2:20 VIII Consent Agenda 25 Min.

A. Motion to approve the list of 2007-2008 degree candidates, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 151/2)

B. Resolution of Appreciation for Jon Genetti, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 151/3)

C. Resolution for the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 151/4)

IX New Business

A. Motion to approve the Library Science Unit Criteria, submitted by the Unit Criteria Committee (Attachment 151/5)

B. Motion to approve the Unit Criteria for the Graduate Program in Marine Science and Limnology, submitted by the Unit Criteria r50to9Scien5e) Mnc -0.sD 8 >

3:20 XIV Adjournment of the 2007-2008 Faculty Senate **

3:25 XV 2008-2009 Faculty Senate Members Take Their Seats 10 Min.
- A. Roll Call of 2008-2009 Members
- B. President's Remarks – Marsha Sousa
- C. President-Elect's Remarks – Jon Dehn

3:35 XVI Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs 5 Min.

3:40 XVII New Senate Business 10 Min.
- A. Motion to endorse 2008-2009 committee membership, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 151/17)
- B. Motion to approve the 2008-2009 Faculty Senate Meeting Calendar, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 151/18)
- C. Motion to authorize the Administrative Committee to act on behalf of the Senate during the summer months, submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 151/19)

3:50 XVIII Adjournment**

**3:30-5:00 PM Faculty Senate and Usibelli Awards Reception at Wood Center C-D

5:30 PM No host dinner at Lemongrass Restaurant
(Please RSVP to fysenat@uaf.edu by Friday, May 2.)

ATTACHMENT 151/1
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION
FOR
UAF CHANCELLOR STEPHEN B. JONES

WHEREAS, Stephen B. Jones has served the University of Alaska for the past four years as Chancellor of the University of Alaska Fairbanks; and

WHEREAS, Stephen B. Jones has worked diligently to increase the national and international reputation of UAF as a premier education and research institution, and to establish the identity of UAF as "America's Arctic University"; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Stephen B. Jones brings prestige and recognition to UAF in his position as the Chair of the governing board, University of the Arctic, a circumpolar consortium of colleges and universities in eight circumpolar nations; and

WHEREAS, during his tenure, UAF has seen an increase in the number of UA Scholars enrolling in UAF, in the number of students entering high-demand workforce programs to meet the needs of the state of Alaska, and in the number of PhD candidates; and

WHEREAS, during the four years of Stephen B. Jones's tenure as Chancellor, the number of degrees awarded has increased in 2007; and

WHEREAS, Stephen B. Jones has begun building a culture of philanthropy in support of UAF, by establishing an annual fund program and providing the resources to build a development and advancement program at UAF; and

WHEREAS, Stephen B. Jones has promoted UAF education and research internationally, by creating agreements with selected universities in China and India; and nationally, by creating MOAs with community colleges in Washington and California; and

WHEREAS, Stephen B. Jones convened the Vision 2017 Task Force, a body of statewide leaders who will help set the future course for UAF;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,Cts entering high-drEREFORE, BE IsC.4yLSe BEw India; and nc

ATTACHMENT 151/2

ATTACHMENT 151/4
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY THE OSYA SCREENING COMMITTEE

OUTSTANDING SENATOR OF THE YEAR AWARD
FOR
ACADEMIC YEAR 2008

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has served the university in the UAF Faculty Senate for the past six years; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has provided leadership as Chair of the Curricular Affairs Committee during academic years 2003 through 2006; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has served as Chair of the Curriculum Review Committee for the past four years; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has served as a representative of both Curricular Affairs and Curriculum Review on the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has led the Curriculum Review Committee to provide a clear, consistent and rigorous process to guide curriculum changes; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has spearheaded the establishment of guidelines regarding the structure of academic credits; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry engaged faculty in dialog about the plus-minus grading system and its implementation and consequences; and

WHEREAS, Rainer Newberry has provided thorough, provocative and tireless advocacy for issues about which he is passionate; now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the UAF Faculty Senate recognizes Rainer Newberry as Outstanding Senator of the Year for Academic Year 2008.

ATTACHMENT 151/5
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY THE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE

MOTION:
=======

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the revised Unit Criteria for Library Science.

EFFECTIVE:	Immediately Upon Chancellor / Provost Approval
RATIONALE:	The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by Library Science. With some further changes agreed upon by the college representative, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

****

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

APRIL 2008

THE FOLLOWING IS AN AMPLICATION OF UAF AND REGENTS CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, SPECIFICALLY DEVELOPED FOR USE IN EVALUATING FACULTY IN LIBRARY SCIENCE. IN BOLDFACE ARE THOSE ADDED OR EMPHASIZED BECAUSE OF THEIR RELEVANCE TO LIBRARY FACULTY, AND ARE CLARIFICATIONS OF UAF REGULATIONS.

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 II

Initial Appointment of Faculty

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment
   Minimum degree, experience and performance requirements are set forth in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," Chapter IV. A MASTER'S DEGREE IN LIBRARY SCIENCE (MLS) OR EQUIVALENT FROM AN AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION (ALA) ACCREDITED PROGRAM IS THE RECOGNIZED QUALIFICATION FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS. IN SOME CIRCUMSTANCES, A MASTER'S OR PHD IN A SPECIFIED FIELD MAY SERVE AS AN ALTERNATIVE. 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

This letter of appointment establishes the nature of the position and, while the percentage of emphasis for each part may vary with each workload distribution as specified in the annual workload agreement document, the part(s) defining the position may not.

