

DRAFT MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #176
Monday, September 12, 2011
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Catherine Cahill
A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Abramowicz, Ken
Alexeev, Vladimir
Arendt, Anthony
Baek, Jungho
Baker, Carrie
Barboza, Perry

Members Present (cont'd):

Newberry, Rainer
Ng, Chung-Sang
Radenbaugh, Todd (audio)
Renes, Sue
Reynolds, Jennifer
Short, Margaret

Others Present:

Doug Goering
Pete Pinney
Linda Hapsmith
Joy Morrison

will only need to file timesheets if they need to report the use of leave, so it greatly simplifies the system (if grant reporting isn't part of the process for those faculty).

Elisabeth N. asked if a separate software program has to be downloaded. Jennifer responded that the system being used is a web interface.

Cecile L. asked what some of the restrictions are that Jennifer is aware of for grant reporting. PPAs have been removed from the timesheet reporting process. They will only have FYI access to look at the timesheets, but can not have more involvement with directly changing it. Currently, there have been cases where PPAs change timesheets and make changes and corrections without the direct involvement of the faculty. HR has argued that they're building in more error checking into the process and the PPA involvement won't be needed.

A. Remarks by Chancellor Brian Rogers

The UAF accreditation visit is coming up the first week of October. The report is online and everyone is encouraged to read it. Be prepared to be approached by a team member to answer questions about your respective units.

The Board of Regents will get their first view of the FY13 budget request at their meeting later this month. They're still in the negotiation process about what is and isn't included in the request. The president's focus is very similar to last year with an emphasis on deferred maintenance projects.

The strategic direction process underway for the UA system will include a lot of community involvement. Terry MacTaggart is participating. Early drafts will be out this fall and will include some major new directions and changes to existing directions for the UA system as a whole. This will have an impact on the UAF mission, goals and themes for the next round of accreditation which begins as soon as the current accreditation process is completed.

B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs
Promotion and Tenure Summary Report (Attachment 176/1)

Susan called attention to the attached promotion and tenure summary report of last year's reviews, noting 90% received awards of tenure and/or promotion and there were mostly favorable fourth-year and post-tenure reviews as well. She emphasized that fourth-year reviews are supposed to be formative and assist newer faculty to improve, rather than be taken as any sort of final judgment of performance or indication of prospects for tenure. She noted there's a lot to be proud of concerning UAF faculty and every year the process helps her get acquainted with the faculty and their accomplishments. This year's review will cover 105 files.

She also mentioned the accreditation site visit, noting that under the new process there is no chance to rest on our laurels once it's completed. Next year at this time the Year One report is due with updated strategic plan and mission statement.

C. Remarks by Vice Provost Dana Thomas

By means of a PowerPoint presentation, Dana covered the basics about institutional accreditation by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) of UAF. [A handout of the presentation is posted online at the senate Meetings page.] The site visit process UAF is about to

undergo will probably result in some additional recommendations that may include some reporting requirements and perhaps additional visits by NWCCU accreditors.

The comprehensive self-evaluation report is posted online at the Provost's web site. It includes many appendices and much online information. The report is now in the hands of the accreditors who are beginning to make contact with indi

- B. Motion to Reaffirm Unit Criteria for CEM, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 176/3)

Perry B. brought the motion to the floor. He mentioned the merging of the Computer Science Department to the college as an explanation for some of the changes to the criteria. In general, it was a smooth process for the committee to approve them and he encouraged the criteria be approved. The motion to reaffirm the CEM unit criteria was called to question and seconded, with a unanimous vote of approval.

- C. Reaffirmation of the Resolution for Open Promotion and Tenure Meetings, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 176/4)

Cathy brought the resolution to the floor, reading it aloud. A vote was taken to reaffirm the resolution, and it passed unanimously. [Reference attachment 176/4.]

