

F. Motion of Confirmation for Outstanding Senator of the Year Award,
submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee (Attachment 166/10)

2:25 VIII Announcements

5 Min.

ATTACHMENT 166/1 Motion B4 versions 1 and 2

appointments. This would require less effort than the current procedure, in which details are required for all UAF faculty, but more effort than Version 2.

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

CAPS = Addition
[[]] = Deletion

VERSION 1

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

VERSION 2

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

ATTACHMENT 166/2 Motion B8
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

MOTION

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

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010

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

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

7 [[8]]. Re-apportionment will be done **IN THE YEAR OF ACCREDITATION REVIEW OF UAF, EXPECTED TO BE EVERY SEVEN YEARS,** [[for the elections held in even numbered years]] or upon two-thirds vote of the Senate.

MOTION

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

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010

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

CAPS = Addition

[[]] = Deletion

C. Election Procedure

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

...

ATTACHMENT 166/4 Motion C2
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

MOTION

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

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010

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

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

CAPS = D in procedure soc T*(MOTION)TjET72 654.4 1 Tf/ ie, this2acs Twthe scning040.001 Tc 0.0(should 15, 2010)

ATTACHMENT 166/5 All amendments together
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

BYLAWS of the
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
FACULTY SENATE

Sect. 1 (ART III: Membership)

- A. The membership of the Faculty Senate, hereinafter referred to as "Senate," shall consist of approximately 41 members plus one non-voting presiding officer. Approximately 35 members shall be elected by and from the faculty and will have voting privileges. Six non-voting members will be selected by and from other university constituencies as follows: one non-graduate student and one graduate student selected by the ASUAF; one professional school dean and one college dean

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

C. Election Procedure

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

VERSION 1:

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

VERSION 2:

2. A faculty member may vote for Senate representatives in only one unit. **FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, THAT UNIT MUST BE THE TENURE-GRANTING UNIT. RESEARCH FACULTY AND OTHER QUALIFYING FACULTY MUST VOTE IN THE UNIT OF PRIMARY APPOINTMENT.** [[That unit must be the unit of primary appointment or, in the case of evenly split appointment, the unit of the faculty member's choice]].
3. Units with full-time permanent faculty based on other than the Fairbanks campus should elect Senate representatives in a number that is at least equal to the proportion of the non-Fairbanks based **QUALIFYING FACULTY** [[FTFEs]].
4. Units with faculty who teach in associate, certificate, or noncredit programs should elect representatives in proportion to such faculty.

5. Units with senior faculty should elect associate and full professors as Senate representatives in a number that is at least equal to the proportion of such faculty.
6. Units with graduate programs should elect at least one graduate faculty member.
7. Each unit shall elect at least half as many alternate representatives as representatives.

ATTACHMENT 166/6
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm the Unit Criteria for the Alaska Native Language

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

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

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment

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

B. Academic Titles

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

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank 6292 Tw 20.13I

CHAPTER III

1. Effectiveness in Teaching

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

- a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for students;
- b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students, show interest/enthusiasm for the subject;
- c. emphasize and encourage student participation, ask questions, frequently monitor student participation for student learning and teacher effectiveness, are sensitive to student diversity;
- d. emphasize regular feedback to students and reward student learning success;

in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere. **THE MISSION OF ANLC PROVIDES FOR THE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVE LANGUAGE PUBLICATIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF ALASKA AND NATIVE GROUPS IN PARTICULAR. THE ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGE CENTER'S PUBLICATION PROGRAM IS AN EFFECTIVE MEANS OF**

STATEWIDE MISSION, ANLC IS STRONGLY COMMITTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE TO ALASKA NATIVE COMMUNITIES.

1. Public Service

Public service is the application of teaching, research, and other scholarly and creative activity to constituencies outside the University of Alaska Fairbanks. It includes all activities which extend the faculty member's professional, academic, or leadership competence to these constituencies. It can be instructional, collaborative, or consultative in nature and is related to the faculty member's discipline or other publicly recognized expertise. Public service may be systematic

4. Evaluation of Service

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

WITHIN ANLC, EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE IS DEMONSTRATED BY

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

E. Unit Criteria, Standards and Indices

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

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

A unit choosing to develop discipline-specific criteria, standards and indices shall have such criteria, standards and indices approved by a majority of the discipline faculty. The unit criteria, standards and indices will be reviewed and approved by the cognizant dean who will forward the unit criteria, standards and indices to the provost. The provost will review for aye review ie

are not revised, a statement of reaffirmation of the current unit criteria, standards and indices must be filed with the Office of the Provost, following the review.

