

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Jayne Harvie

474-7964 jbharvie@alaska.edu

For Audioconferencing:

Toll-free #: 1-800-893-8850

Participant PIN: 1109306

A G E N D A

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #174

Monday, April 4, 2011

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

1:00	I	Call to Order – Jonathan Dehn	5 Min.
	A.	Roll Call	
	B.	Approval of Minutes to Meeting #173	
	C.	Adoption of Agenda	
1:05	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
	A.	Motions Approved:	
		1. Motion to Allow Foreign Language Test Exemption and Core Credit Waiver for Qualifying Foreign Students	
		2. Motion to Address Faculty Concerns about Electronic Student Evaluations	
	B.	Motions Pending:	
		1. Motion to Approve the DANSRD Unit Criteria	
1:10	III	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
1:15	IV	A. President's Comments – Jonathan Dehn	5 Min.
		B. President-Elect's Report – Cathy Cahill	5 Min.
1:25	V	A. Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers	5 Min.
		B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs	5 Min.
1:35	VI	Governance Reports	5 Min.
	A.	Staff Council – Maria Russell	
	B.	ASUAF – Robert Kinnard	
	C.	UNAC – Jordan Titus	
		UAFT – Jane Weber	
1:40	VII	Guest Speaker	
	A.	Mark Myers, Vice Chancellor for Research	20 Min.
2:00	BREAK		
2:10	VIII	Announcements	5 Min.
	A.	Faculty Forum Discussions on General Education Requirements - April 7. Flyer: http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/	
	B.	Advanced Mediation Seminar – April 11-13.	

- Flyer and registration at: <http://www.uaf.edu/oeo/mediation/>
 C. Promotion and Tenure Workshop on April 29.
 Flyer and information at:
http://www.uaf.edu/files/uafgov/2011_Promotion-Tenure-Workshop.pdf
 D. Campus Research Day on May 5.
 Information at:
<http://www.uaf.edu/research/studentsindex/opportunities/researchday.xml>

2:15 IX New Business 25 Min.

- A. Motion to Approve the A.A.S. in Paramedicine, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 174/1)
- B. Motion to Amend the Bylaws of the UAF Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership, submitted by Faculty Affairs (Attachment 174/2)
- C. Motion to Reaffirm the Fisheries Division Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 174/3)
- D. Resolution to Ratify Election of President-Elect (Attachment 174/4)
- E. OSYA Confirmation, submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee (Attachment 174/5)

2:40 X Committee Reports 15 Min.

- A. Curricular Affairs – Rainer Newberry, Chair (Attachment 174/6)
- B. Faculty Affairs – Jennifer Reynolds, Chair (Attachment 174/7)
- C. Unit Criteria – Perry Barboza, Ute Kaden, Co-Chairs
- D. Committee on the Status of Women – Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 174/8)
- E. Core Review Committee – Latrice Laughlin, Chair
- F. Curriculum Review – Rainer Newberry, Chair
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – Charlie Sparks, Chair
- H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Josef Glowka, Chair (Attachment 174/9)
- I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee –Ken Abramowicz, Chair (Attachment 174/10)
- J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Cindy Hardy, Chair (Attachment 174/11)
- K. Research Advisory Committee – Orion Lawlor, Roger Hansen, Co-Chairs

2:55 XI Members' Comments/Questions 5 Min.

3:00 XII Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 174/1
UAF Faculty Senate #174, April 4, 2011
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the A.A.S in Paramedicine.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2012
 Upon Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: See the full program proposal #38-UNP from the Fall 2010 review cycle on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Requires 69-73 credits comprised of A.A.S. degree requirements, and 6 credits for Emergency Medical Technician, 8 credits in Clinical Rotation, 24 credits in Paramedicine, 12 credits in Paramedic Internship, and 8 credits in Anatomy and Physiology and/or Biology core courses.

BRIEF STATEMENT OF PROPOSED PROGRAM

Program Goals

1. Brief identification of objectives and subsequent means for their evaluation

The Mission Statement of the Paramedic Program is to educate paramedic students to be competent entry-level paramedics. The program strives to produce paramedics with outstanding clinical abilities who will be prepared to enter the health professions workforce and be eligible for National certification and an Alaska paramedic license.

To reach the goal of the mission statement the following objectives will be met by the paramedic students at the end of this educational program:

Cognitive Domain: Upon completion of the program students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend, apply and evaluate clinical information to their role as paramedics. (Assessments: Exam, quiz and class assignment scores)

Psychomotor Domain: Upon completion of the program the student will demonstrate the technical proficiency in all skills necessary to fulfill their role as a paramedic. (Assessments: Skill Sheets, Preceptor Evaluations (including evaluation of run reports) review of Clinical Logs)

Affective Domain: Upon completion of the program the student will demonstrate personal behaviors consistent with professional and employer expectations for a paramedic. (Assessments: Professional Behavior Assessment, Preceptor Evaluations)

2. Relationship of program objectives to "Purposes of the University"

The University has a long-standing interest in educating individuals to meet workforce needs in Alaska. Paramedics work for fire departments, hospitals, flight services and other entities engaged in emergency medicine. Further, the Strategic Plan 2010 seeks to increase participation in experiential learning. The proposed Emergency Medical Services AAS includes experiential learning in each of the practicum courses – a total of 36 credit hours. The proposed AAS is also related to statements in Vision 2017, including:

- Emphasize development of career and employability skills throughout UAF curriculum with active involvement of potential employers.
- Identify career pathways and clusters appropriate to all UAF programs, consistent with U.S. Department of Labor categories.
- Ensure basic competencies of all UAF students in communication, computation and critical thinking.

In addition, the proposed AAS is part of a career ladder that begins with tech-prep courses in high school (including a health careers track at Hutchison High School), the paramedic academy, the AAS in Emergency Medical Services, and the Bachelor's of Emergency Management.

3. Occupational/other competencies to be achieved

Fulfill didactic and clinical competency requirements for students to sit for national paramedic exam and become licensed paramedics

Ensure basic competencies of all UAF students in communication, computation and critical thinking.