VII Discussion Items

- A. Dean's Council General Education Revitalization Revision Recommendations – Dana Thomas (Attachment 176/5)

Dana asked the Deans to meet this summer in the spirit of shared governance to discuss the implications of revising the core curriculum. The General Education Revitalization Committee had expressed their concerns about the potential impact of tuition revenue generation affecting the schools and colleges. Engaging the deans early in the process of the core revision was done to help them understand and engage in the process. The last three years of core course tuition revenue figures were provided to the deans to give them a clear picture of the financial side. Of course, the impact of what the GER Committee develops and brings to the Faculty Senate won't be known until they finish their work of deciding what courses and experiences will comprise the changed core. To

What is the timeline? Dana urges the Faculty Senate to be responsible for the timeline. He is hopeful about getting the work done this year but understands the senate might take longer. Chancellor Rogers noted there would also have to be a timeframe for implementation of a new core, as well.

Cathy commented on the recommendations to look at current core course assessment processes, and asks the Core Review Committee to specifically look at that piece both now and for future courses. Courses with written and oral intensive designators need to be reviewed so faculty know the courses still meet requirements and standards and haven't drifted away from the intended learning outcomes. Dana mentioned there are actually core courses which haven't been taught in more than five years.

Lara H. asked how many core courses are being taught by new faculty, and Rainer noted that it's a problem because courses have lost focus and drifted away from learning outcomes in some cases.

Franz M. commented about changes in technology that may have influenced change in core courses.

Cathy mentioned that it's time for moldy courses to be reviewed at the curriculum committees.

Lara asked what comprises the core course evaluation process. Cathy responded that guidelines for assessment of Written- and Oral-intensive and Natural Science core courses are pretty clear; how to assess other core requirements isn't so clear. Assessing drift from the core purpose currently and in the future core is necessary. The work needs to be divided between Core Review for current courses, and future core development at the General Education Revitalization Committee. It should

Cecile L. asked about what is involved in these reports. Dana suggested reviewing the Assessment portion of the Provost's web site which contains much helpful information and reports: www.uaf.edu/provost/assessment-review/assessment

Jennifer R. urged people to go back to their departments and discuss the timing and requirements of assessment and program review reporting with their department faculty and chairs. Bring information from those discussions back to the senate. There will be more discussion on this topic in future senate meetings.

C. Legislative Coordination ad hoc Committee – Cathy Cahill

Faculty Alliance met with Chris Christianson, the new legislative person for the university in Juneau. Now is an opportune time to form an ad hoc committee to develop processes to involve faculty in a year-round effort of communicating with legislators. Cathy asked that interested faculty contact her directly.

Stephan G. commented on the need to reduce duplication of effort in areas like this one where there are numerous requests for reports about the good things the university accomplishes. Cathy agreed on the need for a one-stop shop to report to and will keep that in mind and speak with Marketing about that.

D. Suggested Change to the "I" (Incomplete) Grading Policy – Cathy Cahill

Cathy asked the senate to consider changing the I to F policy, possibly adding a mechanism in the process to address situations where a grade higher than an F might be warranted. Currently, a student has to be passing the course to file for an incomplete grade.

Mike E. asked if I becomes the default grade for anyone who's not getting an A by the end of the semester; in other words, do all students get the same opportunity to raise their grade if they haven't achieved an A by the end of the semester. Rainer noted the two sides of the issue with the example of someone doing very well in the course but having a family emergency the last two weeks of class versus someone who's scraping along and wants an extension of time to essentially re-take the course. Lara H. noted there should be exceptions to the rule (a student gets deployed) but we shouldn't coddle students who are using the system and who don't really care about completing the course. Cecile L. commented that students must be treated like adults, and that faculty must be clearer in communicating the situations that allow for and incomplete to be granted -- not just grant them to be nice.

Ken A. asked Mike E. to address the fact that administrative exceptions to the policy are granted. Mike responded that the circumstances for which exceptions are being allowed are serious, such as military deployment or serious illness.

A tentative show of hands in the room to gauge how senators felt on this issue indicated that further discussion is warranted on the topic.

Linda H. asked Mike E. how many Incompletes are processed each semester and he responded that there are hundreds. Linda predicted that the Registrar's Office would become inundated if the word got out that the grade defaulted back to what the student would have gotten anyway even not finishing the incomplete. Rainer reiterated the reality that in the bulk of cases it wouldn't do any good anyway since the grade, factoring in the unfinished work, would be a D- or F. Jennifer R.

