



associated with the UAF MAU.

B. Motions pending: none

### III Comments from Chancellor Joan Wadlow -

Chancellor Wadlow spent a few minutes giving her sense of what might happen in the legislature. At this time, she believes that we can avoid a cut if we keep up the pressure on the legislators, both those of us from the interior and as well as from elsewhere in the state. This is based on two or three things. First, our supporters are very active. Most importantly, it is based on the sense that a number of community leaders have gained as a result of their meetings with legislators. For example, the Board of Trustees of the UA Foundation met in Juneau, and as part of that meeting a number of Fairbanks community leaders were there. In groups of two to four, they met with more than 40 legislators. The important message that they conveyed in a later debriefing was that the legislators were listening. The general sense from the group was that there would be no further cuts to the university's budget. This is optimistic, but if we keep up the pressure we can avoid the cut. Along with avoiding a cut we need to be sure there is new money available for salaries. It is extremely important for non-university employees to make their voice's heard. Friends and neighbors should be urged in the next few weeks to write, fax, or send Public Opinion Messages (POM) to their legislators.

After the group of volunteers assessed the Brooks Building and came up with their estimates of the cost of renovation, the Regents ask us to take a look at the what would be the likelihood and the desirability of having a bigger building. The volunteers came back on campus and did a walk around the campus central area and concluded that the foot print of the Brooks Building should remain the same. Changing it would destroy the view of the fountain area.

The chancellor then concluded with brief excerpts from four unsolicited letters. One was from a 1995 alumni expressing her support of the justice program. The second letter came from a student in New York who attend UAF last year for one semester. It expressed general support for the faculty at UAF. The third letter was from a rural student, and indicated UAF had talented professors who helped give her the tools to deal with everyday issues. Rather than being considered a burden to the state, those students pursuing their educational goals should be considered as much a resource to Alaska as salmon, oil, and timber. The last letter was from an undergraduate student who attended the AGU meeting last fall. He was funded as part of the undergraduate research program that the provost launched this year. The support he received, financially and academically, was remarkable. Other presenters and attendees were impressed. This kind of support spoke well for him and the university. The chancellor indicated that this is the type of testimony which makes it possible for UAF to get private funding to support the undergraduate research program next year. UAF recently received an anonymous donation of \$20,000 which will enable UAF to continue the program.

John Bruder asked about funding for the negotiated union salaries. Chancellor Wadlow indicate that the university has requested this increase as a separate funding item. McBeath indicated there were two requests--one for this year and one for next year. These are additional requests.

Comments from Provost John Keating -

The provost also announced the anonymous donation of \$20,000. This year UAF started the undergraduate competition with \$25,000 from the one-time only deferred maintenance money. Eighteen undergraduate research projects were funded.

The first return of faculty positions for the RIP has been announced. We are trying to get a sense of the funding for next year. The intent was to fund/release only 25% of the RIP savings for the first go around. As funding becomes clearer an additional percentage would be released. The provost has received 44 proposals for positions.

The School of Education met with representations of the State Board of Education and were visited by an outside review panel. The outside NASDTEC review recommended that the school be granted the right to recommend certification. The Board of Education considered this and gave the School of Education an 18 month renewal of their ability to grant accreditation. After returning in six months to talk about their progress, they will grant an additional six months. The reason for the two years is that the three schools of education will come together and in two years apply for one broad accreditation. We are pleased that the state board recognized the quality of the education program.

Faculty are busy with the new union-negotiated way to develop workload presentations, which first go to department chairs and then to the deans. The provost will send out a standard form that talks about teaching, research and service and defines what each of those are. He asks that faculty use the forms when submitting them to department chairs in order to get consistency across the various units.

Jerry McBeath asked about the performance adjustment process. Keating indicated that each of the schools and colleges will have the faculty recommend the process for approval by the deans and/or directors. John French indicated that the contract reads that it shall be a faculty-driven process similar to the previous Regents' policy. It is suppose to be a faculty-originated and faculty-driven process. The faculty could adopt the same process as last year. John French would be happy to meet with any group as a union representative.