Proposed Catalog Layout:

Emergency Medical Services

College of Rural and Community Development
Community and Technical College

907-455-2853

www.ctc.uaf.edu/programs/emergency/

A.A.S. Degree

Minimum Requirements for Degree: 69 - 73 credits

The UAF emergency medical services program offers students excellent didactic instruction, clinical experiences, state of the art simulation labs, and practical vocational experience for the student seeking to become a paramedic. Upon completion of the program, the paramedic graduate will demonstrate competency in the following terminal objectives:

1. Be able to safely manage the scene of an emergency.
2. Apply the basic concepts of development, pathophysiology and pharmacology to assessment and management of emergency patients.
3. Establish and/or maintain a patent airway, oxygenate and ventilate a patient.
4. Integrate pathophysiological principles and assessment findings to formulate a
 - field impression and implement a treat plan for:
 - the trauma patient
 - the medical patient
 - neonatal, pediatric, and geriatric patients, diverse patients, and chronically ill patients.
 - patients with common complaints.
5. Take a proper history and perform a comprehensive physical exam on any patient, and communicate the findings to others.
6. Be able to properly administer medications.
7. Be able to communicate effectively with patients,
8. Complete a comprehensive paramedic examination with a minimum score of 80%.

At the completion of the paramedic course, students are able to participate in the national paramedic exam. After receiving their national certification, students can apply for their paramedic license through the Alaska State Medical Board.

Special admission requirements include:

The applicant completes an application prior to being admitted into the paramedic course. The applications are reviewed by the program's medical director and advisory board. This application process ensures the applicants selected do not have a background of criminal activity which would inhibit them from being licensed in the state.

Other special requirements are:

Current EMT-basic certification: EMS 170, "Emergency Medical Technician I."
Complete HLTH 114, "Fundamentals of Anatomy and Physiology."

Major -- A.A.S. Degree
Emergency Medical Services

1. Complete the general university requirements.
2. Complete the A.A.S. degree requirements.
3. Complete the following program (major) requirements:*
EMS F170--EMT: Emergency Medical Technician I--6 credits
EMS F181--Clinical Rotation I--4 credits
EMS F183--Clinical Rotation II--4 credits
EMS F280--Paramedicine I--12 credits
EMS F282--Paramedicine II--12 credits
EMS F283--Paramedic Internship--12 credits
HLTH F114--Fundamentals of Anatomy and Physiology (4)
or BIOL F111X and F112X--8 credits
4. Minimum credits required: 69 - 73 credits

*Student must earn a C (2.0) grade or better in each course.

Budget Resource Commitment Form

Resources	Existing	New		Total
	College/School	College/School	Others (Specify)	
Regular Faculty (FTE's & dollars)	1.5 FTE \$159,808	0		1.5FTE \$159,808
Adjunct Faculty (FTE's & dollars)	1.82 \$53,286	0		1.82 \$53,286
Program Assistants (Headcount)	6	0		6
Instructional Facilities (in dollars and/or sq. footage)	1,640 sq. ft.	0		1,640 sq. ft.
Office Space (Sq. footage)	771 sq. ft.	0		771 sq. ft.
Lab Space (Sq. Footage)	843 sq. ft.	0		843 sq. ft.
Computer & Networking (in dollars)	\$12,320	0		\$12,320
Research/ Instructional/ office Equipment (in dollars)	\$49,000	0		\$49,000
Support Staff (FTE's & dollars)	\$39,942	0		\$39,942
Supplies (in dollars)	\$38,435	0		\$38,435
Travel (in dollars)	\$6,565	0		\$6,565



Board of Regents Program Action Request
University of Alaska
 Proposal to Add, Change, or Delete a Program of Study
 (University Regulation R10.04.020)

1a. Major Academic Unit (choose one) UAF	1b. School or College CTC	1c. Department Paramedicine																																								
2. Complete Program Title Associate of Applied Science, Paramedicine																																										
3. Type of Program ☐ Undergraduate Certificate ☒ AA/AAS ☐ Baccalaureate ☐ Post-Baccalaureate Certificate ☐ Masters ☐ Graduate Certificate ☐ Doctorate																																										
4. Type of Action ☐ Add ☒ Change ☐ Delete		5. Implementation date (semester, year) Fall, 2011																																								
6. Projected Revenue and Expenditure Summary. Not Required if the requested action is deletion. (Provide information for the 5 th year after program or program change approval if a baccalaureate or doctoral degree program; for the 3 rd year after program approval if a master's or associate degree program; and for the 2 nd year after program approval if a graduate or undergraduate certificate. If information is provided for another year, specify (1st) and explain in the program summary attached).																																										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Projected Annual Revenues in FY 12</th> <th colspan="2">Projected Annual Expenditures in FY 12</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">Unrestricted</td> <td>Salaries & benefits (faculty and staff)</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>General Fund</td> <td>\$</td> <td>Other (commodities, services, etc.)</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Student Tuition & Fees</td> <td>\$</td> <td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indirect Cost Recovery</td> <td>\$</td> <td>One-time Expenditures to Initiate Program (if >\$250,000)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>TVEP or Other (specify):</td> <td>\$</td> <td>(These are costs in addition to the annual costs, above.)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Restricted</td> <td>Year 1</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Federal Receipts</td> <td>\$</td> <td>Year 2</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TVEP or Other (specify):</td> <td>\$</td> <td>Year 3</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL REVENUES</td> <td>\$</td> <td>Year 4</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Projected Annual Revenues in FY 12		Projected Annual Expenditures in FY 12		Unrestricted		Salaries & benefits (faculty and staff)	\$	General Fund	\$	Other (commodities, services, etc.)	\$	Student Tuition & Fees	\$	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$	Indirect Cost Recovery	\$	One-time Expenditures to Initiate Program (if >\$250,000)		TVEP or Other (specify):	\$	(These are costs in addition to the annual costs, above.)		Restricted		Year 1	\$	Federal Receipts	\$	Year 2	\$	TVEP or Other (specify):	\$	Year 3	\$	TOTAL REVENUES	\$	Year 4	\$
Projected Annual Revenues in FY 12		Projected Annual Expenditures in FY 12																																								
Unrestricted		Salaries & benefits (faculty and staff)	\$																																							
General Fund	\$	Other (commodities, services, etc.)	\$																																							
Student Tuition & Fees	\$	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$																																							
Indirect Cost Recovery	\$	One-time Expenditures to Initiate Program (if >\$250,000)																																								
TVEP or Other (specify):	\$	(These are costs in addition to the annual costs, above.)																																								
Restricted		Year 1	\$																																							
Federal Receipts	\$	Year 2	\$																																							
TVEP or Other (specify):	\$	Year 3	\$																																							
TOTAL REVENUES	\$	Year 4	\$																																							
Page # of attached summary where the budget is discussed, including initial phase-in:																																										
7. Budget Status. Items a., b., and c. indicate the source(s) of the General Fund revenue specified in item 6. If any grants or contracts will supply revenue needed by the program, indicate amount anticipated and expiration date, if applicable.																																										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Revenue source</th> <th>Continuing</th> <th>One-time</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a. In current legislative budget request</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Additional appropriation required</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. Funded through internal MAU redistribution:</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. Funded all or in part by external funds, expiration date</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e. Other funding source Specify Type:</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Revenue source	Continuing	One-time	a. In current legislative budget request	\$	\$	b. Additional appropriation required	\$	\$	c. Funded through internal MAU redistribution:	\$	\$	d. Funded all or in part by external funds, expiration date	\$	\$	e. Other funding source Specify Type:	\$	\$																						
Revenue source	Continuing	One-time																																								
a. In current legislative budget request	\$	\$																																								
b. Additional appropriation required	\$	\$																																								
c. Funded through internal MAU redistribution:	\$	\$																																								
d. Funded all or in part by external funds, expiration date	\$	\$																																								
e. Other funding source Specify Type:	\$	\$																																								
8. Projected enrollments (headcount of majors). If this is a program deletion request, project the enrollments as the program is phased out.																																										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td>Year 1: 25</td> <td>Year 2: 25</td> <td>Year 3: 25</td> <td>Year 4: 25</td> </tr> </table>			Year 1: 25	Year 2: 25	Year 3: 25	Year 4: 25																																				
Year 1: 25	Year 2: 25	Year 3: 25	Year 4: 25																																							
Page number of attached summary where demand for this program is discussed: page 2																																										