They also aim to do more work of handling business within the committees to help the meetings

Cecile L. expressed concern that it appears that the employees earning the least will have to use their leave time because they can't work from home or make use of the recommendations that faculty are able to take advantage of. Staff members expressed inequities in the options available to them as opposed to those available to faculty. To be safe at home during the storm they had to use leave. It seems to send an unintended but strong message that they must be at work or use leave time, and so lower paid employees will take more risk to get in to the office rather than have to use their leave time. Kris asked Cecile where she would establish the cut-off if she were in charge. Cecile noted that the message for employees to stay home in a dangerous situation must be clear and understandable. It's dangerous to come in to work during an ice storm whether one is only two blocks away or far away. The system would have worked better if salary was paid due to these types

XIII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 PM.

ATTACHMENT 176/2
UAF Faculty Senate #176, September 12, 2011
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a Minor in Marine Science.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011 and/or

centered research projects. Several elective options (e.g., Polar Marine Science, Dynamic Alaskan Coastline, Marine Biology and Ecology Field Course) will also emphasize polar regions, and Alaskan marine ecosystems in particular.

Undergraduates that have completed the minor in Marine Science will possess a knowledge base and skill set that will make them more competitive for a wide variety of agency and organization positions, particularly within the state of Alaska. Training provided here will be applicable in jobs with government management agencies (e.g., Alaska Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and

BIOL 473 – Limnology (4 credits)

ECON 235 – Introduction to Natural Resource Economics (3 credits)

Relationship to the “Purposes of the University”:

The objectives of the minor in Marine Science coincide with the UAF academic mission of providing high-quality education to undergraduates, because the minor will offer a suite of courses to augment student expertise in the natural sciences and resource management, and enable students seeking a career in fisheries or oceanographic research. Thus, the program addresses three core mission areas identified in the UAF strategic plan: Serve students; Provide quality educational opportunities and experiences; Be responsive to the needs of the state of Alaska.

Fisheries majors are expected to receive immediate benefits from this program, and many have expressed interest in additional MSL course offerings being made available to them. The Fisheries program has been growing rapidly over the last several years, with 68 students currently enrolled and numbers projected to increase to 70-80 in the next year. We also expect the program will serve students in other disciplines such as resource management and political science, as described in the sections above, and we intend to advertise the program to draw in students from these other fields.

ATTACHMENT 176/3
UAF Faculty Senate #176, September 12, 2011
Submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for the College of Engineering and Mines.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2011
 Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the College of Engineering and Mines. Revisions were agreed upon by the department representatives and the Unit Criteria Committee, and the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

**UAF REGULATIONS FOR THE APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY AND
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND MINES
UNIT CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND INDICES**

CHAPTER I

Purview

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER 5.7 (p. 8.7d) herein.

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

Criteria as 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.

Bipartite Faculty

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

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

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

B. Criteria for Instruction

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

1. Effectiveness in Teaching

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

- a. are highly organized, plan carefully, use class time efficiently, have clear objectives, have high expectations for students;

b. express positive regard for students, develop good rapport with students, show

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.

C. Criteria for Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Inquiry and originality are central functions of a land grant/sea grant/space grant university and all faculty with a research component in their assignment must remain active as scholars. Consequently, faculty are expected to conduct research or engage in other scholarly or creative pursuits that are appropriate to the mission of their unit, and equally important, results of their work must be disseminated through media appropriate to their discipline. Furthermore, it is important to emphasize the distinction between routine production and creative excellence as evaluated by an individual's peers at the University of Alaska and elsewhere.

1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

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

a. They must occur in a public forum.

b. They must be evaluated by appropriate peers.

c. They must be evaluated by peers external to this institution so as to allow an objective judgment.

d. They must be judged to make a contribution.

