

DRAFT MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #213

Monday, March 7, 2016 – 1:00 - 3:00 PM
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

- I. Call to Order – Debu Misra
A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (16)	MCDONNELL, Andrew (16)
ALLMAN, Elizabeth (16) – Falk Huettmann	MEYER, Franz (17)
BARNES, Bill (16)	MISRA, Debu (16)
BOLTON, Bob (17)	NEWBERRY, Rainer (17)

BRET-

B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #212

Minutes approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

Agenda adopted as submitted.

II

know the process, and it will be possible to train and schedule for it, as well as have it effectively resourced and shared.

3.) How can we change the relationship between faculty and the Board of Regents so that it is more collaborative and productive? She noted that she was a little surprised by this question. Speaking for herself, she feels she has good communication with the faculty. The BOR and faculty share the same interests of providing a good education to Alaskans and having the best university they can have, though there is the natural tension one would expect between them. Her background has included over 30 years in a customer service environment. She is a servant leader. Respecting one another is the number one thing that can be done; it's a two-way street. They don't want to jump to conclusions before the data are in. Relationships can be strengthened by not suspecting each other of evil motivations, by not being defensive about shortcomings in our performance, and by bringing forward good and creative ideas for improvement, and by sharing information with each other and communicating openly. Each one should defer to each other whenever it is appropriate and listen to each other. We're all in this together and need to work together in order to move forward.

4.) On what issues should the BOR exercise authority, and conversely, what decisions should be left to the faculty or the shared governance as it operates at each university? She sees the BOR governing the university by establishing the mission and purpose of the university system, and approving the mission and purposes of its campuses. They set policy, hire the president, and approve the strategic plan and the priorities for the university system and campuses. They approve academic program additions and deletions. They approve the budget, (y)20(6s)(1)(y)5(1)5 20(3211(d)4(s)(3)(s) 2206)hr4se2211(t)0471J33(r)-5(s)-2(t)

Ken also asked if BOR meetings could be recorded and made available for viewing outside of the set meeting time. Right now, meetings can be watched “live” but faculty are unable to watch or participate because of their teaching schedules. Chair Heckman said she would ask about that possibility.

Eric C. asked senators in the room to raise their hands if they are doing research. The majority of faculty in the room raised their hands. He commented that Representative Tammie Wilson and other legislators had a problem regarding university research. He asked Chair Heckman to address what the Board has to say about the importance of research.

Chair Heckman responded that there seems to be a misperception that the Board did not advocate for research with the legislature. They did advocate for university research, and she did so herself many times in person and on the phone. But, Representative Wilson has her own unique thoughts about the university budget. They do not know how she came to the conclusion that research should not be funded. Even some of Rep. Wilson’s own committee members were flabbergasted when she cut out research because they understand the importance of research dollars and how they’re used to leverage additional funding sources. It bothered Chair Heckman personally so much, that she wrote the letter to the UA community, asking everyone to please write to their legislators. Hundreds responded and it made a difference, with the House budget moving from \$288 million up to \$300 million. She also commented that she doesn’t think a lot of legislators share the opinion of Rep. Wilson in Juneau. The Board will make sure the message about the importance of research is loud and clear next year. And she stressed that the

decisions and what data were used. Chair Heckman responded that the Board had no part in making those definitions of lead campuses. They were provided to them by the President. The Board is waiting for more information from the President as the plan is being worked on.

Patty Meritt, from the Early Childhood Education Program, thanked Chair Heckman for her letter which she also shared with her students. She asked how faculty can share in or influence the Strategic Pathways process. The Chair answered that it's through the System Governance office. Faye Gallant gave further details of how to give feedback via a form posted online. Chair Heckman also commented that the President has an open door policy and welcomes input.

Cyndee West announced a petition she is circulating to support the university budget as proposed by the Board. She urged faculty to write letters to their legislators.

Robert Shields, president of the Sustainable Campus Action Force, announced weekly meetings of the group starting up this week about sustainable job training in a variety of fields. He also shared a flyer with information.

Sukumar Bandopadhyay commented that the budget situation was similar in 19

The FY17 budget is the urgent issue and focus right now. As spring and summer unfolds, there will be time to weigh in with the analysis of data and options. In January 2017, the teams will make recommendations to the president.