#### IV Governance Reports

##### A. ASUAF -

Matt Shields and Shawn Casey attended for Jean Richardson. They thanked faculty for their support on the April 1st rally. ASUAF just received a resolution from UAA student governance supporting Con Bunde's HB 302. They have also contacted UAS about this issue. Senator Gary Wilken indicates they are supporting flat funding for the university. Matt Shields indicated that the HESS committee will have a teleconference hearing on HB 302; you can participate from the local Legislative Information Office.

Jean Richardson was elected as president of ASUAF for next year.

##### B. Staff Council - P. Long

No report was available.

##### C. President's Comments - J. Craven

The president's comments were included in the agenda. In addition, John indicated that the Senate received the draft 1999-2000 academic calendar and this will be handled by the Administrative Committee, with recommendations and will then be made to the Governance Coordinating Committee. Draft copies of the RIP replacements in progress and information on faculty participating in RIP 1 and 2 were distributed as handouts. John asked for assistance in correcting the list. A discussion on the latest status of the RIP will take place under discussion items. Questions for the Senate: Does the Senate have a vision for UAF and does the Senate wish to have the Senate/Union relations committee formulate suggests on how the existing committees can carry out defined tasks in the union contract (e.g., appeal board and MAU peer review board for promotion/tenure)? This committee can address these questions and make recommendations to the Senate. The third item is that Representative John Davies will be at UAF on Friday, April 10th from noon to 2:00 p.m. for an open forum discussion with faculty, staff and students.

D. President-Elect's Comments - M. Schatz

Madeline's report was attached to the agenda. She was not in attendance.

V Public Comments/Questions - none

Glenn Juday indicated that a group of SALRM faculty met to proceed with the implementation of their workload requirements. During this discussion it occurred to them that we are in a natural transition point in the leadership of this university with the departure of a number of administrators. We have an unimplemented mandate for the evaluation of administrators. It occurred to them that it might be appropriate to have a committee to evaluate the chancellor. If it is positive this could reaffirm the leadership we wish to have for this university. If it is negative then we can proceed with identifying the leadership we believe would be best for the university. Adopting the framework of how we wish to be evaluated, the best case would be to identify the accomplishments of the chancellor over her term, that the plans and priorities that she identifies be put forward, and then the faculty evaluates how that relates to the overall situation at UAF. Steve Sparrow also gave his support for what Glenn presented. One reason is that there is increasing emphasis on accountability of faculty. The Faculty Senate has a mechanism for faculty-driven evaluation of UAF administrators. With the appointment of the provost and other reorganization within UAF some years ago, the chancellor's job has changed considerably. There is currently no mechanism with which to formally measure accountability or to evaluate the person holding the position of chancellor.

Keating indicated that there was no mechanism to do this and it would be an extraordinary call of the Senate at this time. There is a mechanism to review deans and directors and the provost, but not for chancellor. We have used the mechanism to review deans and directors on a timely schedule. The chancellor does serve at the will of the president of the Board of Regents. When we have done the deans/directors review we have been very careful to review the functions of the office. Is this office functioning as opposed to the personality functioning in that office. Keating believes that if this is done at this particular time it would not be a positive message.

Glenn Juday understands that the Board of Regents is the final authority for the university and to put it directly to the Senate



track faculty, and research faculty hired after this motion becomes effective, or not currently enrolled in a graduate degree program, from receiving a graduate degree from UAF.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: It is ethically questionable for faculty to confer graduate degrees upon themselves. Included are tenured, tenure track, and research faculty. Though research faculty are not tenured, they are equivalent to regular faculty in other ways: they are full-time, they are presumed to have graduate degrees or the equivalent before starting the job, and most importantly, they supervise graduate students and sometimes teach as affiliates to academic departments. Thus they are involved in the degree-granting process.

The motion is not intended to restrict faculty professional development derived from enrolling in courses to enhance one's performance in one's own field.