2. Components of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

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

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

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 work at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by juries, recognized artists, or critics.
 - e. Performances in recitals or productions, selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.
 - f. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.
 - g. Citations of research in scholarly publications.
 - h. Published abstracts of research papers.
 - i. Reprints or quotations of publications, reproductions of art works, and descriptions of interpretations in the performing arts, these materials appearing in reputable works of the discipline.
 - j. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.
 - k. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.
 - l. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.
-

- g. Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.
- h. Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.
- i. Training and facilitating.
- j. Radio and TV programs, newspaper articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media.
- k. Judging and similar educational assistance at science fairs, state fairs, and speech, drama, literary, and similar competitions.

2. University Service

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

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

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

4. Evaluation of Service

Each individual faculty member's proportionate responsibility in service shall be reflected in annual workload agreements. In formulating cr

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,

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 process for the development and approval of the unit criteria, standards and indices as outlined above in Chapter III, E. shall also apply to the definition and evaluation of faculty in special academic rank positions.

The appointment to special academic rank shall terminate on the date specified in the letter of appointment, and implies no expectation of a subsequent appointment.

ATTACHMENT 176/4
UAF Faculty Senate #176, September 12, 2011
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

The following resolution was passed at Faculty Senate Meeting #146 in Fall 2007, and endorsed by a letter

Deans Council General Education Revision Recommendations August 2011

During summer 2011 the Deans Council met four times to discuss the revision of UAF's general education requirements. The chancellor and provost contributed to the discussion. These meetings were held, in part, because of the potential impact on college and school tuition revenue, but also to formulate specific recommendations (given below) for consideration by the faculty senate.

Recommendations

1. Revise the existing general education motion to include all baccalaureate degrees, e.g., BM, BT, BBA, BFA, etc. The motion should refer to all baccalaureate degrees and the AA and AS degrees. It should not refer to associate degrees in general because general education requirements do not apply to applied associate of science (AAS) degrees.
2. We encourage the faculty senate to adopt general education requirements of 34 to 35 credits plus a capstone experience. The capstone experience is particularly useful in satisfying the integration component of the new learning outcomes and for assessment. In particular, a capstone experience (many of which already exist, e.g., senior thesis, senior recital or exhibit, and senior seminar), is recommended for every baccalaureate program.
3. The intended learning outcomes of each general education area (e.g., humanities and social science) should be approved by the faculty senate, made available in a convenient web location, and well communicated to the faculty. Guidelines like those for the current W, O, and Natural Science courses, which were approved by the faculty senate, need to be updated. In addition, the course syllabi for general education courses should be reviewed regularly to ensure the intended learning outcomes are included. The following pages list the existing guidelines approved by the senate and those provided by mathematics and library science; the deans were not aware of any other such guidelines. Suggested revisions should specify explicit student experience requirements. For example, W courses might require at least 20 pages written in a semester. Such experiential requirements are consistent with recent general education literature (e.g., see *Student Success in College* by Kuh et al. 2005 or *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses* by R. Arum and J. Roksa 2011).
4. We encourage the faculty senate to incorporate the collaborative learning, globalization, technology competence and sustainability elements of the new intended learning outcomes into the learning objectives of general education requirements. For example, the collaborative learning element could be incorporated in communication or natural sciences requirements. The intended outcomes for these elements need definition. Courses satisfying the collaborative learning (C), globalization (G), technological competence (T), and sustainability (S) elements could be labeled much like W and O courses are now. Existing courses could be revised or new ones created that fulfill these new elements of the intended learning outcomes. Assessment of these elements could be incorporated into the capstone requirement. The senate should consider waving one or more of these requirements for students who complete a related experiential activity such as study abroad, internships or volunteerism, or spending a semester at a rural campus.

5. The collection of possible ways to satisfy the information literacy component of the general education requirements should be expanded to include the existing stand alone LS101X course, a one-credit addition to first-year experience courses, a one-credit addition to other existing courses, or the incorporation of content into existing courses without adding credit. Library faculty would team teach courses in the case of one-credit additions and when the content is incorporated into existing courses; distance methods could be used in these situations. In addition, the information literacy requirement should be a prerequisite or co-requisite for ENGL 211 and 213 to ensure that this requirement is not put off until the end of a student's academic career.
6. Each general education course should include the senate approved intended learning outcomes in the course syllabi distributed to students. Course syllabi should be regularly reviewed for inclusion of intended learning outcomes as well as the faculty senate general syllabus requirements.
7. General education requirements should allow more choices for Alaska and transfer student flexibility no matter where or how delivered provided these choices are regularly assessed to ensure the intended objectives are being fulfilled.
8. General education requirements should be available by a variety of delivery methods to provide broad access so that a path to complete the AA degree is available. Not every general education course need be available by multiple delivery modes but every areaemation illfilled.