He shared briefly about a Title IX visit to Nome last week with Mae Marsh. And, he announced a \$1 million donation from British Petroleum D6Pum p317, t

A. Staff Council – Faye Gallant

Faye thanked the students for their excellent advocacy in Juneau this past weekend. Regarding SB 174 which concerns weapons on campus, SC is

VIII New Business

- A. Motion to approve Unit Criteria for the Geophysical Institute, submitted by Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 213/1)

Mara introduced the motion to approve unit criteria for the GI. The unit criteria were approved with no

Mae talked about the Title IX compliance scorecard posted online as a handout for the meeting. The President wanted a way to measure Title IX progress across the system. He has also charged her team with updating

Curricular Affairs – Jennifer Carroll, Chair (Attachment 213/5)
Faculty Affairs – Chris Fallen, Chair (Attachment 213/6)
Unit Criteria – Mara Bacsujlaky, Chair (Attachment 213/7)
Committee on the Status of Women - Jane Weber, Chair (Attachment 213/8)
Core Review – Andy Seitz, Chair (Attachment 213/9)
Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry, Chair
Student Academic Development & Achievement – Sandra Wildfeuer, Chair
(Attachment 213/10)
Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Franz Meyer, Chair
(Attachment 213/11)
Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Donie Bret-Harte, Chair
(Attachment 213/12)
Research Advisory Committee – Jessica Cherry, Chair
Information Technology Committee – Julie Cascio, Chair (Attachment 213/13)
Administrative Committee – Orion Lawlor (Attachment 213/14)

XIII Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:02 PM.

CHAPTER II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment.

Minimum degree, experience and performance requirements are set forth in UAF Faculty Policy, 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 and reside within a specific discipline.

C. Process for Appointment of Faculty with Academic Rank.

Deans of schools and colleges, and directors when appropriate, in conjunction with the faculty in a unit shall observe procedures for advertisement, review and selection of candidates to fill any vacant faculty positions. 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 on the unit.

E. Following the selection process.

CHAPTER III.

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

THOSE FACULTY OF THE GEOPHYSICAL INSTITUTE WHO HOLD A TENURE TRACK JOINT APPOINTMENT WITH A UAF COLLEGE OR SCHOOL ARE EVALUATED UNDER THE UNIT CRITERIA OF THE RESPECTIVE COLLEGE OR SCHOOL.

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 with 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.

BIPARTITE FACULTY MEMBERS AT THE GEOPHYSICAL INSTITUTE PREDOMINANTLY FILL POSITIONS PERFORMING IN THE RESEARCH AND SERVICE COMPONENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY'S MISSION, BUT MAY HAVE A TEACHING COMPONENT.

SPECIFIC SCIENCE CRITERIA FOR TEACHING PERFORMANCE:

BIPARTITE FACULTY WHO ENGAGE IN TEACHING AS AN OVERLOAD SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO DO SO AS A CONDITION FOR EVALUATION OR PROMOTION. EVALUATIONS MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH AN INDIVIDUAL FACULTY MEMBER'S REGULAR WORKLOAD AGREEMENT (I.E., NOT OVERLOAD). IF A RESEARCH FACULTY MEMBER HAS AN ASSIGNED TEACHING COMPONENT AS PART OF THEIR REGULAR WORKLOAD (I.E., NOT OVERLOAD), TEACHING SHOULD BE PART OF THE EVALUATION IN THE SAME PROPORTION AS IT IS TO THEIR WHOLE WORKLOAD FOR THE ENTIRE REVIEW PERIOD. ONLY TEACHING ACTIVITIES NOTED ON A FACULTY'S REGULAR (I.E., NOT OVERLOAD) WORKLOADS WILL BE EVALUATED UNDER TEACHING.

