place include music, business administration, social work, and engineering. Teams will be formed in fall 1996 to coordinate the development and implementation process for . evaluating out-of-class learning and student support services. They will need to identify what constitutes out-of-class learning at UAF and suggest methods of evaluation. Rural Student Services is developing a process to assess their impact on the education of the rural and native students they advise.

Question and comments from Senate members included using a degree primarily offered in the rural areas, use of material that is already in place, and incorporating assessment into the existing cycles within units. Dana indicated that this is something that has come to the accrediting institution recently. Our accrediting institution is one of six recognized by the Secretary of Education for institutional accreditation. Of the six, ours is the farthest behind in this regard. We have to do something by the year 2000 when we have our ten-year evaluation by our accrediting institution.

#### VIII Annual Committee Reports

##### A. Curricular Affairs - Dana Thomas

The Curricular Affairs Annual report was attached to the agenda.

##### B. Faculty Affairs - Barbara Alexander

A committee report was attached to the agenda. All through the entire year, Faculty Affairs has discussed issues, designed motions, and provided reports that made it clear to faculty the importance and interrelatedness of all these issues, including dispute resolution, sexual harassment, promotion and tenure review, administrative duties, vote of no confidence, and so forth. This also holds true for the second issue of compensation including equity, merit, unit criteria, faculty evaluation, and teaching effectiveness. The third item of workload and accreditation is something that goes together along with program assessment and faculty evaluation. It is not difficult to see how closely knitted all these programs are. Marginally discussed in the committee was health care. Many of these issues have not been resolved and will need to be worked on in the coming years.

C. Graduate Curricular Affairs - Robert Carlson

A report was attached to the agenda. This was the first year that the duties were split between the two graduate committees. Bob Carlson thought it worked very well and Graduate Curricular Affairs was able to concentration on that part of the graduate program.

D. Scholarly Activities - Paul Layer

A report was attached to the agenda.

E. Committee to Nominate Commencement Speakers and Honorary Degree Recipients - Rudy Krejci

No report was available. However, Eric indicated the report might consist of the May 12th commencement program and their choice of honorary degree recipients. Linda Curda asked who received honorary degrees. The recipients were Joe Usibelli, Sr., Howard Luke, Jill Kerr Conway, and Jay Kertulla.

F. Developmental Studies - Ron Illingworth

The following report was submitted as a handout at the Senate meeting.

Developmental Studies Committee, 1995-96 Annual Report - Ron Illingworth, Chair

The Developmental Studies committee met frequently during this academic year. The primary focus during the year dealt with the climate for learning at all of the UAF campuses. The underlying presumption is that we, as faculty, can have a positive effect on this climate and that there are things which we, as faculty, can do to affect it. Improving the learning climate, we believe, will also increase retention. We have several initiatives in progress at this time. These are ongoing projects which will require adequate time for evaluation and, if appropriate, implementation. Major areas include:

--Enhancing the opportunity for student educational success and retention.

-Better identification of student starting points

-Improving student placement into specific courses

Renorming of the ASSET test. When completed, this will affect student placement into freshman English and Mathematics classes. This action will continue to the Fall semester of 1996 when we anticipate completion.

An evaluation of alternative placement instruments was initiated. ACT's COMPASS placement instrument will be on-site tested during the Fall 96 semester. This instrument allows for application of the placement test at any time during the semester from any networked computer throughout the Fairbanks campus and includes both a diagnostic and a placement function. The rural campuses would have COMPASS installed onto their network system as well. A decision regarding

implementation will be made during the Spring 97 semester. Because of the need to continue to be able to offer paper and pencil placement testing to students, the ASSET placement test would not be eliminated.

-Adapting course delivery to better meet student needs

Development of an introductory level lab-based science course for students with limited pre-college experience with lab intensive science courses was initiated.

Evaluation of the Supplemental Instruction system for possible implementation in a video supplemental instruction (VSI) mode with selected courses for UAF's Fairbanks and rural campuses. VSI is a successful industry initiative which has been adapted for post-secondary use.