CHAPTER III

Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

A. General Criteria

Criteria as outlined in "UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies," Chapter IV, AND LIBRARY SCIENCE UNIT CRITERIA AND INDICIES, 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.

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.

A CUSTOMARY RESEARCH WORKLOAD FOR LIBRARY SCIENCE FACULTY IS 2-3 UNITS OF THEIR TOTAL WORKLOAD. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY ARE A SMALL PORTION OF THE NORMAL LIBRARY SCIENCE WORKLOAD.

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, CASE STUDIES, PEER-REVIEWED TRANSLATIONS, 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.

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 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.

ALONG WITH UNIVERSITY SERVICE, LIBRARIANS MUST ALSO PERFORM SERVICE IN THE UNIT. AS SUCH, LIBRARIANS MUST DEMONSTRATE

COMPETENCE AND EVIDENCE OF DEVELOPING EXCELLENCE IN HIS/HER PRIMARY AREA(S) OF RESPONSIBILITY WHICH ARE DESCRIBED BELOW. LIBRARY FACULTY WORKLOADS MAY SHOW ACTIVITY AND/OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOME BUT NOT ALL OF THESE SERVICE ACTIVITIES AND MAY ALSO INCLUDE ACTIVITIES SPECIFIED IN INDIVIDUAL WORKLOAD REQUIREMENTS.

REFERENCE
REFERENCE SERVICES PROVIDE A LINK BETWEEN USERS SEEKING INFORMATION AND THE INFORMATION SOURCE. SERVICES INCLUDE PROVIDING ASSISTANCE IN LOCATING BASIC INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTION IN THE SELECTION AND USE OF LIBRARY RESOURCES AND RESEARCH TOOLS.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT
COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IS THE PROCESS BY WHICH LIBRARIANS DETERMINE THE MATERIALS TO BE INCLUDED IN LIBRARY COLLECTIONS THROUGH: SELECTION OF MATERIALS CHOSEN TO SUPPORT THE CURRICULUM AND THE UNIVERSITY'S MISSION; DEVELOPMENT OF DEPARTMENTAL LIAISON RELATIONSHIPS; MANAGEMENT OF THE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE; COLLECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF DATA FOR COLLECTION ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION/ASSESSMENT; AND DIRECTING LIBRARY PARTICIPATION IN CONSORTIAL OR OTHER JOINT PROJECTS SUCH AS COOPERATIVE PURCHASES AND SHARING OF ONLINE RESOURCES WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS.

MANAGEMENT OR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES
THIS AREA INCLUDES MANAGING BUDGETS; SUPERVISING AND EVALUATING LIBRARY STAFF; BROAD-BASED PLANNING; AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT, DATA ANALYSIS, AND REPORT WRITING RELATED TO THE FUNCTIONING OF THE LIBRARY.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVOLVES ASSESSING AND USING CURRENT TECHNOLOGIES TO CREATE AND MAINTAIN SYSTEMS AND PUBLIC INTERFACES THAT DEVELOP OR IMPROVE ACCESS TO LIBRARY COLLECTIONS AND INFORMATION RESOURCES, INCLUDING: PLANNING, INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE OF SOFTWARE SYSTEMS; CREATION OF SOFTWARE AND DESIGN OF WEB SITE ARCHITECTURE; AND WRITING AND IMPLEMENTING POLICIES TO SUPPORT AND CARRY OUT LIBRARY SYSTEMS/TECHNOLOGY WORK.

ARCHIVES
ARCHIVAL ACTIVITIES INCLUDE FACILITATING DONOR RELATIONSHIPS AND DONATIONS, RESULTING IN NEW ACQUISITIONS AND/OR FUNDING FOR ARCHIVAL PROJECTS; APPRAISAL OF COLLECTIONS TO DETERMINE ADMINISTRATIVE OR HISTORICAL VALUE; ARRANGEMENT AND DESCRIPTION OF COLLECTIONS TO FACILITATE RESEARCHER ACESS; PRESERVATION OF FRAGILE MATERIALS AND/OR OBSOLETE MEDIA;

DEVELOPMENT OF OUTREACH PROGRAMS; AND PROVISION OF RESEARCH SERVICES TO ASSIST PUBLIC ACCESS TO HISTORICAL COLLECTIONS OF PAPERS, PHOTOGRAPHS, AND OTHER UNIQUE AND UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS.

h. Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.

i. Mentoring OF NEW FACULTY.

j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

3. Professional Service

a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.

b. Active participation in professional organizations.

c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.

e. Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings.

f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

4. Evaluation of Service

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

ALTHOUGH ALL FACULTY MEMBERS ARE INDIVIDUALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT, SCHOLARSHIP AND OTHER RELEVANT EXPERIENCE, A HIGH PROPORTION OF COOPERATIVE WORK IS ESSENTIAL FOR PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF LIBRARIANSHIP. THEREFORE, EVALUATION OF LIBRARY SCIENCE FACULTY IS BASED UPON INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE PRACTICE OF LIBRARIANSHIP, SCHOLARLY, RESEARCH OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND SERVICE.

EFFECTIVENESS IN SERVICE MAY BE EVALUATED BY ANY OF THE FOLLOWING METHODS:

A. DOCUMENTATION DEMONSTRATING SUCCESSFUL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS, POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND STANDARDS.