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

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

1. Process of Evaluation

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

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

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

G. Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Members

1. Frequency of Evaluation

a) All tenured faculty at UAF shall be evaluated once every three years according to a schedule and process announced by the provost.

b) For tenured faculty with joint appointments, the cognizant dean will arrange a review that assures that all appropriate administrators provide a written evaluation of the faculty member. The dean will inform the faculty member of these arrangements.

2. Annual Activities Report

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

H. Evaluation of Faculty with Special Academic Rank

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

1. Process of Evaluation

The college/school dean or institute director shall require an annual activities report of a faculty member who has an appointment renewed beyond the initial year of appointment. The review process outlined above for academic rank faculty shall apply. The optional

ATTACHMENT 166/7
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve an Associate of Applied Science in Drafting Technology.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2010 and/or
 Upon Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: See the program proposal #37-UNP on file in the Governance
 Office, 314 Signers' Hall.

Brief statement of the proposed program, its objectives and career opportunities.

The proposed Associate of Applied Science in Drafting Technology consists of courses that prepare a student for employment in the construction industry as engineering, architectural, or design draftspersons. The existing Certificate in Drafting Technology offers students a basic understanding of computer aided drafting, but little to no knowledge of what they will be asked to draw. The proposed AAS addresses the deficiency by utilizing existing Construction Management courses, and two new course offerings, to familiarize students with the different design disciplines and trades inherent in the construction industry. Students will graduate having the industry vocabulary and knowledge required to meet the skills of employees that architectural, engineering, and construction firms are demanding.

The goals of this A.A.S. program are to:

- x Provide a well-rounded exposure of construction technology to students in order that they can effectively communicate with architects, engineers, and contractors.
- x Provide focused education and skill development in drafting in order that students enter the workforce with a readily marketable skill.
- x Meet the local demands for draftspersons that possess a basic knowledge of construction, accurate and efficient drafting skills, and the flexibility to utilize evolving drafting and design technologies.

Proposed Catalog Layout:

Drafting Technology: Associate of Applied Science

College of Rural and Community Development
Tanana Valley

svr " ... Š < - † ... - — " f Ž " f ^ - < • %oo u
 swr < ~ < Ž " f ^ - < • %oo u
 syr † %oo < • • < • %oo u
 tsr • - † " • † † < f - † u
 tyr † ~ f • ... † † u
 svw - " - ... - — " f Ž " f ^ - < • %oo u
 sww † ... Š f • < ... f Ž f • † ... Ž † ... - " < ... f Ź " f ^ - < • %oo
 srt † f • • f • † † - Š ' † • ' ^ - < Ž † < • %oo u ' • • - " - ... - < ' •
 stu ' † † • f • † - f • † f " † • u
 svt † ... Š f • < ... f Ž f • † Ž † ... - " < ... f Ž v † ... Š • ' Ž ' %oo >
 tsu < ~ < Ž † ... Š • ' Ž ' %oo > v
 tus - " - ... - — " f Ž † ... Š • ' Ž ' %oo > v

v ä † Ž † ... - ' ^ ' • † Š † ^ ' Ž Ž ' TM < • %oo † Ž † ... - < ~ † • u x ... " † † < - •
 sxr " f ^ - < • %oo • - † " • • Š < ' u æ x
 sts ' • • - " - ... - < ' • ' ... - • † • - • f • † " uf TM < • %oo •
 trs ' • • - " - ... - < ' • " ' Œ † ... - f • f %oo † u † • -
 srs • - " ' † - ... - < ' • - ' • %oo < • † † " < • %oo

