I. Call to Order
II. Roll- (P= Present; A= Absent; E= Excused; T= Telephonic Participation)

2015-2016 Officers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Smith, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Vice President</td>
<td>Fitzgerald, Dave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Vice President</td>
<td>Widdicombe, Toby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, UAB</td>
<td>King, Carrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
<td>Schmuland, Arlene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President</td>
<td>Hirshberg, Diane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015-2016 Senators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartels, Jonathan</td>
<td>Foster, Larry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Brian</td>
<td>Fox, Deborah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benningfield, Tim</td>
<td>Garcia, Gabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha</td>
<td>Graham, Rachel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowie, David</td>
<td>Harville, Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges, Anne</td>
<td>Hoanca, Bogdan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Barbara</td>
<td>Hollingsworth, Jeffrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cenek, Martin</td>
<td>Horn, Steve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Sam</td>
<td>Ippolito, Mari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dannenberg, Clare</td>
<td>Kappes, Bruno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Leanne</td>
<td>Karahan, Gokhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison, Veronica</td>
<td>Kelley, Colleen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Din, Herminia</td>
<td>Kirk, Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downing, Scott</td>
<td>Knott, Catherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutta, Utpal</td>
<td>Kopacz, Eva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders Crosby, Jill</td>
<td>Kuden, Jodee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folias, Stefanos</td>
<td>Laube, Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCoy, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Agenda Approval (pg. 1-3)

III. Meeting Summary Approval (pg. 4-7)

IV. Officer’s Reports
   A. President’s Report (p. 8-9)
   B. First Vice President’s Report
   C. Second Vice President’s Report

V. Old Business
   A. Revisions to the Faculty Senate Bylaws/Constitution (pg. 10-39)
      Second Reading
B. Motion on the Open Access Policy - Library Advisory Committee (pg. 40-42)
   *Second Reading*

C. Sabbatical Leave Ch. V (pg. 43-49)
   *Second Reading*

VI. **Consent Agenda**
   A. Graduate Curriculum (pg. 49)
      
   B. Undergraduate Curriculum (pg. 50-52)

VII. **Boards and Committees Reports**
   A. Graduate Academic Board
      
   B. Undergraduate Academic Board
      
   C. General Education Review Committee
      
   D. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
      
   E. Academic Assessment Committee (pg. 53)
      
   F. Academic Computing, Distance Learning and Instructional Technology and e-Learning (pg. 54)
      
   G. Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee- BPFA
      
   H. Nominations and Elections Committee
      
   I. Diversity Committee (pg. 55-57)
      
   J. Faculty Grants and Leaves Committee
      
   K. Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee (pg. 58)
      
   L. Library Advisory Committee
      
   M. Student Academic Support and Success Committee (pg. 59-60)
      
   N. Community Campus Committee
      
   O. Academic Honesty and Integrity Committee (pg. 61)
      
   P. Research and Creative Activity Committee (pg. 62-63)
Q. Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation

VIII. New Business
    A. Revisions to the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (pg. 64-110)

    Additional Agenda Items:

IX. Administrative Reports
    A. Chancellor, Tom Case
    B. Provost of Academic Affairs, Sam Gingerich (pg. 111-113)
    C. Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, Bill Spindle
    D. Vice Chancellor of Advancement, Megan Olson (pg. 114-117)
    E. Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Bruce Schultz (pg. 118-121)
    F. CIO, Patrick Shier (pg. 122-124)
    G. Union Representatives
       i. UAFT
       ii. United Academics
    H. Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Engagement and Academic Support (pg.125-128)
       Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Alaska Natives and Diversity, Jeane Breinig
       i. Update from Diversity Action Plan Co-Leaders.

VIX. Informational Items & Adjournment
    A.
I. Call to Order

II. Roll- (P= Present; A= Absent; E= Excused; T= Telephonic Participation)

2015-2016 Officers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Bartels, Jonathan</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Fitzgerald, Dave - 1st Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Widdicombe, Toby - 2nd Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>King, Carrie</td>
<td>Chair, UAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Schmuland, Arlene</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hirshberg, Diane</td>
<td>Past President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015-2016 Senators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Bennett, Brian</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Benningfield, Tim</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bowie, David</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Bridges, Anne</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Brown, Barbara</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Cenek, Martin</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Cook, Sam</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Dannenberg, Clare</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Davis, Leanne</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Denison, Veronica</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T*</td>
<td>Din, Herminia</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Downing, Scott</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Dutta, Utpal</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Flanders Crosby, Jill</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Folias, Stefanos</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Smith, Tara</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>King, Carrie</td>
<td>Chair, UAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Schmuland, Arlene</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Orley, Soren</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Ohle, Kathryn</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Harville, Barbara</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hoanac, Bogdan</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Hollingsworth, Jeffrey</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Horn, Steve</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Ipolito, Mari</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Kappes, Bruno</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Karahan, Gokhan</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Kelley, Colleen</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Kirk, Sarah</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Knott, Catherine</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Kopacz, Eva</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Kuden, Jodee</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Laube, Jeff</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>McCoy, Robert</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thiru, Sam</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Toscano, Sharyl</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Trotter, Clayton</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Venema, Rieken</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Ward, Jervette</td>
<td>Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Agenda Approval (pg. 1-3)

Approved

III. Meeting Summary Approval (pg. 4-6)

Approved

IV. Officer’s Reports

A. President’s Report (p. 7-8)

Discussed Capitol Report, link in report.

B. First Vice President’s Report

No report
C. Second Vice President’s Report
   No Report

V. Old Business

VI. Consent Agenda
   A. Graduate Curriculum (pg. )
      Approved
   B. Undergraduate Curriculum (pg. )
      Approved

VII. Boards and Committees Reports
   A. Graduate Academic Board
   B. Undergraduate Academic Board
   C. General Education Review Committee
   D. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
   E. Academic Assessment Committee
   F. Academic Computing, Distance Learning and Instructional Technology and e-Learning (pg. )
   G. Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee- BPFA (pg. )
   H. Nominations and Elections Committee
   I. Diversity Committee (pg. )
   J. Faculty Grants and Leaves Committee
   K. Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee (pg. )
   L. Library Advisory Committee (pg. )
   M. Student Academic Support and Success Committee (pg. )
   N. Community Campus Committee
   O. Academic Honesty and Integrity Committee (pg. )
   P. Research and Creative Activity Committee (pg. )
   Q. Joint Ad Hoc Committee
VIII. New Business
   A. Strategic Pathways Memo

   B. Proposed Revisions to the Faculty Senate Bylaws & Constitution (pg. 22-53)
      Accepted for first reading

   C. Motion on the Library Advisory Committee (pg. 52-54)
      Motion: The Faculty Senate supports the following Open Access Policy for the
      University of Alaska Anchorage, and recommends its adoption and implementation
      effective as of August 10th, 2016.
      Accepted for first reading

   D. BPFA Motion on the Budget, Planning and Advisory Committee
      Motion: When instructors are scheduled to teach back-to-back classes in order to
      fulfill educational goals for students the classes need to be scheduled in the same
      or adjacent buildings.
      Discussion centered on the language of the motion. The final amendment on the
      language reads as follows, “In order to fulfill educational goals for students, when
      instructors are scheduled to teach back-to-back classes the classes need to be
      scheduled in the same or adjacent buildings.”
      29 For; 3 Against; 3 Abstain
      The amendment passes
      Motion to accept the BPFA Motion
      32 For; 2 Against; 1 Abstain

   E. Proposed Revisions to Faculty Handbook Ch. IV & Sabbatical Leave Ch. V (pg. 55-72)
      Accepted for first reading

Additional Agenda Items:
   A. Faculty Response to Concealed Weapons on Campus Bill
      Solidarity with USUAA's Resolution on #16-18, Opposing SB-174
      17 For; 7 Against; 4 Abstain

      Introduce another Resolution, Opposing SB-174
      Discussion centered on the language of the motion. The final amendment on the
      language reads as follows, “Faculty Senate at UAA agrees with current BOR policy
      relating to weapons on campus and firmly opposes SB-174”
      19 For; 4 Against; 1 Abstain
Administrative Reports

F. Chancellor, Tom Case
   Update on state budget, ‘Coffee with the Chancellor’ to discuss budget and the
   importance of morale during this time. Urges faculty to continue to do their jobs very
   well to assure students that we’re still here and taking good care of them.
   Read Memo to students regarding budgets.

G. Provost, Sam Gingerich
   NWCCU 7 year review: Fall 2017, considering 2016-2017 a “self study year”
   Two Deans Searches: Community Technical College and College of Education.

H. Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, Bill Spindle
   LEAN Presentation by LuAnn Piccard

I. Vice Chancellor of Advancement, Megan Olson (pg. 73-75)

J. Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Bruce Schultz (pg. 76-78)

K. CIO, Patrick Shier (pg. 79-81)

L. Union Representatives
   i. UAFT
   ii. United Academics

M. Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Engagement and Academic Support (pg. 82-85)

N. Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Alaska Natives and Diversity, Jeane Breinig

VIX. Informational Items & Adjournment
   A.
April 2016
Report of the President

Budget
The Capitol Reports will have the latest on legislative actions and deliberations on the University of Alaska budget for next year. You should receive these notices in your UAA email. You can access them here, as well: http://www.alaska.edu/state/report/

For UAA budget information or to post suggestions or ideas on the budget, please visit the Chancellor’s website: https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/chancellor/budget.cfm

UA Regents
The Regents held a special meeting on March 25th. They considered a change to BOR Policy on weapons on campus, but as the announcement from UA Outreach explained, they instead confirmed their opposition to the current version of SB 174. Regents Fisher and Andersen voted against.

The April meeting will be in Anchorage. This is an important opportunity to help the regents and the president understand UAA more deeply. Please consider encouraging your students, colleagues, or yourself to give the BOR a glimpse into one of the many facets of UAA. Learn more about public testimony to the BOR here: http://www.alaska.edu/bor/public-testimony/
Even if you do not get a chance to speak, your presence will be noted by the board. You are also free to submit written comments via ua-bor@alaska.edu, http://www.alaska.edu/bor/

UA President Johnsen & Statewide
President Johnsen will review the final recommendations of the Statewide Transformation Team soon and make decisions. The current status of the Statewide Transformation project can be found at http://www.alaska.edu/swbir/transformation-team/

Faculty Alliance
The Faculty Alliance held two March meetings to respond to requests for input from President Johnsen on criteria for the review of academic programs. We have renewed the charge of the UA GER Coordinating Task Force, which is chaired by Dr. Dan Kline. We meet once a month on second Fridays from 1:00-3:00p. The meetings are held via Google Hangouts.

Please contact me for more information on Faculty Alliance or visit http://www.alaska.edu/governance/faculty-alliance/
Faculty Senate Executive Board
Your ‘Eboard’ meets weekly to examine on going issues and prepare them for discussion of the boards, committees, and/or the senate. We are reviewing the priority registration deadlines within the system and examining the current UAA deadlines. We reviewed the report from the Statewide Transformation Work Teams and offered feedback to President Johnsen via my membership on the Statewide Academic Council, Faculty Alliance, and the System Governance Council. Faculty Senate and Eboard have heard requests for information on the cost of Athletics at UAA. We have requested Athletics budget information from Vice Chancellor Spindle. We welcome your input on issues of concern to you and your fellow faculty members.

Please remember that we have changed the final Faculty Senate meeting of AY16 to Monday, May 2nd in consideration of the end of faculty contracts. Faculty Senate will still meet 2:30-4:30 in LIB 307. We will be holding a faculty reception after the meeting adjourns. Please invite your colleagues! There will be entertainment...

Faculty Senate elections will be held soon. Please vote and encourage your colleagues to do so as well. Not only will we be filling our vacancies, but if we approve the proposed revisions to our Bylaws and Constitution, those must be approved by referendum, as well. It will be an important ballot.

Questions or Concerns?
The Faculty Senate President meets biweekly with Provost Gingerich and monthly with Chancellor Case and Vice Chancellor Spindle and the Union of Students President. I am continuing with these regular meetings and invite you to send me governance issues or items you would like these leaders to consider.

Tara Smith
tmsmith@uaa.alaska.edu
PSB 102N
BYLAWS OF THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE
FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Section 1. (Article III. Membership)

a. Nomination of Senators

(1) The Nominations and Elections Committee shall prepare a slate of candidates for Senate positions consisting of eligible faculty nominated by faculty.

