

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral
312 Signers' Hall
474-7964 FYSENAT

A G E N D A
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #83
Monday, November 16, 1998
1: 30 p. m - 4: 00 p. m
Wood Center Ballroom

- | | | | |
|-------|------|---|---|
| 1: 30 | I | Call to Order - Madeline Schatz
A. Roll Call
B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #82
C. Adoption of Agenda | 5 Mn. |
| 1: 35 | II | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions
A. Motions Approved:
1. Motion to delegate the authority to approve petitions.
B. Motions Pending:
1. Motion prohibiting faculty from receiving a graduate degree from UAF. | 5 Mn. |
| 1: 40 | III | A. Remarks by Chancellor J. Waldow
Questions
B. Remarks by Provost P. Reichardt
Questions
C. Guest Speaker - Ralph Gabrielli
Questions | 10 Mn.
5 Mn.
5 Mn.
10 Mn.
5 Mn. |
| 2: 20 | IV | Governance Reports
A. ASUAF - J. Richardson
B. Staff Council - S. Christensen
C. President-Elect's Report - R. Gatterdam | 5 Mn.
5 Mn.
5 Mn. |
| 2: 35 | V | Public Comments/Questions | 5 Mn. |
| 2: 40 | | ***BREAK*** | 10 Mn |
| 2: 50 | VI | Consent Agenda
A. Motion on Unit Criteria for Music, submitted by Ad Hoc Committee of Unit Criteria (Attachment 83/1) | |
| 2: 50 | VII | New Business
A. Motion on Board of Regents Policy & Regulations 09.03--Student Dispute Resolution, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 83/2)
B. Motion of Diploma size, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 83/3) | 5 Mn.
10 Mn. |
| 3: 05 | VIII | Committee Reports
A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath (Attachment 83/4)
B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - J. Yarie (Attachment 83/5)
C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen (Attachment 83/6)
D. Core Review - J. Brown
E. Curriculum Review - C. Basham
F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber (Attachment 83/7)
G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley (Attachment 83/8) | 20 Mn. |

- H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - D. Porter
- I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - L. Duffy (Attachment 83/9)
- J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal
- K. Service Committee - K. Nance

- 3: 25 IX Discussion Items
 - A. ACSI (Alaska Quality Schools Initiative) 15 Min.
 - strategy for action - presentation by Carol Barnhardt & P. Andre' Layral, President, AASSP & ACSA
- 3: 40 X Members' Comments/Questions 5 Min.
- 3: 45 XI Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 83/1
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
 NOVEMBER 16, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIT CRITERIA

NOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for Music.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately
 Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the Music Department. With some minor changes, agreed upon by the department representative, David Stech, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

UNIT CRITERIA

for Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion and Tenure

Department of Music
 University of Alaska Fairbanks

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

These unit criteria are to supplement the University of Alaska Fairbanks Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion and Tenure (hereafter referred to as the "University Policies and Regulations") and to clarify their application to faculty of the UAF Department of Music. These unit criteria are subordinate to the University Policies and Regulations.

INTRODUCTION.

These criteria define for the University Promotion/Tenure Review Committee the kinds of music performance and conducting events that are most appropriately assigned to the categories of Teaching, Research and Service.

professional activities apply to the discipline of music:

- I. TEACHING
- II. RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY
- III. UNIVERSITY/PUBLIC SERVICE

for the three levels of professional forum

- a. local and surrounding community
- b. statewide; mostly outside the local community
- c. national or international; mostly outside the state.

MUSIC PERFORMANCE activities defined as part of TEACHING

DEFINITIONS: Performance done as an adjunct to formal course instruction, principally to provide role models for students in the classroom environment.

LOCAL: Local solo and ensemble events done as part of studio teaching, master classes, student recitals, or non-solo participation with credit-producing university music ensembles.

Method for Evaluation: This activity should be evaluated by use of the Learning Assessment System (LAS).

STATEWIDE: Similar activities done as part of formal course instruction delivered at other units of the University.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

NATIONAL: Similar activities done as part of formal teaching done at institutions beyond the state or done at institutions outside the U.S.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

Statewide and national teaching activities should not be confused with workshop-type performance activities described in Public and University Service.

MUSIC PERFORMANCE

activities defined as part of RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

DEFINITION: Formal concerts given clearly independently of formal instruction or service activities. Shall include performance of music created through electronic music synthesiolo partAl i Armal concCPAA

community.