9. Number* of new TA or faculty hires anticipated (or number of positions eliminated if a program deletion): <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Graduate TA</td> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adjunct</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Term</td> <td>1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tenure track</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Graduate TA		Adjunct		Term	1.5	Tenure track		10. Number* of TAs or faculty to be reassigned: <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Graduate TA</td> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Adjunct</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Term</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tenure track</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> Former assignment of any reassigned faculty: None For more information see page N/A of the attached summary.	Graduate TA		Adjunct		Term		Tenure track	
Graduate TA																	
Adjunct																	
Term	1.5																
Tenure track																	
Graduate TA																	
Adjunct																	
Term																	
Tenure track																	
11. Other programs affected by the proposed action (please list): <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;">Program Affected</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Anticipated Effect</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Program Affected</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Anticipated Effect</th> </tr> <tr> <td>None</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>None</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		Program Affected	Anticipated Effect	Program Affected	Anticipated Effect	None				None							
Program Affected	Anticipated Effect	Program Affected	Anticipated Effect														
None																	
None																	
Page number of attached summary where effects on other programs are discussed: N/A																	
12. Specialized accreditation or other external program certification to needed or anticipated. List all that apply or 'none': The UAF Paramedic Program is nationally accredited through the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP).	13. Aligns with University or campus mission, goals, and objectives (list): - Responsiveness to State Needs - Increase the types of healthcare providers - Educational Quality - Workforce Training Page in attached summary where alignment is discussed: page 1																
14. State needs met by this program (list): According to the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, a 26 % increase is projected for Paramedic and Emergency Medical Technicians positions. Page in the attached summary where the state needs to be met are discussed: page 1	15. Program is initially planned to be: ☒ Available to students attending classes at UAF campus. ☐ Available to distance students. ☐ Partially available to distance students. (More than one box may be checked if applicable.) Page # in attached summary where distance delivery is discussed: N/A																
Submitted by the University of Alaska Fairbanks with the concurrence of its Faculty Senate.																	
_____ Authorized MAU Signature _____ Date																	
☐ Approved ☐ Disapproved _____ Chair, Academic and Student Affairs Committee _____ Date																	
☐ Approved ☐ Disapproved _____ Chair, Board of Regents _____ Date																	

*Net FTE (full-time equivalents). For example, if a faculty member will be reassigned from another program, but their original program will hire a replacement, there is one net new faculty member. Use fractions if appropriate. Graduate TAs are normally 0.5 FTE. The numbers should be consistent with the revenue/expenditure information provided.

Attachments: ☒ Summary of Degree or Certificate Program Proposal.
☐ Other (optional)

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Senate, Section 1, Article III: Membership. This amendment adds a new subsection *E. Changes in Unit Representation* that specifies how changes in unit representation on the Faculty Senate will be implemented, including changes that occur in during a representative's term of office.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011

RATIONALE: While the existing Bylaws specify how to handle vacancies in existing seats on the Faculty Senate, they do not specify how to implement changes in the number of seats that each unit has, nor changes in unit affiliation of sitting representatives. These issues have arisen in 2010-2011 with the transfer of the Department of Computer Science from CNSM to CEM, and with reapportionment of the Faculty Senate for the first time in at least a decade. The reapportionment takes effect with Faculty Senate elections in Spring, 2011.

The amendment to section *D. Vacancies* broadens the reasons for which an alternate should be appointed to fill a seat on the Faculty Senate. The existing language of the Bylaws, by specifying "death, resignation, or transfer of an elected representative of the Senate," limits appointment of alternates to those circumstances. The addition of "other reason why an elected representative can no longer represent the unit" allows for additional circumstances such as recall (procedure described in section *F. Absenteeism*), a change in unit affiliation of a sitting representative, or other unforeseen events.

The principles underlying the new section *E. Changes in Unit Representation* are: (1) sitting representatives should serve out their terms; and (2) adjustments to the number of representatives for each unit should be made at the time of regularly scheduled elections or by attrition, whichever occurs first.

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

B. Representation shall be by academic or research unit and based on the number of qualifying faculty in each unit as described below.

C. Election Procedure

D. Vacancies

1. In the case of death, resignation, **[[or]]** transfer **[[of an elected representative of the Senate]]**, **OR OTHER REASON WHY AN ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE CAN NO LONGER REPRESENT THE UNIT**, an alternate shall immediately become the

representative. The president of the Senate will appoint a replacement **FROM AMONG THE UNIT'S ELECTED ALTERNATES**, with the concurrence of the affected constituency[[,]] and the consent of the Administrative Committee.