(2) Nominations shall be made in accordance with Article III, sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Constitution.

b. Election of Senators

(1) Faculty Members shall vote in accordance with Article III, sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Constitution.

(2) Election of Senators shall be by ballot.

(3) The terms of the newly elected Senators shall commence at the beginning of “New Business” of the last regularly scheduled Senate meeting of the Academic year.

c. Recall of Senators

(1) Any elected Senator may be recalled by a two-thirds vote of all qualified voters in the Senator’s unit as defined in Article III, sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Constitution casting ballots in a recall election held in accordance with paragraph two (2) below. A successful recall shall be effective immediately upon tabulation of all ballots cast.

(2) A recall election shall be held upon receipt by the Faculty Senate Executive Board of a written petition signed by at least ten percent (10%) of the tenure-track faculty members in the Senator’s unit as defined in Article III, sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Constitution, which sets forth the basis for recall. A copy of the petition shall be provided to the Senator who is the subject of the petition. Announcement of a pending recall election shall be published in the agenda for the next Faculty Senate meeting, and the Senator whose recall is being sought shall be provided an opportunity to address the Faculty Senate at that meeting if the Senator so desires. At the Faculty Senate Executive Board’s discretion, other members of the faculty may be permitted a reasonable opportunity to address the body, either in favor of or in opposition to the recall petition. A recall election shall then be conducted within 14 days after the meeting.

Approved February 2014
Section 2. (Article 4IV. Officers)

aA. Nomination of Officers

(1) The Nominations and Elections Committee, Governance Coordinator shall prepare a slate of candidates for the officer positions of President, First Vice President, and Second Vice President. This slate, and must consist of eligible faculty nominated by faculty.

b. Election of Officers

(1) Officers shall be elected by the faculty at large.

(2) Election of officers shall be by secret ballot.

(3) The terms of the newly elected officers shall commence at the beginning of "New Business" of the last regularly scheduled Senate meeting of the academic year.

bB. Election of Officers

(1) Faculty Members shall vote in accordance with Article 4, section 3 of the Constitution.

C. bC. Recall of Officers

(1) Any elected officer may be recalled by a two-thirds vote of all qualified voters casting ballots in a recall election held in accordance with paragraph (2) below. Recall shall be effective immediately upon tabulation of all ballots cast.

(2) A recall election shall be held upon receipt by the Faculty Senate Executive Board of a written petition signed by at least ten percent (10%) of the tenure-track faculty members, which sets forth the basis for recall. A copy of the petition shall be provided to the officer who is the subject of the petition. Announcement of a pending recall election shall be published in the agenda for the next Faculty Senate meeting, and the officer whose recall is being sought shall be provided an opportunity to address the Faculty Senate at that meeting if the officer so desires. At the Faculty Senate Executive Board's discretion, other members of the faculty may be permitted a reasonable opportunity to address the body, either in favor of or in opposition to the recall petition. A recall election shall then be conducted within fourteen (14) days after the meeting.

Section 3. (Article 5IV. Boards and Committees)

(1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) will apply to the following committees: Academic Computing, Distance Learning, Instructional Technology, and eLearning; Student Academic Support and Success; Budget, Planning and Facilities Advisory; Diversity; Library Advisory; Institutional and Unit Leadership Review; Academic Honesty and Integrity; and Research and Creative Activity.

(1) The Senate shall select a minimum of three Senators for the Committee, with a maximum of two Senators from any unit as defined in Article 3IV, section 3, subsections A-K, and section 4 of the Constitution.
(2) A Senate member of the Committee shall convene the first meeting.

(3) New and continuing members shall elect the chair(s) no later than May 15, with service to begin June 1. The Chair or a Co-chair must be a member of the Faculty Senate.

(4) The Committee shall present an outline of its yearlong agenda and goals to the Faculty Senate no later than the regularly scheduled October meeting.

(5) The Committee shall present a report of its yearlong activities to the Faculty Senate at the regularly scheduled May meeting.

aA. Composition of the Undergraduate Academic Board. Faculty members on leave that prevents them from meeting the qualifications for membership and attendance requirements in the Faculty Senate Constitution (Article 5, Sections 3 & 12) are not eligible to serve as members of the Undergraduate Academic Board and must relinquish the position.

(1) Each of the units listed in Article 3III, Section 3, of the Constitution shall elect representatives to the Undergraduate Academic Board so that total membership on the Board is the equivalent of one representative for each sixty (60) or fraction thereof of faculty members who meet the requirements laid down in Article 5V, Section 3, of the Constitution.

(2) The Senate shall choose four senators to serve on the Board.

Senate Representation
- Arts and Sciences - (1)
- Any Senators - (3)

(3) Non-Senate Faculty Members shall be elected by faculty within their respective units as defined in Article 3III, section 3 of the Constitution.

Non-Senate Faculty Representation:
- Arts and Sciences
- College of Business & Public Policy
- College of Education
- College of Health
- Community & Technical College
- School of Engineering
- Library
- Matanuska-Susitna College
- Kenai Peninsula College
- Kodiak College
- Matanuska-Susitna College
- Prince William Sound College
- Student Affairs
- Adjunct (Part-time) Faculty

Members may attend the meetings of the Undergraduate Academic Board as voting members via remote link.

(4) Faculty holding appointments of less than .50 F.T.E. (hereafter called adjunct or part-time faculty) may collectively elect one representative to the Undergraduate Academic Board.
(5) Faculty members of the Board for Undergraduate Academic Board shall serve
two-year staggered terms.

(6) The students of the University of Alaska Anchorage may appoint one
undergraduate or certificate-seeking student to voting membership on the
Undergraduate Academic Board. The method of selection of the student
representative shall be the responsibility of the student government.

(7) New and continuing members of the Board shall elect the chair person(s) no
later than May 15, with service to begin June 1. The chair(s) shall be elected by
the Board from those members who are in the second year of their terms or
who have served at least one previous term of office. If no chair is an elected
senator, a chair shall act as an ex officio, voting member of the Senate
at Senate meetings.

(8) One representative from the Office of Academic Affairs, appointed by the
Provost, one representative from the Office of the Registrar, and one
representative from Enrollment Services, Publications and Scheduling, shall be
ex officio and non-voting members of the Undergraduate Academic
Board. The Governance Office shall be responsible for coordinating the
activities of the Undergraduate Academic Board.

bB. Functions and Responsibilities of the Undergraduate Academic Board

(1) The Board may initiate and review all academic policies of undergraduate
programs as defined in Article 2II, Section 2, subsection c(1) of the Faculty
Senate constitution.

(2) Subject to Article 5V, Sections 5, 5a, and 5b of the Constitution, the Board shall
have the authority to

(a) approve all new permanent numbered courses, including those
from Community Campuses and changes in number, content, title, and
description of existing undergraduate courses;

(b) review and recommend any changes in existing undergraduate degree
and undergraduate certificate programs, which have been initiated by
program faculty;

(c) review and recommend any new undergraduate degree or
undergraduate certificate programs, which have been initiated by
faculty.

(3) The Board may forward issues about academic computing, distance learning,
instructional technology, e-learning, or telecommunications to the Academic
Computing, Distance Learning, Instructional Technology, and eLearning
Committee. These requests may include a request for a timely response.

(4) Approved actions of the Board shall be submitted for review to the Faculty
Senate at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate.

(5) The Chairs of the Undergraduate Academic Board and the Graduate Academic
Board may establish a joint special committee to consider matters of mutual
concern to the Academic Boards.

(6) The Undergraduate Academic Board shall present an outline of its yearlong
agenda and goals to the Faculty Senate no later than the regularly scheduled October meeting.

(7) The Undergraduate Academic Board shall present a report of its yearlong activities to the Faculty Senate at the regularly scheduled May meeting.

The General Education Review Committee (GERC) is a standing sub-committee of the Undergraduate Academic Board (UAB) reporting to the Undergraduate Academic Board.

The membership of the GERC shall consist of a minimum of eight to a maximum of twenty members. The UAB Chair will serve in an ex officio position. A minimum of three other members will be concurrently serving members of UAB and UAB members will be from different curricular divisions or campuses.

The following units shall be represented by a faculty member:

Each of the GER Tier I and II Categories (i.e. Written Communications, Oral Communications, Quantitative Skills, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities, and Fine Arts)
College of Arts and Sciences
College of Business and Public Policy
College of Health
Community and Technical College
College of Education
School of Engineering
Consortium Library
Community Campuses

At least one Community Campus must be represented. There shall be a student member. Members representing Tier I or II Categories may also represent their respective administrative units.

All membership terms are for two academic years.

The UAB GERC members will be elected by UAB members at a meeting prior to the first Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year. Other members will be appointed by UAB and (Faculty Senate Executive Board if necessary). UAB will request a nomination from faculty of any unit with an open position.

A quorum is constituted by a majority of UAB members of the GERC. All other regulations of UAB apply to the GERC.

The Committee shall: (with respect to course actions and reviews):

1) apply the current UAA catalog’s GER category descriptors and GER Student Outcomes as primary criteria for evaluating all GER courses for inclusion in specific categories of the General Education curriculum. Tier 3: Integrative Capstone courses have additional criteria (see http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/ger/upload/tier3model.pdf);

2) review all requests to add to, delete from, or substantively modify the courses in the General Education curriculum;

3) recommend course actions to the Board based on the criteria;

4) facilitate the overall review and processing of General Education course actions by working with initiators and departments;

5)
5) expedite the review of course action requests currently on hold (with respect to policy);
6) review all requests to modify General Education Requirements or policies;
7) recommend actions to the Board based on the review;
8) undertake such additional tasks or responsibilities relating to GERs as assigned by the Board.

C. Composition of the Graduate Academic Board. Representation on the Graduate Academic Board is limited to faculty representing graduate programs. Faculty members on leave that prevents them from meeting the qualifications for membership and attendance requirements in the Faculty Senate Constitution (Article 5, Sections 3 & 12) are not eligible to serve as members of the Graduate Academic Board and must relinquish the position.

(1) The Senate shall choose four senators to serve on the Board:
   College of Arts & Sciences (1)
   Any senator (3)

(2) Non-Senate Faculty Members shall be elected by faculty within their respective units as defined in Article III, section 3 of the Constitution.
   College of Arts & Sciences (2)
   College of Business & Public Policy (2)
   College of Education (1)
   College of Health (1)
   Community & Technical College (1)
   School of Engineering (1)
   Library (1)

Members may attend the meetings of the Graduate Academic Board as voting members via remote link.

(3) Faculty members of the Board for Graduate Academic Board shall serve two-year staggered terms.

(4) The students of the University of Alaska Anchorage may appoint one graduate student to voting membership on the Graduate Academic Board. The method of selection of the student representative shall be the responsibility of the student government and be in accord with USUAA's Constitution and Bylaws.

(5) Newly elected and continuing members of the Board shall elect the chairperson no later than May 15 with service to begin June 1. The chair shall be elected by the Board from those members who are in the second year of their terms or who have served at least one previous term of office. If the chair is not an elected senator, the chair shall become an ex officio, voting member of the Senate.

(6) One representative from the Office of Academic Affairs, appointed by the Provost, one representative from the Office of the Registrar, and one
representative from Enrollment Services, Publications, and Scheduling shall be ex officio and non-voting members of the Graduate Academic Board. The Governance Office shall be responsible for coordinating the activities of the Graduate Academic Board.

### d. Functions and Responsibilities of the Graduate Academic Board

1. The Board may initiate and review all academic policies of graduate programs as defined in Article 24, Section 2, subsection c (1) of the Faculty Senate Constitution.

2. Subject to Article 34, Sections 5, 5a, and 5b, of the Constitution, the Board shall have the authority to
   
   a. approve all new permanent numbered courses, including those from Community Campuses, and changes in number, content, title, and description of existing graduate courses;
   
   b. review and recommend any changes in existing graduate degree and graduate certificate programs; which have been initiated by program faculty;
   
   c. review and recommend any new graduate degree or graduate certificate programs, which have been initiated by faculty.

3. The Board may forward issues about academic computing, distance learning, instructional technology, e-learning, or telecommunications to the Academic Computing, Distance Learning, Instructional Technology, and eLearning Committee. These requests may include a request for a timely response.

4. Approved actions of the Board shall be submitted for review to the Faculty Senate at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Senate.

5. The Chairs of the Undergraduate Academic Board and the Graduate Academic Board may establish a joint special committee to consider matters of mutual concern to the Academic Boards.