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 WHEN EVALUATING THE QUALITY OF THE TEACHING, CONS(e)TMe3.28 58

d. peer/department chair evaluation of course materials

SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR TEACHING PERFORMANCE:

¾ ASSISTANT PROFESSOR: EVIDENCE OF TEACHING ABILITY AND A COMMITMENT TO A QUALITY AND CURRENT TEACHING PROGRAM. STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND SUMMARY STATISTICS SHOULD SHOW THAT THE MAJORITY OF STUDENTS RATE COURSES FAVORABLY, AND, IF NOT, THERE SHOULD BE A DEFINITIVE 0.012 Tw 0.85 T48 0 Td (IF) Tj Td (IF)

1. Achievement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

- I. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving RESEARCH problems, such as computer programs, and systems for the processing of data, SAMPLE PREPARATION genetic plant and animal material, and where

- PUBLICATION OF DISCIPLINE-RELEVANT DATA AND METADATA, CONTRIBUTION TO CYBER INFRASTRUCTURE, OR CONTRIBUTING TO PUBLICLY AVAILABLE COMPUTER MODELS
- PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS
- LEADERSHIP IN PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS
- ACQUISITION OF EXTERNAL RESEARCH FUNDING
-

1. Public Service

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

- a. Providing information services to adults or youth.
- b. Service on or to government or public committees.
- c. Service on accrediting bodies.
- d. Active participation in professional organizations.
- e. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.
- f. Consulting.
- g. Prizes and awards for excellence in public service.
- h. Leadership of or presentations at workshops, conferences, or public meetings.
- i. Training and facilitating.
- j. Radio and TV program CONTRIBUTIONS, INCLUDING INTERVIEW, newspaper articles and columns, publications, newsletters, films, computer applications, teleconferences and other educational media.
- k. Judging and similar educational ~~instance~~ ^{instances} at science fairs, state fairs, and speech, drama, literary, and similar competitions.
- l. PROVIDING TOURS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC (MAY ALSO BE COUNTED AS UNIVERSITY OR PROFESSIONAL SERVICE DEPENDING ON THE AUDIENCE).

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 noninstructional work with students and their organizations. Examples of such activity include, but are not limited to:

- a. Service on university, college, school, institute, RESEARCH GROUP 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 ~~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~~lected~~ 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~~ecturer~~.
 - i. Mentoring INCLUDING SERVING AS NEW FACULTY MENTORS.
 - j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.
 - k. SERVING ON COMMITTEES THAT REPRESENT THE UNIVERSITY AT OTHER PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTIONS.
 - l. MANAGEMENT AND DIRECTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE THAT MAY INCLUDE DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS, RESEARCH EXPEDITIONS AND RESEARCH AND CAMPAIGNS AND MAINTAINING SCIENTIFIC EQUIPMENT.
 - m. CURATING SAMPLES AND DATA AND/OR THE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF FORMALLY RECOGNIZED UNIVERSITY COLLECTIONS THAT SERVE AS RESEARCH RESOURCES FOR STUDENTS AND RESEARCHERS AT UNIVERSITY, STATE, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS.
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~~o~~riented 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. SERVING AS A MENTOR/ADVISOR, COMMITTEE MEMBER OR EXTERNAL EXAMINER FOR STUDENTS AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS.

4. Evaluation of Service

Each individual faculty member's proportionate responsibility 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, AND PROFESSIONAL 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.

MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICE PERFORMANCE INCLUDE (BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO):

- O ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EFFORT OF ORGANIZATION TO WHICH SERVICE WAS PROVIDED.
- O OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF QUALITY OF SERVICE (E.G., AWARDS, LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION).
- O OPINIONS OF CLIENTS SERVED AND/OR COLLEAGUES INVOLVED IN DELIVERY OF SERVICE.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR SERVICE PERFORMANCE:R/J /T rCT,R/J /T rCTITI,R / J

"Term" would be retained in its current meaning and remain within the special academic rank category (it is not present as a defined title in the BOR policy).

Proposed Definitions Attached is a draft of what these proposed definition changes could be (with inclusion of some of the Provost's proposed wording/definiers in response to concerns raised and identified below) for purposes of further discussion and refinement, and as a starting point for discussing the idea of how to achieve parity. Upon review the Provost raised several concerns. Chief among these, and shared by this committee, is the potential for confusion that the modifiers "research", "teaching", "service" would apply to tenure

C. "non-tenure track position" means a position that is but does not provide faculty member any rights to consideration for appointment to tenure

1.