according to the number of students regularly enrolling in a given course, i.e., Small Class (less than 12 students), Medium or Large Class (at least 12 students), and Large Class (at least 20 students).

***Note specifically that under guideline 5 for a Large Class, a given course fulfills only half of the "O" intensive requirement, so that a student must take two such courses (hence the designation "O/2"). Under each of the other sets of guidelines, a single course would fulfill the "O" requirement.*

- d. Exceptions to these guidelines may be made by the Core Review Subcommittee because of unique circumstances in individual departments.

2. Specific Guidelines for "O" Designated Courses Emphasizing Group Communication in Medium or Large Class Contexts:

- a. Each student must be involved in at least one ongoing group project or team of 5 to 8 members, with

presenter and the respondent, and must be viewed by these individuals with the instructor present to provide feedback on oral communication effectiveness in the presentation and response.

- d. For individual presentations that relate to a common theme or project, it is highly desirable that the presentations be organized in a panel format, with a student moderator.
- e. All presentations must have a clear introduction-body- conclusion organization, appropriate to the discipline.
- f. At least one presentation must involve the development and use of appropriate visual aids, and it is desirable that all presentations do so.
- g. All presentations should receive evaluation by the instructor on oral communication competency (including responsiveness to audience questions), as well as on subject mastery.
- h. Students must receive, as part of the course structure, information/instruction on effective speaking, effective responding, organization of material for effective presentation, and on development and use of media and visual aids. If thematic panels are used, students should also receive instruction on panel/symposium and moderator techniques.

5. Specific Guidelines for "O/2" Designated Courses Emphasizing Public Communication in Large Class Contexts (Regularly enrolling 20 or more students):

- a. Each student must take at least two "O/2" designated courses to meet the Core Curriculum requirement for oral intensive coursework.
- b. Each student must be involved in the individual preparation and delivery of at least 2 course related presentations one of at least 5 minutes duration and one of at least 8-10 minutes duration, to an audience of about 20 persons.
- c. The 8-10 minute presentation, must be a formal individual presentation, and must involve questions from the audience and responses by the presenter.
- d. All presentations must have a clear introduction-body- conclusion organization, appropriate to the discipline.
- e. All presentations should receive evaluation by the instructor on oral communication competency (including responsiveness to audience questions), as well as on subject mastery.
- f. Students must receive, as part of the course structure, information/instruction on effective speaking, on organization of material for effective presentation

4. At least one personal conference should be devoted to the student's writing per term and drafts of papers should receive evaluation from the teacher and/or peers.
5. Written material should comprise a majority of the graded work in the course for it to be designated "intensive." "Written material" can consist of quizzes and exams with short answers or essay sections, journals, field notes, informal responses to reading or class lectures, structured essays, research projects, performance reviews, lab reports, or any forms suitable to the discipline being taught.

B. Guidelines for the "W" designator in Technical courses

1. In order to ensure that technical disciplines can meet the goals of the writing intensive requirements without compromising the technical quality of their courses, such disciplines may substitute longer courses or a series of courses (typically 1-credit labs) for each of the two necessary 3-credit writing intensive or "W"-designated courses. Courses meeting all the general guidelines will, of course, also be acceptable.
2. The longer course option allows the "W" designator for a 4- or 5-credit course in which written material comprises a portion of the grade equivalent to "a majority" of a 3-credit course. The course must also meet the other general guidelines.
3. The series option allows a student to replace one or both 3- credit "W" courses with a series of courses, each of which may be less than three credits--e.g., a series of 1-credit or 1-credit-equivalent laboratories. Each series, however, must sum to the equivalent of at least one 3-credit "W"- designated course. The initial course in the series will be designated "W1" and, while less than three credits, will fulfill all the other general requirements for a "W." The subsequent courses will base a majority of the grade on written material. Students must take the "W1" course before taking the other courses in the series.