-Discussions involving the relationship between student financial aid, grading policies and procedures, and developmental classes.

A survey of the grading policies and practices of other institutions with developmental programs has been implemented.

The National Center for Developmental Education will be queried for research results regarding connections between grading policies and procedures, financial aid, and developmental classes. Information will probably not be available until the Fall 96 semester.

-Development of institutional research data regarding students involved in developmental classes at UAF.

Baseline information is being requested from Institutional Research regarding both UAF and statewide data.

#### G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Diane Bischak

The Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee Annual report was attached to the agenda. They will be finishing up the review of the faculty evaluation of administrators process that was started this year in the fall. Mark Tumeo and DeAnne Hallsten were members of the oversight committee. Mark indicated that they met with the evaluation committee chair for Robert Trent in the School of Mineral Engineering and went over the procedures that were used. One thing discussed was that the procedures seemed adequate and they would like to see them used consistently for all the various evaluators. It was also clear that there was more time needed for the evaluation process.

#### H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - Rich Seifert

The Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement Annual report was attached to the agenda. Rich indicated that they did not meet as often as they wanted. They spend the first part of the year in evaluating and reviewing the process for the Usibelli Awards.

#### I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - Peggy Shumaker



The Graduate School Advisory Committee Annual report was attached to the agenda.

J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - Michael Jennings

Michael had no report from the Legislative & Fiscal Affairs Committee. He introduced a resolution of appreciation for Eric Heyne. The resolution passed without opposition.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

FOR

ERIC HEYNE

Whereas, Eric Heyne has provided inspirational service to the UAF Faculty Senate for more than three years;

Whereas, Eric Heyne has effectively represented the interests of the UAF Faculty Senate in the Faculty Alliance and to the administration of UAF; and

Whereas, Eric Heyne has exercised his superior writing talents on behalf of the Faculty Senate;

Therefore be it resolved, That the UAF Faculty Senate acknowledges the contribution of Eric Heyne and expresses its appreciation for his exemplary service.

Dated this 13th day of May 1996

\*\*\*\*\*

K. Service Committee - Michele Hebert

No report was available.

L. University-wide Promotion/Tenure - John Keller

John Keller submitted the following 1995-1996 Annual Report of the University-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Administrative Committee on May 24. The report consists of four sections: statistical information, comments and recommendations, committee membership, and committee operating rules.

I. Statistical Information

Tenure:

The campus-wide P/T committee evaluated 20 files for tenure not including one late reviewed file. Of these 20 candidates, 7 were in their year of mandatory review. Seventeen were concurrent candidates for promotion to associate professor, two to full professor, and one had previously attained the rank of associate professor and did not apply for promotion. Thirteen files came to the committee with support from all levels. The P/T committee supported 12 of these by unanimous votes, and one with a single dissenting no. Six files had split support at earlier levels. The committee supported two of these by split votes (8 to 1, 6 to 2), and

did not support four others, one by unanimous vote and three by split votes (1 to 7, 3 to 5, and 4 to 4). One file was not supported at any prior level and was not supported by the committee. Table 1 summarizes these data.

Table 1. Tenure Statistics (1995-1996)

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Total number of files     | 20 |
| Concurrent with promotion | 17 |
| Mandatory year            | 7  |

Supported\* by:

|                             |    |
|-----------------------------|----|
| Head, peer, Dir./Dean, P/T  | 14 |
| Peer, Dean, P/T             | 1  |
| Head, Dean                  | 1  |
| Head, Peer                  | 1  |
| Head                        | 1  |
| Peer                        | 1  |
| No support                  | 1  |
| Withdrew after P/T or later | 2  |

\*Equally split votes counted as non-support

#### Promotion:

The campus-wide P/T committee evaluated 40 candidates for promotion, including 17 who were candidates for concurrent tenure. Twenty were candidates for promotion to associate professor or research associate professor, and 20 were candidates for promotion to full professor. Of the 40 files, 30 were supported at all levels of review including the P/T committee. One candidate was supported at all levels except the P/T committee (1 to 8 against). Of the 5 other candidates supported by the P/T committee, two were supported by head and dean, two by peer committee and dean, and one by department head and peer committee. Of the 5 candidates not supported by the P/T committee, one was supported by head, peer committee and dean, two were supported by head and peer committee, one was supported by department head, and one was supported by a split vote of the peer committee. Table 2 summarizes these data.