B. LETTERS SUPPLIED BY COLLEAGUES WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY EVALUATING PERFORMANCE, CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LIBRARY AND ASSISTANCE TO INDIVIDUALS AND/OR GROUPS.
C. UNSOLICITED TESTIMONIALS DEMONSTRATING OUTCOMES AND/OR EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICE ACTIVITIES.
D. HONORS AND AWARDS FOR PERFORMANCE EXCELLENCE WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY, INCLUDING LIBRARY AND PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS.

ATTACHMENT 151/6
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY THE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE

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

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.

PERFORMANCE AS MAJOR ADVISOR IS EVALUATED BASED ON DEGREES COMPLETED UNDER THE FACULTY MEMBER'S SUPERVISION, SINCE EACH REPRESENTS A MAJOR INVESTMENT OF FACULTY TIME. HOWEVER, IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT DEMAND FOR GRADUATE DEGREES IS NOT UNIFORM ACROSS DISCIPLINES, AND LIMITED AVAILABILITY OF STUDENTS MAY LIMIT A FACULTY MEMBER'S ACTIVITY IN GRADUATE ADVISING. PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR REQUIRES THAT AT LEAST ONE M.S. GRADUATE DEGREE HAS BEEN COMPLETED, OR ONE Ph.D. STUDENT HAS MADE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS TOWARDS COMPLETION UNDER THE FACULTY MEMBER'S SUPERVISION AS MAJOR ADVISOR IF THE FACULTY MEMBER'S WORKLOAD INCLUDES TEACHING. PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR REQUIRES THAT AT LEAST TWO GRADUATE DEGREES (M.S. OR PH.D.) HAVE BEEN COMPLETED UNDER THE FACULTY MEMBER'S SUPERVISION AS MAJOR ADVISOR IF THE FACULTY MEMBER'S WORKLOAD INCLUDES TEACHING. ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF PERFORMANCE QUALITY INCLUDES PUBLICATION OF PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL ARTICLES OR BOOK CHAPTERS BASED ON THE ADVISED STUDENT'S THESIS OR DISSERTATION RESEARCH; STUDENT PRESENTATIONS AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS; AWARDS TO STUDENTS; AND STUDENT SUCCESS IN INITIAL EMPLOYMENT AFTER GRADUATION.

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 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.

THE PRIMARY EVIDENCE OF HIGH RESEARCH QUALITY IS PUBLICATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS IN RESPECTED, NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL, PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS OR PEER-REVIEWED BOOKS OR BOOK CHAPTERS. IN EVALUATING SUCH PUBLICATIONS, QUALITY, AS JUDGED BY GPMSL/SFOS FACULTY PEERS, IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN QUANTITY.

SECONDARY EVIDENCE OF RESEARCH SUBSTANCE AND QUALITY CAN INCLUDE PUBLICATIONS THAT ARE NOT PEER-REVIEWED, SUCH AS FINAL CONTRACT REPORTS, DATA REPORTS, AND WEBSITES.

b. Competitive grants and contracts to finance the development of ideas; these grants and contracts being subject to rigorous peer review and approval.

SECONDARY EVIDENCE OF RESEARCH SUBSTANCE AND QUALITY CAN INCLUDE EXTERNAL FUNDING FROM SOURCES KNOWN FOR RIGOROUS PEER OR ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW OF PROPOSALS.

c. Presentation of research papers before learned societies that accept papers only after rigorous review and approval by peers.

d. Exhibitions of art works at galleries, selection for these exhibitions being based on rigorous review and approval by peers**,** juries, recognized artists, or critics.

e. Performance in recitals or productions; selection for these performances being based on stringent auditions and approval by appropriate judges.

f. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations**.**

g. Scholarly reviews of publications, art works and performance of the candidate.

h. Citations of research in scholarly publications.

i. Published abstracts of research papers.

j. 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.

k. Prizes and awards for excellence of scholarship.

l. Awards of special fellowships for research or artistic activities or selection of tours of duty at special institutes for advanced study.

m. Development of processes or instruments useful in solving problems, such as computer programs and systems for the processing of data, genetic plant and animal material, and where appropriate obtaining patents and/or copyrights for said development.

FACULTY APPLYING FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE MUST PRESENT EVIDENCE OF HIGH-QUALITY CONTRIBUTIONS IN RESEARCH. FOR A FULL-TIME (9-MONTH) WORKLOAD, THE MINIMUM EXPECTATION FOR AWARD OF TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR IS A SUSTAINED PUBLICATION RECORD AVERAGING ONE PER YEAR, WITH A MINIMUM OF SIX. THE MINIMUM EXPECTATION OF PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR IS A SUSTAINED PUBLICATION RECORD AVERAGING ONE PER YEAR, WITH A MINIMUM OF TWELVE. TYPICALLY, AT LEAST HALF OF THE PUBLICATIONS AT EACH PROMOTION LEVEL WILL BE FIRST-AUTHORED BY THE CANDIDATE OR BY A GRADUATE STUDENT, UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT, OR POST-DOCTORAL SCHOLAR UNDER THE CANDIDATE'S DIRECT SUPERVISION.
IT IS THE CANDIDATE'S TOTAL PUBLICATION RECORD, REGARDLESS OF AFFILIATION, THAT IS CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING THESE COUNTS.

D. Criteria for Public and University Service

Public service is intrinsic to the land grant/sea grant/space grant tradition, and is fundamental part of the university's obligation to the people of its state. In this tradition, faculty providing their professional expertise for the benefit of the university's external constituency, free of charge, is identified as "public service." The tradition of the university itself provides that its faculty assume a collegial obligation for the internal functioning of the institution; such service is identified as "university service."