6. The Graduate Academic Board shall present an outline of its yearlong agenda and goals to the Faculty Senate no later than the regularly scheduled October meeting.

7. The Graduate Academic Board shall present a report of its yearlong activities to the Faculty Senate at the regularly scheduled May meeting.

### E. Composition of the Academic Computing, Distance Learning, Instructional Technology, and eLearning Committee

1. Membership on the committee is open to any faculty member who submits their name to the Nominations and Elections Committee Second Vice President or to a Senate member of the Academic Computing, Distance Learning, Instructional Technology, and eLearning Committee by April 20 or as vacancies permit.

### f. Functions and Responsibilities of the Academic Computing, Distance Learning, Instructional Technology, and eLearning Committee

1. The Committee may initiate and review all policies affecting academic computing, instructional technology, distance education, and e-learning as
defined in Article 2II, Section 2, subsections c (1) and (3) of the Faculty Senate constitution.

(2) The Committee shall represent the faculty to the Chancellor and the Faculty Alliance on academic computing, instructional technology, distance education, e-learning, and telecommunications as defined in Article 2II, Section 2, subsections d (5) and (8) and subsection e (5), (6), (7), and (8) of the Faculty Senate constitution.

(3) The Committee shall respond to requests from the UAB or GAB in reference to academic computing, instructional technology, distance education, e-learning, and telecommunications. In addition to any reports requested by the initiating Board, the Committee shall submit a report to the Faculty Senate summarizing any findings or recommendations. This may be the same report submitted to the initiating Board.

gG. Composition of the Student Academic Support and Success (SASS) Committee

(1) Membership on the committee is open to any faculty member who submits their name to the Nominations and Elections CommitteeSecond Vice President or to a Senate member of the Student Academic Support and Success (SASS) Committee by April 20 or as vacancies permit.

Hh. Functions and Responsibilities of the Student Academic Support and Success (SASS) Committee

(1) The Committee may initiate and review all policies affecting student academic support to include but not be limited to attrition, assessment, placement, and advising. Examples of academic support include supplemental instruction, tutoring, learning communities, and in-processes.

iI. Composition of the Budget, Planning and Facilities Advisory Committee

(1) Membership on the committee is open to any faculty member who submits their name to the Nominations and Elections CommitteeSecond Vice President, or to a Senate member of the Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee by April 20 or as vacancies permit.

Jj. Functions and Responsibilities of the Budget, Planning and Facilities Advisory Committee

(1) The Committee shall represent the faculty to the Chancellor and the Faculty Alliance on budget matters as defined in Article 2II, Section 2, subsections d (1), (3), and (8) and subsections e (1), (3), and (5) of the Faculty Senate constitution including, but not limited to, budget and planning, administrative appointments, and computing.

(2) The Committee may initiate and review all policies affecting the facilities and equipment of the university as defined in Article 2II, Section 2, subsections c (3) and (4) of the Faculty Senate constitution including, but not limited to, physical facilities, safety, parking, offices, space, and classrooms.

(3) The Committee shall represent the faculty to the Chancellor and the Faculty Alliance on the budget as defined in Article 2II, Section 2, subsections d (4), (6), (7), and (8) and subsection e (4) of the Faculty Senate constitution.
including, but not limited to, physical facilities, safety, parking, offices, space, and classrooms.

k. Composition of the Nominations and Elections Committee

(1) The Nominations and Elections Committee will consist of the Second Vice President and two members elected by the faculty. The two elected faculty must be eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate. The chair shall be the Second Vice President of the Faculty Senate with service to commence at the beginning of “New Business” at the last regularly scheduled senate meeting of the academic year.

l. Functions and Responsibilities of the Nominations and Elections Committees

(1) To prepare slates of candidates for Senators.
(2) To prepare a slate of candidates for the posts of President, First Vice President, and Second Vice President of the Senate.
(3) To prepare slates of candidates to serve in at-large positions on boards and committees.
(4) To prepare slates of candidates to serve on all boards, and committees, which include representation from the Faculty Senate.
(5) To review the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws annually, and recommend changes or corrections to the Executive Board.
(6) The Committee shall present an outline of its yearlong agenda and goals to the Faculty Senate no later than the regularly scheduled October meeting.
(7) The Committee shall present a report of its yearlong activities to the Faculty Senate at the regularly scheduled May meeting.

K. Composition of the Diversity Committee

(1) Membership on the committee is open to any faculty member who submits their name to the Nominations and Elections Committee Second Vice President or to a Senate member of the Diversity Committee by April 20 or as vacancies permit.

L. Functions and Responsibilities of the Diversity Committee

(1) The Committee may initiate and review all policies affecting diversity in faculty and student populations, including community outreach, as defined in Article 2H, Section 2, subsection c (4) of the Faculty Senate constitution.
(2) The Alaska Native and Indigenous Faculty Committee will be a standing committee of the Diversity Committee.

-Composition of the Alaska Native and Indigenous Faculty Committee:

-This committee shall maintain a minimum membership of percent (50%) who are Indigenous Faculty,

-Two (2) members of this subcommittee must be from the Native Coalition Group on campus which includes representatives of the
programs that service indigenous students and,

Two (2) Indigenous students.

(3) The Indigenous Peoples Committee may initiate and review all policies affecting indigenous faculty and students.

Composition of the Library Advisory Committee

(1) Membership on the committee is open to any faculty member who submits their name to the Nominations and Elections CommitteeSecond Vice President, or to a Senate member of the Library Advisory Committee by April 20 or as vacancies permit.

Functions and Responsibilities of the Library Advisory Committee

(1) The function of the Committee shall be to advise the Dean of the Library with regard to collection development, levels of service, and other policies affecting use of the Library to the Faculty Senate no later than the regularly scheduled October meeting.

Composition of the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee

The Faculty Senate shall establish one University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee consisting of a total of fifteen (15) tenured full professors, seven (7) from the bipartite workload tracks and eight (8) from the tripartite workload track. No more than three (3) faculty members may be from an individual school or college in each Bipartite-Academic and Tripartite-academic workload category. Tenured associate professors will be elected if there are insufficient numbers of professors to staff the committee. All faculty members who serve on this committee shall be elected by the faculty at large to three-year terms. Any faculty member serving on a promotion or tenure committee at a prior level may not serve on the UFEC subcommittee reviewing files that member has already reviewed. Elections shall be held annually, and in each year, seven or eight members shall be elected. No faculty member who holds an administrative appointment (dean, director, associate dean, assistant dean) in the University is eligible. The committee shall establish subcommittees composed of committee members for the purposes of evaluation of individual faculty. Each subcommittee shall include a majority of representatives from the same workload track (bipartite or tripartite) as the faculty member being evaluated and at least one member from the other track. No committee member may review his or her own or an immediate family member’s file, nor may any committee member participate in a meeting where those files are being reviewed.

Functions and Responsibilities of the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee

(1) to review and recommend policies on tenure, promotion, appointment reappointment, and termination as defined in Article 2, Section 2, subsections c. (2) of the Faculty Senate constitution.

(2) to review school and college evaluation criteria and processes for consistency with Board of Regents and University policies and to make change recommendations to the Provost.
(3) to review the recommendations of school and college peer review committees and of deans and directors for their consistency with Board of Regents and University policies and with the requirements adopted by the schools and colleges.

(4) to make recommendations on faculty promotion and tenure to the Provost.

### Composition of the Faculty Grants and Leave Committee

Tenure-track faculty elected from the following units:

- College of Arts & Sciences (3)
- College of Business & Public Policy (1)
- College of Education (1)
- College of Health (2)
- Community & Technical College (1)
- School of Engineering (1)
- Library (1)

1. The Committee shall be composed of faculty members serving three-year, staggered terms. No committee member may review sabbatical files nor participate in a meeting where sabbatical files are being reviewed when the committee member’s or an immediate family member’s file is being evaluated.

### Functions and Responsibilities of the Faculty Grants and Leave Committee

1. The Committee may initiate and review grant and leave policies as elements in academic and faculty affairs subject to statewide authority. Grant and leave policies include but are not limited to policies concerning:

   - (a) sabbatical leave
   - (b) release time and research and faculty development workload measurement,
   - (c) categorization and prioritization of objectives,
   - (d) support services,
   - (e) allocations among units,
   - (f) standards,
   - (g) research and faculty development opportunities,

   Sabbatical leave policies shall be considered independently of other grant and leave policies.

2. The Committee may provide advice and consultation to the Chancellor, University of Alaska Anchorage in matters relating to the administration of Faculty Development Funds, Research and Travel Funds, and Sabbatical Leave including but not limited to:

   - (a) development of time lines and procedures for awarding grants;
   - (b) review and assessment of applicants for University grants; and,
   - (c) fostering of faculty development and research opportunities for faculty members.

3. The Committee shall present a report of its activities to the Faculty Senate at the regularly scheduled December and May meetings.

### Composition of the Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee:
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A Senator on the Committee shall convene the first meeting in each academic year.

Membership on the committee is open to any faculty member who submits his or her name to the Nominations and Elections Committee Second Vice President by April 20 or as vacancies permit.

Functions and Responsibilities of the Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee

1. Oversee the faculty review of Deans and Directors via a periodic survey.

2. Annually advise the Senate’s Executive Board by the end of September of the Committee’s timeline and milestones for that academic year; thereafter, the Committee shall present an outline of its yearlong agenda and goals to the Faculty Senate no later than the Senate’s regularly scheduled October meeting.

3. Annually review the survey instrument and modify as needed.

4. Annually discuss with the University’s Deans and Provost the overall scope of the survey instrument, the expected protocols for its administration, and the timeline noted in (2) above.

5. Notify faculty prior to the survey’s administration; advance faculty participation in the survey process.

6. Confer with each dean to determine the reporting process most suitable for that dean’s respective unit. If a dean is newly appointed or leaving his/her post during a year when his/her unit is to be surveyed, the Committee, following discussion with that dean and the Senate’s Executive Board, may elect to postpone the survey period for up to two years.

7. Oversee the survey’s administration.

8. Provide an annual summary report to the Senate addressing faculty participation rates, suggestions from the deans and Provost on needed improvements for subsequent surveys, faculty perceptions on how well the survey instrument addressed faculty concerns, faculty views on the effectiveness of the overall survey process in improving their respective college or school, a template summarizing survey results, etc.

At the discretion of its Dean, a unit may be subdivided, with the Committee’s approval, into subunits provided such subunits are sufficiently large to ensure the anonymity of respondents.
Composition of the Assessment Committee

(1) Representation on the Assessment Committee shall be elected by faculty within their respective units as follows:
   a. College of Arts & Sciences (1)
   b. College of Business & Public Policy (1)
   c. College of Education (1)
   d. College of Health (1)
   e. Community & Technical College (1)
   f. School of Engineering (1)
   g. Library (1)
   h. Kodiak College (1)
   i. Kenai Peninsula College (1)
   j. Matanuska-Susitna College (1)
   k. Prince William Sound College (1)

(2) In addition, there shall be four (4) representatives from Faculty Senate (4)

(3) Faculty members of the Assessment Committee shall serve two-year staggered terms.

(4) Newly elected and continuing members of the Assessment Committee shall elect the chairperson no later than May 15 with service to begin June 1. The Chair or a Co-chair must be a member of the Faculty Senate.

(5) One representative from the Office of Academic Affairs, appointed by the Provost and one representative from the office of the Registrar shall be ex-officio and non-voting members of the Assessment Committee. OAA shall be responsible for coordinating and supporting the activities of the Assessment Committee.

Functions and Responsibilities of the Academic Assessment Committee:

(1) Develop and maintain the UAA Assessment Handbook.

(2) Apply the current UAA Assessment Handbook as primary criteria for evaluating all program assessment, both of existing assessment efforts and of proposed or modified programs;

(3) Recommend program assessment-related actions to the Senate;

(4) Develop institutional learning outcomes assessments and direct the collection and analysis of that data;

(5) Review and recommend all requests to modify institutional learning outcomes;

(6) Review all requests to modify assessment policies;
1. The committee membership shall include at least one eligible faculty member from each of the three community campuses listed in Article A. Article A.3III, Section 3 of the Constitution. Membership on the committee is open to any eligible faculty member who submits their name to the Nominations and Elections Committee or to a Senate member of the Community Campus Committee by April 20, or as vacancies permit.

2. To provide a single point of liaison between the community campus Faculty Forums and other standing committees of the Faculty Senate.