Tenured, tenure track, and research faculty already in graduate degree programs by the effective date of the motion, are grandfathered. For questionable cases, the affected individual should process his/her appeal through the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate.

\*\*\*\*\*

VII New Business

A. Election of the 1998-99 UAF Faculty Senate President-Elect

John Craven asked for any other nominations. He then directed any comments and questions to Ron Gatterdam. Ballots were distributed.

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Resolution to ratify the election of 1998-99 UAF Faculty Senate President-Elect, submitted by Administrative Committee.

The election results were ratified unanimously.

RESOLUTION  
=====

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

BALLOT  
PRESIDENT-ELECT

Please vote for ONE individual to serve as the President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate for 1997-98.

\*\* Ron Gatterdam, Professor  
Computer Sciences & Mathematics

---

\*\* President-Elect

\*\*\*\*\*

C. Motion to amend the Deadlines for Academic Changes to include a spring review cycle for New Degree Programs and Deletion of Programs, submitted by Ad Hoc Committee on Catalog Review

Michael Whalen indicated that this motion was to even out the review of all courses and degree programs by including a complete review in both the fall and spring. John Craven said the Senate received a request to have reviews in the spring so that a catalog could be worked on during the summer and made available in January. The catalog could then be used for recruiting students for the next year. This motion would spread the effort out and have two complete reviews a year. John French said the committee had two main sentiments. One, most students with access to the web are much more likely to access the web site than the print catalog. The other was in review of the schedule they felt the schedule worked well, but there was no justification for program changes only in the fall. Program changes could then be made in a timely manner and be incorporated in an electronic form. Ann Tremarello expressed concern about the motion and the effective dates of the spring actions. Also the opinion that the catalog is the official contract with students. Jerry McBeath asked that this motion be referred back to the committee with the addition of Ann as a member. There is a need to get a legal opinion of the use of the catalog as a contract or the use of the web. The motion to refer passed by a vote of 12 yes and 7 nays.

\*\*\*\*\*

D. Resolution to recommend the insertion of the URL address of UAF on the front cover of the UAF catalog, submitted by ad hoc committee on Catalog Review

Again there is a need for clarification from General Counsel about the catalog as a contract. Clif Lando asked that this motion be referred back to committee. The motion to refer passed unanimously.

\*\*\*\*\*

E. Motion to recommend revisions of the proposed Regents' Policy and University Regulation 09.06.00, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Jerry McBeath spoke on the committee's recommendations of these proposed policies. Ron Gatterdam indicated his strong objection to the policies where the DSS coordinator can make unilaterally make changes to degree requirement or general university requirements they felt appropriate without any consultation with faculty. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate recommends the revisions of the proposed Regents' Policy and University Regulation 09.06.00 (Services for Students with Disabilities) as proposed by the Curricular Affairs Committee and to forward these recommendations to the Faculty Alliance

\*\*\*\*\*

The committee considered the proposed policy and regulations for students with disabilities as submitted by the Board of Regents to the Faculty Alliance.

#### Chapter 06. Definitions

F. Student with a Disability. In the opinion of the committee, this section required either a cross-reference to the definitions in the regulations (Chapter 6, Provision of Appropriate Academic Adjustments ... A. Requesting Accommodation for Students...) or the definition in policy should state that documentation of disability status needs to be supplied.

Accommodation of Students with Disabilities.

Maynard Perkins questioned how this section of policy rptitioned how q











recommendations. Ron Gatterdam indicated that their intent was to strike a very narrow resolution which would serve for this one-time period only. The motion passed.

MOTION  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to accept the interim Standards and Indices for Promotion and Tenure to Associate Professor, bipartite academic, developed and approved by the ACCFT faculty of the College of Rural Alaska and incorporated on pages 9 & 11-13 of their document, Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Review Process for University of Alaska Fairbanks Alaska Community College Federation of Teachers Bargaining Unit Members. These interim standards and indices will be for academic year 1997-98.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: ACCFT faculty have, for the last 6 years, had a regional review promotion and tenure process with standards and indices by which all ACCFT faculty at UAF were evaluated for promotion and tenure.

