

MINUTES

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #192

Monday, September 9, 2013

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – David Valentine

A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Present – continued:
---------------------------------	----------------------

ALBERTSON, Leif (14) - audio

RADENBAUGH, Todd (15) - audio

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #191

Minutes for Meeting #191 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to approve the list of 2012-2013 degree candidates
2. Motion to approve continuation of the PhD in Mathematics and DMS PhD Revitalization Plan
3. Motion to approve a new Minor in Dispute RTd ()m05 TTj e3 Td (16(nc) P)1(h)-2(D)-11(Td

convocations for CLA, CNSM and SOEd so far. She attended the CRCDC gathering recently, and this made her more aware of the need for helping to make the Senate more visible. In this regard, they also want to attend research institute meetings.

Another area Cecile hopes to address is developing more ways to support the chairs of Senate committee

Mike D. asked the Provost how she envisions Faculty Senate being part of the process to evaluate and potentially prioritize and/or eliminate programs (referring to the program review process that took place last year). The Provost

affected significantly. They are the only school in Alaska with dual accreditation for accounting and business. Their six peer institutions cost a lot more, especially with non-resident tuition rates. While they might lose a few students, across the nation schools with differential tuition are not losing students,

and they have asked Don Foley to follow up and ask that “UAF” be dropped from the name. There is also an ongoing investigation by Mae Marsh’s office which cannot be reported upon yet. To the extent it’s possible to report back, David will do so at a later date.

Debu thanked David and Cecile for their efforts.

2:00 BREAK

VII New Business

- A. Reaffirmation of Resolution in Support of Allowing Candidates for Promotion, Tenure, or Comprehensive Review to Opt for “Open” Meetings – submitted by the Administrative Committee (Attachment 192/3)

David noted that for the last several years, the Faculty Senate has encouraged

Georgina G. asked if the function of review processes shouldn't occur before a particular review gets underway. David responded that the policies and procedures are already laid out, and what the committee does is a final review of the procedures that were used (as required by the policy).

Knut K. commented about the possibility for infinite regress of reviews with the policy. David responded that a reporting mechanism is needed to handle the work results of the ad hoc review committees in order to review the procedures that have been used. The new committee takes on what FAOC used to do, but in a slightly better defined manner.

Georgina G. asked if the committee can make an ad hoc committee go back and re-do a procedure. David answered that he hoped this would not be necessary because of how the new committee is comprised, which would allow issues to be addressed as they come up in the process. Cecile commented that the new committee can meet as they need to throughout the academic year with the understanding that they make sure a quality control process is happening at the end of the review cycle.

Glenn J. commented that if one of the intended benefits is to capture ways to improve the process, then the regularly-changing ad hoc committee membership from year to year would potentially cause loss of information instead of fostering institutional memory about best practices. David noted that they have considered how to go about creating some institutional memory of the learning that takes place longitudinally throughout the process, and he has asked General Counsel about what types of information could be retained from review cycle to the next for use by future committees. Of course,

Ohe neavc4(l)34(o)-6(y)36(r)-1 0 Tc 0 Tw 22.14.7d ()TjA0.01 Tw 0.26 0 Td [(a)4(ppe(a)4(usl)

populate the senate committees as it is, but the FARC would still involve one senator, as would each of the ad hoc review committees.

Debu commented that only putting one senator on each ad hoc committee would be giving away control for this serious business of reviewing administrators. He would like the senate to think about reviving

addressing the methods and processes for assigning attributes to courses, though it would likely be a committee review function much as it is now for the core curriculum. There is more to be fleshed out, including rubrics for courses.

There is new information in Appendix 2 regarding the General Education Learning Outcomes

UAFT – Jane Weber

Jane mentioned the JHCC will next meet on Sept. 19.