Table 2. Promotion statistics (1995-1996)

|  |    |    |
|--|----|----|
| Total number of files                        | 40 |    |
| Concurrent with tenure                       | 17 |    |
| To associate or research associate professor | 20 |    |
| To full professor                            |    | 20 |
| Supported* by:                               |    |    |
| Head, peer, dean, P/T                        |    | 30 |
| Head, dean, P/T                              | 2  |    |
| Peer, dean, P/T                              | 2  |    |
| Head, peer, P/T                              | 1  |    |
| Head, peer, and dean                         | 1  |    |
| Head and peer (both split)                   | 2  |    |
| Head   |    | 1  |
| Peer (split)                                 | 1  |    |

\*Equally split votes counted as non-support

The Provost and Chancellor agreed on all cases, except for three tenure cases from the School of Education in which no letter was submitted by the Provost. The Chancellor and P/T committee agreed on all tenure files this year. The Chancellor differed with the P/T

committee in two promotion cases: one in which the committee voted to deny promotion by 1 to 8 vote, and another in which the committee voted to award promotion by a 6 to 3 vote. Table 3 shows the outcomes of these cases.

Table 3. Cases in which the Chancellor (and Provost) and P/T committee reached opposite conclusions on promotion files (1995-1996)

| P/T Committee vote | Chanc & Provost | Chanc & Provost agreed with |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| No (1 to 8)        | Yes             | Head, peer, dean            |
| Yes (6 to 3)       | No              | Peer and dean               |

Statistics from the previous five years, showing the cases in which the Chancellor's decision differed from that of the P/T committee, are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Cases in which the Chancellor and P/T Committee reached opposite conclusions (1991-1995). Data taken from annual reports of the University-Wide P/T Committee.

| Academic year | P/T Committee   | Chancellor | Number of cases |  |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|--|
| 1990-1991     | split           | yes        | 1               |  |
|               | yes             | no         | 2               |  |
|               | no              | yes        | 2               |  |
| 1991-1992     | split           | no         | 1               |  |
|               | yes             | no         | 1               |  |
|               | no              | yes        | 2               |  |
| 1992-1993     | split(maj. neg) | yes        | 1               |  |
|               | no              | yes        | 1               |  |
| 1993-1994     | split(maj. neg) | yes        | 1               |  |
|               | split(maj. pos) | no         | 1               |  |
| 1994-1995     | no              | yes        | 1               |  |
|               | split(maj. neg) | yes        | 1               |  |
|               | split(maj. pos) | no         | 2               |  |

## II. Other Results, Comments, and Recommendations

1. Non-SOI teaching evaluation. During annual reviews, candidates and academic mentors are strongly urged to document candidates' teaching accomplishments with additional tools besides SOI's. This may be in-class evaluations, reviews of teaching materials, videos of teaching activities, or similar items. In each case, a written evaluation should be included in the annual report.

2. Publication information in candidate files. Candidate files are much enhanced by publication lists that include the complete bibliographic information for each publication. Also, it is desirable to include a commentary for each publication that describes the role of the candidate in preparing the manuscript (if it is a multi-author paper), the type and quality of the journal, the editorial review policy of the journal, the citation record for the article, if it is known, and other details that will help reviewers at all levels appreciate the publication.