3. To assist each community campus Faculty Forum, when requested by such, in developing and implementing a system of periodic feedback between the Director and faculty on matters specific to their respective campuses; each feedback system shall provide information useful to the respective campus Director and shall enhance communication between that Director and his or her faculty on matters derived therein. Each Forum shall periodically report its activities to the committee for inclusion in the latter’s year-end report.

4. The committee may initiate and/or review all policies affecting student academic honesty and integrity on campus, to include but not be limited to the regular reviews of the Student Code of Conduct, guidance and instruction on academic honesty and integrity principles and procedures for faculty and students, incident reporting, sanctioning, adjudication of cases, and the promotion of awareness of academic integrity issues on campus.
Composition of the Research and Creative Activity Committee

(1) Membership on the committee is open to any faculty member who submits their name to the Nominations and Elections Committee, Second Vice President, or to the chair of the Committee by April 20 or as vacancies permit.

Functions and Responsibilities of the Research and Creative Activity Committee

(1) The Committee may initiate and review all policies affecting research and creative activity.

(2) The Committee will provide a connection between the faculty and the UAA Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies (VPRS), and advise the VPRGS on developing productive relationships with faculty engaged in research and creative activity across the campus.

(3) The Committee will provide reports and recommendations to the Faculty Senate on behalf of the faculty engaged in research and creative activity at UAA.

(4) The Committee may conduct needs assessments, engage in planning, and advocate on behalf of faculty engaged in research and creative activity.

Section 4. (Article 4VI. Meetings)

aA. Faculty Senate meetings shall be open to attendance by all faculty members.

Bb. Faculty Retreats shall be open to attendance by all faculty members.

cC. UAA faculty members who are not members of the Senate may participate in Senate debate, including speaking for or against motions on the floor.

dD. The Senate shall make use of a “consent agenda” in which non-controversial items of new business are bundled as a single action item. Items will be removed from the consent agenda and placed in the regular agenda upon request by any Senator.

Section 5. (Article 8VIII. Parliamentary Authority)

aA. A roll call vote shall be ordered if requested by one-third of the members present.

Section 6. (Article 10X. Amendments)

aA. Amendments to the Bylaws may be proposed by any tenure-track member of the faculty eligible to serve as a Senator.

bB. Copies of proposed amendments shall be sent to all members of the Faculty.

cC. The President shall schedule a first reading and discussion of the proposed amendment at the first meeting of the Faculty Senate following distribution of copies of the proposed amendment. The second reading of a proposed amendment may be held not sooner than the second regular meeting following the distribution of copies.
dD. Following the second reading, the amendment shall be voted on by all faculty members eligible to serve as Senators, as described in Article 344, section 1, of this Constitution. Amendments shall be approved by a simple majority vote. The vote shall be considered invalid if fewer than twenty-five (25%) of the eligible voters respond. A Motion to Reconsider may be made only at the following meeting.
CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE.

The faculty of the University of Alaska Anchorage establishes this constitution to govern the workings of its Faculty Senate. The Senate provides a forum for addressing university-life issues (curriculum, student success, institutional organization, and professional development) as well as to create a voice to represent faculty as part of UAA shared governance. Effectively, the faculty of the University of Alaska Anchorage, in order to provide a forum for and create a voice to address university-life issues, including curriculum, student success, institutional development, and professional development, establish this constitution.

ARTICLE I. NAME

Section 1. The name of this organization shall be the Faculty Senate of the University of Alaska Anchorage (hereafter referred to as Faculty Senate).

ARTICLE II. PURPOSES, RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY

Section 1. The Faculty Senate shall carry out its functions subject to the statewide authority of the Board of Regents within the laws of the State of Alaska (BOR Policy 03.01).

Section 2. The purposes of the Faculty Senate are:

a. To provide official representation for faculty of the University of Alaska Anchorage in matters that affect the general welfare of the University and its research, creative activities, and educational programs.

b. To serve as an agency by which information of general concern and interest to the University of Alaska Anchorage faculty may be freely collected, disseminated, and discussed.

c. To function as the legislative body having primary authority to initiate, develop, review, and recommend policy of the University of Alaska Anchorage, including but not limited to:

(1) Academic Matters

   (a) degree requirements,
   (b) program approval,
   (c) course approval,
   (d) admissions policies,
   (e) instructional policies,
   (f) transfer policies,
   (g) academic advising,
   (h) assessment of incoming students,
   (i) outcomes of courses,
   (j) distance education,
   (k) e-learning,
   (l) library,
   (m) conduct of research, scholarship, and creative activities
(n) mentorship of research, scholarship, and creative activities
(o) other matters directly concerned with the academic programs of
    the University of Alaska Anchorage.
(2) Faculty Matters

(a) tenure,
(b) promotion,
(c) leave,
(d) appointment, reappointment and termination,
(e) professional ethics,
(f) faculty development,
(g) grants,
(h) other matters affecting the welfare of the faculty.

(3) Physical Facilities and Equipment

(a) academic computing,
(b) instructional technology,
(c) classrooms,
(d) laboratories, research, and creative arts facilities,
(e) other facilities affecting the quality of instruction and scholarship.

(4) University Community

(a) diversity,
(b) continuing education,
(c) safety,
(d) community outreach,
(e) other issues affecting students, faculty, and the community.

dD. To provide consultative and advisory services to the Chancellor of the University of Alaska Anchorage in matters including but not limited to

(1) budget,
(2) calendar,
(3) administrative appointments,
(4) physical facilities
(5) telecommunications,
(6) computing,
(7) creation of or changes to institutes or centers,
(8) offices,
(9) parking,
(10) other matters affecting the general welfare.

eE. To provide consultative and advisory services to the Faculty Alliance in matters including but not limited to

(1) budget,
(2) calendar,
(3) administrative appointments,
(4) physical facilities,
(5) computing,
(6) distance education,
(7) e-learning,
ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Those eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate shall be tenure-track or term faculty members with a non-administrative assignment of .5 F.T.E or greater. These members must hold the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor with a .5 F.T.E. or greater, non-administrative assignment, and who hold the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Faculty members on any type of leave must be able to attend at least eighty percent (80%) or more of Faculty Senate meetings or they are not eligible to serve as members of the Faculty Senate and must relinquish the position.

Section 2. The membership of the Faculty Senate shall consist of elected representatives (hereafter referred to as Senators).

Section 3. Each of the following units shall elect Senators at a ratio of one Senator per fifteen eligible members, with each unit having at least one Senator. Senators will be elected to staggered two-year terms.

A. College of Arts & Sciences
B. College of Business & Public Policy
C. College of Education
D. College of Health
E. Community & Technical College
F. School of Engineering
G. Consortium Library
H. Kenai Peninsula College
I. Kodiak College
J. Matanuska-Susitna College
K. Prince William Sound College
L. Student Affairs

The faculty of schools and colleges with departments or other logical subdivisions may vote to apportion the selection of senators to represent departments or groupings.

Section 4. There shall be eight Senators elected at large.

Section 5. A faculty member may vote or be nominated for Senate representatives in only one unit.

That unit must be the unit of primary appointment or, in the case of evenly split appointment, the unit of the faculty member’s choice.

Two faculty members may share a committee/board position if at least one of the faculty members is on the trimester system or on leave. The names of the two faculty members sharing the committee/board position and the portion of the term each will cover will be on the ballot.
Section 6. Senators shall be elected no later than April 15. Voting will be by secret ballot. Candidates shall be elected by a simple majority of those responding. If two seats of unequal duration are available, the faculty member with the greatest number of votes serves the longer term. If a faculty member wins both a senate position at-large and for a unit, the Nominations and Elections Committee/Faculty Senate Executive Board will determine which one of the offices will be filled by that member.

Section 7. The terms of newly elected Senators shall commence at the beginning of “New Business” of the last regularly scheduled Senate meeting of the academic year.

Section 8. Any voting member of the Senate may be recalled according to the provisions of the bylaws.

Section 9. Changes to the ratio of eligible faculty-to-senate seats shall be done upon a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Section 10. Senate Representatives to Board vacancies shall be elected by the Faculty Senate annually at the May meeting. Thereafter, other vacancies during the academic year shall be elected by the Faculty Senate at the earliest possible convenience.

Section 11. A senator or academic board member may run for re-election in the final year of his or her term but not before.

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers of the Faculty Senate shall be the President, First Vice President, and Second Vice President.

Section 2. Any faculty member, as defined in Article III, Section 1, shall be eligible to serve as an officer.

Section 3. The officers shall be elected from and by the faculty at large. Officers shall be elected no later than April 15. Voting will be by secret ballot. Candidates shall be elected by a simple majority of those responding. If a faculty member wins both a senate position and an officer position, the faculty member must choose which position to fill.

Section 4. The term of office for the President, First Vice President, and Second Vice President shall be one year.

Section 5. The President shall preside at Executive Board meetings and Senate meetings. The President shall serve as a representative of the Faculty Senate to the Council of Deans and Directors, Faculty Alliance, University Assembly and Chancellor’s Advisory Council.

Section 6. The First Vice President shall be the President-elect and shall assist the President in the performance of all duties and responsibilities relative to the business of the Faculty Senate. The First Vice President shall serve as a representative of the Faculty Senate to the University Assembly and the Faculty Alliance and as necessary to the Council of Deans and Directors.

Section 7. The Second Vice President shall assist the President and First Vice President in the performance of all duties and responsibilities relative to the business of the Faculty Senate.
Faculty Senate. The Second Vice President shall chair the Nominations and Elections Committee. The Second Vice President shall serve as a representative of the Faculty Senate to the University Assembly as necessary. The Second Vice President shall serve as a representative of the Faculty Senate to the CAFE Advisory Board.
Section 8. The Chair of the Graduate Academic Board, the Chair of the Undergraduate Academic Board, the Second Vice President or the Past President, shall serve as a representative of the Faculty Senate to the Faculty Alliance. The UAA Faculty Senate President will select this representative.

Section 9. If for any reason the President should relinquish or be recalled from office, the 1st Vice President will automatically and immediately assume the Presidency.

Section 10. If for any reason the 1st Vice President should relinquish or be recalled from office, the President will call an election.

Section 11. If for any reason the 2nd Vice President should relinquish or be recalled from office, the President will call an election.

Section 12. The terms of newly elected Officers shall commence at the beginning of “New Business” of the last regularly scheduled Senate meeting of the academic year.

Section 13. The President, First Vice President, and Second Vice President of the Faculty Senate together with the chairpersons of the Undergraduate Academic Board; the Graduate Academic Board; and the Past President, who shall be an ex officio, non-voting member; shall constitute the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate. The Executive Board shall be empowered to act in the name of the Senate on an emergency basis. Any actions taken by the Executive Board are subject to Senate review at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.

ARTICLE 5V. BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

Section 1. There shall be two permanent boards and fourteen (14) standing committees of the Faculty Senate as established by the Bylaws. The Committee Chairs may appoint ex-officio non-voting members.

Aa. Undergraduate Academic Board
   Subcommittee: General Education Review (GERC)

Bb. Graduate Academic Board

Cc. Committees:
   1) Academic Computing, Distance Learning, Instructional Technology, and eLearning
   2) Student Academic Support and Success
   3) Budget, Planning & Facilities Advisory
   4) Nominations and Elections
   45) Diversity
   Subcommittees: Indigenous Peoples, Alaska Native and Indigenous Faculty

56) Library Advisory
62) University-wide Faculty Evaluation
7b) Faculty Grants and Leave
8b) Institutional and Unit Leadership Review
10) Distinguished Service Awards
914) Academic Assessment
1042) Community Campus
1143) Academic Honesty and Integrity
1244) Research and Creative Activity
1345) Ad hoc committees as described in Sections 7-9
Section 2. Senate members of permanent boards and committees shall serve one-year terms. The terms of newly elected senate members of permanent boards shall commence at the beginning of “New Business” of the last regularly scheduled Senate meeting of the academic year, unless otherwise noted in the Bylaws. The membership on these Boards and Committees shall be chosen in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate.

Section 3. Membership on the Undergraduate Academic Board and the Graduate Academic Board is limited to tenure-track faculty members whose F.T.E. workload during the term of appointment consists of less than 50% administration and at least 20% teaching.

Section 4. The specific functions of the permanent boards and committees shall be those established by the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. Additional functions may be assigned to the boards and committees by a simple majority vote of the membership of the Faculty Senate present and voting at a regular meeting.