X Public Comment

Eric Madsen shared information about Faculty180 and mentioned the launch memo that has been sent out. A copy of it is on the Provost's web site. He also mentioned training webinars coming up soon. Faculty180 is voluntary this year and mandatory next year. He invited feedback from everyone who is trying it out. There is mention in the launch memo of an advisory committee being formed by the

ATTACHMENT 192/1
UAF Faculty Senate #192, September 9, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

Faculty Senate Administrative Committee

Special Meeting – May 10th, 2013

Summary Notes

Committee Members Present: Cécile Lardon (chair), David Valentine, Rainer Newberry, Cindy Hardy, Syndonia BreHarte, Kayt Sunwood (for Jane Weber)

Guests: Sine Anahita, Don Foley, Mae Marsh, Robyne

This meeting was scheduled in response to a Faculty Senate Resolution (see May meeting) charging the committee to address issues of sexual harassment on campus. Sine Anahita had brought the issue to the Senate in response to two articles in the Sun Star (both April issues, one was in the Fun Star issue). Summary of Sine Anahita's argument: Both articles, plus the image and the title (a play on sexual slang for a woman's genitals) accompanying the Fun Star article were offensive and created a hostile work environment. They constitute sexual harassment. Faculty and students have a right to an environment

fr1.391 TD [(Is)-23(t)8((r)-3(i)-14(u)-1(a)-3(M-6(n)-1((c)9(re)-31.391 TD [(l)-1(pas(e)-6(1)-8(t0(R)-1(ai)-1(t)50



UAF Faculty Senate

[REDACTED]

www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate

MEMORANDUM

June 7, 2013

TO: The UAF Sun Star Editorial Board

FROM: David Valentine, President
Cecile Lardon, President-Elect
UAF Faculty Senate

Handwritten signatures of David Valentine and Cecile Lardon. The signature of David Valentine is written in a cursive style, and the signature of Cecile Lardon is written in a similar cursive style below it.

[REDACTED]

to appear on behalf of UAF Professors. We are not convinced that inclusion of names in the cover

shots is justified, and ask that you redact the on-line article so that the names are no longer legible.

The UAF Sun Star is not answerable to the UAF Faculty Senate, and we harbor no conceit that we can demand the changes we request. Even if we could, such an undertaking might raise real and important

concerns about freedom of speech and of the press. Faculty at UAF cherish academic freedom, freedom of the press, and freedom of speech. We understand and honor the Sun-Star's rights to these freedoms as well. We see our requests as in line with our mutual goals for a vibrant campus newspaper with high

ATTACHMENT 192/4
UAF Faculty Senate #192, September 9, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the Faculty Senate Bylaws of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, Section 3, Article V: Committees, subsection E, to establish the Faculty Administrator Review Committee (FARC) as a Permanent Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: One of the responsibilities of the discontinued Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee was to approve the processes used to review Group A and B administrators. Without this committee the responsibility falls to the Administrative Committee. Approximately 5-6 administrator reviews need to be completed per year. The reports are due in March which, of course, is a particularly busy time for the Administrative Committee. The newly formed Faculty Administrator Review Committee would take on that oversight function while also providing some structure and support to the individual Ad Hoc Administrator Review Committee chairs.

BOLD CAPS = Addition
[[]] = Deletion

Faculty Senate Bylaws, Section 3, Article 5: Committees, subsection E:

E. The standing and permanent committees of the Senate are:

...

PERMANENT

...

- 8. THE FACULTY ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE (FARC) WILL FACILITATE THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS IN GROUPS A AND B. THIS WILL INCLUDE ENCOURAGING THE TIMELY COMPLETION OF ALL REVIEWS AND RESULTING LETTERS, AS WELL AS PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF EACH REVIEW TO THE PROVOST, CHANCELLOR, VICE-CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH, OR OTHER SUPERVISOR IN MARCH. THE FARC WILL ALSO APPROVE THE PROCESS WHICH EACH AD-HOC ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW COMMITTEE UTILIZES.**

ATTACHMENT 192/5
UAF Faculty Senate #192, September 9, 2013
Submitted by the Administrative Committee

be highlighted. Any issues raised in the last evaluation should be referenced with a view to what progress has been made on those items. Finally, the self-evaluation should identify a limited set of reasonable goals for the unit over the next three years, with some discussion about specific strategies that may be undertaken through his/her administrative leadership.