E. CHANGES IN UNIT REPRESENTATION

- 1. CHANGES IN A UNIT'S NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE FACULTY SENATE SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED AT THE TIME OF THE NEXT SCHEDULED ELECTION. REDUCTIONS IN A UNIT'S NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES SHALL BE ACCOMPLISHED BY ATTRITION, AS TERMS EXPIRE. INCREASES IN A UNIT'S NUMBER OF SENATE REPRESENTATIVES SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH ELECTION OF ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIVES AT THE NEXT SCHEDULED ELECTION.**
- 2. REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD SERVE OUT THE TERMS TO WHICH THEY ARE ELECTED. THIS INCLUDES BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO REPRESENTATIVES WHO HOLD OFFICE AT A TIME OF REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE FACULTY SENATE, AND THOSE WHOSE UNIT AFFILIATION CHANGES DURING A TERM OF OFFICE. IF THE REPRESENTATIVE IS NO LONGER AFFILIATED WITH THE UNIT FROM WHICH THEY WERE ELECTED, THEN AN ALTERNATE SHALL BE APPOINTED AND BOTH SHALL SERVE CONCURRENTLY TO THE END OF THE TERM. THIS MAY LEAD TO A TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES SERVING ON THE FACULTY SENATE.**

[[E.]] **F. Absenteeism**

[[F.]] **G. Recall**

ATTACHMENT 174/3
UAF Faculty Senate #174, April 4, 2011
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the SFOS Fisheries Division.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the SFOS Fisheries Division. Revisions were agreed upon by the department representative and the Unit Criteria Committee, and the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

**UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY:
INITIAL APPOINTMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, REAPPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION, TENURE, AND SABBATICAL LEAVE
AND
FISHERIES DIVISION UNIT CRITERIA
STANDARDS AND INDICES**

The following is an adaptation of UAF and Board of Regents (BOR) criteria for promotion and tenure, specifically developed for use in evaluating faculty in the Fisheries Division of the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences. Underlined text reflects additions and clarifications to UAF regulation. These unit criteria are for use in the annual evaluation of faculty as well as promotion and tenure.

**CHAPTER I
Purview**

The University of Alaska Fairbanks document, "Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies", supplements the Board of Regents 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 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 or schools and colleges, and directors when appropriate, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit shall establish 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 outlined in “UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies,” Chapter IV, 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, including curation.

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 teaching enables learners to gain knowledge and /or skills. Effective teachers will demonstrate some, but not necessarily all, of the following characteristics in an individual year.

Effective teachers:

- a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for their students;
- b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students, show interest/enthusiasm for the subjects being taught;
- 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 an appropriate level;
- f. regularly develop new courses, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design;
- g. may receive prizes and awards for excellence in teaching;
- h. successfully mentor graduate students;
- i. may write text books, textbook chapters, or articles on teaching methods, develop case studies, organize teaching workshops, or prepare course modules for broad distribution.

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.

Teaching is an important role of fisheries division faculty. Faculty members discharge their responsibility by teaching formal courses, advising undergraduate and graduate students, directing independent studies (497 or 697), supervising experiential learning and internships, and conducting informal courses or workshops. Teaching and advising graduate students is more demanding than teaching and advising undergraduate students; nevertheless, the extra effort faculty invest in graduate teaching and advising are central to fisheries division's mission. Faculty workload assignments may reflect dissimilar loads related to formal classroom teaching and graduate and undergraduate advising loads; however the guideline expectation is that faculty members will teach at least four academic credits in the classroom each year. Quality of classroom teaching is indicated by peer evaluations of course materials, peer evaluations of teaching performance, and the recurring level of enrollment in classes. Quality graduate advising is indicated by the success of students in completing degrees under the faculty member's supervision, and in their subsequent employment in professional or scientific capacities. Faculty will be recognized for advising graduate students who are not based in SFOS in the same way that they are recognized for advising graduate students who are based in SFOS. Additional evidence of effecting teaching and mentoring includes results of student evaluations, peer-reviewed publication of students' thesis or dissertation research, student presentations at regional, national and international meetings; and awards to students.

Recognizing that workload assignments vary among faculty members the guideline expectation is that each candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor should be able to identify at least two successful graduate students who have completed degrees under her or his supervision. Similarly, each candidate for promotion to professor should be able to identify at least six successful graduate students. In addition, candidates for promotion should be able to identify at least two regularly scheduled courses that they have developed or have primary responsibility for delivering and which are central to the undergraduate or graduate program requirements.

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 importantly, 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.
- b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas; these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.
- c. Presentation of research papers before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.
- d. Exhibitions of art works at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by peers, juries, recognized artists, or critics.
- e. Performance 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.

Faculty in fisheries applying for promotion or tenure must present evidence of substantial, high-quality contributions in research. While there is no substitute for the exercise of good judgment on the part of those who are called upon to assess research and scholarly productivity, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to explain and/or otherwise provide evidence of the significance of their research and scholarly activities. The varied nature of research and scholarly contributions make it difficult to identify simple criteria for assessing the quality and significance of such contributions. In general, the primary evidence of high quality research is publication of research results and interpretations in respected peer-reviewed journals, books or other media and evidence of substantial contribution to research is primary authorship by the applicant or his or her student, or leadership as principal investigator of the research—quality, as judged by Fisheries Division faculty peers, is more important than quantity. Fisheries Division faculty are expected to author an average of at least one refereed publication per year. Thus candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor are expected to have authored at least six refereed publications; candidates for promotion to professor are expected to have authored at least twelve refereed publications. These expectations should be interpreted in the context of actual workload and adjusted accordingly.

Each promotion applicant's complete publication record, including papers published before they were affiliated with the UAF Fisheries Division, is relevant to tenure and promotion decisions. In addition, the nature of their workload assignments and their opportunity for publication throughout their career leading up to the review date is considered relevant to promotion and tenure decisions. The standard for tenure, promotion to associate professor, and satisfactory post-tenure review is satisfactory research performance for the period being evaluated. The standard for promotion to professor is sustained, excellent research performance, recognized nationally and internationally.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is 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 assume 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 that 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 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. Unremunerated consulting in the faculty member's area of expertise and discipline consistent with the obligation for public service.
- 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 or trade journal 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.

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, 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, or program.
- d. Participation in accreditation reviews.
- e. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.
- f. Service in support of student organizations and activities.
- g. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.
- h. Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.
- i. Mentoring.
- j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

3. Professional Service

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

4. Other Service: Curation

Curators at the University of Alaska Museum (UAM) can hold a tenure-track faculty position. Rank and tenure are held within departments at UAF, and curators are thus treated as joint appointments between a department and the UAM. As is the case for all tenure-track faculty in Fisheries, curator's performances are evaluated on the basis of their activities in teaching, research, and service.