3. Proposed regulation change concerning P/T committee representation. Current UAF regulations stipulate that the P/T

committee be composed of one representative from each school or college in existence at the beginning of the academic year. However, we recommend that the regulations be revised so that the current membership of the committee be maintained for next year. That is, the new college (comprised of math, CNS, and SOE) would have two representatives (Keller, formerly of CNS and Bennett, formerly of SOE), CLA would have one (W. Benesch), CLA-School of Ed one (W. Parrett), CRA, ACE, SOM, SME, SFOS, and SALRM one each. The consolidation of the various colleges into new ones should not result in a decrease in the size of the P/T committee, which already contains an absolute minimum of disciplinary diversity. The new regulation would perhaps allow two representatives from the new college, with the stipulation that they hail from different sub-units, e.g., one could be from (former) CNS and one from (former) SOE, or, one from math and one from (former) SOE, etc. Thus over time the representation would be averaged over the college. This would dilute slightly the representation of (former) CNS and (former) SOE on the P/T committee, and concentrate slightly the representation of CLA since it is smaller due to the loss of math.

4. Abstentions and minority votes. In the voting of peer committees, UAF regulations do not allow abstentions. If they are recorded in spite of this rule then the P/T requests that the reasons be stated in the report of the peer committee. Also, minority points of view should be expressed in this report, or a separate minority report may be included.

5. Evaluation of research. The report from the peer committee should include an in-depth analysis that reflects the expertise of the committee members in the discipline or disciplines related to the candidate's discipline, especially regarding evaluation of specific items in the candidate's list of publications. For instance, any available data concerning literature citations to the articles, or data concerning the impact factor of the journal the article is published in, should be included in the report. If such data do not exist within a certain discipline, then anecdotal evidence about the type of publication and its quality should be adduced.

6. 1996-1997 P/T Chair. John Keller was re-elected chair of the P/T committee for 1996-1997.

### III. Committee members and alternates

| 1995-1996                 |                 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Members                   | Alternate       |
| Larry Bennett (SOE)       | Deben Das       |
| Michael Castellini (SFOS) | Chuck Crapo     |
| John Gimbel (CLA)         | John Leipzig    |
| T. Harikumar (SOM)        | Kelley Pace     |
| Scott Huang (SME)         | vacant          |
| Meriam Karlsson (SALRM)   | Stephen Dofing  |
| John Keller (CNS)         | John Morack     |
| Jerry Lipka (SOEd)        | Dauna Browne    |
| Kristine Long (ACE)       | Don Quarberg    |
| Joli Morgan (CRA)         | Ruiz Ann Rozell |

| 1996-1997            |              |
|----------------------|--------------|
| Members              | Alternate    |
| Walter Benesch (CLA) | Kes Woodward |
| Larry Bennett (SOE)  | Deben Das    |
| T. Harikumar (SOM)   | Kelley Pace  |
| Scott Huang (SME)    | vacant       |

Meriam Karlsson (SALRM)  
John Keller (CNS)  
Joli Morgan (CRA)  
William Parrett (SOEd)  
Brian Paust (SFOS)  
Sheryl Stanek (ACE)

Stephen Dofing  
John Morack  
Ruiz Ann Rozell  
Dauna Browne  
Dolly Garza  
Don Quarberg

#### IV. Committee operating rules, 1995-1996

##### UAF University-Wide Promotion and Tenure Committee Operating Rules and Procedures, 1995-96

1. The role of this committee is described in a UAF Faculty Senate resolution passed at Meeting #15 on December 8, 1989, from which the following is excerpted:

Therefore be it resolved, That the primary focus of the University-Wide Promotion & Tenure Committee is to: 1) add a recommendation to the file of the candidate where the conclusions of the unit peer review committee do not coincide with the candidate's administrative supervisors (department head, institute director, and/or dean); and 2) review promotion and tenure files to assure that University-wide standards are met, using unit standards and indices as the major benchmarks for review.

2. Committee members are expected to read each file for promotion and tenure and be prepared to discuss each file at a meeting of the full committee. Access to the files is provided during working hours in 315 Signer's Hall. Members requiring evening access may arrange to check out a key from Sheri Layral in the Governance Office, phone 7964.