3. The Ad Hoc Committee will interview a select sample of faculty, staff, students and others as relevant for further evaluative comments about the administrator's performance.
4. The Ad Hoc Committee will interview the administrator either in person or by conference call. The interview shall proceed on the basis of a set of questions which reference the administrator's self-evaluation, the results of returned questionnaires, and the interviews of faculty, staff, and students.
5. The Ad Hoc Committee will prepare an evaluative summary, and submit its report to the Provost (in the case of evaluation of deans) or to the Chancellor (in the case of evaluation of the Provost or any other administrator who reports directly to the Chancellor). The Ad Hoc Committee shall work as expeditiously as possible in completing its report and submit it to the Provost or Chancellor as the case may be by March 15 of the spring semester.

(a) At a date to be set by the Provost, the Provost or administrator's supervisor shall meet in joint conference with the Ad Hoc Committee and the Faculty Senate **FACULTY** Administrator **REVIEW** Committee (**FARC**) for final review, recommendations, and disposition of the Administrator's evaluation. The specifics of the content of the report of the Ad Hoc committee shall not be discussed if the Administrator's supervisor deems that inappropriate under Board of Regents' Policy P04.01.062. and Alaska Statute. In particular, the Administrator must give written consent for the specific content to be discussed. However, the **FARC** [[Administrative Committee]] shall be provided information on the process followed by the ad hoc committee, excluding the names of persons interviewed unless they have waived confidentiality. The supervisor of the administrator will thereafter provide his/her formal evaluation taking into account the Ad Hoc Committee's report.

(b) At a date to be set by the Chancellor, the Provost (or other administrator reporting directly to the Chancellor) and the Chancellor shall meet to discuss the Ad Hoc Committee's evaluation of the Provost (or other administrator reporting directly to the Chancellor). During this meeting the f16 TD2(t)-

past or present employee of the university are not public records and are not accessible by the public. Personnel records will be released only under the following circumstances:

1. upon receipt of written authorization from the employee, former employee, or applicant, as directed in the authorization;
2. to the employee's supervisors and to university supervisors to whom the employee or former employee has applied for promotion, transfer or rehire;
3. to a state agency authorized by statute to review such university documents upon receipt of a subpoena issued by a competent authority and upon execution of an agreement that confidential information will not be made public;
4. upon receipt of an order of a court of competent jurisdiction;
5. for internal university operations, to persons having a need to know as determined by the regional personnel officer or the custodian of the record.

GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Group B Administrators:

In addition to being reviewed annually by his/her immediate Supervisor, "Group B" administrators are to undergo a 3-year comprehensive review. At a time designated by the Supervisor during the fall semester of the academic year of comprehensive review, the "Group B" administrator will submit a self-evaluation report to his/her Supervisor. The self-evaluation shall include: (1) comments on the annual performance evaluations; (2) a summary of his/her notable activities/accomplishments in the previous years; and (3) a statement of relevant goals/objectives relative to assigned or planned administrative duties for the upcoming years. The Supervisor's evaluation shall include faculty and/or staff opportunities for comment on the "Group B" administrator's performance. Comments received shall be referenced in anonymous and aggregate summary in the written evaluation provided to the "Group B" administrator. The Supervisor will include, as part of the written evaluation, an appended workload assignment and/or statement of performance expectations for the "Group B" administrator for the subsequent review period. A summary statement of the process used to assure faculty/staff input into the evaluation will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office by March 15 of the academic year the "Group B" administrator is scheduled for review. The Faculty Senate **FACULTY** Administrator **REVIEW** Committee shall review the evaluation process in order to perform their oversight function in administrator review.

The following criteria will be used to determine which administrators are placed on or removed from the "Group B" list. As vacancies and appointments occur, changes to the list shall be determined annually by the Provost in consultation with the Faculty Senate President.

- "Group B" administrator responsibilities must be administrative in nature. ("Group B" administrators must not be Union members, UNAC or ACCFT).
- "Group B" administrators report to "Group A" administrators. ("Group A" administrators report to the Chancellor, Provost, or a Vice Chancellor.)
- "Group B" administrators supervise faculty and are involved in faculty performance reviews.