Curation involves the management and development of a formally recognized university collection that exists to serve as a research resource for students and researchers at university, state, national, and international levels. Examples of curatorial activities include, but are not limited to:

- a. Maintaining, enhancing, and enlarging the collection (includes computerization and database development, archival upgrades, specimen conservation and identification, and adding specimens or objects to existing collection);
- b. Interacting with state and federal agencies and with the public on collections-related issues;
- c. Facilitating collections use through loans, exchanges, and visiting researchers;
- d. Maintaining appropriate permits (as needed for the collections);
- e. Supervising collections managers, student employees, and volunteers;
- f. Working with public program staff to create exhibits and educational activities appropriate to the collection;
- g. Pursuing funding for collections growth and maintenance;
- h. Producing curatorial or collections-related publications, reports, and/or manuals;
- i. Ensuring university compliance with state and federal laws and international treaties and agreements that pertain to the collection.

Specific criteria for curatorial performance:

Assistant professor and curator

Evidence of curatorial ability and a commitment to developing and managing research collections relevant to the area of specialization includes the following:

- a. Curators will develop the collections as a permanent record of the natural and/or cultural diversity of Alaska, the circumpolar north, and beyond and as a research resource for studies of biological and/or cultural diversity.
- b. Collections care includes responsibility for the physical condition and storage of objects/specimens, corresponding documentation, budgetary management, and annual reports.
 - (i). Curators will preserve the specimens, artifacts, objects, and material under their purview through the use of methods and techniques professionally accepted within their respective disciplines.
 - (ii). Curators will ensure that all records and field notes concerning collection materials are maintained in a secure fashion and meet or exceed documentation standards for their respective discipline.
 - (iii). Curators will maintain current accession files, deaccession files, and catalogs of objects in their collections. They will develop electronic databases with computer data formats that follow data standards of the respective discipline and UAM.
 - (iv). Curators will develop, maintain, and revise written policies and procedures for curation of objects or specimens in their collections.
- c. Curators will take part in interpretive activities of the museum in order to fulfill the museum's mission to interpret the natural and cultural history of Alaska.
- d. Curators will actively submit grant applications for external support for their curatorial activities and collections-based research.

Associate professor and curator

Consistent contributions to interpretive (education and exhibition) activities of the museum, response to collection-related inquiries (from other professionals, the public, and state agencies) and/or development of interpretive materials for the public-at-large are expected. Use of the collections for teaching and/or research must be evident. Active solicitation for external funds to support curatorial activities and collections-based research must be evident.

Professor and curator

Significant development of the collections under the curator's care is expected. This development includes sustained growth of the collections as research resources and as a means of fulfilling the museum's mission of acquiring, preserving in perpetuity, investigating, and interpreting objects and specimens relating to the natural and or cultural history of Alaska and the circumpolar north. Significance of collections will be measured in terms of research significance, value to University of Alaska research and instructional programs, and value to national and international research programs. The curator should be a recognized authority in his/her field, locally and nationally. He or she must have a record of success in acquiring external funds for curatorial activities and collections-based research.

5. 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 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.

University and public service is expected of all fisheries faculty. Pertinent service is related to the faculty member's professional expertise or university position. Some members may have greater or lesser than average assignments in service and the expectations of them should be adjusted accordingly. However, except for faculty on sabbatical leave, the guideline expectation is that every faculty member will spend at least one month of time annually on service related activities regardless of their level of research and teaching. Service is typically limited to 5 units (approximately 1.5 months) unless otherwise authorized in the workload proposal. The mix of public, university, professional, and other service may vary with the faculty member's field of expertise and stage of career. Some faculty may have substantial administrative or special assignments that increase the service portion of their workload. Evidence of high-quality performance can include specific accomplishments related to the service. Service on national or international bodies is expected of candidates for promotion to professor.

For faculty providing curation services, the application for promotion should include a letter prepared by a committee of tenured curators at the museum. Excellence in curation may be demonstrated through, e.g., appropriate letter of commendation, recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards, and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

ATTACHMENT 174/4
UAF Faculty Senate #174, April 4, 2011
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

RESOLUTION:

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate ratifies the election of President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate for 2011-2012 on the basis of the following ballot.

BALLOT
PRESIDENT-ELECT

Please vote for one individual to serve as the President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate for 2011-12.

____ Jennifer Reynolds

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF THE NOMINEE:

Jennifer Reynolds is Associate Professor of Geological Oceanography, in the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences. She joined the UAF faculty in 2000, after completing a Ph.D. in Geosciences at Columbia University (Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory) and postdoctoral fellowships at the U.S. Geological Survey's Hawaii Volcano Observatory and the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute. Her formal training is in submarine volcanism, but her research in Alaska has focused on application of seafloor geology to marine habitat studies. She has supervised M.S. and Ph.D. students in Oceanography, Fisheries, and Geology. In addition to the normal tripartite faculty activities, she has a long-term administrative/service role as Associate Director of the West Coast & Polar Regions Undersea Research Center, a NOAA program which has been located at UAF since 1990.

Jennifer has served on the Faculty Senate for a total of seven years, in 2003-2005 and 2007-2010. She has experience on two of the Faculty Senate committees, the Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee (2003-2005) and Faculty Affairs (2007-2010), and has chaired the Faculty Affairs Committee for the past two years. In Spring, 2010 she served as a faculty representative on the Provost's Planning & Budget Committee. In Fall, 2010 she was appointed to fill a UAF vacancy on the UA system-wide Faculty Alliance and participated in the Faculty Alliance effort to finalize a UA Academic Master Plan.

The faculty of UAF are highly skilled, talented people who have an important role in shared governance of the University. The Faculty Senate is the formal voice of the UAF faculty, and is the forum for collective decisions, judgments, and initiatives. To function effectively, the Faculty Senate should be representative of the faculty, and act constructively to improve the university. Different points of view among the faculty should be seen as contributions toward considering possibilities and reaching a common decision. The better the Faculty Senate functions, the more influence it will have, and that will benefit all of us.

ATTACHMENT 174/5
UAF Faculty Senate #174, April 4, 2011
Submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee

The Outstanding Senator of the Year Award Screening Committee has carefully reviewed the 2011 nomination according to the award criteria, and forwards the nomination of Rainer Newberry for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

PROCEDURE--After appropriate discussion, the full Senate shall vote by secret ballot. A simple majority vote of those attending will be necessary for the Senate to confirm an OSYA.