TO BE CONSIDERED IN PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS, PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES MUST BE RELATED TO THE FACULTY MEMBER'S UNIVERSITY

POSITION. SOME GPMSL FACULTY HAVE PART-TIME ADMINISTRATIVE

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

a. Service on university, college, school, institute, departmental committees or governing bodies.

b. Consultative work in support of university functions, such as expert assistance for specific projects.

c. Service as department chair, or term-limited and part-time assignment as assistant/associate dean in a college, school, **OR PROGRAM.**

d. Participation in accreditation reviews.

e. Service on collective bargaining unit committees or elected office.

f. Service in support of student organizations and activities.

g. Academic support services such as library and museum programs.

h. Assisting other faculty or units with curriculum planning and delivery of instruction, such as serving as guest lecturer.

i. Mentoring **JUNIOR FACULTY**

j. Prizes and awards for excellence in university service.

3. Professional Service

a. Editing or refereeing articles or proposals for professional journals or organizations.

b. Active participation in professional organizations.

c. Active participation in discipline-oriented service organizations.

d. Committee chair or officer of professional organizations.

e. Organizer, session organizer, or moderator for professional meetings.

f. Service on a national or international review panel or committee.

4. Evaluation of Service

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

recommendation, and/or appreciation, certificates and awards, and other public means of recognition for services rendered.

FOR GPMSL FACULTY, EVIDENCE OF HIGH-QUALITY PERFORMANCE MAY INCLUDE (1) EVALUATION LETTERS FROM PEERS, ADMINISTRATORS, OR OTHERS WITH DIRECT KNOWLEDGE, (2) SPECIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS AS REPORTED IN THE SELF-EVALUATION AND/OR ACTIVITY REPORTS, AND (3) EVIDENCE OF REPEATED REQUESTS FOR THE FACULTY MEMBER TO PERFORM NEW OR EXPANDED SERVICE ACTIVITIES. SUCH REQUESTS ARE STRONG EVIDENCE FOR QUALITY PERFORMANCE.
FACULTY APPLYING FOR PROMOTION OR TENURE MUST PRESENT EVIDENCE OF QUALITY SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS. FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND TENURE, SERVICE IN AT LEAST TWO OF THE THREE CLASSES OF SERVICE (PUBLIC, UNIVERSITY, PROFESSIONAL) IS NORMALLY EXPECTED. FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR, FACULTY SHOULD DEMONSTRATE AN EXPANDED

ATTACHMENT 151/7
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend approved alternatives to a Minor to include certificates in addition to A.A.S. degrees (p. 121, 2007-2008 UAF Catalog).

CAPS = Additions
[[ ]] = Deletions

An associate of applied science (A.A.S.) degree **OR CERTIFICATE OF AT LEAST 30 CREDITS** earned at any regionally accredited college or university may be used to meet

ATTACHMENT 151/8
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY AFFAIRS

MOTION:
=======

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reject use of the Digital Measures software for electronic Faculty Annual Activities Reports at UAF.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The UAF Administration is in the process of testing an electronic system of Faculty Annual Activities Reports. The company Digital Measures was contracted to customize existing software for the UA system, incorporating requests from administrators and a survey of deans/directors. A beta test of the software was conducted in Fall 2007 with the faculty of the School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences at UAF. Beta tests were also performed with departments at UAA and UAS.

The faculty of UAA oppose adoption of this system, and it is no longer under consideration for that MAU. The UAF administration wishes to move forward with adoption, focusing its efforts on refining and improving the software. The feedback received from SFOS faculty addressed programming and design issues from the users' point of view, i.e., the nuts and bolts of the data entry. This feedback did not include discussion of the role of these electronic reports at UAF, nor their broader implications.

The Annual Activities Reports are designed to help guide the career of faculty in consultation with their dean and/or director, and are used as a tool for faculty performance evaluation as stated in the Collective Bargaining Agreements. The system being tested from Digital Measures focuses on measuring university performance. These are two separate goals which have limited overlap. The attempt to achieve both at once has made for a system with critical failings for each goal.

The Faculty Alliance in 2004 drafted objectives, guidelines and constraints of an electronic interactive database system for faculty workload and activity reports. A detailed analysis of the Digital Measures system has shown that few of these objectives, guidelines and constraints were met. Further, the proposed system doubled the required information over the current Annual Activity report. The primary concerns of the faculty are the security of sensitive information, use of this information for inappropriate purposes, duplication of effort through lack of coordination with other on and off campus databases, and compliance with the respective Collective Bargaining Agreements. As a database for measuring university performance, the system is poorly designed, error prone, cumbersome and does not take advantage of modern computing capabilities.

The recommendation of the Faculty Senate is to drop the effort to use electronic Annual Activities Reports as input for a comprehensive university database. The faculty would support an electronic version of Annual Activities Reports if it met the criteria specified by the Faculty Alliance in 2004. A separate database of faculty activities could be created with only the public professional products of the faculty; however, considering the poor result from the time, effort, and resources already devoted to adapting the

Digital Measures software for the University of Alaska, further investment in this system as a public professional products database is not advisable.