The standards and indices approved by the UAF CRA ACCFT faculty are identical to the currently existing standards and indices identified above.

The collective bargaining agreement between the University of Alaska and the ACCFT effective from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 2000 mandates in item 5.4.B that "The University and the Union agree that evaluation policies in which decisions are made within MAUs are desirable. New policies which reflect this goal will be generated through the normal governance structure and will be patterned on the current Regional Review Process."

In light of the newly agreed upon contract the University of Alaska and United Academics, it is recognized that a rewrite of the current University of Alaska Fairbanks Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty will be necessary and that this rewrite should reflect the contract language binding on both unions and the University thus it is appropriate to establish interim standards and indices pending this rewrite.

\*\*\*\*\*

PROMOTION

MINIMUM CRITERIA

BIPARTITE ACADEMIC

The criteria listed below are intended as the minimum for determining eligibility for consideration for promotion. However, it is specifically recognized that University programs may require faculty whose education and/or experience may be different from the stated criteria. Exceptions to the minimum time in rank, terminal degree, or experience qualifications for rank must be fully justified through all review levels. The basis for exception shall be outstanding academic performance and/or outstanding professional

experience.

Associate  
Professor

Meet criteria for initial appointment to associate professor

or

Master's degree in the discipline or appropriate field and

Demonstrated evidence of successful college-level teaching and service and

Five (5) years at the rank of assistant professor, or which three (3) must be at UAF.\*

-----

EVALUATION GUIDELINES  
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR STANDARDS AND INDICES

The key concept for promotion to Associate Professor is "successful," which means "resulted in a positive outcome." The candidate must demonstrate through the promotion file that each workload component meets this requirement.

STANDARD 1: (Teaching)

Provides leadership and guidance regarding curriculum issues and in the development, delivery, and evaluation of educational activity.

INDICES:

The following accomplishments are representative of "successful" performance of the above criteria. The list is not exhaustive, nor is it expected that faculty will accomplish all items. Rather, the quality and quantity of accomplishments is expected to increase with time in rank. The list is not a set of criteria nor is it exhaustive or weighted. The list is merely illustrative and should serve as a guide for faculty and faculty evaluators.

- \* Positive student evaluations.
- \* Colleagues recognize and seek out the expertise of this individual.
- \* Serves as a resource for other faculty in advising students.
- \* Demonstrates mature levels of critical thinking and contributes knowledge to the field.
- \* Demonstrates leadership in course and curriculum development activities.
- \* Serves as a role model in providing academic advising, educational planning, vocational/career counseling on an individual or group basis.
- \* Demonstrates leadership in designing and teaching/facilitating credit/non-credit workshops, seminars, and short courses.
- \* Demonstrates leadership in designing and developing and/or evaluating materials to enhance the teaching process (i.e. planning sheets, degree formats, etc.).
- \* Provides guidance and direction designing and delivering educational services to special student populations (i.e. Alaska Native, disabled, re-entry, economically disadvantaged, etc.).
- \* Initiates course development appropriate to area of expertise and student need.

STANDARD 2: (Service)

Demonstrates leadership in service activities.

INDICES:

The following accomplishments are representative of "successful" performance of the above criterion. The list is not exhaustive, nor is it expected that faculty will accomplish all items. Rather, the quality and quantity of accomplishments is expected to increase with time in rank. The list is not a set of criteria nor is it exhaustive or weighted. The list is merely illustrative and should serve as a guide for faculty and faculty evaluators.

- \* Chairs or provides leadership on a Campus/College committee.

\* Non-research manuscripts are published as monographs,



To deal with this issue, while acknowledging that the situation may be different in different departments, the committee adopted the following draft motion, with statements of rationale and editing changes to be added later by e-mail:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to assign graduate thesis and research, and special topics credits to the faculty member immediately and directly responsible for supervising those students.

This was later edited to the form that will appear in the Agenda.