3. A schedule will be established for discussion of candidate files. The schedule will consider availability of peer review committee presenters and Promotion & Tenure Committee members. The candidates will be notified of the times for consideration of their file, and each may request an open meeting by contacting the Governance Office. The candidate and members of the audience may not participate in the committee discussion of the file unless requested by the Promotion & Tenure Committee chair.

4. Committee members are responsible for assuring their official alternates will attend meetings in their absence, and the committee chair and Governance Office is notified. The alternate assumes all the member's responsibilities with regard to reading files, discussion, and voting.

5. The normal time to consider a candidate will be 30 minutes. Committee members may request additional time. Only materials included in the file, including valid and official minority reports included per peer review committee rules, will be considered.

6. The peer review committee chair or chair's designee will be invited to give a short (5-10 minute) introduction of the candidate's file, and to respond to questions, after which he or she will be excused. The peer chair or designee will not participate in the voting or evaluation of the candidate, and will not be informed of the results of the straw poll.

7. Each member of the committee will then be called on to evaluate the file, beginning with the representative of the candidate's school or college. It is the responsibility of each member to give an independent opinion of the qualifications of each candidate in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and public and

university service. Tenure and associate professor candidates must demonstrate continuing effective performance in their discipline.

8. To minimize time spent on files which have unanimous support at previous levels of review, the Promotion & Tenure Committee may, at its discretion, do an initial straw vote before discussion, but after the presentation of the peer committee chair or designee, based upon the presentation and reading of the files.

9. Only committee members present will vote. No absentee voting will be permitted. However, if a member of the committee is absent, the alternate is permitted to vote unless the alternate has considered the candidate at another level.

10. The committee will record a secret straw vote after each evaluation and discussion. Each committee member will indicate "yes" or "no," as well as rating performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service using a scale of excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The rating in each category is by majority vote or average vote. This rating will be indicated in the letters which will be provided to each candidate. A straw vote may be changed at the final voting in open meeting.

11. The "yes" and "no" results of the straw vote will be announced to the candidate if he/she is present at an open meeting. Open meetings will then end, and the straw vote results, both "yes/no" and ratings, are announced to the committee.

12. The first files to be considered will be candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. When all candidates, have been reviewed, an open meeting will be held to record the final voting. The final vote is by voice vote and will be recorded.

13. A letter will be written for each candidate's file to summary the committee's positive or negative recommendation. The committee chair will assign letters to committee members. It is the responsibility of each committee member to compose a draft letter and submit it to each member for corrections and comments. Because of the short time available, the letters will be drafted as soon as possible after the candidate's file has been reviewed. The letter, along with the record of the vote of each committee member, will be included with the file when it is forwarded to the Office of the Provost

14. After the files for tenure and promotion to associate professor are completed, the committee will consider in the same way the files for full professor. Full professor candidates must demonstrate sustained excellence and recognized leadership in their discipline to qualify for promotion, and must receive a majority rating of very good or better in each of the faculty tripartite (or bipartite) areas of activity.

15. After all files have been reviewed and the voting and letters completed, the committee will submit to the Faculty Senate a report of recommendations and comments related to the process, to help subsequent committees in their deliberations. A chair for next year will be elected.

12/6/95

#### M. Other Committee Reports -

Jin Brown submitted the following annual report for the Core Review Committee as a handout at the Senate meeting.

## Core Review Committee, Annual Report - Jin Brown, Chair

The CORE Review Committee accomplished several useful tasks in the 1995-96 school year.

\*Approved courses in both "O" oral intensive and "W" written intensive areas for the CORE.

\*Approved American Sign Language to act as a language option for the Perspectives on the Human Condition.

\*Approved the change from depth to breadth for GEOS 102 (now GEOS 125).

\*Approved revisions which will simplify petition procedures to the CORE (begins Fall 1996).

\*Approved Communication 300X as an additional option for the CORE ethics course (pending approval by the Senate curricular committee and the Senate).

\*Took on the process, assigned by the Provost, of managing an outcome assessment of the CORE. Pilot assessments will be accomplished in 1996-97 of the English 111X, Library Science 101X, and Communication 131X courses.