8. "visiting" means a person employed to perform the faculty function expected of academic rank for a specific period;
 9. "collaborating" means a faculty member employed by one unit of the university in voluntary faculty service with another unit;
 10. "joint" means a faculty member employed by two or more units of the university.
- E. "tenure" means the status of holding a faculty appointment on a continuing basis following evaluation and award according to the terms of P04.04.040.B;
- F. "tenure track position" means a position that may lead to consideration for appointment to tenure as described in the policies and procedures approved for each university; a tenure track position will require the performance of faculty function at least 50% of full-time; for exceptional cases and when in the judgment of the chancellor or the best interests of the university will be served, a faculty member may be appointed to a tenure track position at less than 100% but more than 50% of a full-time appointment;
- G. "university" means any one of the three universities within the University of Alaska.

Crossreference For other definitions applicable to this chapter, see P04.04.040.
(09-19-14)

P04.04.040.Appointment Categories.

The following categories of appointments shall be used to

B. Tenure Status

A faculty member appointed to a tenure track position may receive tenure only under the conditions of P04.04.045 and 04.04.050.

C. Faculty rank and title.

1. Academic rank. Titles of academic rank shall be the same throughout the ~~state~~ ~~university~~

ATTAC

courses? It was agreed to take this issue to the Administrative Committee for further discussion and input.

Ethics and Library Science will remain under the GER section of the catalog, since University Regulations allow credits in excess of 34 credits. Upper division courses can meet the criteria for GERs, though most will be 100 or 200-level courses. The upper-division writing and oral communication requirements will remain in this section, also, since plans do not go into effect until fall of 2017. OAR will continue to work on a GER brochure for faculty and advisors.

Status of capstone requirement was mentioned. Mike E. was going to work on a list of programs that don't have a capstone yet.

Holly mentioned the AA and AS programs which need time to make changes to their degree requirements that reflect the ER. Mahla and Pete (CRCD) need to be contacted; Jennie to follow up.

ii. Transition issues (Ginny's e-mail)

Topic was not discussed due to time constraints.

iii. Possible ways of going forward with less disruption

1. Shorten the list?

4.

Minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Old Business

a. Grade Appeals Policy

- i. Special guests Amber Cagwin, Dean of Students Office, and Mathew Carrick, ASUAF President

ASUAF President Mathew Carrick presented three main questions about the grade appeals policy to the committee.

Questions submitted by Mr. Carrick

- i. Why is the student member of the grade appeal committee appointed by the dean, and why is the student nonvoting?

In the case of judicial reviews, Mathew noted that student government appoints the student member. So, he wanted to learn why the dean does so with regard to grade appeals.

- ii. Why is the appealing student not allowed an advocate when he or she has the second meeting with the dean and professor?

He pointed out that current policy is out of compliance with Regents' Policy at P09.03.040, which says that an advisor may be present at all times for the student.

- iii. Why is the review committee's decision final? Does this mean there's no way to appeal the committee's decision at all?

While the decision being final does not contradict BOR policy, Mathew still wanted to understand why that was the case. Ken A. pointed out that the committee review was the third and final step in the three-step process, so he could understand why it would be considered final.

Members of the committee responded that the grade appeals policy was many decades old (actually predating Faculty Senate and "UAF"), having been in place before anyone present even worked at the university. They agreed the questions had merit, particularly in light of the contradiction with BOR policy concerning advocates. Some of the faculty members had served on appeals committees where the student had been allowed to have an advocate present.

Amber commented that her office has not been allowing advocates because of the current UAF policy, but that the contradiction with BOR policy was also a point she had noted down in order to raise today. What would be the most helpful for students would be guidance about the process before they submit their appeal and a discussion about what kind of documentation they need to put together.

Alex F. noted that an academic appeals advisor position was created a couple of years ago to provide this sort of guidance, and this is mentioned in the catalog. It would be helpful if this were noted in the policy.

Procedural changes that would be helpful were discussed at length. Dean Goering brought up the issue of e-learning and changing modes of instruction, which are raising new issues the policy does not address. Having an academic appeals advisor could be very helpful in this regard, also, to help sort through problems and perhaps prevent unnecessary appeals. Ginny K. commented that since the former advisor who was tasked with the appeals advising duties left UAF employment, the role has not been reassigned. Mathew commented that the role of student peer advisor could also be very helpful to

students, but the policy does not provide an established role for them. The committee expressed support for the roles of appeals advisors (both staff and student).