Section 5. Approved actions of the permanent boards and committees shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate at each regular meeting of the Faculty Senate in accordance with the provisions of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. Such actions of the permanent boards and committees shall be deemed enactments of the Faculty Senate when confirmed by a simple majority vote of the membership present and voting. If a board or committee does not present any approved actions during the academic year, a written report of the year’s activities shall be presented to the Faculty Senate at the May meeting.

a. The Faculty Senate may, by a majority vote of the members present, empower Boards and Committees to act in the name of the Senate.

b. The Undergraduate Academic Board and Graduate Academic Board are empowered to act in the name of the Faculty Senate on the following issues:
   1. All requests for permanent course numbers including those from Community Campuses.
   2. Change in credit hours, grading basis and course level.
   3. Addition/deletion of courses with permanent numbers.
   4. Stacking/Cross-listing of courses.

Section 6. Each permanent board and committee shall have a chair person(s) elected by a majority vote of its members.

Section 7. The Executive Board may establish any ad hoc committee it deems necessary for the conduct of Faculty Senate business. Ad hoc committees established by the Executive Board are subject to approval by the Faculty Senate at the next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting.

Section 8. By the majority vote of those present and voting at any meeting, the Faculty Senate may establish any ad hoc committee it deems necessary for the conduct of Faculty Senate business. The President shall appoint the members of any ad hoc committee. Such committees shall submit their actions to the Faculty Senate in accordance with the provisions of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate.

Section 9. Senate ad hoc committees shall cease to exist when work is completed or no later than the last regularly scheduled Senate meeting of the academic year.

Section 10. The President of the Faculty Senate shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of
Section 11. The President of the Faculty Senate shall notify the Chancellor in writing within ten working days of any action taken by the Senate that affects administrative practice.

Section 12. The position of any member of a permanent board or committee shall be vacated if the occupant fails to attend two consecutive regularly scheduled meetings, unless the absence is excused by the Chair of that board or committee.

Section 13. The position of any Senator shall be vacated if the occupant fails to attend two consecutive regularly scheduled meetings or fails to attend four regularly scheduled meetings in an academic year, unless the absence is excused.

Section 14. The position of Board or Committee Chair shall be vacated if the occupant fails to attend two consecutive regularly scheduled meetings of the Board or Committee; or if the occupant fails to attend two consecutive regularly scheduled Senate meetings.

Section 15. Senate, permanent board, and committee vacancies that occur after a regularly scheduled annual election shall be expeditiously filled in the manner designated for that position in the Constitution and shall be for the unexpired term of the position.

Section 16. Board and Committee Chairs may appoint ex-officio, non-voting members.

Section 17. A member of the Undergraduate Academic Board or Graduate Academic Board may designate a voting substitute for a meeting from which the board member will be absent. This substitute must be eligible for membership on the board. Voting substitutes are not allowed on Faculty Senate committees. The presence of a voting substitute means that the absence of the elected member does not count.

ARTICLE VI. MEETINGS

Section 1. The Senate shall meet once a month from September through December and February through May. Other meetings, including electronic voting meetings, may be held on the special call of the President of the Faculty Senate. Only matters pertaining to course or program approval may be voted on electronically. Electronic voting meetings during the period between May and August can be called only on an emergency basis by the President of the Faculty Senate, at the written request of the Undergraduate and/or Graduate Academic Boards. The results of any electronic voting meeting during the May-August period must be reported to the Senate at its regularly scheduled meeting. Senators may attend the senate meetings as voting members via remote link. Voting within meetings may be conducted using electronic means.

Section 2. Each academic year, the senate shall conduct one Faculty Senate Retreat in the fall semester for senators and board and committee members and one Faculty Forum for all faculty members in the spring semester. The agenda for the Faculty Senate Retreat and Faculty Forum shall be set by the Executive Board in consultation with the faculty.

Section 3. The business of the Faculty Senate shall be conducted in accordance with its
ARTICLE VII. QUORUM

Section 1. The presence of fifty percent (50%) of the membership shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VIII. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

Section 1. The parliamentary authority shall be the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order. The President shall appoint a parliamentarian each year.
ARTICLE IX. AMENDMENTS

Section 1. Amendments to the Constitution may be proposed by any tenure-track member of the faculty eligible to serve as a Senator.

Section 2. Copies of proposed amendments shall be sent to all members of the faculty.

Section 3. The President shall schedule a first reading and discussion of the proposed amendment at the first meeting of the Faculty Senate following distribution of copies of the proposed amendment. The second reading of a proposed amendment may be held no sooner than the second regular meeting following the distribution of copies. Any tenure-track faculty member eligible to serve as a Senator may participate in floor discussions during the first and second readings.

Section 4. Following the second reading, the amendment shall be voted on by all faculty members eligible to serve as a Senator, as described in Article III, section 1, of this Constitution. Amendments shall be approved by at least a two-thirds vote. The vote shall be considered invalid if fewer than twenty-five percent (25%) of the voting membership respond. A Motion to Reconsider may be made only at the following scheduled meeting.

ARTICLE X. REFERENDUM

Section 1. Any tenure-track or term faculty member with a teaching load of at least fifty percent (50%) may bring a motion before the Senate by submitting a petition signed by a minimum of twenty percent (20%) of the full-time faculty.

   Aa. The petition shall be considered to second the motion.
   bb. The Senate must consider this motion at the meeting following the submission of the petition.
   cc. This petition may include a requirement that the entire faculty be notified of the discussion of the petition on the Senate floor and that interested faculty members be included in the floor discussions.
   dd. This petition may include a requirement that the vote be put to all tenure-track and term faculty who are eligible to be elected to the Faculty Senate by secret ballot.

Section 2. If a petition is submitted to rescind or amend an action of the Senate,

   Aa. The Senate shall, after discussion, vote on the motion to rescind or amend the motion. If the Senate concurs with the motion, the original action shall be considered rescinded or amended as appropriate.
   Bb. If the Senate does not concur with the motion, the question shall be put to the entire faculty by secret ballot.

Section 3. If a question is put to all tenure-track and term faculty eligible to be elected to the Faculty Senate, voting will be by secret ballot, supervised by the officers of the Senate and will be passed by a simple majority of those responding. The vote will be considered invalid if less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the faculty respond.

ARTICLE XI. EFFECTIVE DATE OF ENACTMENTS

Section 1. Enactments of the Faculty Senate shall become effective upon the
recommendation of the Provost and the approval of the Chancellor.
Section 2. The Chancellor shall act to approve or disapprove any enactment of the Faculty Senate within 15 working days of the date it is submitted for approval.

Section 3. Approval of a Faculty Senate action by the Chancellor constitutes approval of the enactment. Actions of the Senate may not be partially approved and partially disapproved nor may they be approved as modified or amended by the Chancellor.

Section 4. The Chancellor shall convey in writing to the Faculty Senate the reasons for disapproval within 15 working days of the date of the disapproval.

Section 5. Any action approved by the Senate and disapproved by the Chancellor's Office may be submitted to a reconciliation committee upon a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Up to three members appointed by the Senate and up to three members appointed by the Chancellor's Office shall constitute a reconciliation committee whose task it shall be to formulate recommendations to the Senate and the Chancellor's office.

Section 6. If the Senate and the Chancellor's Office are not able to resolve the impasse, then the Senate, upon a two-thirds vote, may elect to forward its previous action through the University of Alaska governance structure as provided for under Regents' policy.
To: Faculty Senate

Fr: Library Advisory Committee

Re: University of Alaska Anchorage Open Access Policy

Issue
Faculty are often asked to sign away their intellectual property rights in the course of publication agreements. This can result in their creative and scholarly work being trapped behind a paywall, resulting in decreased use, citation, and impact. Additionally, in this tight budgetary environment, it is possible and likely that much of UAA faculty members’ output may become inaccessible to the university and state if the library budget is unable to accommodate further price increases from publishers.

Considerations
The above scenario is an avoidable state of affairs. Many universities and funding institutions have Open Access Policies that, by default, allow self-archiving of scholarly and creative works in local open access institutional repositories. The scholarly publishing community has largely accommodated these policies and the presence of an OA policy results in increased use of materials in most disciplines.

However, to facilitate the maximum visibility for faculty materials, faculty need to be able to waive the deposit of items at their own discretion in the rare event that a publisher is adamant about disallowing open-access archiving.
Proposal

The Faculty Senate Library Advisory Committee recommends the consideration and passage of the following motion to maximize the visibility and utility of faculty scholarly works:

**Motion:** The Faculty Senate supports the following Open Access Policy for the University of Alaska Anchorage, and recommends its adoption and implementation effective as of August 10th 2016.

**Open Access Policy for the University of Alaska Anchorage**

Preamble

The Faculty of the University of Alaska Anchorage is committed to disseminating its research, scholarship, and creative works as widely as possible. In particular, as part of a public university system, the Faculty is dedicated to making its creative and scholarly output available to the people of Alaska and the world. Furthermore, the Faculty recognizes the benefits that accrue to themselves as individual scholars and to the scholarly enterprise from such wide dissemination, including greater recognition, more thorough review, consideration and critique, and a general increase in scientific, scholarly and critical knowledge. Faculty further recognize that by this policy, and with the assistance of the University, they can more easily and collectively reserve rights that might otherwise be signed away, often unnecessarily, in agreements with publishers. In keeping with these considerations, and for the primary purpose of making our scholarly articles widely and freely accessible, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

Grant of License and Limitations

Each faculty member grants to the University of Alaska Anchorage a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles and creative works, in any medium for the purpose of making their articles widely and freely available in an open access repository. Any other uses of the licensed materials by the University of Alaska Anchorage must be approved by the original author. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with faculty authors.

Scope and Waiver (Opt-Out)

The policy applies to all scholarly articles and creative works authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the UAA faculty except for any works published before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. Upon express direction by a faculty
member, the University of Alaska Anchorage will waive the license for a particular work or delay access to the article for a specified period of time.

Deposit of Articles and Other Creative Works

To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles and other creative works, the Faculty commit to helping the University obtain copies of the articles. Specifically, each faculty member who does not permanently waive the license above will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article or work to the University of Alaska Anchorage by the date of its publication, for inclusion in an open access repository. When appropriate, a faculty member may instead notify the University of Alaska Anchorage if the material will be freely available in another repository or as an open-access publication. Faculty members who have permanently waived the license may nonetheless deposit a copy with the University of Alaska Anchorage or elsewhere for archival purposes.

Notwithstanding the above, this policy does not in any way prescribe or limit the venue of publication. This policy neither requires nor prohibits the payment of fees or publication costs by authors.

Oversight of Policy

The Faculty Senate will be responsible for implementing this policy through the Library Advisory Committee, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. Any changes to the text of this policy will require approval by both the Faculty Senate and the University of Alaska Anchorage Office of Academic Affairs. The Faculty Senate and the University of Alaska Anchorage Office of Academic Affairs will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty and the University of Alaska Anchorage Provost.

University of Alaska Anchorage Open Access Policy by University of Alaska Anchorage is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. The policy is based on The University of California Open Access Policy, available at http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/policy-text/systemwide-senate/.
CHAPTER V: SABBATICAL LEAVE GUIDELINES
Basic Purpose of Sabbatical Leave
According to the University of Alaska Board of Regents, sabbatical leaves for professional development may be made available to faculty with academic rank who meet the requirements set forth below. The objective of such leave is to increase the faculty member’s value to the university and thereby improve and enrich its programs. Sabbatical activities may involve formal or informal study, research or creative activity, or other activities that increase the faculty member’s ability to serve the university and the general public through teaching, research and creative activity, and public service. In order to fulfill this basic purpose of professional development, faculty are encouraged to make use of the opportunities presented by sabbatical leave for travel to or residence at a center of scholarly or creative activity, or for collaboration or study with recognized experts in the field. Sabbatical activities may include acquisition of new skills, investigation of new areas of interest, or formal study leading to completion of terminal degrees.

Eligibility for Sabbatical Leave
Faculty members with academic rank may apply for and be granted sabbatical leaves in accordance with the Board of Regents’ Policy 04.04.06 and the UAA Sabbatical Guidelines.