Method for Evaluation: Based upon opinion

NATIONAL or INTERNATIONAL: Similar activities done as part of formal credit-bearing course instruction done at institutions beyond the state or done internationally.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

MUSIC CONDUCTING

activities defined as part of RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

DEFINITION: Formal concerts given independently of formal instruction and independent of service activities, except where noted below

LOCAL: Conducting of non-credit producing department-sponsored music ensembles given locally. Conducting of faculty chamber recitals given locally would be considered part of this category.

Method for Evaluation: Based primarily upon opinions by music unit faculty who attended the performance. Printed reviews would not normally be expected. The provision to allow occasional credit-producing events into the category is NOT to be misunderstood to mean that any successful course-related performance may be automatically included in this category. The assertion by the candidate that the "exceptionally favorable" test was met would need to be supported by Departmental Peer Review and Chair evaluations.

STATEWIDE: Similar events where the visibility extends beyond the community (e.g., if televised to the general public, or if noted in out-of-town press).

Method for Evaluation: Faculty do much conducting would be expected to have received some printed reviews for some of the concerts. Letters of appreciation, or other unsolicited written comments recognizing the merit of the performances, could also be used to substantiate the impact and success of the performance.

NATIONAL: Similar events given mostly at nationally or internationally recognized forums. May include local performance if visibility is judged to extend to beyond the state. Also includes faculty conducting appearances with a national, or internationally, known music ensemble or at nationally, or internationally, visible concert forums. Sound recordings commercially marketed and distributed beyond the State would also be included in this category.

Method for Evaluation: The significance of such participation would derive from the visibility or prestige of the ensemble. For evaluation of nationally-released sound recordings, the existence of printed reviews, would reflect the significance of the product in the professional world.

In the absence of published reviews, the Department Chair or the Departmental Peer Review Committee could (at their discretion), solicit opinions from knowledgeable persons who attended out-of-town performances. Such evaluations, if available, can supplement the candidate's professional file. Faculty members desiring to

implement this evaluation tool should suggest the possibility of the music executive well in advance of the concert advance. The lack of external peer evaluations should not reflect negatively on the record of the faculty candidate

The principal determinant for categorizing conducting events described above is the scope of the professional visibility achieved by the performance, and to a lesser degree, where the performance actually took place.

Special recognition should be given to those performances which

- 1) exposed the conductor to critical public evaluation by professional peers,
- 2) major statewide events in which the conductor was elected from a national or international pool of conductors, or
- 3) where the conductor placed well in a formal competition or in a similar juried evaluation process.

MUSIC CONDUCTING

activities defined as part of UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE

DEFINITION: to benefit an extra-university host or sponsor, especially where the host or sponsor is principally involved with activities other than sponsorship of the performing arts.

LOCAL: Performances given at a municipal event sponsored by a service organization, church, public school, or private business. Also includes conducting municipal band, light opera theater, youth orchestra, conducting of departmental ensembles for public school music ensembles (including those out-of-town groups which were hosted locally).

Method for Evaluation: There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

STATEWIDE FORUM: Similar performances given out-of-town. Also includes conducting of department-sponsored music ensemble on tour of the state. Also includes conducting of music clinics at state region festivals by invitation and other clinics done around the state.

Method for Evaluation: There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

NATIONAL or INTERNATIONAL: Similar events done where professional visibility of the conductor extends beyond the confines of the state or local region. May include being a clinician at a nationally-recognized event held locally, if sponsors of the event have a previously established record of selecting clinicians from a national pool.

Method for Evaluation: The importance of the event could be assessed according to the professional prestige of the sponsor or the host. There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION DOCUMENT
 SUMMARY OF UNIT CRITERIA DESIGNATIONS AND
 PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| I. Teaching | A. Local and surrounding community |
| II. Research | B. Statewide; mostly outside the local community |
| III. University and Public Service | C. National or International, mostly outside of the state. |

PROFESSIONAL VISIBILITY EXPECTED FOR
 PROMOTION TO DIFFERENT ACADEMIC RANKS

- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Lecturer (non-tenure) | IA |
| Instructor (non-tenure) | IA |
| Instructor (tenure) | IA, IIA, IIB, IIIA |
| Assistant Professor (tenure) | IA, IIA, IIB, IIIA |
| Associate Professor (tenure) | IA, IIA, IIB, IIC, IIIA, IIIB |
| Professor (tenure) | IA, IIA, IIB, IIC, IIIA, IIIB |

Criteria for tenure are assumed to be the same as those used for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Candidates for promotion are expected to have a record of recent professional activities beyond the professional record used to achieve promotion to previous rank.