The committee decided that the issues could be most effectively addressed by creating a subcommittee to look at the issues in depth and to find better ways to advise students about appeals. Joan, Ken, Mathew, Alex, Ginny, Mike and Amber agreed to serve on the subcommittee. The new subcommittee will provide a status report by the first of April, and they will consult with General Counsel to be sure changes are in line with BOR policy. Potentially, there would be time to get any changes to Faculty Senate at the May meeting.

- b. GER classification implementation
 - i. Foreign Languages
 - 1. Draft guidelines (attached)

Rainer reported about the discussion at the Administrative Committee concerning allowing the second semester language courses. They were supportive of making languages an exception to the 'no prerequisites' standard. The topic will be brought to the full Faculty Senate as an information item.

The UA Regulations do not address the 3 credits vs. 5 credits language courses. The Foreign Languages department does not wish to have the 3 credit (100A and 100B) courses count toward the GER because they are not the equivalent of the first year, 5 credit courses. The 3-

ATTACHMENT 2136
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Faculty Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes: Wednesday, January 20, 2016
4::00 PM, Conference Room (330), Murie Building, UAF

Present: Andreas Anger, Chris Fallen, Valerie Gifford, Joshua Greenberg, Leslie McCartney, Walter Skya

Absent:

ATTACHMENT 2137

management word into being clearer as to what it means—this is probably not the intent of the section to be speaking to management in the sense of building management. IAS scores—difficulty is in specifying score benchmarks. Will remove IAS benchmark statement from unit criteria. GI will revise and resubmit final copy – we will review and finalize at Jan meeting.

2. Unit Criteria committee position on student evaluations as metric in faculty evaluations/promotion/tenure

Short discussion due to time limits: For the interim, as a temporary measure since evaluation metrics are not available for online student evaluations, committee will request/recommend that unit criteria submitted for review not contain criteria tied to IAS and/or online student evaluations. Mark suphio 2.66 0 Td ()

W: 0.59879-0.400374(6)H: 2.2273-0.091535003 Td: 0.0476(0.6)

ATTACHMENT 213/8
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women
Minutes Friday, 19 Feb 2016 10-11am, School of Ed Conference Room Gruening 718

Present: Jane Weber, Diana Di Stefano, Derek Sikes, Alex Fitts, Megan McPhee (via skype), Sine Anahita, Ellen Lopez, Kayt Sunwood

- 1) Promotion, Tenure & Career Success Workshop April 22 (10:00noon). Jayne Harvie will reserve

-

ATTACHMENT 213/9

taken another ESK language class, therefore meets the PHC language substitute requirement, so the petition was not necessary.

b. Approved :

i. W designator request for BIOL F497. After reviewing the course syllabus, the committee agreed that the course clearly meets the UAF "W" requirements.

ii. tUK •]Pv š}CE• CE ‹μ •š (}CE &đôò š l v]v •μuu CE îîíñX
CE À] Á μCE]vP šZ E}ÀX îì u š]vPU μš]• CE %o v Ç]v
committee to request more information from the course instructor. The course instructor provided more information about the course requirements and grading, vis a vis W and O designators. The committee agreed that the course met the UAF "W" and "O" requirements. It was then mentioned that several other students took the class in •μuu CE îîíñ v •Z}μo šZ Ç CE]À t v K •]Pv š}CE• (}C }uu]šš PCE šZ š oo •šμ vš• vCE}oo]v &đôò μCE receive W and O designators for the course.

c. Denied:

i. Request to substitute SPCH 104 taken in 1979 for the CO9 f7f0.9(3()10w 1)10.1110Td (]) (o
i.h

ATTACHMENT 213/10

UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016

Submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee
Meeting Minutes for December 8, 2015

On Faculty Senate site:

Appointed Members:

Cindy Hardy, CRCD/DevEd - SADAC Liaison

to CAC Ben Kuntz, Kuskokwim Campus

Joe Mason, Northwest Campus

Jennifer Tilbury, CTC Developmental Ed - Co-Chair -

absent Sandra Wildfeuer, BBC / IAC - Chair

Stacey Howdeshell, Academic Advising Center

Colleen Angaiak, Rural Student Services

Elected Members:

Jill Faudree, Math/CNSM (17)

Eileen Harney, English/CLA

(16) Bill Howard,

Science/CNSM (17)

Ex officio:

Alex Fitts, Provost's Council Rep -

absent OAR: Mike Earnest

1. The minutes for November were approved with the change of adding Bill Howard's name to the attendance.
2. The agenda for the day was approved.