CONFIRMATION BALLOT
Outstanding Senator of the Year Award

Please vote to CONFIRM the following nominee to receive the 2011 Outstanding Senator of the Year Award.

____ Rainer Newberry

ATTACHMENT 174/6
UAF Faculty Senate #174, April 4, 2011
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

**Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for 9 March 2011**

Voting members: Diane McEachern, Brian Himelbloom, Carrie Baker, Dave Valentine, Rainer Newberry, Anthony Arendt, Jungho Baek, Sarah Fowell Ex officio: Libby Eddy, Lillian Misel

1. AAS Paramedicine

Discussion: It's a zero cost program, just a reorganization of a current program, and a must have program. Include vital info in the rationale.

Clarify title of program AAS in Paramedicine? or AAS in Emergency

Medical Services (we currently have an AAS program in Emergency Services)

2. Stacked courses: where from here?

Rainer talked with Larry Duffy, who suggested getting some graduate student input. Although, this would potentially be stepping on GAAC's toes.

Discussion: Small numbers of students may cause a course to not be viable. Two separate syllabi.

Ask graduate students what they think. Expect varied answers depending on who is asked.

Ask undergraduates as well? More work for faculty to teach stacked classes.

Take this issue to ASUAF? Send proposal to Deans?

Opportunity for faculty to discuss this phenomenon Evaluations and comments

Most grad students feel that the stacked courses are diluted [coursework there to provide]

A professional program would perhaps have more weight on the coursework and should incorporate advanced study Rainer to ask Ken Abramowicz (GAAC) if survey can be conducted

3. UAF courses designed for high school students, continued.

The fundamental problem: traditionally, courses taught in high school, including those like Calculus (unquestionably college level) are not counted for college credit unless a standardized exam is passed with some minimum score. Should UAF-designed high school courses be any different? And if no standardized exam is available...? Rainer recommends 'we' write up a paragraph or two and send it to deans who will then present it to their department chairs for comment. Any better ideas???

Discussion:

If taught in high school-it's a high school class

Courses designed to attract students into the major regardless of who teaches it it's a high school course To what extent can we say these courses must be below 100 level?

Two sets of classes (Calculus) vs (Computer Info Systems)

What is the origin of this issue? As an incentive to get interest in various programs and to increase enrollment? Solicit feedback? Take to Faculty Senate?

How many courses are we talking about? Get a list of trial courses and provide feedback to this group (Libby will investigate) Ask Provost to bring this issue up at the Dean's council.

Dave's report on GERC

GERC-F.S. meeting on Monday, Dave gave a presentation. Many felt this needs much more time and attention. A forum will be hosted by the senate that describes what is being done.

When to do this? After the draft document is ready.

Tues or Thurs 1-2 and/or 5-7. Early April allows time to get first draft and possibly be ready in time for the May senate meeting. Rainer agreed to get the ball rolling on the Faculty Forum.

ATTACHMENT 174/7
UAF Faculty Senate #174, April 4, 2011
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

**Faculty Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 4, 2011**

Members present: Jane Allen (by phone), Lily Dong, Cecile Lardon (by phone), Andrew Metzger, Morris Palter, Jennifer Reynolds, Roger Smith (by phone).

Reapportionment and Research Institutes:

Per-unit faculty numbers provided by the Provost's staff had separate listings for the College of Engineering and Mines and the Institute for Northern Engineering, and reapportionment calculations were done accordingly. However, Andrew Metzger and the CEM Dean's Office pointed out that INE is administratively within CEM (the Provost confirmed this), and they believed that INE should be represented on the Faculty Senate through CEM rather than as a stand-alone research institute.

The Faculty Affairs Committee agreed, and stated that the principle for Faculty Senate representation should be that a research institute is eligible for separate representation if its director reports to the Vice Chancellor for Research (e.g., Geophysical Institute), but not if the director reports to a dean of an academic unit (e.g., Institute for Marine Science in the School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences).

Reapportionment calculations were corrected to move INE back into CEM. The result is that INE does not have separate representation on the Faculty Senate, but CEM gains a 4th senator. This will be reflected in the March, 2011 elections for the two-year terms that begin in Fall, 2011.

Accommodating changes in a unit's numbers of Faculty Senate representatives:

For various reasons, the number of senators representing a unit on the Faculty Senate may change. This topic has come up twice during the past year, because of (1) transfer of the Department of Computer Science from CNSM to CEM, and (2) reapportionment of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Bylaws do not address how to implement these changes. FAC discussed a draft motion to amend the Bylaws and lay out a clear procedure to be followed in the future. This is not intended to address any existing problems, but to prevent problems and confusion in the future.

Last fall, the Administrative Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate asked FAC to recommend how to handle a situation created by the transfer of the Department of Computer Science from CNSM to CEM. One of the CNSM representatives to the Faculty Senate was Orion Lawlor, in Computer Sciences, who was beginning the second year of his term. At the FAC meeting on September 27, 2010, the committee recommended the following:

- (1) When a unit's representation on the Faculty Senate changes, elected senators should serve out the terms to which they were elected.
- (2) Any decreases or increases in a unit's number of Senate representatives should be accommodated in the next election. However, if an increase cannot be rapidly accommodated by election (for example, if the increase occurred during the fall and the next election was not until spring), then the unit should choose one of its existing alternates to fill the new seat. This would result in a one-year overlap between previous and new representation, and a temporary increase in the number of senators. The Faculty Senate Bylaws do not restrict the Senate to a fixed number of elected senators.

This recommendation was accepted by the Administrative Committee.

The draft motion discussed at the current FAC meeting was intended to broaden and generalize the recommendations so that they could be added to the Bylaws. FAC agreed that (1) senators should serve out

their full terms; (2) the term itself should be served to completion, so if the elected senator cannot do this then an alternate should be appointed for the remainder of the term, as for any other seat on the Faculty Senate. Accordingly, if an individual can no longer represent the unit from which they were elected, then an alternate should be appointed from that unit to serve as a full senator for the remainder of the term. This means that a sitting senator and an alternate appointed to the seat may both serve on the Senate for the remainder of the term. And (3) adjustments to the number of a unit's representatives on the Faculty Senate should be implemented at the next election, and not by special arrangement outside of elections. A revised draft of the motion will be circulated by email.

Database on Teaching by Non-Regular Faculty:

Colleen Abrams is days away from producing the data files for this project. We are now asking her for data from fall and spring semesters in AY 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10. A student assistant is being hired to work on the database, under Jennifer's supervision and with salary from the Faculty Senate office. FAC members reviewed the preliminary files and agreed the project is ready to proceed.