ATTACHMENT 83/2
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
 NOVEMBER 16, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the proposed Regents' Policy and University Regulation 09.03.00A

The drafting team requests the Faculty Alliance and the Coalition of Student Leaders to consider completing final recommendations on the policy in time for its presentation to the board in November. Because the regulation is approved not by the board, but by the president, more time could, and probably should, be taken for consideration of final recommendations regarding the regulation.

This request is made out of respect for Academic and Student Affairs Chair Sharon Gagnon, who was primarily instrumental in calling for and expediting the sorely needed revisions to policy regarding academic matters and student affairs. Regent Gagnon's term is coming to an end, and the November meeting is most likely to be her last. It would be fitting to accomplish as much revision as possible before she leaves.

(The following policy draft is the equivalent of the hard copy with the footer "For Governance Review second reading; Disp Res Pol 10.13gov.doc)

DRAFT

POLICY 09.03.00

PART IX

STUDENT AFFAIRS

CHAPTER III

Student Dispute Resolution

General Statement: Student Dispute Resolution P09.03.01

The University of Alaska will provide fair, consistent, and expeditious procedures for students to contest actions or decisions which adversely affect them. These procedures will be published in student catalogs or handbooks. Students may direct a complaint to the MAU senior student services officer, the chief academic officer, the chief administrative services officer, or designee. This official will initiate action to resolve the complaint or will inform the student of the appropriate procedure, if any, for review of the action or decision in dispute.

Actions or decisions of the Board of Regents or the substance of Regents Policy, University Regulation, and MAU rules and procedures are not subject to review pursuant to the provisions of this policy.

General Procedures For Dispute Resolution P09.03.02

A. Informal Resolution Procedures

Unless specified to the contrary, the first step for a student to challenge a university action or decision will GENERALLY be to seek an informal resolution with the person responsible for the decision or action, or with the person's immediate supervisor.

B. Formal Review Procedures

If the matter [is not] CAN NOT BE resolved informally, a

student may submit a written statement to initiate one of

PART IX

STUDENT AFFAIRS

CHAPTER III

Student Dispute Resolution

General Statement: Student Dispute Resolution R09.03.01

[RESERVED]

General Procedures for Dispute Resolution R09.03.02

A. Resolution of Disputes Regarding Student Employment Decisions or Actions

Issues related to student employment will be reviewed in accordance with the grievance procedure specified in Regents' Policy and University Regulation on human resources, except where specifically modified by Regents' Policy and University Regulation on employment of students.

B. Resolution of Disputes Regarding Academic Decisions or Actions

Examples of academic actions or decisions subject to this regulation include, but are not limited to: assignment of final course grades, denial of admission to an academic program and academic dismissal. [Only the final grade] GRADES ASSIGNED PRIOR TO THE FINAL GRADE RECEIVED IN A COURSE ARE NOT [i s] subject to review under this section.

1. Definitions Applicable to Academic Disputes

a. Academic Leader

The term "academic leader" is used to denote the administrative head of the academic unit offering the course or program from which the academic decision or action arose, AS DEFINED IN MAU RULES AND PROCEDURES. [The term is adopted to refer to the person with immediate administrative authority for the program generally but not always, at a level below that of dean or director.]

b. Academic Unit

The term "academic unit" generally refers to a department or other group with responsibility for academic decisions within a school, college, institute, or center. The term may refer to a school, college, institute or center in instances when a smaller unit is either of insufficient size for a given purpose or non-existent.

c. Arbitrary and Capricious Grading

Arbitrary and capricious grading means the assignment of a final course grade on a basis

other than performance in the course; the use of standards different from those applied to other students in the same course; or substantial, unreasonable and/or unannounced departure from the course instructor's previously articulated standards or criteria. (See also "grading error.")

The following terms is no longer used in this section
[d. Chief Academic Officer

The chief academic officer is the individual responsible for the administration of the academic program of the MAU.]

d. Class Day

As used in the schedule for review of academic decisions, a class day is any day of scheduled instruction, excluding Saturday and Sunday, included on the academic calendar in effect at the time of a review. Final examination periods are counted as class days.

e. Dean/Director

The dean/director is the administrative head of the college or school offering the course or program from which the academic decision or action arises. For students at extended campuses the director of the campus may substitute for the dean/director of the unit offering the course or program

f. Faculty Review Committee

A FACULTY REVIEW COMMITTEE IS AN AD HOC COMMITTEE COMPOSED SOLELY OF FACULTY APPOINTED BY THE DEAN/DIRECTOR TO FORMALLY REVIEW A CONTESTED FINAL GRADE ASSIGNMENT.

g. Final Grade

Note: The following, recognized as under dispute, should probably wait for modification until after the Faculty Alliance agrees upon grading standards.