\*\*\*\*\*

## IX 1996-97 Faculty Senate Members Take Their Seats

## A. Roll Call of 1996-97 Members

## Members Present:

Barnhardt, C.  
Boone, R.  
Braddock, J.  
Cooper, B.  
Craven, J.  
Creed, J.  
Curda, L.  
Finney, B.  
Gavlak, R.  
Hallsten, D.  
Lynch, D.  
Maginnis, T. (Alexander, B.)  
McBeath, G.  
McFadden, T. (Tumeo, M.)  
Nance, K.  
Nielsen, H.  
Perkins, M.  
Pippenger, M.  
Robinson, T.  
Schatz, M.  
Seifert, R.  
Spell, D.  
Swazo, N.  
Walworth, J.  
Weber, J.

## Members Absent:

Bandopadhyay, S.  
Beget, J.  
Fast, P.  
Gerlach, C.  
Kelley, J.  
McLean-Nelson, D.  
RaLonde, R.  
Reynolds, J.  
Ruess, D.  
Tape, W.  
Wade, C.

## OTHERS PRESENT:

Gregory, G.  
Keating, J.  
Layral, S.  
Wadlow, J.

## B President's Remarks

A statement by Don Lynch was attached to the agenda. Don wished to elaborate on three points. First, if you attend the commencement ceremony you saw what happened. If you attend the departmental honor awards, the Phi Kappa Phi and the Gold Key initiations you would know that this campus has nothing to be ashamed about on the educational side of things. Don complimented the Registrar's office and Ann Tremarello for once again doing a

fantastic job.

Second, Don indicated that if you listened to what was said at the Senate meeting today and have sat through the Alliance meetings and listened to what goes on at the national meetings, about 75-80% of the policies being considered by the Regents affecting us have nothing at all to do with the University of Alaska. They have everything to do with the perceptions of what people believe are going on outside. Twenty-one states are concerned about faculty workloads. We are run by federal and state policies. Most of the thing we hear about are coming out of the federal government. For example, teaching effectiveness and outcomes is being laid on the accreditation society by the federal government.

The next educational fad will not be dedicated to the ever changing mission statement and not dedicated to their own discipline, but dedicated to that particular university, its values, history and its institution. If you look at the history of UAF you will see that is what has made this place strong since 1923. The people who have been dedicated to it, that is what we need to carry us into the future. We need, as a small group of tenured faculty, to bring forth junior faculty in the spirit, traditions, and values of our particular institution. That will be the wave of the future. Whoever follows us will be looking for people and policies designed to keep people at the university and to keep them dedicated to the place. The issues that the Senate will be facing in the coming year are going to be very similar to those we have faced in the recent past. Don intends to concentrate his efforts on the Faculty Alliance. The faculty on the three campuses work very well together. The Faculty Alliance system works and the three senates on most major issues are in agreement with each other and he is looking forward to that process continuing.

#### C. President-Elect's Remarks - John D. Craven

John Craven submitted the following statement as a handout at the Senate meeting.

First, let me congratulate the new members of the Senate on their election as representatives to shared governance at UAF. You have arrived just in time to participate in what could be a year of significant changes for the faculty and for this body. Let me also welcome back those who have elected to continue in spite of what may be coming at us. I will not address here the issue of a union and the upcoming vote, for as my predecessor in this chair stated one year ago, we represent all the members of the faculty, and, as there are many on each side of the union issue, it is not my place at these meeting to take a position on this issue.