ATTACHMENT 174/8
UAF Faculty Senate #174, April 4, 2011
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes Fri, Mar 25, 2011; 3-4 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Jane Weber, Derek Sikes, Jenny Liu, Kayt Sunwood, Stefanie Ickert-Bond,
(online - Shawn Russell, Melanie Arthur), Nilima Hullavarad, Dan White
Members absent: Nicole Cundiff, Jessica Larsen

1. Announcements

April 29th - Friday 10-12 Promotion & Tenure Workshop plan, Butrovich 109, Jane might not be able to MC the event, asked for volunteer to replace, Derek agreed. Fliers to be distributed.
Tues, Oct 4th, luncheon - Carol Gold speaker
Chose May meeting date. May 11th, 3-4pm, Wed.

2. CSW & Worklife Balance Committee - Melanie investigated the mission of the WBC relative to CSW. WBC currently trying to address issue of lactation rooms to comply with new federal health care law. They're trying to find suitable rooms on campus. A member of CSW is supposed to be on the WBC but this has yet to happen. Melanie noted the WBC had said they would setup a website but have yet to. Melanie will invite Kris Racina, the committee's chair, to the May 11th meeting to discuss the WBC (overview, charge, composition, etc).

3. Dan White - Idea to raise funds to increase # of senior women on campus, based on Joy Morrison's study on women on campus. Brian Rogers is waiting for a proposal from CSW if we choose to pursue. Many issues remaining to work out eg. limit to STEM faculty? CSW discussion resulted in a decline on this idea based on the perception that if there is a problem with the process of P&T for women at UAF, bringing in senior women from other institutions where they have succeeded in their own P&T process, wouldn't fix the problems in the process at UAF.

4. CSW discussion of Cecile Lardon's presentation on Feb 18th. Question raised: Do we want to invite Cecile back and/or determine if there is more to the project than what was presented.

5. Andrew Sheeler - journalist (SunStar) writing on issue of gender inequity among faculty. Discussion of past studies (Worklife by CSW, STEM by Joy Morrison) . More men in tenure track positions than women and more women in adjunct positions. More men at higher ranks than women. STEM study interesting but there are fewer women faculty proportionately in STEM disciplines than in non-STEM. Maternity leave at UAF is actually taken from accumulated 'sick leave' - Melanie described giving birth at 6.5 months after starting at UAF at which point she had accumulated 2 weeks of sick leave and then took an additional 1 week of non-paid leave before returning to work. CSW age - 6 years, brain child of Carol Gold. Melanie asked - is it time for CSW to do a new survey? - item for next agenda.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:00.

Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/>

ATTACHMENT 174/9

UAF Faculty Senate #174, April 4, 2011

Submitted by the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee

**UAF Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee
Meeting Minutes for March 9, 2011**

I. Josef Glowa called the meeting to order at 8:00 am.

II. Roll call:

Present: Melanie Arthur, Diane Erickson, Josef Glowa, Kelly Houlton, Julie Joly, Channon Price

Excused: Mike Castellini, Alexandra Oliveira, Larry Roberts

III. Report from Diane

Neil Howe's presentations had good turnouts. Josef and CP inquired if the presentations will be available online or DVD for folks who were unable to attend. Diane said that once Neil Howe has previewed and approved them, they will be available as a webstream.

There has been no word on travel funding yet, and due to the lateness of the fiscal year, Diane does not think that any more money will be coming in. UNAC can buy out workload units for faculty performing union work, and the difference in the cost of buy-out and what it costs to replace faculty is put towards travel funding. This year, however, the funding went to support the negotiating team. Diane reports that Fiscal Officer Susan Phillips has not heard anything from UNAC yet.

IV. Old Business

Josef reported that the FDAI committee's motion regarding electronic student evaluations was unanimously passed by Faculty Senate. He noted that this continues to be a hot topic and generates lively discussion. A Faculty Senate member suggested that the FDAI committee be in charge of choosing UAF's next student evaluation system. While this is flattering, it is beyond the scope of our committee. Josef reiterated that research needs to be done at the administrative level, while CP stated that whatever system of evaluation is chosen it must have proof that it will be an improvement. Julie noted that Provost Henrichs seems to have taken our concerns regarding electronic student evaluations to heart. After some discussion it was decided that Administration should research the various evaluation systems and recommend up to three systems for the FDAI committee to evaluate as the final step. Diane recommended committee members talk to past UAA Faculty Senate President Kerri Morris about the specific problems encountered with IDEA in Anchorage, particularly ensuring understanding of the new numbers generated by the system and the statistical invalidation caused by low response rates. Another issue with IDEA is that when faculty members enable the evaluation system on Blackboard for their particular class, it is then enabled for *all* courses the student is enrolled in. Melanie added that IDEA does offer a paper-based system of evaluation as well.

Josef reported that the Lilly Arctic Institute was a great success with many attendees from the Lower 48. He stated that it was very interesting and a good opportunity for faculty development. Next year's Institute will be held in Kodiak.

Our Faculty Forum was attended by CP, Josef, Diane, Mike, and six others: one in person and five via audio conference. Despite the low turnout, the discussion was lively. Diane wondered how we can get more attendance for future Forums. CP suggested the following: 1) choose a site on lower campus (though upper campus was chosen in hopes of encouraging science faculty to attend); 2) advertise the Forum earlier and more broadly (it is an opportunity for faculty to come together and share ideas and experiences); and 3) choose a more specific topic. The committee agreed.

V. New Business

Electronic student evaluations and future Faculty Forums were already discussed.

VI. Next meeting

Josef will send out a meeting Doodle to schedule our next meeting during the week of April 11 – 15.

VII. Adjourned at 8:40 am.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 174/10
UAF Faculty Senate #174, April 4, 2011
Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

**Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for February 28, 2011**

9:00-10:00 a.m.

408 Rasmuson Library (Kayak Room)

Voting members present: Ken Abramowicz (Chair), Donie Bret-Harte (phone), Lara Dehn, Orion Lawlor, Anupma Prakash (phone), Sue Renes, Jen Schmidt (phone).

Ex officio members present: Anita Hughes, Laura Bender, Larry Duffy, Karen Jensen.

Guest: Jayne (notes)

1. Discussion/modification/approval of agenda

Agenda was approved. Laura Bender mentioned the topic discussed last time about academic dismissal from a graduate program, and it was agreed to include this topic at the next meeting. Next meeting is scheduled for March 28.