Joe Mason is retiring after serving on the committee for many years!!!!

3. Committee definition and General Description of Committee

SADA committee reviewed the most recent version of committee motion passed through the faculty senate. Concerns were raised by SADA members in November about wording in the general committee description section of the motion regarding voting procedures. Changes were made at the Ad Comm meeting in November to clarify that each

The registrar can run advisor audit to see who is assigned to students.
Currently in Banner there is a need to TRICK the system to put students in two different colleges. Degreeworks=TRNG

Courseleaf is curriculum management

Requests for data about the number of students at UAF that are impacted.

How many double majors?

How many double degrees?

What departments are impacted?

What about AAS and AA and Bachelor's?

A possible solution is a special training for advisors about double majors and double degrees, to make sure all are informed.

8. Subcommittee Report: Student Resiliency Project
The committee has shared relevant articles. There was an illness and the committee will refresh in January.
9. Next meeting: A doodle poll will be sent to set up a time for the next meeting. Expect to meet in January, February, March and April.

Adjourn

Joy reported that she has ~~been~~ meeting one-on-one with all new faculty members since returning on February 1. She has set up the faculty development training calendar for the spring semester and it is available on the website. Upcoming is a presentation on bullying within departments called “Responding to Toxic Behavior” and will feature Libby Roderick from UAA. Due to results from a satisfaction survey indicating faculty concerns over academic bullying, UAA has created a video on the subject. The video will be shown and discussed on Tuesday, February 23 at 12:30 – 2:30 pm (Rasmuson 340) and again from 3~~5~~ pm (Murie Auditorium). Joy is hoping that this presentation will get a dialog going at UAF.

Joy informed us that the Office of the Registrar and the Dean of Students will give a talk for faculty on February 16. Several registration issues will be discussed.

Joy explained that there may not be enough money remaining in the budget this year to do much; and travel next fall to the POD Conference is limited, so she most likely will not be able to attend and take faculty members.

V. Upcoming activities by UAF eLearning & Distance Education

Chris passed out a list of upcoming faculty development opportunities at eLearning and Distance Education which will include iTeach Spring (March 25, 28, 30 and April 1) as well as various iTeach+ Workshops occurring throughout the spring semester. He informed us that faculty participating in iTeach will have access to one-on-one help from eLearning’s Instructional Designers after completing the course. In addition eLearning offers various times for “Open Lab” for all faculty members needing assistance with teaching or developing their eLearning classes.

Coming in late February or early March there will be a workshop (or two) regarding the new Quality Matters Rubric for reviewing electronic courses. Chris explained that more information on this will be forthcoming.

There was some discussion regarding eLearning’s collaboration with the other two MAUs. Chris explained that UAF is the only one to have a centralized eLearning office. He noted that while there is some collaboration, UAA and UAS are just getting started on the process of centralization that UAF has had for years.

VI. Discussion on Status of the Faculty Mentoring program

Franz started the discussion by saying that in the current economic climate where there are fewer people doing more work, mentoring can fall by the wayside. Our committee has been charged with coming up with ideas regarding incentivization: is it needed, and if so, what is the best way to do it?

Franz noted four components to mentoring programs: 1) pairing mentors and mentees – which is mainly done by assignment through directors or deans; 2) training for both mentors and mentees – how much is being offered at UAF needs to be defined; 3) tracking mentoring activities – should tracking be recommended? If so, care should be taken to not put a burden on the mentoring process; and 4) Incentivizing mentors, mentees, and (potentially) Deans – what incentives are most effective?