See the Faculty Affairs Committee report on the automated Annual Activity Reports for more detailed information. A copy is posted online at the following web address:
http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/fsfy08meetings/index.html

ATTACHMENT 151/9
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED JOINTLY BY THE STUDENT ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT COMMITTEE AND THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION:
==========

SUPPORTING SUCCESS INITIATIVES THROUGH HIRING OF FULL TIME TENURE TRACK FACULTY

WHEREAS, UAF has been engaged over the past several years in an increasing emphasis on programs and policies that enhance student success; and

WHEREAS, national data indicates that students are more successful when their first contact with instructors is with full-time faculty in stable positions who are involved in and committed to planning and evaluation of entry-level programs; and

WHEREAS, with upcoming changes in admissions and placement for entering students, there will be a greater need for faculty in entry level classes, including student success and developmental classes; and

WHEREAS, in motions to implement mandatory placement and to endorse the recommendations of the Developmental Education Implementation Task force, the Faculty Senate clearly stated that these motions require financial commitment from UAF, including the creation and support of full-time tenure track faculty positions; and

WHEREAS, many in the general public and the state Legislature are becoming increasingly concerned about the disproportionately rising administration costs while funding for direct

ATTACHMENT 151/10
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY THE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Curricular Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes March 24, 2008

Present: Deanna Dieringer, Linda Hapsmith, Rainer Newberry, Ilana Kingsley, Amber Thomas, Jane Allen, Carol Lewis, Falk Huettmann, Beth Leonard, Diane McEachern, Caty Oehring, Libby Eddy, Lael Croteau,

- Deanna brought up the issue of waiving core courses. “If a student is accepted to UAF

Meeting Minutes April 14, 2008

Present: Deanna Dieringer, Linda Hapsmith, Rainer Newberry, Ilana Kingsley, Amber Thomas, Jane Allen, Falk Huettmann, Beth Leonard, Lillian Misel

- Falk was wondering how to get a "digital/paperless" course designated in the calendar. This would be part of the sustainable campus initiative and IPY. Committee didn't have an answer for this.

- Alternative to minor:
  - Suggest changing the wording in the catalog, pg. 121 from "…A.A.S. degree earned…." to "….Certificate program of at least 30 credits from a regionally accredited institution or an A.A.S. degree…"
  - Motion to bring this to FS. Rainer will write the Rationale.

- The committee is looking for a chairperson. This will go on agenda for next meeting.
- Ilana will follow-up with Dana regarding CLEP scores.
- Univ. is looking to switch from Compass to Accuplacer placement tests.

Next meeting is April 28th, 9am, Rasmuson Library Joint Conference Room.

ATTACHMENT 151/11
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY THE FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
Rasmussen 341 15:15 Wednesday March 26th.

Dehn, Christie, Hogan, Barrick, Weisenburg, Reynolds

* Report on from Barrick on adjunct faculty. A series of guidelines were suggested, but no data on the actual conditions at UAF yet gathered. The Provost's office has been requested for this

the candidates the choice of holding open or closed meetings. This was done out of the concern of individual faculty members as well as through a request from the Unions to aid in negotiations. Though the resolution did not result in a change of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, it did promote discussion on this issue. Further, at least one committee revisited its decision to hold closed meetings based on the Resolution, however upheld the results of its first vote on the format of the meetings. The timing of the Resolution was unfortunate, since the tenure/promotion committees had been formed well in advance and most the procedures already decided upon when the resolution was passed. As a follow-up, the Committee recommends that the Resolution be brought to the attention of the new tenure/review committees as soon as they are formed.

Based on this the Faculty Affairs Committee found no grounds for censure of the Chancellor. It would be of some concern if the Senate's nominees are regularly declined by the Chancellor, but there is no evidence to suggest that this is the case. Nevertheless, it is recommended that the Senate seek an explanation from the Chancellor if a nominee is declined in the future. Meanwhile, Dr. Bult-Ito has informed the Senate that he has since been re-instated to the Committee for Campus Diversity.

Potential exploitation of Adjunct Faculty

This issue was brought to Faculty Affairs Committee through concern in the Committee on the Status of Women and the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee. The Faculty Affairs Committee made an effort to quantify this problem and determine whether and

This issue has been before the Faculty Affairs Committee several times over the last 3 years, and has never received a favorable response from the Committee. The current system being tested by Digital Measures was found to be inadequate, both for the needs of the faculty for their reports, as well as for gauging the products of the university. The Faculty Affairs Committee made a motion to abandon the Digital Measures annual activity reporting, and suggested instead a standardized database of public professional products of the faculty. A detailed report on the findings and suggestions is attached to this document.

ATTACHMENT 151/12
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY THE UNIT CRITERIA COMMITTEE

Unit Criteria
Meeting Minutes from 25 April 2008

Attending:
Brenda Konar
Julie Cascio
Gerri Brightwell
Lee Taylor
Mark Herrmann

GPMSL:
The committee approves the GPMSL criteria and will forward it to the Faculty Senate for the next meeting.

Library Science:
The section that the Senate questioned has been removed from the Library Science criteria. The committee approves these criteria and will forward it to the Faculty Senate for the next meeting.

DANRD:
We strongly suggest that DANRD review the Marine Advisory Program Unit Criteria and perhaps Library Science to see how non-traditional criteria are written.
When DANRD re-submit, please do not send as a PDF file.
It would be very helpful if a DANRD representative came to the next Unit Criteria meeting for clarification when their criteria are re-submitted.

General Comments:
Put specific items under the relevant bullet points that are already provided. As example: Put W (Pg 6, Play or Dance Production) under E (Pg, 6, Exhibition of art work….). This is just one example. There are many that need to be re-arranged.
Also, put specific items in the correct category. As example: JJ (Pg 6) belongs under Service.
Some specific items need clarification. As example: BB (Pg 6) Websites…. More details need to be put into this and it needs to go into the correct heading.
Non-peer reviewed items need to be under service. Research reports, manuscripts, etc… need to be peer-reviewed.