2. Discussion/approval of minutes from 2-21-2011 meeting

Minutes were approved without modifications.

3. Discussion item related to stacked courses (attached)

Ken mentioned the most recent changes to Rainer's document, which included taking out the content referring to workload credit and adding a statement (in caps) about the importance of stacked courses to master's programs.

Lara noted that it would only address new courses, not existing ones.

Anupma felt there's a problem with the stipulation that differences in level should be reflected by weekly assignments. A course might not have weekly assignments. Donie agreed, and there was consensus on that point. Homework may also not be given on a weekly basis. New language is needed for this point.

Lara suggested getting student input. Larry mentioned graduate student organizations could be invited for discussion or included in a poll. It was pointed out that no question for student evaluations exists on current SOI forms. Could one be added? Or use SurveyMonkey? Anupma noted that there is a wide variety of reasons for students taking stacked courses. Ken acknowledged that, noting that stacked courses are a fact of life here at UAF. It's a complex issue, particularly in light of the fact that new programs are not being encouraged right now and reallocation will be on the rise.

Everyone agreed that a senate discussion is needed. Open faculty forums could be held down the line.

4. Review of GAAC proposals already discussed (review leader is listed first, followed by the secondary reviewers)

- 19-GNC_ATM F666 - Atmospheric Remote Sensing (Donie, Jen, Xiong)

Approved on the condition that the reading assignments be written into the syllabus.

- 25-GNC_ATM F678 - Mesoscale Dynamics (Xiong, Jen, Sue)

Numerous syllabus modifications are needed. Ken will contact course instructor to request needed changes. [Modifications were made after the meeting. **Approved by email.**]

- 38-GNC_EE F646 Wireless Sensor Networks (Orion, Donie, Lara)

Revised syllabus was received by Orion, and looks good to both he and Lara. **Approved.**

- 39-GNC_EE F668 Radar Systems (Orion, Donie, Lara)

The syllabus revisions were not made. As a result, the proposal was **not approved.**

- 40-GNC_EE F675 Robot Modeling and Control (Orion, Donie, Lara)

Approved on the condition that the grading process be written into the syllabus. There was discussion about grading on a curve by the committee. Larry noted that the syllabus is very important and is used in a grade appeal.

- 27-GNP Master of Arts in Political Science and related courses [28-GNC, 29-GNC, 20-GNC] (Ken, Jen, Regine)

The committee consensus was that the program needs more work at the department.

Not approved. Concerns of the committee include:

- o Difficulty of passing new programs at statewide at this time.
- o Workforce development considerations.
- o Almost all the required courses for the degree are stacked.
- o Potential impact on NORS student numbers.
- o Issue of necessary internal allocation of resources (NORS support is conditioned on keeping all existing TA positions, but new PS degree will require three new TA positions) [especially considering the fact that CLA is currently searching for a new Dean].
- o Issues with using internship option in lieu of a thesis requirement.
- o Discrepancies related to number of credits required (30-33 for Concentration in Environmental Politics and Policy, 33-36 for Concentration in Arctic Policy).

Larry suggested that Political Science might want to consider converting this new degree into a professional degree.

The meeting was adjourned at 10 AM.

(Remainder of agenda items will be put on the agenda of the 3-28-11 GAAC meeting.)

ATTACHMENT 174/11

UAF Faculty Senate #174, April 4, 2011

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

**March 4, 2011 Minutes of the
Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee**

Attendees:

Cindy Hardy, Kate Quick, Sarah Stanley, Amy Barnsley, Margaret Short, Deseree Salvador, Sandra Wildfeuer, Jane Allen, Gabriel Russell, Linda Hapsmith, Nancy Ayagarak

Draft Motion: Posting Reasons for D or F

Sarah Stanley presented for discussion a draft of a motion to require faculty to record reasons for D or F grades. This could be done through a pop-up menu on UAOnline and would record such reasons for poor performance as non-attendance or illness. Sarah noted that we don't have good data on why our students fail and that this would provide this data. However, she did not think this should be used as a factor to deciding on placement overrides for subsequent courses. She also noted that she had discussed this with Dana Thomas, who is interested in the idea.

The discussion included the following points:

Some committee members expressed concern that noting outside factors would not apply if instructors give a weighted average--all of these things are considered when giving the grade.

Another noted that a D or F in a prerequisite means they do not met pre-requisite. This would provide useful information for an instructor when they are reviewing an incoming class list.

There was much discussion of prerequisite overrides as a factor in student failure. Students without prerequisite knowledge often fail.

There were questions about how this information would be used. Could it be used against an instructor? Are there FERPA restrictions? Could we have the opportunity to check multiple boxes? UAOnline is very public. Is this the right forum for this data?

Committee members who do advising were favorable to the idea. This would help in advising the "whole" student, especially since advisors could look for patterns between classes.

Sarah agreed to take committee comments to refine this draft to distribute to the committee. Cindy will bring it to the Admin Committee as a discussion item.

Amending Mandatory Placement Motion--Writing Sample (Writeplacer)

Cindy reported on an e-mail from Dana Thomas that reports that UAA and UAS are not using Writeplacer. UAF DEVE and English faculty have been unhappy with Writeplacer, as well. The message seems to be that we should have consistent criteria across the MAU. We discussed amending 76the original motion to remove Writeplacer, however the wording of the motion is open-

ended: “a scored writing sample such as ACT, SAT, or UAF generated writing sample such as Writeplacer.”

We discussed whether this provides us an opportunity to develop a UAF writing sample and scoring methods; however, there is no money to make changes. We also asked if the money can be “reapplied” to paying for hand scoring.

Linda Hapsmith suggested another route: to change the catalog wording so that the Accuplacer Sentence skills test score takes precedence over Writeplacer. This can be done through Advising and Testing and would not require a change in the original motion. She will follow up on this.

We also discussed reading placement. How/ when does this go into effect? Linda noted that reading is not currently noted on the graduation checklist, so is not a required class.

Rural faculty expressed a concern that a multiple choice exam is not best format for all students. Their much smaller student population means they can hand score or do placement in a more individualized way. They do use Writeplacer, then print and hand score the writing samples.

Core revitalization proposals (LEAP, CEM, CAC)

Kate Quick gave a short summary of the proposals under review by the Core Revitalization Committee, especially the LEAP learning objectives. We will continue to follow this process.

We did not have time for updates on the Learning Commons or retention issues. They will continue to remain on our long-range agenda.

Next meeting: April 1, 1:30-3pm.