Finally, we had some brief discussion of the new workload agreements, especially what "30 workload units" means. Bob White mentioned that our definition will have to match up with UA Anchorage's, and there is a meeting to discuss that on April 3. It was generally agreed that faculty should be discussing and resolving this issue, as opposed to leaving it up to administrators to work out.

C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen

A report was attached to the agenda. They have been reviewing the masters degree requirements and a proposed motion is included in the report. Comments are very welcome.

D. Core Review - J. Brown

A report was attached to the agenda.

E. Curriculum Review - J. French

The committee is halfway through the process of reviewing approximately 50 requests.

F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber

The following report was distributed as a Senate handout.

Minutes of The Developmental Studies Committee, March 31, 1998

Attending: Charley Basham, Richard Clausen, Cindy Hardy, Marjie Illingworth, Ron Illingworth, Ruth Lister, Wanda Martin, Joe Mason, Mark Oswood, Greg Owens, Kay Thomas, Jane Weber.

The Developmental Studies committee discussed the following items:

Outcomes Assessment:

The discussion focused on two difficulties in developing an assessment method for DEV classes. Both Wanda and Marjie reported some difficulty getting our statistical data into the system to be evaluated. Ron expressed his ongoing concern that the models we've seen are focused toward gathering information from urban students primarily and that rural students will have to be added to the mix in some way. Marjie added that evaluating rural classes will be difficult because their record-keeping systems don't work the same way as the urban campuses.

This discussion was primarily an update on an ongoing process.

Emerging Scholars Program:

Ron and Marjie presented information they've found on Emerging Scholars in other institutions. Though most of the programs they found relate to math and science, they feel that the underlying philosophy—a preparatory year (or two) that deals with developmental issues as well as remediation—applies to English as well. Marjie presented a handout outlining the preparatory year of DEVE, DEVM, DEVS and a DEV Science class, and a second, which is essentially a regular freshman year, supported by DEVS and problem-solving classes. The idea of this program, like those in other schools, is to prepare an underprepared student for work at an honors level; thus the standards of the program are high.

Mark reported that the Biology Dept. had met about the DEV Science course and had concluded that an across-the-board science class would be less of a burden to each department than DEV Science classes in each discipline. A class using this model is already being developed using the Howard Hughes grant. Though the class is designed for elementary science teachers, it could be offered to DEV students as well. The course will include problem solving and major scientific concepts and, using limited jargon, interweave biological and physical sciences. The committee felt that this would serve the need for a DEV Science component in the Emerging Scholars sequence.

We also discussed funding both for this program and its development. The Committee decided to look into both the President's Special Project Funds to bring up a guru to jump-start the project and to look into FIPSE funds for the program itself.

Tracking:

There was a general discussion of the difficulties we are encountering with statistical search requests. Banner still poses problems, as Wanda reported. Greg suggested40 prb

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley

No report was available.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -  
D. Porter

David Porter thanked the faculty for returning the questionnaire that was recently sent out. Approximately 100 were returned. The committee will begin the analysis.

I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - S. Henrichs

A report was attached to the agenda.

J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal

A report was attached to the agenda. Scott and Eduard Zilberkant just returned from a trip to Juneau. They spent all day Friday in the State House with mostly republican legislators. Not all was discouraging. There is no new news, everything is still the same as last week. The budget recommendations from the House were flat. From the Senate it is minus \$1 million. They don't anticipate it remaining that way. The POM's are very effective and these should continue.

K. Service Committee - K. Nance

No report was available.

L. Ad Hoc Committees-

Ron Gatterdam said the Ad Hoc Committee on Senate/Union Relations has sent out questionnaires to fifteen universities. These have been sent to union leaders and they have been asked to distribute it to their Faculty Senate and appropriate administrator.

A report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Catalog Review Cycle was attached to the agenda.

\*\*\*\*\*

IX Discussion Items

Jerry McBeath moved to adjourn. The following kttamm

A report on I

Ron Gatterda" !

YDFXOW\ 6HQDWH 0LQXWHV