Academic rank faculty members who have completed at least four (4) years of service in academic rank positions within the university system may apply for consideration during their fifth (5th) or subsequent year of service for a sabbatical leave to be taken in their sixth (6th) or subsequent year. For faculty members who have taken a sabbatical leave, eligibility for application will be determined in the manner noted above and will be calculated from the date of return from any previous sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leave applications will be considered annually based on a review schedule to be published annually by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Format for Sabbatical Leave Proposals
Sabbatical leave proposals shall be prepared in writing according to the following format: See Sabbatical Application on the Faculty Services website. Applicants should use the Sabbatical Leave Application Form provided.

A. Name of candidate.
B. Eligibility (include length of service, dates and subject of previous sabbatical leaves).
C. Term of leave requested.
D. Title and description of proposed study, investigation, or other effort (Limit to no more than five pages exclusive of 3 and 4 below):
   1. Description and justification.
   2. Goals and/or objectives.
   3. Schedule (timetable) of activities.
   4. Funding information (include specific information on all applications for non-university funds and all other income related to or derived from activities carried out while on leave).
E. Contributions and/or benefits. (Please discuss each of the following in sufficient detail):
   1. What new skills, learning or accomplishments are likely to result from successful completion of the sabbatical?
   2. How important are these skills to the professional development of the faculty member?
   3. What benefits accrue to the university and to the broader community from application of these skills or accomplishments in future teaching, research or creative activity, and public service?
F. Necessity of the sabbatical for the proposed activities. (Please discuss in sufficient detail.)
G. Ability to accomplish objectives of proposal:
   1. Current vita (required)
   2. Letters indicating support from collaborating institutions, investigators or individuals (required where applicable. If documents are not yet available but will be forthcoming, please note this.)
   3. Other supporting documentation.
G. Optional: Supplementary material (regardless of form...written or otherwise).

Approvals
Signatures from the Department Chair and Campus Director or Dean are required for the Sabbatical Application to be considered.
Criteria for Evaluating Sabbatical Leave Proposals

A. Likelihood of applicant to accomplish objectives of planned study or investigation. Is the description of activities logical and complete?
   1. Is the requested term of leave sufficient or appropriate for the scope of proposed activities?
   2. Ability to accomplish plans as reflected in vita.
   3. If the proposal assumes cooperation from other institutions or investigators, are letters included indicating their support?
   4. Is the time schedule of proposed activities to increase professional development of the applicant appropriate?

B. Funding information. The applicant for sabbatical leave must demonstrate that the resources, both internal and external, are adequate to fulfill the objectives of the proposal.

C. Capability of proposed activities to increase professional development of the applicant.
   1. What new skills, learning, or accomplishments in the areas of faculty development, teaching, research and/or creative activity are likely to result from successful completion of the sabbatical?
   2. What benefits are likely to accrue to the university and to the broader community?
   3. How important are these skills to the professional development of the faculty member?
   4. Is a sabbatical leave necessary in order to undertake the proposed activities?

Process for Committee Consideration of Sabbatical Leave

A. Proposals for sabbatical leave will stand on their own merit. Questions will not be addressed to applicants, nor will applicants be invited to make presentations.
B. Sabbatical leave proposals will be considered at a public meeting specifically called for that purpose. A quorum for the meeting(s) shall consist of two-thirds of the members of the whole committee.
C. All committee members will review the proposals prior to the meeting(s).
D. Each committee member will fill out the rating sheet and then rank the proposals from the highest raw score to the lowest.
E. The initial member rankings will be submitted to the Faculty Services Coordinator two days prior to the meeting. The individual members’ rankings will be combined to produce the initial committee ranking.
F. The committee members will examine the ranked list of sabbatical leave proposals at the public meeting called for that purpose.
G. The committee, by a majority vote of members present, may identify a proposal as unacceptable and, therefore, withdraw from further consideration. In this case, the reasons for this view will be conveyed to the Chancellor or designee.
H. The committee, by two-thirds vote of members present, may decide to accept the initial ranking as final. If this occurs, steps I and J will be omitted. Failing two-thirds vote, the committee will proceed to step I.
I. The committee will discuss each proposal. Discussion of each proposal will be limited to ten minutes.
J. Rankings will be modified based on committee discussion. The committee also may choose to group the proposals into categories such as “Very Strong,” “Strong,” “Acceptable” and “Unacceptable” if they wish.
K. Upon the completion of the rankings, the committee chairperson will transmit the committee ranking and a list of unacceptable proposals to the Chancellor or designee through the Office of the Provost for Academic Affairs.
L. The Chancellor or designee will then make his/her own ranking. If the rank order of the committee differs from that of the Chancellor or designee, the committee and the Chancellor or designee shall meet and attempt to reconcile their differences. The committee and the Chancellor or designee may agree to disagree on any application.
M. The committee shall maintain a record of its proceedings and shall keep all records of rankings.

Terms of Sabbatical Leaves
Sabbatical leaves for all faculty shall include one or both academic semesters. A maximum of six months’ salary will be paid for a two-semester...
leave and a maximum of 4.5 months’ salary will be paid for a one-semester leave.

**Human Research Subjects**

Sabbatical leave proposals involving research with human subjects should conform to Principles and Procedures of Human Research Subjects approved by the Institutional Review Board. [See Chapter VI in this Handbook]
RATING SHEET FOR SABBATICAL LEAVE PROPOSALS

In order to provide for the full and equitable selection of the most meritorious sabbatical leave proposals, the faculty has established criteria for their review and evaluation. These criteria are intended to be applied to all proposals in a balanced and judicious manner, in accordance with the objectives and content of each proposal. Applications must include:

- Application Form
- CV
- Letters/Documentation of Support (if applicable)
- Approval Signatures

"Items" are from "Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Criteria" on page 2

1. Proposal Description (0-125)
   a. Is the description of activities logical and complete? (Item A) (0-5)
   b. Is the project timetable realistic, clear, and necessary? (Items A1, A4) (0-5)
   c. Is the requested term of leave sufficient or appropriate for the scope of proposed activities? (Item A1, C4) (0-5)

2. Feasibility (0-20)
   a. What is the ability of the applicant to accomplish plans, as reflected in the vita? (Item A2) (0-10)
   b. Is funding information complete? (Item B) (0-5)
   c. If these activities are collaborative, is all appropriate documentation included? (Item A3) (0-5; automatic 5 points if project is not collaborative)

3. Faculty Development (0-220)
   a. What new skills, learning, or accomplishments in the areas of faculty development, teaching, research, and/or creative activity are likely to result from successful completion of the sabbatical? (Item C1) (0-10)
   b. How important are these skills to the professional development of the faculty member? (Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Criteria—Items C1 and C3) (0-10)

4. What benefits are likely to accrue to the university and the broader community? (Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Criteria—Item C2) (0-10)

5. Is a sabbatical leave necessary in order to undertake the proposed activities? (Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Criteria—Item C4) (0-10)
5. What is the ability of the applicant to accomplish plans, as reflected in the vita? ("Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Criteria" item A3) (0-10)

Is funding information complete? (0-5)

If these activities are collaborative, is all appropriate documentation included? ("Sabbatical Leave Evaluation Criteria" items A1, A2, A4, A5, B1) (0-5)

Total Score (0-75)
### Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>New Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>CE A653</td>
<td>Advanced Reinforced Concrete Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>CE A698</td>
<td>Individual Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>CE A699</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>PADM A610</td>
<td>Public and Non-Profit Organizational Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>PM A686A</td>
<td>Capstone Project: Initiating and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>PM A686B</td>
<td>Capstone Project: Executing, Controlling and Closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programs

<p>| Chg    | PADM-MPA    | Master of Public Administration |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA A264</td>
<td>Personal Selling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA A273</td>
<td>Introduction to Statistics for Business and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA A303</td>
<td>Real Estate Investment Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA A431</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO A430</td>
<td>Marine Animals and Seabirds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL A311</td>
<td>Experiential Learning: Animal Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL A317</td>
<td>Experiential Learning: Plant Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A101A</td>
<td>Keyboarding A: Basic Keyboarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A101B</td>
<td>Keyboarding B: Business Documents I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A101C</td>
<td>Keyboarding C: Business Documents II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A113</td>
<td>Operating Systems: MS Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A115</td>
<td>10-Key for Business Calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A125A</td>
<td>Electronic Communications I: MS Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A130A</td>
<td>Word Processing I: MS Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A135A</td>
<td>Spreadsheets I: MS Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A140A</td>
<td>Databases I: MS Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A146</td>
<td>Internet Concepts and Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A150A</td>
<td>Presentations: MS PowerPoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A161A</td>
<td>Proofreading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A165</td>
<td>Office Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A230A</td>
<td>Word Processing II: MS Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A235A</td>
<td>Spreadsheets II: MS Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A260A</td>
<td>Business Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A262A</td>
<td>Job Search Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A264A</td>
<td>Records Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A265</td>
<td>Office Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A276A</td>
<td>Independent Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIOS A295</td>
<td>Office Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO A146</td>
<td>Geomatics Computations I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO A156</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Surveying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO A246</td>
<td>Geomatics Computations II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO A256</td>
<td>Engineering Surveying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO A265</td>
<td>Spatial Data Adjustments I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO A357</td>
<td>Photogrammetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO A410</td>
<td>High Density Surveying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO A420</td>
<td>Point Cloud Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO A433</td>
<td>Hydrographic Surveying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS A301</td>
<td>Spatial Data Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS A351</td>
<td>Remote Sensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS A367</td>
<td>Image Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS A433</td>
<td>Coastal Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS A458</td>
<td>Spatial Data Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS A466</td>
<td>Spatial Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Type</td>
<td>Course Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>JUST A251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>MBIO A410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>MBIO A420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>MBIO A421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>MBIO A440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>MBIO A452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>MBIO A468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>ME A420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>ME A421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>OSH A101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>OSH A108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>OSH A111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>OSH A120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>OSH A201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>OSH A211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>OSH A230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>OSH A240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>OSH A250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>OSH A495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>SOC A251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>SOC A342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Type</th>
<th>Program Code</th>
<th>Program Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>BIOS-BA</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>BIOS-BS</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Occupational Safety and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>HMSV-AAS</td>
<td>Associate of Applied Science in Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>HMSV-BHS</td>
<td>Bachelor of Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>LANG-BA</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>LGLS-BA</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Legal Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chg  MGMT-BBA  Bachelor of Business Administration in Management
Chg  NSCI-BS  Bachelor of Science in Natural Sciences
Chg  OFFD-OECERT  Occupational Endorsement Certificate in Office Foundations
Chg  OFSP-OECERT: Occupational Endorsement Certificate in Office Support
Chg  OSHL-AAS  Associate of Applied Science in Occupational Safety and Health
Chg  REAL-MNR  Minor in Real Estate
Academic Assessment Committee March Report to UAA Faculty Senate

Committee Membership
Scott Downing - KPC, Cynthia Falcone - KOD, Holly Bell - MSC, Deborah Mole - LIB, Bill Myers - CAS, Christina McDowell - CBPP, Adrainne Thomas - COE, Jennifer McFerran Brock - CoEng, Rachel Graham - Faculty Senate, Jeffrey Hollingsworth - Faculty Senate, Tim Benningfield - Faculty Senate, Kathi Trawver – COH (co-chair), Brian Bennett - Faculty Senate (co-chair), Thomas Harman – CTC, Susan Kalina (Ex-officio) -

Guest(s) and Public Attendee(s)

Committee discussion(s)

NWCCU Visitation

Sharepoint Assessment archive project

UAA Survey of progress on Core Theme Objectives

Planning for the Spring Assessment Workshops

CoEng Speaker for ‘soft skills’ assessment

Assessment tracking and archives of artifacts, data, and reports CIS A310 class usage

Motions

Informational Items

Programs whose assessment plans were reviewed during the period
BS in Applied Technology represented by Darlene Gill
AAS Computer Systems Technology represented by Harry Banks

Submitted by: Brian Bennett                  Date: 28 Mar., 2016
March 28, 2016 ACDLI Te Committee Report
Faculty Senate April 2016

Committee Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Fitzgerald</td>
<td>CBPP</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Harville</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Murray</td>
<td>COH</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorelei Sterling</td>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno Kappes</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Kupilik</td>
<td>CoENG</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Paterna</td>
<td>COH</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammie Tremblay</td>
<td>COH</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi Everett</td>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed McLain</td>
<td>COE</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Petersen</td>
<td>CoENG</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Trussell</td>
<td>Kodiak</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getu Hailu</td>
<td>CoENG</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann Bartley</td>
<td>COH</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-present  E-excused  A-absent  D-Distance

Meeting date 3/11/2016 9am-11am IT conference room

1. Guest – Library Advisory committee member Erik Carlson: Open Access Policy
   a. Committee reviewed the proposed Faculty Senate Motion proposed by the Library Advisory Committee
   b. ACDLI Te moved to endorse and support this policy – Motion put on the floor by Matt and seconded by Lorelei.