**RESOURCE COMMITMENT TO THE
PROPOSED DEGREE PROGRAM**

<u>Resources</u>	<u>Existing</u>	<u>New</u>		<u>Total</u>
		College/School	College/School	
Regular Faculty (FTE's & dollars)	FTE .70 (\$57,000 + 40% benefits) \$55,860	0	0	FTE 1 @ \$55,860
Adjunct Faculty (FTE's & dollars)	FTE 1.25 (30 credit hours @ \$1,200/credit hours in AY09/10) \$36,000	FTE .25 (Adjuncts will teach 6 credits and will be self- supporting through tuition.) \$7, 200	0	FTE 1.5/ \$43,200
Teaching Assistants (Headcount)	0	0	0	0
Instructional Facilities (in dollars and/or sq. footage)	1,108 sf	0	0	1,108 sf
Office Space (Sq. footage)	161 sf	0	0	161 sf
Lab Space (Sq. Footage)	0	0	0	0
Computer & Networking (in dollars) Research/	\$66,000 (22 computers at \$3,000 each)	0	0	\$66,000

University of Alaska Board of Regents
Program Approval Summary Form

MAU: **University of Alaska Fairbanks**
Title: **Associates of Applied Science in
Drafting Technology**
Target admission date: **Fall 2010**

How does the program relate to the
Education mission of the University of Alaska and the MAU?

This program is proposed by the Construction Management and Drafting Technology programs at the Tanana Valley Campus within the College of Rural and Community Development. It has been promoted by the Community Advisory Committee of the Drafting Technology program made up of industry professionals, existing and former students who need additional education before becoming workplace ready and potential employers within the community.

The creation of an Associate of Applied Science program in Construction Management at UAF in 2006 has provided the Drafting Technology program an opportunity to offer much needed additional training to students in the area of construction with a minimal outlay in resources or additional courses. Similar to the Architectural and Engineering Program in Anchorage, the A.A.S. in Drafting Technology would utilize courses taught in Construction Management to bolster the existing Certificate into an A.A.S.

No impact to existing programs across the UA system is expected. The DRT Program in Fairbanks serves a population grounded to the community by work and/or responsibilities. Course offerings are typically in the evenings, allowing students who would otherwise be unable to pursue the degree to do so while meeting other responsibilities.

What State Needs met by this program.

According to the Alaska Department of Labor Statistics, there will be a 19.6% increase in drafters employed between 2006 and 2016, exceeding the projected state average employment growth rate of 14%.

The Army Corp of Engineers, a principal source of local construction work, is requiring the use of Building Information Modeling (BIM) on their projects. BIM, a three-dimensional software platform, can be used by designers, contractors, and owners; increasing the need for well-trained drafting technicians that can navigate the software.

What are the Student opportunities and outcomes? Enrollment projections?

Feedback from the Drafting Technology Community Advisory Committee, made up of local professionals and potential employers, has consistently supported a program with greater emphasis on technical training in building technologies in order for students to know how to use the skills in computer aided drafting they learn in the existing Certificate program. The proposed AAS meets this need with little to no additional commitment of resources. Graduating students will leave the program with the vocabulary and knowledge needed to converse with engineers, architects, and contractors- skills needed to seek and retain employment.

The Department of Labor Occupational Outlook Handbook for 2008-2009 clearly states

Mining engineers are trained on a broad variety of topics since mining engineers are normally responsible for many aspects in a mine, such as mine ventilation, ground control, mine operation, economics, environmental laws and labor management. The minor will allow non-mining engineering majors to pick topics within mining engineering courses that are of interest to them as we will not restrict them to any specific courses. Two examples of course sequences are given below:

Here is a sequence (prerequisites are in parentheses):

MIN 301 (ES 208 & ES 307)
MIN 313
MIN 370 (ES 331)
MIN 407 (CHEM F106X; ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213)
MIN 409

For engineering majors, the above is exactly 15 credits as they will have met other prerequisites.

Another sequence:

MIN 370 (ES 331)
MIN 407 (CHEM F106X; ENGL F111X; ENGL F211X or ENGL F213)
MIN 408
MIN 409
MIN 443 (MIN 370)
MIN 482

Relationship to the “Purposes of the University”

UAF's Academic Development Plan (2007-2012) states this goal at UAF: “Produce graduates who are job-ready in areas of high employer demand, and conduct training and research applied to the development, planning, and management activities of the State”. The proposed minor in mining engineering feeds directly into that since it produces graduates that will be in high demand in a key industry in this resources state.