The final grade is the letter grade assigned for a course upon its completion. A grade of I (Incomplete) is considered a temporary grade up to one year following assignment, during which time it is not subject to review. After standing for one year an Incomplete grade may be challenged by the student.

h. Grading Error

A grading error is a mathematical miscalculation of a final grade or an inaccurate recording of the final grade. (See also "arbitrary and capricious grading").

i. Next Regular Semester

The next regular semester is the fall or spring semester following that in which the disputed

C.

tradition of issuing diplomas in two sizes.

ATTACHMENT 83/4
UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
NOVEMBER 16, 1998
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS RATIONALE

Notes on Curricular Affairs meeting, 10/27/98 - J. McBeath, Chair

At our meeting today, we took action on a motion, agreed to a registrar's proposal on commencement announcements, and reacted to the latest version of the student dispute resolution policy. We also formed two sub-committees and had general discussion on several issues. I list here the items that members of the administrative committee may be interested in; Harry Bader is committee secretary and he will forward minutes by the end of the week.

1. Motion on diploma size

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves that diplomas be issued in two sizes: a 6" by 9" diploma for recipients of certificates and associate degrees, and an 8 1/2" by 11" diploma for recipients of baccalaureate and graduate degrees.

EFFECTIVE: Spring 1999

RATIONALE: The UAF tradition has been to issue diplomas in two sizes, with certificate and associate degree diplomas smaller than those for baccalaureate and graduate degrees. When UAF began printing its own diplomas, the software then in use produced diplomas of one size only. Now software allows different sizes of diplomas, and it is possible to return to the tradition of issuing diplomas in two sizes.

(The committee discussed amending the proposal to have one diploma for undergraduate degrees and another for graduate degrees; this proposal was not passed. The registrar said it was possible to create diplomas in only two sizes. The main motion passed by a 5-4

revision work group on Policy/Regulation 09.03.01-- Student Dispute Resolution. No member of the committee objected to this revision, and generally members believed the committee's concerns had been addressed. However, the chair believes the issue should be discussed at the administrative committee meeting.

5. Certification of degree requirements and honors

Ann Tremarello proposed a change in the timing of degree requirements' and honors' certification--that it occur after (and not as at present, before) the commencement. She also proposed that language similar to the following appear at the bottom of each page of the commencement program "Certificates, degrees and honors for May degree candidates will be awarded after final grades have been received and verification of completion of requirements has been completed."

The committee agreed unanimously with Ann's proposal. The chair believes that this item falls within the purview of administrative discretion and does not require full Faculty Senate action.

I have classes Monday from 1:00 to 3:20 p.m., and will join the administrative committee meeting afterwards. Best regards, Jerry.

ATTACHMENT 83/5
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
 NOVEMBER 16, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY & SCHOLARLY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Report of the October 26, 1998 meeting of the Faculty and Scholarly Affairs Committee

Present: S. Bandopadhyay, S. Grigg, B. Luick, B. Mortensen, J. Olson and J. Yarie

Meeting Overview

1. Dr. Godwin Chukwu was present to make a presentation on the role of Department Head's in the University. With the development of the union contract the exact role of a Department Head is no longer as straightforward as it was in the past. At this point in time it needs to be decided if the committee should address this issue in the future.
2. We started a discussion of the changes that need to be made to the Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies (FAEP) and the Regulation for the Evaluation of Faculty (REF). We have decided to start with the first three chapters in both sections. Within the FAEP document we will start with the following chapters: Construction and Application, Definitions and Appointment of Faculty. Within the REF document we will start with the Purview Initial Appointment of Faculty and Periodic Evaluation of Faculty.
3. We will place future discussion of the Faculty Handbook on the shelf for the time being.
4. Finally Dr. Pippenger was present to give a presentation on evaluation policies. Dr. Pippenger presented a short discussion on the development of a disciplinary committee for the faculty.

2. Review of Administrators: John Kelley met with Provost Paul Reichardt and his assistant Gina Bailey on October 13 to discuss the subject of review of administrators. This meeting was in response to the request of the Appeals and Oversight committee last month to solicit information on former procedures. The original motion was