   *ACDLI Te voted to support the adoption of the Open Access Policy for the University of Alaska Anchorage as moved by the Library Advisory Committee.

2. Guest -- CIO Pat Shier
   a. Statewide IT Taskforce has delivered their report to the UA President.
   b. New CMS. They have the right tool, they have paid for it, and it is working very well.
   c. Outages – Good news! The old hardware used to hold BB but over winter break, but everything uploaded into the new system. There have been a few outages but the issues have been worked through. Everything is off the old hardware and Dell is going to come in and rework the system under warranty.

3. Faculty Senate Motion: Motion passed to endorse the LAC faculty senate motion.

4. eLearning Luncheon -- Successful! We had more people who wanted to attend than we had space! It was a great format for facilitation and recommended that we do something similar next year.
   a. We can look at the topic to feature next fall.

5. Task Force on ePortfolio/electronic AAR –Todd
   a. Todd Informed ACDLI TE about the ad-hoc committee investigation into Electronic AAR and P&T.
   b. First meeting was an investigation into defining needs/wants in a system.
   c. Collected feedback from ACDLI Te to return to the Taskforce

6. Next meeting April 8th, 9-11am IT conference room
FACULTY SENATE DIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Rachael Ball History</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Sean Licka Art History</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Gokhan Karahan CBPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Pam Bowers Social Work</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yelena Yagodina Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Herminia Din Art Education</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Jervette Ward English 2nd Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Gabe Garcia Health Sciences, 1st Co-Chair</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Maria Williams Alaska Native Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Erin Hicks Astronomy</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Song Ho Ha History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Wei-Ying Hsiao Education</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Toby Widdicombe English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Colleen Kelley Nursing</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Christie Ericson Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultants and Representatives

_E_ Jeane Breinig, Vice Chancellor of Alaska Natives & Diversity

I. Garcia: Roll call and Welcome.
   a. Meeting began at 3 pm. Quorum was established at 3 pm.

II. Approval of agenda and minutes
a. Motion to approve the agenda: Dr. Williams; seconded by Dr. Hsiao; no objections; motion passed.
b. Motion to approve the minutes: Dr. Williams; seconded by Dr. Hsiao. No objections to the motion. Motion to approve the minutes with revision passed.

III. Diversity Action Plan Presentation

Drs. Williams, Boeckman, and Thorn, DAP tri-chairs, updated the FSDC about their DAP efforts. They provided a summary of and their reflections on the Diversity Summit that was held last February 12, 2016. The chairs anticipate that the report of the Summit will be completed by next week. The chairs are planning on reaching out to student groups later in the semester (March 30, 31, and April 1).

IV. Diversity Post-Doc Presentation (Dr. Cheryl Wilga)

Dr. Wilga, Interim Director of UAA’s Department of Biological Sciences, presented on the Multicultural Post-Doc Program at the University of Rhode Island (URI). The goal of this program was to increase the diversity of the faculty at URI and advance issues of diversity in research and teaching within this institution. This program has been running since 2011 through a funding from URI’s Provost Office.

At the end of Dr. Wilga’s presentation, there was a general interest among FSDC membership in having a similar program like this at UAA. FSDC membership recommended to bring up this idea to the joint DAC-FSDC meeting with the Chancellor.

V. Updates from the Alaska Native and Indigenous Faculty Subcommittee (Maria Williams)

Dr. Williams invited FSDC to the Alaska Native Conference, which will be held in Anchorage on April 15. The theme of the event is “Wellness and Healing”.

VI. Recaps and Updates

a. Transgender Diversity Dialogue – Gabe provided a brief recap of the Transgender Diversity Dialogue held last February. The dialogue was well attended by students, faculty, and staff.
b. International Faculty Update – Gabe updated the FSDC membership about the efforts related to addressing the needs and problems of international faculty. FSDC co-chairs, along with members in the international faculty workgroup (Gokhan and Songho) will be meeting with the Provost on March 24 to discuss ways the UAA administration can support international faculty.
c. Mentoring Plan – Jervette updated the FSDC membership about the efforts of the group (Toby, Sudarsan, Libby, Shanalee, Clare, Gabe, Jervette) developing the
faculty mentoring program on campus. The group met to discuss ideas about the faculty mentoring program last February 19, 2016.

VII. Joint DAC-FSDC Meeting with the Chancellor

Gabe informed the membership that the joint DAC-FSDC meeting with the Chancellor is set. It will be held on March 31 at 3 pm. FSDC agenda will most likely include key FSDC accomplishments and needs (i.e., international faculty issues, transgender issues, mentoring, and multi-cultural post-doc idea).

VIII. 2016-2017 FSDC Co-Chairs

Gabe informed the membership the possibility of stepping down as FSDC Co-Chair next academic year. He encouraged members to consider taking on the leadership role in FSDC.

Meeting Adjourned at 4 pm.
The Committee’s tasks for this academic year include:

1. Confer with the Deans of the Library and CBPP on the survey process, as administered last year.
2. Confer with the Provost on the survey process for this academic year. Topics will include a review of last year’s survey process, the utility of the data collected, cost estimates, and the selection of colleges to be surveyed this year.
3. Consulting with the deans of colleges to be surveyed.
4. Assisting the staff in developing an analogous survey.
5. Formatting and testing the survey(s); this may include the staff survey.
6. Assembling the necessary listservs.
7. Promoting the survey(s).
8. Implementing the survey(s).
9. Completing post-survey dialogues with the Office of Academic Affairs and applicable deans.
10. Continue dialogue, and provide support as requested, with/to the Faculty Senate’s Community Campus Committee as it explores survey options.

The Committee has conferred with the Dean of the College of Education and is preparing to survey that College’s faculty. The survey of faculty within CAS has commenced.

Committee members include: S. Orley (Co-chair), L. Foster (Co-chair), F. Nabors, T. Hinterberger, G. Blackmon, E. Kopacz, David Ampong, and D. Fox. The Committee’s next meeting is at 10:00 AM, April 1st; the location will be announced.

Prepared by Larry Morris Foster (Mathematics & Statistics Department).
STUDENT ACADEMIC SUPPORT AND SUCCESS (SASS) COMMITTEE
REPORT FOR March 2016 TO UAA FACULTY SENATE

Membership

The members of the 2015-2016 SASS Committee are Tracey, Burke, Connie Fuess, Jo Gottschalk, Keith Hackett, Tom Harman, Trish Jenkins, Kamal Narang, Irasema Ortega, Galina Peck, Karl Pfeiffer (Chair), Ruth Terry, and Sharyl Toscano. The sixth meeting of the academic year was held 3/25/16.

2015 – 2016 SASS Committee Goals

1. Review prior years’ goals. Assess accomplishment, continued priority, or discontinued priority. Status: ongoing. Continue for the coming year. Reports to Faculty Senate as requested.

2. Explore intervention strategies for at-risk students. Status: ongoing. Continue for the coming year as regular agenda item for discussion and review. Reports to Faculty Senate as requested.


5. Continue promoting committee participation to include students, parents of students, and alumni. Status: ongoing. The first SASS Student Forum was hosted by SASS during the March 20, 2015 meeting. It was successful and was done again this year during the March 25, 2016 meeting.


9. Explore system fixes for problems in student services and particularly advising: incorrect information, extensive wait times “on hold,” confusing and time consuming voice mail menus, etc. Status: ongoing.

10. Review current rules and processes related to financial aid that effect advising, program sequencing, grading, etc. Status: new/ongoing.

Chair Summary: The SASS Committee met for the sixth time of the 2015-2016 academic year on March 25, 2016. The SASS Student Forum was held during this meeting. Following further discussion by SASS, a report on these proceedings will be submitted with the April Report to the Senate. The last meeting for this academic year is scheduled for April 15, 2:30-4:00 PM, in ADM 101A.
Student Academic Support and Success (SASS)
Friday, March 25, 2016
ADM 101B, 2:30-4:00 PM
Meeting Minutes

Present: Jo Gottschalk, Patricia Jenkins, Kamal Narang, Irasema Ortega, Galina Peck, Karl Pfeiffer (Chair), and Ruth Terry. Excused: Tracey Burke and Sharyl Toscano.

I. Old Business
   a. Reviewed/approved minutes from 2/19/16 SASS meeting.

II. New Business
   a. SASS Student Forum was held using the general outline below. Following further discussion by SASS during the April 15, 2016 meeting, a report of the proceedings will be included in the April Report to the Senate.

      1. Introductions:

      2. Background: Open-ended: students describe their experience at UAA in relation to things that helped them succeed and things felt like obstacles to success. If they overcame the obstacle, how did they do it? This might include years at UAA, current status, full-time/part-time, transfer, traditional/non-traditional, expected graduation date, etc.

      3. What motivated you most as a student?

      4. What motivated you least as a student?

      5. Did you take developmental classes? If yes, did you feel they helped prepare you for college level courses?

      6. What advice would you give to other students?

      7. What self-advising tools have you successfully used (DegreeWorks, printed or online college catalogues, discussions with other students, etc.)?

      8. What do you like about UAA?

      9. What do you dislike about UAA?

III. Adjourn: 4:00 PM
Academic Honesty and Integrity Committee (AHI)

March 28, 2016, 8:30 – 9:30 a.m.

Present: Dede Allen, David Bowie (Chair), Wei-Ying Hsiao, Mari Ippolito, Megan Kolendo, Carri Shamburger, Michael Votava

David Bowie announced that Jacque Woody resigned with regret from the AHI Committee. Thanks were extended for her service.

The CAFÉ workshop will be held in Fall 2016 (rather than the end of this semester) to maximize attendance. David will send out a Doodle poll to schedule a meeting of the working group for next month.

The website group met and created a table of website components and their intended audiences. The table will be distributed to the committee by email for discussion at the next Committee meeting.

In the next two April (9 and 25) meetings, the Committee will work on the report to Faculty Senate on the Committee’s work over the last year, e.g., what was done to meet the goals. There may also be a final meeting on May 9.

Next Meeting: Monday, April 11
The Faculty Senate Research and Creative Activity Committee met March 25, 2016.

The meeting focused on planning for the 3rd annual UAA Faculty Research & Creative Activity Symposium, which will be held April 7-8.

The flyer for the event is attached to this report.

***

Committee co-chair shared the committee’s interest in an all-UA faculty research & creative activity showcase, and President Johnsen said he wanted this to happen in October at UAA, and that he would fund it.

***

The next committee meeting will be in late April. We will

1) Discuss planning for the Fall all-UA research showcase
2) Select new leadership for this committee
3) Draft the committee’s final report for the May 2 faculty senate meeting
Join us in celebrating Research, Innovation & Creative Works at UAA!

Get a glimpse into the creative world of UAA Faculty with posters, presentations, demonstrations, performances, exhibitions, and a community panel.

Theme: “Strength and Resiliency in a Changing World”

Full schedule of events available at www.uaa.alaska.edu/facultyshowcase

Sponsored by the Vice Provost for Research & Graduate Studies, Dr. Helena Wisniewski and the UAA Faculty Senate Research & Creative Activity Committee

UAA is an EEO/AA Employer and Educational Institution.
March 27, 2016

To: UAA Faculty Senate

From: Marian Bruce  
Assistant Vice Provost, Faculty Services

Re: Revisions to the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Attached are some additional revisions to the UAA Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for your consideration and approval, which have been reviewed and approved by the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee. These revisions include:

- Changing all references from "Faculty Evaluation Guidelines" to "Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures."

- Deletion of the language about adding missing information to a file (page 33). The Provost determined, after consultation with SW Labor Relations and UNAC, that files should be reviewed as is, without placeholders or any additional material being added after the submission deadline.

- Adding the clarifying language to the student evaluation requirement in light of changes to IDEA reports, recent discussions in Faculty Senate regarding alternate methods of course evaluation and assessment (page 34).

- There are a few other minor cleanups here and there, including updating the numbering on the table of contents.
Faculty evaluations will be conducted according to Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook until the new Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (now called the Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures) are approved by the Provost.