Need for the minor

As stated earlier, the mining industry has a severe shortage of skilled labor, especially mining engineers. The industry resorts to hiring non-mining engineers and then training them to fulfill mining engineering roles.

Mine operators around the state such as Usibelli Coal Mine, Barrick Gold etc were surveyed on their acceptability of the proposed minor. Their response was clear: they see the minor as a positive development. All respondents thought that a “non-mining engineer” was a lot more employable with the proposed minor than without.

Projections

The number of undergraduate MIN majors currently stands at 25. We expect 5 students to enroll in the minor. The minor will be a success even if we get one student since it is at no cost.

ATTACHMENT 166/9
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs and Administrative Committees

MOTION

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF *Policies and Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty* by addition of a process for the promotion of non-represented faculty (e-class of FN or FR). The new process will be posted online; and then later incorporated into the printed document upon its upcoming revision.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Because the vast majority of faculty are represented by a bargaining unit, the faculty promotion process is typically governed by the collective bargaining agreements between the University and the two bargaining units. However, promotion is granted by and at the discretion of the University therefore, the University is able to offer the opportunity for promotion to faculty who are not members of a bargaining unit due to an administrative assignment (who are in an e-class of FN or FR, versus F9 or A9). As of July 2009, non-represented faculty promotion is not disallowed by Board of

faculty shall be that which is described in Chapter IV of UAF's *Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty*, except as amended below:

- x All levels of review will be given instructions as to how to evaluate the file. Only work that results from faculty duties is to be evaluated, and that work is to be evaluated relative to the portion of appointment/workload dedicated to faculty duties. This portion of appointment must be not less than 49%. Faculty at 49% appointment will be evaluated relative to unit criteria for half-time faculty.
- x As stated in UAF's *Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty*, the provost will prepare and distribute guidelines for the preparation of a candidate's file and the required content. These requirements and guidelines are located on the provost's website (www.uaf.edu/provost) as four documents titled "Guidelines for Promotion/Tenure Review: Part I," "Part II," "Part III," and "Best Practices."
- x Chapter IV.B.5.b./Chapter IV.C.4.b. Unit Peer Review. The appropriate peer review committee for non-represented faculty standing for promotion will be appointed by a dean or director from a unit other than that of the candidate. This dean or director will be selected by the provost. At least one committee member must be from the candidate's unit; if conflicts of interest cannot be avoided in this appointment, then the appointed member will not vote and will participate in an advisory capacity. The peer committee will not include individuals who are supervised by the faculty member, except as described above. Members of the peer committee must not have any other type of conflict of interest. To the extent possible, the peer committee should represent the candidate's discipline and faculty work. (The remainder of this regulation will be followed as written in UAF *Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty*.)
- x Chapter IV.B.5.c./Chapter IV.C.4.c. Levels of Review. The levels of review for non-represented faculty will be those associated with the faculty member's previous bargaining unit. (The remainder of this regulation will be followed as written in UAF *Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty*.)
- x Chapter IV.B.5.d. Constitution and Operation of the University-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee. The university-wide review committee convened to review promotion of represented faculty candidates will also review the non-represented faculty candidate. The Faculty Senate and provost must take this into account when selecting members for the university-wide review committee. (The remainder of this regulation will be followed as written in UAF *Regulations for the Appointment and Evaluation of Faculty*.)
- x Chapter IV.B.6./Chapter IV.C.5. Exclusive process for reconsideration. A non-represented faculty member who is denied promotion may request reconsideration in accordance with the process identified herein.

Exclusive Process for Reconsideration/Appeals Process for Non-Represented Faculty

Notice of an appeal must be submitted by the faculty member (i.e., "complainant") to the chancellor's office within ten business days of the faculty member's receipt of official notification of the decision regarding the promotion. The notice of appeal must include a statement of why the decision is being appealed; the reasons why the complainant disagrees with the decision; the remedy sought; and the name, academic unit, telephone number, and address at which the complainant shall receive all correspondence related to the complaint.

Within ten business days of receipt of the appeal, the chancellor shall transmit the appeal to an ad-hoc appeals committee (hereafter "the committee").

The committee will be appointed by the chancellor, or by the provost as the chancellor's designee. The committee will be composed of three administrators, three faculty members, and a fourth faculty member to serve as the chair of the committee. No member will be appointed to the committee who has a professional or personal conflict such that they cannot render an impartial judgment.