Joy explained that she ensures that every new faculty member has a mentor. She conducts an initial introduction to mentors and mentees including training in the main components of UAF’s mentoring program. She also revisits mentees in their second semester to hear how the mentoring process is

ATT

ATTACHMENT 213/13
UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016
Submitted by the Information Technology Committee

Information Technology Committee
February 17, 2016 at 10 a.m. via Adobe Connect.

The meeting of the Information Technology Committee via Adobe Connect was convened at 10:03 a.m.

Roll Call

Attendees: Julie Cascio, Joanne Healy, Rorik Peterson, Ruth Prato, Siri Tuttle, Chris Lott ex officio, Debra Kouda ex officio, Fred Schlutt ex officio

Not present: Falk Huettmann, Eric Collins, Bill Barnes, Martha Maso ex officio

Adobe Connect – Chris Lott shared information on setting this up and that eLearning is using it as it works for some Online teachers. Thoughts noted include:

There is a cost... \$19/mo for a room that contains up to 25 users.

People should probably mute the mic when they aren't talking. Switch to single speaker mode can help.

Use of Blackboard Collaborate Feedback – One comment indicated that learning to use multiple mics in the meeting was helpful. Using Blackboard Collaborate as a class seemed to work better than for a meeting some thought. The effect was described like an old-fashioned teleconference, except with diminished sound quality at times

Maintaining student records from online book sources – Rorik Peterson looks at assignments turned in via McGraw Hill or other book to keep for a long enough time period. One automatic score that gets aggregated into the Blackboard. Grades were not being populated. He could not get information so will report next meeting.

eLearning's efforts to bring Quality Matters to UAF – Chris shared the design on this rubric used for faculty development to look at quality. He asked for interest, and who else would be interested in learning about this. Some comments included interest in applying this rubric to courses and that would like to take a copy of this rubric to my next department meeting. Having an account with QM to get a look at the rubric is interested.

Overall scores are sent to the teacher being looked at. Chris shared information that can be shared with Faculty Senate. Attached is the text of a Teaching Tip about Quality Matters and a page summary of the Rubric QM uses for peer reviews. This is available by signing up to the free account

Explorance Blue – Chris reported that Andrea sent letter via this on what has happened now. Paper evaluation was 60% in past. Decline is not as steep as expected. Online is lower which was to be expected in this first year being used. The website created will be going online soon to promote using these. Inspire us! Is the theme and is designed to help students understand how important this is. Chris will connect to see why Siri did not see her student responses yet. He said may have not been enough responses or got caught in SPAM. Joanne shared that she allowed in class time for responses but students responses were minimal and incomplete. Another comment was that some are voluminous responses!

OIT faculty engagement – Debra connected via a mobile phone, which made this connection more difficult to hear. Debra said work on the Lecture capture is in progress. Working with Faculty

engagement has not started yet.

Page Up- Julie reported that she called two universities that were listed on the ppt about this program. Kansas State University reported it was used only for employee recruitment. University of Alabama was also called. Neither used it for faculty evaluation.

Next Meeting –

March 23, 2016, 10 am CANVAS talk will facilitate using this platform

April 20, 2016, 10 am Platform suggestions

The meeting adjourned 10:56 am

Chair, Julie Cascio

ADDITIONAL HANDOUT INFORMATION POSTED ON COMMITTEE'S WEB SITE:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/156-itc/>

"The Quality Matters Higher Education Rubric" (PDF, 650KB)

Quality Matters at UAF (PDF, 160KB)

ATTACHMENT 213/14

UAF Faculty Senate #213, March 7, 2016

Submitted by the Administrative Committee

UAF FACULTY SENATE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes for Friday, February 26, 2016 – 1:00 - 3:00 PM Chancellor's Conference Room

Present: Mara Bacsujlaky; Jennie Carroll; Julie Cascio (via Zoom); Chris Fallen; Alex Fitts (ex officio); Orion Lawlor (Chair); Debu Misra; Rainer Newberry; Andy Seitz; Sandra Wildfeuer

Absent: Donie Bret-

additions. This item will be brought to the Faculty Senate meeting as a discussion item. There was support for the goal of preparing a related motion for the April meeting.

- o GER and Alaska Native requirement