At the end of each section (Teaching, Research and Service), the evaluation for each rank either needs to be included or deleted. As it is written, it is unclear if these items are suggested or required. They are not helpful if they are suggested. As the criteria are written, it can not be determined what is expected of an associate and full professor. This will not help a faculty member to determine what is expected from them. As example: 3. Evaluation of research, scholarly and creative activity (Pg 7). This needs to say that faculty "should" and not "may". It also should say what is expected at the associate and full professor level. You do not need to add it as a separate "3.". Most other criteria have just added a paragraph explaining expectations of associate and full professor.

Teaching:

The paragraph that starts “Research is a relatively new part of the mission…” needs to be deleted. It does not add anything. In the second and third paragraph, the mission of your unit needs to be explained. Only items that will help people evaluate your faculty should be here. The sentence that starts “Some faculty members may have greater or lesser…” needs to be eliminated. This does not add anything. Evaluation of faculty is based on their workloads.

We are confused with the definition “or appropriate judges”. This definition needs to come prior to the first time it is used.

Unit Criteria Committee
Annual Report for 2007-2008

UAF Unit Criteria Committee 2007-08 Annual Report

Members:
Brenda Konar (Chair)
Gerri Brightwell
Julie Cascio
Mark Herrmann
Lee Taylor
Jing Zhang
Thomas Zhou

April 25 2008

During the 2007-2008 academic year, the UAF Faculty Senate Unit Criteria Committee met five times: September 4 2007, October 29 2007, February 25 2008, March 31 2008, and April 25 2008.

Criteria Considered:

Library Science: These criteria were first submitted in the 2006-07 academic year. The 2007-08 Unit Criteria Committee first reviewed these criteria at the meeting on October 29 2007. It was returned to Library Science for revisions and was eventually approved by the committee on March 31 2008. The Faculty Senate did have some concerns so it came back to the committee after which the senate comments were forwarded to Library Science. These criteria were amended according to the Senate’s suggestions and reviewed by the committee on April 25 2008, where they were approved. These criteria will be voted on by the Faculty Senate on May 5.

English and Philosophy and Humanities: These criteria were first submitted on February 25 2008. The criteria went through some minor revisions and were approved by the committee on March 31 2008. These criteria were approved by the Senate on April 7 2008.

Graduate Program in Marine Science and Limnology: These criteria were first submitted on March 31 2008. The criteria went through some minor revisions and were approved by the committee on April 25 2008. These criteria will be voted on by the Faculty Senate on May 5.

Department of Alaska Native and Rural Development: These criteria were reviewed by the committee on 25 April 2008. The committee made many suggestions and it is hoped that the next revision will be more in line with the standard unit criteria.

ATTACHMENT 151/13
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Committee on the Status of Women 2007-08 Annual Report

The Committee on the Status of Women (CSW) met monthly during AY 2007-08 to work on issues affecting women faculty at UAF. There were at least nine members present at most meetings.

CSW was instrumental in shaping the campus-wide discussion of child care needs, including drafting a resolution in support of Bunnell House that was passed at Faculty Senate. One of our committee members was invited to join the Bunnell House task force. Through this work, the CSW strengthened the collaborative relationship with Staff Council, leading to a parallel resolution in support of Bunnell House being passed in Staff Council.

The CSW co-wrote a grant with the UAF Women's Center to sponsor a keynote talk by Professor Martha West as part of a larger, campus-wide project on Equal Pay Day. West's talk was attended by 40 persons, many of whom were female faculty. Other notable attendees were the newly appointed interim chancellor, the provost, women staff members, and students.

In the fall, CSW organized UAF's third annual Women Faculty Luncheon, which was audioconferenced for rural faculty. Provost Susan Henrichs gave a keynote address that was quite well received, and nearly one hundred women faculty attended. We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Office of the Chancellor. We have secured the funding and are planning the fourth luncheon for October 7, 2008.

CSW again organized a two hour comprehensive tenure and promotion workshop. The workshop this year highlighted strategic planning for promotion and tenure. Thirty-one persons attended in person, or through audioconference or E-Live. This extremely useful workshop has now also become an annual event, and provides an informal venue for faculty to discuss strategies, file preparation, mentoring, effectively preparing for tenure and/or promotion, fourth year reviews, and other issues related to the T&P process at UAF. Members of both ACCFT and United Academics are panelists and participants.

CSW has a permanent seat on the Chancellor's Campus Diversity Action Committee (CCDAC). This committee met several times during AY 2007-08, and the CSW representative brought issues of equity to the attention of the committee.

In Progress:

- Study of the tenure and promotion decision-making process (the study is partially funded by the Office of the Provost)
- Gathering and analyzing historical data information with gender on time to tenure and promotions, rank, and salary information for faculty at UAF for at least the last ten years
- Discussion of the issue of adjuncts and term-funded faculty, especially as these issues differentially affect women
- Facilitating mentoring of new, mid-career, and senior women and allied men

- Strengthen liaison relationships with women staff members at UAF, the UAF Women's Center, and with faculty at the other MAUs.

ATTACHMENT 151/14
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT

Faculty Development & Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes April 16, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 8:20 am. The following faculty were present: Larry Roberts, Joy Morrison, Channon Price, Michael Daku, Julie Lerman, Susan Herman,

Final Committee Reports

The Faculty Peer Assessment group reported on their recent work. The group found several good sites for tools others are using around the country, including tools for faculty self-reflection and peer evaluation. They also found where there was an absence of tools available for specific

met since she's been Provost. To pursue setting it up, she would need to see how it differs from what our committee does.