*** To grade a course on written work means to use the student's written work as the basis for his or her grade. Written work is graded mainly on content and organization, with tone, word choice, sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling accounting for a smaller fraction of the grade.*

Effective: November 29, 1990

April 13, 1990
UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #18

GUIDELINES FOR CORE NATURAL SCIENCE DESIGNATOR:

The Natural Science requirement in the Core Curriculum shall be two 4-credit hour courses, each with a laboratory (8 credit hours total). Both courses must be selected from those available in one of the two options defined below.

The goal of the Natural Science component of the Core Curriculum is to prepare students for lifelong learning in the natural sciences (biology, chemistry, earth science, physics). In order to achieve this goal, three objectives will be met:

1. Students will become familiar with the methods used for acquisition and expansion of scientific knowledge through laboratory/field exercises which deal with
 - a. data collection and analysis,
 - b. hypothesis building, and
 - c. experimentation.
2. Students will learn and use major concepts of natural science either by exploring in depth a single discipline or the conceptual relationship between at least two of the natural sciences. Although there are no well-defined criteria for identifying a "major concept" of natural science, the following are generally accepted examples: momentum and energy, electricity and magnetism, the atomic and nuclear nature of matter, equilibrium, the cellular basis of life, evolutionary theory, and plate tectonics.

ATTACHMENT 176/6
UAF Faculty Senate #176, September 12, 2011
Submitted by the Office of the Provost

DRAFT MOTION

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness policy as indicated below:

EFFECTIVE: Upon approval by the Chancellor

RATIONALE: UAF institutional and specialized accreditation requires outcomes assessment reporting and assessment is important for the continuing improvement of curricula. To ensure that outcomes assessment information is collected regularly, with no long gaps, each program is asked to prepare a report every 2 years. This is consistent with the two year commitments that department chairs make so each department chair will know a report must be filed during their service. In addition, this change will provide timely information to summarize the implementation and results of assessment practices reported annually to the Board of Regents as required in policy P10.06.020.

CAPS = Additions
[[]] = Deletions

UAF EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS POLICY

In accordance with its mission, the University of Alaska Fairbanks has a continuing responsibility to review and improve performance of its students, faculty, and programs. The UAF therefore establishes the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation to describe the effects of curriculum, instruction, and other institutional programs.

The process will be useful for curricular and institutional reform and will be consistent with UA Board of Regents Policy and institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

The university shall ensure the academic freedom of the academic community in the development and maintenance of this process.

The data gathered and summarized as part of the educational effectiveness evaluation process shall not be used for evaluating individual faculty. Furthermore, no student shall be denied graduation based solely upon information gathered for the educational effectiveness evaluation process.

Each faculty member's activities in developing and/or implementing programmatic and institutional educational effectiveness efforts may be summarized in the instructional section of annual evaluations and promotion and tenure files.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

- 1) Student Information
Students shall be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.
- 2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum
Evaluation of the CORE curriculum shall include course assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.
- 3) Programmatic assessment
Each degree and certificate program shall establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.
- 4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning
An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of activities and student support services will be conducted.

The chair of each department (or equivalent as identified by the Dean or Director) shall prepare a report at least **BIANNUALLY** [[four years]] summarizing the Educational Effectiveness program for each certificate and degree program offered by that department. The report shall include a summary of the following:

- A. Student outcome goals and objectives of the program,
- B. The methods and criteria used to evaluate whether the goals and objectives are being met,
- C. A description of what information is collected annually, and
- D. How the results of such information are being used to improve the curriculum.

The report shall be presented to the dean or director's office **AND THE ACCREDITATION AND ASSESSMENT ASSISTANT IN THE PROVOST'S OFFICE BY THE END OF 9-MONTH FACULTY CONTRACTS IN MAY** [[during the month of May]]. At least some information gathering for this process shall occur annually.