The function of the committee shall be to hear the evidence relating to an appeal and to render a majority recommendation. The evidence subject to review by the committee is limited to the documentary evidence considered in the original academic decision being appealed. The committee may seek testimony from witnesses for clarification of the documentary evidence.

The committee shall conduct its deliberations according to informal and non-adversarial procedures, which shall be submitted in writing to the provost's office prior to the committee's review of the appeal.

The committee shall, within 30 business days of the receipt of the appeal from the chancellor, prepare a written recommendation addressing each issue included in the appeal presented to the committee. The committee's recommendation shall be forwarded to the chancellor as the final recommendation on the appealed decision. Members of the committee not concurring with the majority opinion may submit a minority recommendation, which shall be presented in a meeting with the chancellor along with the majority recommendation.

Upon advance written notice to the chair of the committee, the chancellor may meet with the committee at any time after having received its recommendation for the sole purpose of seeking clarification concerning the bases and implications of its recommendation.

The chancellor may accept the recommendation of the committee and proceed accordingly; or the chancellor may find that the best interests of the University would not be served in accepting the recommendation. In those cases in which the chancellor does not accept the committee's recommendation, the chancellor shall set forth in writing the reasons for the rejection. The decision of the chancellor shall be rendered in writing within 20 business days of the receipt of the committee's recommendation. The chancellor's decision is final and binding and not subject to further review. Copies of the committee's recommendation and the chancellor's decision shall each be transmitted by the chancellor to the complainant within 10 business days of receipt.

By mutual agreement, the parties may extend the appeal filing and response timelines set forth above. Such agreements shall be confirmed in writing by the party requesting the extension.

ATTACHMENT 166/10
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the OSYA Selection Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the nominations of Jennifer Reynolds and Anne Christie for the 2010 Outstanding Senator of the Year Award.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The Outstanding Senator of the Year Award Screening Committee has carefully reviewed the 2010 nominations of Jennifer Reynolds and Anne Christie. The committee has concluded that both Jennifer Reynolds and Anne Christie are well-deserving candidates for this award. Procedure stipulates that a simple majority vote of the Senate shall confirm the nomination, and a formal resolution shall be prepared for presentation to both recipients at the May meeting of the Senate.

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

Comments:

A peer observation form used at the University of Washington School of Dentistry:
<http://www.dental.washington.edu/departments/restorative/pdfs/resources/PeerEvalSmSeminar2009-0425.pdf>

ATTACHMENT 166/12
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

**Minutes Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) meeting
Feb 8th 2010, 9:00 AM til 10:15 AM
by Falk Huettmann**

Participants: Falk Huettmann (Co-Chair), Ken Abramowicz (Co-Chair), Ginny Tschanz, Carrie Baker, Rainer Newberry, Tim Stickel, Dana Thomas, Beth Leonard (Phone), Lewis (Phone), Eric Heyne (guest)

1. Welcome

The new meeting time and venue was introduced and confirmed by all participants.

2. Minutes of previous CAC meeting

Approved

3. Announcements

- a) Rainer reported on a forthcoming Certificate on Rural Nutrition; it was briefly discussed by the committee. It will likely be submitted to CAC for a regular review soon.
- b) A motion to approve an Associate of Applied Science in Drafting Technology was also briefly discussed, steps are coming forward as outlined in the previous CAC meeting (see notes)
- c) It was briefly mentioned that UAF will face financial hardships for the coming 2-3 years. Reasons and implications were discussed.

4. CORE Short presentation by Eric Heyne re. Statewide Committee Work relating to LEAP and CORE Curricula.

Eric read a short note that gave an overview of LEAP on other campuses, provided reasoning to LEAP, and ended with a question on the state of our progress. Dana clarified further details, and that the three Alaskan campuses can maintain their own CORE but adhere to the Outcomes as the binding and overruling 'umbrella'. The committee made clear that UAF has not even worked on LEAP yet, and that the CORE discussion is still ongoing (draft 1 in review). It was further debated that CORE and LEAP do have bigger impacts that are not fully assessed and known even. Finally, the progress and work on CORE by this committee was presented to the Faculty Senate, and widely supported there.