Channon brought up the issue that the UAA Faculty Development office has more resources than we do. Susan agrees this is a problem. She said she asked for more resources during the last budget cycle, but we are unlikely to get them from statewide. Any resources we procure would have to come from a redirect from other focus areas. The FY10 focus areas for the statewide budget include engineering, allied health, work force development, teacher preparation, research, and student success (which includes learning communities and revision of math instruction and curriculum). We will have $6million in carry-forward. It seems likely that she can get some of this for faculty development for next year.

Susan brought up the issue that Faculty Development activities are lightly attended, and that it's hard to put funding into them under these circumstances. Joy's been compiling attendance statistics; Susan will review them soon. Channon said that perhaps if there were a culture of participation in faculty development people would be there more, and that new faculty are benefitting. Susan agreed that new faculty are benefitting from the activities. But she said she doesn't think that senior faculty and deans are emphasizing the importance of this area. In some departments, workload units are given to faculty for mentoring and being mentored, but this may not be true across the board. Susan said we need to do some more research about how to get a broader spectrum of people to attend. Faculty need to know what will make it worthwhile for them to attend. Susan has been reviewing promotion and tenure files: the existence of reports of participation in faculty development activities is spotty. Joy had done a survey of the usefulness of Faculty Development activities, but Susan thinks the information generated was too general to be useful. She will check the survey results again. She plans to interview people who attended Faculty Development events to find out what worked and didn't work for them.

Joy was not at the meeting, but she later said she will meet with Susan and discuss ways of improving attendance. She is thinking of things like only having two events a month, maybe on Friday afternoons. Right now she has something nearly every Friday morning, sometimes two events on a Friday morning. This might be too much. She has done lots of surveys in the past, but it wouldn't hurt to find out what the newer faculty needs are. It might be good to have FDAI do this instead of Joy's office this time. A series of focus groups with first year, second year, third year and fourth year faculty might produce interesting data.

Larry said that our committee could sponsor a UAF survey of faculty, administrators, etc. about what does work, what hasn't worked, and what might work. We could research what UAA and other leading centers in the US have done to become successful. Joy has done some of this already; perhaps we could continue it. One emphasis would be on how these programs got to this point, how they developed the culture, whether they did a needs assessment, what they focused on in the genesis of the program. We could host audio-conferences with good faculty development programs to discuss this (e.g. with Barbara Millis and Todd Zakrajsek). The meetings could be public so other faculty could attend. We have to build the culture from the ground up.

As far as faculty peer evaluation goes, Susan would like to see more emphasis on formative peer evaluation rather than just evaluation for the tenure and promotion files. She would like to see more people trained and available to do these evaluations, to extend the range.

Susan said that meeting with FDAI at the *beginning* of each semester is important. We ended the meeting by planning to meet next fall. Susan said making an appointment way in advance is the best way to be sure to meet with her.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dana Greci, Recorder

FDAI Committee
Year-end report 2007-2008
Submitted April 22, 2008

Active Participation

The Faculty Development, Assessment, and Improvement Committee (FDAI) ends this year in a most positive and productive manner after an active participation by its membership throughout the academic year. The FDAI successfully held regular meetings and performed its business each month September 2007 through April 2008. In addition to these eight regular sessions, an additional meeting with the Provost is scheduled for April 23 to complete the year. If that were not busy enough, faculty members also met in their respective subcommittees apart from the regular meetings.

New and Continued Projects/Activities

1) The FDAI played an active role in establishing and supporting the third, in-state national conference on teaching excellence in higher education. This year's conference received national recognition at an official institute under the Lilly group on teaching in higher education. As such the title for year three was the *Lilly Arctic Institute on the Innovations and Excellence in Teaching: Celebrating the Adult Learner & Cultural Attunement*. Held at the Princess Hotel in Fairbanks, 100 participants representing 10 states and all three University of Alaska campuses benefited from the first true national conference of its type at a most nominal cost to participants due especially for UAF faculty who did not have to seek funds for airfare or housing required with when traveling to conferences out of state. Review of the conference can be found at the following web site: www.uaf.edu/crcdhealth.conference.htm
2) Faculty Senate Forums: the idea of regular faculty forums emerged last year as a result of the Provost Reichardt's sponsored forum on teaching assessment. The idea was generated and supported to have the FDAI sponsor on behalf of the faculty a series of faculty forums as an opportunity to bring interested faculty together on a semester basis to discuss and review important issues and thoughts surrounding the practice of good teaching specifically and the more general academic duties of faculty such as research and service.

Entitled *Hook them, hold them, and educated them: What's your bait?* The first series was arranged for one forum at the TVC campus downtown followed by a second offering on the main campus. Respectively, they were held April 2 and 4.
Both forums included audioconference participation. 24 faculty were in attendance at the TVC forum. The forum on the main campus was held in the Honors building had 18 participants including call ins and four invited students. Thanks to the special work by FDAI Faculty Forum committee members, both forums well facilitated and received. Presenting faculty members

included Dani' Sheppard, Charlie Dexter, Ron Illingworth, Susan Herman, and Beth Kersey. Provost Henrichs was generous in her supply of lunches for participants at both forums.

As a result of the success of our first series of Senate Faculty Forums, the FDAI has intentions of sponsoring other topical forums next year and beyond.

3) Monthly program updates from Joy Morrison on the work of the Faculty Development Office's work and events.