Once an educational effectiveness evaluation program has been implemented for the core, the core review committee of the faculty senate shall prepare a report, at least biannually, summarizing the educational effectiveness of the components of the core curriculum. This report shall be similar in content to the report described above for individual programs but shall provide a summary for the components of the core curriculum. The components of the Core may be summarized in the report on a rotational basis, but at least some information should be gathered annually.

ATTACHMENT 176/7
UAF Faculty Senate #176, September 12, 2011
Guest Speaker: Kris Racina, HR Director



administrative leave time from available unrestricted funds

UAF Marketing and Communications is responsible to disseminate updated information to the campus and community through all available channels.

NON-COMPLIANCE

Non-compliance may result in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

EXCEPTIONS

None

PROCEDURES

Absent conditions requiring the authorization of administrative leave, the following options regarding employee leave may be implemented by supervisors, consistent with Cabinet determinations:

Department Status:

1. Vice-Chancellors must coordinate decision-making through Cabinet and keep the Chancellor advised of planned actions; Vice-Chancellors must coordinate with each other to be assured that essential services are adequately covered.
2. Vice-Chancellors and supervisors should determine essential services and communicate department status and operating hours to employees.
3. Vice-Chancellors may choose to reduce hours or remain fully open for business as circumstances dictate; employees who wish to work and avoid leave use should be accommodated to the extent possible. Supervisors should remain flexible during unusual circumstances and consider whether employee attendance is necessary to perform critical or essential functions.
4. Vice-Chancellors will update Marketing and Communication of department status.
5. Marketing and Communications will communicate information on University status during emergencies.

Leave Options

1. Employees may telecommute from home and work all or part of the day with supervisor approval.
2. If employees can safely commute and have access to their workspace, they can work a normal day.
3. Employees who are unable to safely commute to work, and are unable to telecommute, may use annual leave, leave without pay, or any combination of these leaves, for all or part of the day. Sick leave may be used for qualifying events described in University Regulation 04.06.130.
4. With supervisor approval and if the arrangement does not violate the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), employees who do not have adequate leave may flex their work schedule to make up time missed due to conditions. Overtime and overtime pay must be approved in advance by the supervisor. Approval is subject to budget considerations and department needs.
5. Other options as the Chancellor may authorize under circumstances presented.

ATTACHMENT 176/8
UAF Faculty Senate #176, September 12, 2011
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Meeting Minutes for Wed, Aug 31, 2011; 2-3 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Melanie Arthur, Nilima Hullavarad, Jenny Liu, Ellen Lopez, Shawn Russell, Derek Sikes, Kayt Sunwood, Jane Weber

Members absent: Stefanie Ickert-Bond, Jessica Larsen, Dan White

1. Luncheon. Jane Weber reported: Carol Gold will be the speaker. Tues, Oct 4th, 12:30 Wood Center ballroom reserved. All present CSW members will arrive 11am to help setup. Use online RSVP form instead of email to reserve seat.

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

Discussion on question of replacing paper invitations with digital in future years. This year's invitations will still be paper - Ellen, Jenny, & Melanie and others will contact Jayne Harvie to setup times to help fold invitations.

2. Brown Bag Lunch subcommittee. Kayt Sunwood, Ellen Lopez, Nilima Hullavarad, Shawn Russell, and Melanie Arthur. Discussion on those held in past years. Meeting to organize next will be Sep 19th, Monday 10:30 in the Woman's Center (also on Elluminate live). https://elive.uaf.edu/join_meeting.html?meetingId=1233801250389

3. Data on UAF faculty salary by gender. Sine Anahita offered to do a gender analysis of salary data which could be used to create posters which hopefully can be ready for posting October 3-5th during the Accreditation visit. The committee voted to give CSW's approval of moving forward on this project.

4. UAF Statistics on P&T and retention - 10 years of data. Jane will contact Dan White & Ian Olson regarding these data and attending next meeting.

5. Next CSW meeting, Oct 11th 2-3pm

6. CSW co-Chair. Jane Weber agreed to continue as co-Chair. Additional co-Chair TBD.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:40; Respectfully Submitted, Derek Sikes & Kayt Sunwood

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

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