5. CORE: Trip by Carrie and Falk to the General Ed conference in Seattle, 18th - 20th Feb.

Carrie and Falk were asked to participate for CAC-UAF at the General Ed conference. They registered at the Assessment workshop. But both asked the committee for input on what specific tasks to focus and report on. A. Christie asked earlier to report on library issues, and Dana suggested to focus on how Measurable Outcomes are assessed, which instruments get used, what experiences other institutions have, and learn about the Voluntary System and Accountability (APLU).

6. CORE: Fine-tuning of paragraphs, discussion

The fall updates from Carrie Debbie, Beth and the email group discussion were discussed and further revised. Falk has compiled a draft 1 document, distributed via email to the CAC list, that includes all of these details, and which forms as a discussion platform to be revised further over the coming month.

7. Other Business

Ken informed on the UAF Calendar discussion to come.

8. Adjourn

Minutes Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) meeting
Feb 22nd 2010, 9:00 AM til 10:15 AM
by Falk Huettmann

Participants: Falk Huettmann (Co-Chair), Ken Abramowicz (Co-Chair), Ginny Tschanz, Carrie Baker, Rainer Newberry, Christa Bartlett, Dana Thomas, Thayne Magelky (guest)

1. Welcome

2. Approval of minutes

(delayed for a week; draft1 exist on email)

ATTACHMENT 166/13
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

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

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

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

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

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

ATTACHMENT 166/14
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

**Unit Criteria Meeting Minutes
Feb 25 2010 1-200pm ONL 201**

Attending:

Mark Herrmann

Tim Wilson

Brenda Konar (chair)

Julie McIntyre (co-chair)

Andy Anger

Heidi Brocious

Sonja Koukel (absent from meeting but sent an email saying that she had no comments and approved criteria)

Visiting Participant:

Carrie Baker (Theater)

Kade Mendelowitz (Theater)

Old Business:

Natural Sciences:

This has still not been revised. We recommend that a revision be submitted and that someone from Nat Sci attend our next meeting.

Theatre:

The committee would like to thank Theatre for their hard work on this current draft and for attending our meeting to help clarify some issues. They will make a few adjustments and then send us a new version. It is hoped that this new version will be approved via email.

Overall, these criteria are much better and easier to understand than past versions.

A few remaining concerns/questions:

The explanation on Page 3 was left in the document so that everyone would understand what the national standards are for this group. The committee is still unsure if this is necessary. It was decided that it is fine to keep as is.

Another concern is that there is currently no way to rank the various levels (assistant, associate and full professor) for service, research, and teaching. This is hard for both new faculty determining what they should be doing at the various ranks and for those who need to review the files. The Theater Dept will try to come up with a paragraph or two to help clarify. This can be sent to the committee prior to the next meeting for more input.

There was a bit of concern about the statement about the “unusually high teaching load”. Theater says they want to make sure everyone understands that, since this is a research university, teaching is their priority. This is in their workloads, they just want to emphasize the point.

There was some discussion of grant money available (page 6, section d). The committee would like this to be re-worded so that it is clear that their faculty apply for grants but it is rare that they get it because of a lack of funding.

New Business:

None

Next meeting:

A poll will be conducted to pick a time/day for the week of April 19

ATTACHMENT 166/15
UAF Faculty Senate #166, April 5, 2010
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

**Committee on the Status of Women,
Meeting Minutes for Monday, 25 Mar 2010, 2-3, 330 Signer's Hall**

Members Present: Alexandra Fitts, Jenny Liu, Derek Sikes, Diane Wagner, Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Janet McClellan

Members absent: , Elizabeth Allman, Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen

1. Leave Share Resolution. Jane reported that CSW's Leave Share Resolution passed the Faculty Senate on March 1, 2010 and Staff Council passed it on 3/19/10. Family Medical Leave vs Leave Share differences were discussed, the former has broader coverage than the latter. Question regarding the cost effectiveness of the resolution remains unanswered but is probably related to the fact that leave \$ comes from a different source than salary.

2. Promotion and tenure workshop planning. Friday April 23rd. 10am-12pm, 109 Butrovitch (Regent's Conference Room). Planning discussion; Kayt will set up webstreaming; Derek & Jenny will help with room setup.

3. Brown bag lunches. Plan for fall, tabled until next meeting

4. CSW elections.