<u>New subcommittees formed</u>

Four standing committees were formed this year to do the work of our committee. They include the following:

1)

ATTACHMENT 151/15
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008

2008 Usibelli Award Nominees and Recipients

The 2008 Usibelli Awards for Distinguished Teaching, Research, and Service

Winner, Distinguished Teaching: Marsha Sousa, Associate Professor of Allied Health
Winner, Distinguished Research: Gerald Mohatt, Professor of Psychology, Director, CANHR
Winner, Distinguished Service: John Kelley, Professor of Marine Science

2008 Usibelli Award for Distinguished Teaching Nominees

Debendra Das, Professor of Mechanical Engineering
Erich Follmann, Professor of Biology and Wildlife
Carol Gold, Professor of History
Kathleen Gustafson, Instructor, Math
Shann Jones, Instructor, Fly Fishing
Debasmita Misra, Associate Professor of Geological Engineering
Robert Perkins, Associate Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Douglas Reynolds, Associate Professor of Economics
Paul Robinson, Adjunct, Applied Business
Marvin Schulte, Associate Professor of Biochemistry
Dani Sheppard, Associate Professor of Psychology

2008 Usibelli Award for Distinguished Research Nominees

Satyanarayan Naidu, Professor Emeritus of Marine Geology
Igor Polyakov, Research Professor of Atmospheric Sciences and Oceanography
John Walsh, President's Professor of Climate Change, Chief Scientist, IARC

2008 Usibelli Award for Distinguished Service Nominees

Charles Crapo, Professor of Fisheries
Robert Gorman, Professor of Agricultural Extension
Donald Kramer, Professor of Fisheries
Gary Laursen, Research Professor of Mycology
Paul Layer, Professor of Geology and Geophysics
Robert Parr, Assistant Professor, Coordinator, Human Services
Julie Riley, Professor of Horticulture
Todd Sherman, Professor of Art

ATTACHMENT 151/16
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008

2008 Emerita/us

Roy Bird, Professor of English and Director, Emeritus

Lillian Corti, Professor of English, Emerita

Stephen Cysewski, Professor of Computer Applications, Emeritus

John Eichelberger, Professor of Geology and Geophysics, Emeritus

Donald Kramer, Professor of Fisheries, Emeritus

Sheri Layral, Governance Coordinator and Faculty Senate Secretary, Emerita

Shusun Li, Research Professor of Geophysics, Emeritus

Sue McHenry, Academic Advisor, Emerita

ATTACHMENT 151/17
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

MOTION:
=======

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to endorse the 2008-2009 committee membership as attached.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: New Senate members' preference for committee selection were reviewed and weighed against membership distribution from schools and colleges.

****

2008 -2009 UAF FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

STANDING COMMITTEES

Curricular Affairs

Ken Abramowicz, SOM (10)
Seta Bogosyan, CEM (10)
Jane Allen, CRCD/KUC (09)
Carrie Baker CLA (10)
Falk Huettmann, CNSM (09) – Co-Chair
Beth Leonard, SOEd (10)
Diane McEachern, CRCD/KUC (09)
Rainer Newberry, CNSM (10)
Amber Thomas, CLA (09) – Co-Chair

Faculty Affairs

Ken Barrick, SNRAS (09)
Marion Bret-Harte, IAB (09)
Cathy Cahill, CNSM (10) - Convener
Anne Christie CLA (10)
Mike Davis, CRCD (10)
Kenan Hazirbaba, CEM (10)
Maureen Hogan, SOEd (09)
Meibing Jin, IARC (10)
Jingjing Liang, SNRAS (10)
Marla Lowder, CES (09)
Jennifer Reynolds, SFOS (09)
Norm Swazo, CLA (10)

Unit Criteria

Mike Davis, CRCD (10)
Kraig Hays, CLA (10)
John Heaton, CLA (10)
Brenda Konar, SFOS (10) - Chair
Sonja Koukel, CES (10)
Jing Zhang, CEM (09)

PERMANENT COMMITTEES

Committee on the Status of Women

Elizabeth Allman, CNSM (10)
Uma Bhatt, CNSM (09)
Alexandra Fitts, CLA (10)
Carol Gold, CLA (09)
Cindy Hardy, CRCD (09)
Stefanie Ickert-Bond, IAB (10)
Renate Wackerbauer, CNSM (09)
Diane Wagner, CNSM (09)
Jane Weber, CRCD (10) - Chair

Core Review

Christine Coffman, English, CLA (10)
Christie Cooper, CLA (10)
James Gladden, Social Sci, Applied & Distance Ed, CLA (10)
Karen Gustafson, Humanities, CLA (10)
Suzan Hahn, Library CLA (09)
Latrice Bowman, Math, CNSM (10) – Co-Convener
Michael Harris, Sciences, CNSM (09) – Co-Convener

Student Academic Development & Achievement Committee

Jane Allen/Nancy Ayagarak, KUC Campus

ackerbauer, CNSM (09)
Ja400(Stefanie Ickert-Bond, IAB (10))]TJEMMarjor/MllTw worC 0.MC BDC T*[( )-2750(Ja4 Math, CNSM

IAB (10) u K/MCP a26 EM,05 Tw -14.34 -1.125 Td[( )-253Renate Wackerbauer, CNSM (09)

ATTACHMENT 151/19
UAF FACULTY SENATE #151
MAY 5, 2008
SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

MOTIONID 5 ƀBD0D 5 ƀBD0D 5 ƀBD0D rT*(2 5 ƀBD0D 5 ƀBDB 1 Tf-0.00067Tc 0.0006 0 12 72 627224 47151/19
MOTION
MOTION