I wish here to outline one concern I have with regard to the UAF Faculty Senate: its near invisibility to many of our peers within the faculty. Most faculty members are generally aware of the Faculty Senate's existence and some participate by submitting ballots in the spring for selection of our membership and/or by giving freely of their time to serve on our several permanent committees. However, there appears to be little acknowledgment when it comes to the day-to-day activities of the senate and its committees through which we exercise our participation in shared governance. I believe that this must change, and as a beginning, I will pay particular attention in the next academic year to the obligation of each committee through its chair to announce in advance its meeting time and locations, and I will seek new ways to make this and the work of the committees routinely available to all faculty members who are or may be interested in our work. Several of our committees last year did a large amount of work on our behalf, and what they did does have an impact on each of us and the







Greg Goering, SOM (98)  
 DeAnne Hallsten, CRA (97)  
 Alan Jubenville, SALRM (97)  
 Meriam Karlsson, SALRM (98)  
 Ken Krieg, ACE (98)  
 Jonah Lee, SOE (97)  
 Joe Niebauer, SFOS (97)  
 Olayinka Ogunsola, SME (98)  
 Nag Rao, CLA (97)  
 Richard Stolzberg, CNS (98)  
 Mark Tumeo, SOE (98)  
 Wayne Vandre, ACE (97)  
 Daniel Walsh, SME (97)  
 Craig Wiese, SFOS (98)  
 Barbara Wilson, CRA (98)

#### Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement

Ron Barry, CLA (98)  
 Linda Curda, CRA (97)  
 Wendy Ernst Croskrey, CLA (98)  
 Barry Mortensen, CRA (97)  
 ^David Porter, Dean, SOM  
 Channon Price, CNS (97)  
 Raymond RaLonde, SFOS (97)  
 Tom Robinson, SOM (98)  
 \*Rich Seifert, ACE (97)

#### Graduate School Advisory Committee

Susan M. Henrichs -FS appointee  
 Mark Oswood - FS appointee  
 David Smith -FS appointee  
 Curt Scuberla - Graduate Student  
 \*Peggy Shumaker -Provost appt.  
 Stephen Sparrow -Provost appt  
 John Zarling -Provost appt  
 Ex-Officio: Joe Kan, Graduate Dean  
 John Craven, Senate President-Elect

#### Legislative and Fiscal Affairs

\*Michael Jennings, SOEd (98)  
 Wendy Redman, SW Univ. Rel.  
 Janice Reynolds, CLA (97)  
 ^Robert Trent, Dean, SME  
 Charles Wade, CRA (97)  
 James Walworth, SALRM (97)

#### Service Committee

^Hollis Hall, Director, ACE  
 Don Kramer, SFOS (98)  
 Tara Maginnis, CLA (98)  
 Kara Nance, CLA (98), convener  
 Yinka Ogunsola, SME (98)  
 Diane Ruess, CLA (98)  
 Richard Seifert, ACE (97)  
 Non-University: Herb Smelcer, US BIA  
 Non-University: Vacant

#### University-wide Promotion & Tenure Committee

Walter Benesch, CLA (99); Kes Woodward, alt.  
 Larry Bennett, SOE (98); Deben Das, alt  
 T. Harikumar (98), SOM; Kelley Pace, alt.  
 Scott Huang, SME (97)  
 M. Karlsson, SALRM (98); Stephen Dofing alt.

\*John Keller, CNS (97), John Morack, alt  
 Joli Morgan, CRA (97), Ruiz Ann Rozell, alt.  
 William Parrett, CLA/SOEd (99); Dauna Browne, alt.  
 Brian Paust, SFOS (99), Dolly Garza, alt.  
 Sheryl Stanek, ACE (99), Don Quarberg, alt.

## OTHER COMMITTEES

### Core Review

\*Jin Brown, Speech, CLA (98)  
 Lillian Corti, English, CLA (97)  
 Basil Coutant, Math, CLA (98)  
 D. Hatzignatiou, SME (98)/Dan White, SOE, alt.  
 Tara Maginnis, Humanities, CLA (98)  
 Doug Schamel, CNS (98)  
 Janice Reynolds, BSHS, CRA (97)  
     Student, ASUAF  
 Ex-Officio: ^Gorden Hedahl, Dean, CLA  
               Sue McHenry, RSS

### \*Chairs

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Motion to empower the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate during the summer months, submitted by Administrative Committee

The motion passed with no objection.

### MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to empower the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate until the Senate resumes deliberations in the Fall of 1996 on all matters within its purview which may arise. Senators will be kept informed of the Administrative Committee meetings and will be encouraged to attend and participate in these meetings.

EFFECTIVE: May 13, 1996

RATIONALE: This motion will allow the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate so that necessary work can be accomplished and will also allow Senators their rights to participate in the governance process.

\*\*\*\*\*

### XI Discussion Items

#### A. Report on Distance Delivery - J. Craven

A report was attached to agenda. John said it would be very difficult for him to argue with any faculty member that we are set up for the 21st century in distance delivery when we can't even communicate through simple telephone with our colleagues in this Senate. He asked the Provost for financial assistance wiinth organizing a basic audio system for communications between campuses for more than two people so that we can carry out our business effectively.

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Changes to student athlete and other financial aid policies - T. Robinson

The Intercollegiate Athletics Committee submitted the following motion to the Governance Coordinating Committee for approval and it was forwarded to the Chancellor. This motion will bring the academic eligibility for student athletes into the same review period as used by other areas of the university. This was an informational item presented by Tom Robinson, chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.

MOTION  
=====

The UAF Governance Coordinating Committee moved to approve the recommendation by the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee that the enforcement of academic eligibility for student athletes participation be applied on the same period of review as used by Financial Aid at the University of Alaska Fairbanks for all student receiving aid, and that the evaluation period being the academic year.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor's Approval

RATIONALE: The consideration of academic eligibility conforms to the NCAA rules currently in place and may be amended by the NCAA as follows: A mandatory study hall will be established for the 1996-97 academic year. This study hall will incorporate teaching study skills, note-taking, class performance and enforced quiet-time to complete necessary homework. Rick Goeb, Compliance Coordinator and Academic Advisory indicated that the mandatory study hall would be for all student athletes with a GPA below 2.5, all freshmen, and JV transfers.

\*\*\*\*\*

C. University Benefits - M. Tumeo

Mark Tumeo introduced a resolution asking the Board of Regents to keep the existing domestic partnership benefits program in place. This issue will be discussed at the June 13-14, Board of Regents meeting. Dave Spell spoke against the resolution and proposed a motion to refer it to the Faculty Affairs Committee. After considerable debated the motion to refer failed with 3 yes votes. The resolution then passed with 4 nays.

RESOLUTION  
=====

WHEREAS, The University of Alaska is dedicated to promoting an environment of non-discrimination and fairness in which all employees, staff and students are treated equally; and

WHEREAS, The establishment of domestic partnership benefits programs has been used by top institutions and companies around the country to attract and retain highly qualified employees (over 450 companies and 100 institutions of higher education, both public and private, including Princeton, Harvard, the University of South Carolina, the University of South Dakota, Stanford, and the University of Iowa, offer similar domestic partnership programs); and

WHEREAS, The University of Alaska, last September instituted a

Domestic Partnership benefits program that has not resulted in economic or administrative impacts; and

WHEREAS, The cost of continuing the domestic partnership program already in place is less than 0.5% of all the benefits costs incurred by the University per year (\$88,000 out of \$18 million) and has increased the number of people insured by less than 1%; and

WHEREAS, The current and continuing advantages of the domestic partnership benefits program are the creation of a fairer and less discriminatory workplace environment, and improved morale among faculty and staff who feel more fairly treated and valued;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate of the University of Alaska Fairbanks requests that the Board of Regents leave the existing domestic partnership benefits program in place and take no action to remove or reduce benefits provided to bona fide domestic partners, spouses and legal dependents of UA employees.

## XII Members' Comments/Questions

Don Lynch asked that each member at the Senate meeting introduce themselves. Linda Curda from Bethel expressed a desire to repeat this at the first face-to-face meeting of the Senate in the fall.

## XIII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Tapes of this Faculty Senate meeting are in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall if anyone wishes to listen to the complete tapes.

Submitted by Sheri Layral, Faculty Senate Secretary.