Upon final approval by the Provost, the process outlined in section VI. Evaluation Process and Review Cycle of the new Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Policies and Procedures is to be used for all faculty reviews. The criteria outlined in section IV. Evaluation of Faculty for Progression towards Tenure, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review and section V. Academic Rank, Appointment and Tenure will be phased in, as outlined below, to achieve full implementation by AY 2014-15.

Upon final approval by the Provost, units will be asked to review and, if needed, revise their guidelines to ensure they conform to the new Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Policies and Procedures and to submit the unit guidelines to the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee and Provost for review and approval.

The criteria in the new Faculty Evaluation Guidelines Policies and Procedures will become effective for an individual faculty member in the first academic year of service after the completion of their next major review. For the purposes of this transition, major reviews are defined as promotion, tenure, and comprehensive post-tenure review. Additionally, for those faculty members who have not previously been required to undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review, their next post-tenure review will be considered a major review.
Revision History

The UAA Faculty Senate accepted the base version of this document at its April 1, 2011 meeting with the provision that the Faculty Senate conduct a thorough review of the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (now called the Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures) five years after the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines have gone into effect and revise them as needed.

Many revisions to the April 1, 2011 document were made during the 2011-2012 academic year. These changes were primarily a result of conversations with the UNAC, UAFT, and UAA Faculty Senate. This resulted in a marked-up document dated March 24, 2012. There was substantial agreement among all parties on the March 24, 2012 version, with only a few items to resolve.

The March 24, 2012 document used a variety of colors and fonts to show changes over the April 1, 2011 version. These changes were accepted and the different colors and fonts were removed to form the base document for the version dated April 24, 2012. The April 24, 2012 version was endorsed by the UAA Faculty Senate on May 4, 2012 and by the PWSCC Faculty on May 11, 2012. The version, dated June 6, 2012 corrects minor typographical errors and improves formatting based on input from faculty.

The version dated March 22, 2013 contains corrections to some inconsistencies and errors in the June 6, 2012 version. These changes were approved by the UFEC, the Faculty Senate (March 1, 2013), United Academics and the Provost in accordance with the change process detailed on pages 33-34 of the guidelines.

The version dated April 28, 2014 contains corrections to text, and amendments to make the document more consistent with changes to the United Academics Collective Bargaining Agreement. These changes were approved by the UFEC, the Faculty Senate (April 4, 2014), United Academics and the Provost in accordance with the change process detailed on page 34 of the guidelines.

The version, dated May 29, 2015 contains revisions to Union Service and Emeritus Status, and amendments to make the document more consistent with changes to the University of Alaska Federation of Teachers’ (UAFT) collective bargaining agreement (CBA). These changes were approved by Faculty Senate (May 1, 2015), UAFT and the Provost in accordance with the change process detailed in the guidelines.

The version dated July 1, 2015 contains corrections to the text to make the document consistent with changes in the Collective Bargaining Agreement with the University of Alaska Federation of Teachers signed on December 11, 2014, as well as to incorporate changes adopted by the Faculty Senate Executive Board on May 1, 2015, approved by the Provost on May 4, 2015.

The version dated (new date) changes the references throughout from “Faculty Evaluation Guidelines” to “Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures.” It also corrects an error in the time
period for promotion, makes minor corrections to text, and corrects page numbers on the table of contents.
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I. PURPOSE
The mission of the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) is to discover and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, engagement, and creative expression. As faculty, we value the role of university scholarship in service to society, and are committed to engaging in and producing high-quality scholarly work. Together, the faculty and administration aspire to be a university of distinction, recognized for excellence in teaching and learning centered on professional and craft practice, academic research, and creative expression. In achieving our mission, UAA places greatest emphasis on a set of core values:1

- Academic freedom and diversity
- Affordable access and high quality
- Student success and community engagement
- Innovation and creativity
- Cooperation and collaboration
- Sustainability and stewardship
- Integrity and accountability
- Effectiveness and efficiency

The following policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty have been established to provide an equitable and fair assessment of each individual faculty member and his or her contribution to the collective institutional mission, goals, and core values.

II. PRINCIPLES
UAA is committed to excellence in the selection and continued development of faculty members. A key aspect of faculty development is the regular evaluation of faculty for progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. Individual faculty members bring different strengths, perspectives, experiences, and talents to their faculty role, and they are members of disciplinary departments with varying forms of scholarship, foci, and goals. Therefore, expecting identical outcomes for all faculty members is unrealistic and can serve to undermine the ultimate quality of an academic unit and the institution as a whole.

---

1 This paragraph and the values that follow come from UAA’s mission and strategic plan, UAA 2017, http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/strategicplan/upload/StrategicPlan_12pg.pdf, pp. 2-4.
The guidelines, policies, and procedures in this document serve as the foundation and broad framework of standards for the faculty evaluation system at UAA. Within this framework, each of the units and their constituent departments have the responsibility to establish comprehensive unit-specific evaluation guidelines and procedures that conform to the University guidelines, policies, processes, and procedures and that are reflective of their diverse academic, disciplinary, craft, and professional fields. In this way, the system has been developed to recognize and honor the inherent diversity of faculty work, with the goal of supporting and encouraging faculty to bring together their unique talents into a cohesive and integrated scholarly practice. Furthermore, the system recognizes and supports differential emphases and interests over the course of a faculty member’s career.

The policies and procedures outlined here guide the evaluation process for all tenure-track and tenured faculty members across the various campuses of UAA. As used in these guidelines, this document, “unit” refers to the colleges and schools within UAA (see BOR P10.02.040).

The examination and evaluation of faculty work must be done within the context of the explicit goals of the institution, as embodied in the mission and strategic plan. The most valuable resource the University has for enacting its mission is the time, talent, and expertise of the faculty. An evaluation system aligned with the mission provides faculty with a clear set of expectations around which they may focus their work and continue their professional development and achievement. In this way, a faculty member may pursue an individualized professional pathway based on his or her unique talents while contributing to the collective achievement of the institutional mission.

The evaluation of faculty members for hiring, progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review should also occur in the context of established criteria for high-quality work; clearly communicated expectations and responsibilities set forth in a faculty member’s initial appointment letter approved by the dean, campus director or other designated administrator; subsequent modifications made for annual workload agreements; the results of periodic reviews or previous promotion or tenure decisions; and the priorities of the department, unit, college, campus, and University.

These guidelines, policies, and procedures shall be interpreted and implemented within the framework of the UA Board of Regent’s Policies (P0.04.04.010-070), the internal governance

---

2 Unit and departmental guidelines must be in agreement with procedures in the governing Collective Bargaining Agreements.

3 A more detailed discussion of the relationship of the FEPPs (formerly the FEGs) and unit guidelines can be found on page 34-35.
procedures of UAA, and the relevant Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs) of United Academics (UNAC) and the University of Alaska Federation of Teachers (UAFT).

III. FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Overview of Faculty Responsibilities

The central tasks of the University include the promotion of learning and the expansion of knowledge. These tasks place specific responsibilities upon faculty members with respect to their students, their discipline, craft or professional field, the University, and communities. In support of these responsibilities, the University seeks to foster the continued development of faculty in ways that support their effective engagement with students, as well as with a variety of local, state, national and international communities and colleagues.

Faculty have a responsibility to their students, their discipline, craft or professional field, the University and communities to strive for exemplary intellectual, ethical, aesthetic, and creative achievement. Such achievements are the defining qualifications for appointment, tenure, and promotion in the academic ranks. Individuals appointed to the faculty are expected to possess the intellectual and professional integrity associated with the exercise of academic freedom and shared governance; to show respect for the opinions of others; to maintain accepted standards of civility and professionalism; to cooperate effectively with others; and to consider the welfare of the total institution.4

One of UAA’s strategic priorities is to build a university of first choice distinguished for excellence in teaching and learning and to become a leader in undergraduate and graduate education centered on professional and craft practice, academic research, and creative activity. This requires faculty of the highest caliber who will maintain currency in the developments in their fields--whether disciplinary, multi-disciplinary, or interdisciplinary--and remain actively engaged in scholarship throughout their careers.

All faculty members have a responsibility to engage in scholarly work in teaching, academic research, craft or professional practice, or creative activity, and in professionally related service activities according to their respective appointments, positions and workload agreements. In this way, faculty members contribute to the knowledge-base in their fields, advance student success, and contribute to the mission of the University in service to society. Each faculty member is also

4AAUP, 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments ; On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation
http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/default.htm
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expected to contribute to the shared governance, accreditation processes, and other service activities within the University if that is part of their workload.

The Centrality of Scholarship to Faculty Responsibilities

The faculty evaluation guidelines and procedures of UAA are grounded in a definition of scholarship that can be appropriately applied to the full scope of academic work: Scholarship, or scholarly work, is characterized by creative intellectual work reflective of a high level of professional expertise, is communicated so others may benefit from it, is subjected to reflective critique and evaluation by others, and supports the fulfillment of the mission of the University.

Scholarship may be derived from, and manifested in teaching, academic research, creative activity, professional and craft practice, and service. Scholarship takes a number of forms, including:

1) Discovery—Advancing of knowledge through original research, or original creations in writing, performance, or production;
2) Integration—Synthesizing and integrating knowledge, revealing new patterns of meaning, and new relationships between the parts and the whole, either within a discipline or across multiple disciplines;
3) Application—Assessing the efficacy of existing academic, aesthetic, creative, and professional or craft knowledge and practices within a particular context or to address a significant problem, refining its implications or using it to affect change;
4) Engagement—Uniting the intellectual expertise and questions of the academy with the intellectual expertise and questions of the public and communities external to the academy to address their identified issues, concerns, or problems;
5) Transformation/Interpretation—Revealing, explaining, and illuminating knowledge and intellectual, creative, and professional or craft processes for others.

This expanded definition of scholarship serves to encompass all high-quality faculty work that furthers the educational goals of students, faculty, academic units and campuses, the University, and the varied public and professional communities with which we are engaged. Recognizing that not all faculty members will engage in all forms of scholarship, this more inclusive

---

5 A number of sources have been synthesized and adapted to develop this section in response to UAA’s unique context and mission: E. Boyer (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; Campus Compact (2007). Conference Report: New Times Demand New Scholarship, Author, University of California, Los Angeles; Portland State University, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases (1996); University of North Carolina at Greensboro, University-wide Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure; Criteria for Scholarship, Southern Polytechnic State University.
definition of scholarship allows for greater recognition of the diverse scholarly activities and outcomes that reflect the mosaic of faculty talent that strengthens the University as a whole.

Scholarship traditionally has implied that one has a solid foundation in the academic, craft, or professional field addressed and is current with developments in that field. The expanded and more inclusive definition takes into account that significant advances often accrue when a faculty member extends his or her scope of creative intellectual work to engage in collaborative, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary inquiry and scholarly activities.

The expanded definition of scholarship used throughout these guidelines, this document is a valuable concept that connects strongly to UAA’s Mission Statement and to a common national practice in recognizing an underpinning concept of all faculty work. However, the terms “scholarship” and “research” are widely used in higher education with a range of (sometimes inconsistent) definitions. This can lead to confusion in faculty reviews. In these guidelines, this document, “scholarship” is used solely to denote the broad, central principle that underlies all faculty work as described in this section. The terms “academic research” and “creative activity” are used to describe what is often called “research” or “scholarship” in other documents. Reviewers and faculty under review should take care to use the terms consistently in presenting and evaluating faculty work.

Community Engagement as a Component of Academic Research, Teaching, and/or Service

UAA has been nationally recognized for community engagement, receiving the Carnegie classification of “Community Engaged University in Curricular Engagement and Outreach & Partnerships.” In alignment with the Carnegie classification, UAA describes community engagement as collaborations between institutions of higher education and individuals, organizations, and institutions in their larger communities (local, regional, state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. The range of local, regional, state, national, and global communities with which faculty might engage are vast and broad. A community may be defined by shared academic, aesthetic, craft, or professional interests; political, social, or geographic contexts; or a variety of other shared interests and concerns around which communities form, develop, and participate together.

---

6 The Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University and UNAC, for example, uses the terms in different senses. The CBA uses both “research” and “scholarship” to refer to what this document denotes as “academic research”. Reviewers should use this mapping when working between the CBA and these policies and procedures.

7 UAA Definitions of Community Engagement, Curricular Engagement, Community-based Research, and Engaged Service. Approved by UAA Faculty Senate and UAA Office of Academic Affairs and submitted by Nancy Andes, Professor of Sociology, and Director, Center for Community Engagement & Learning, May 8, 2007.
Community engagement expands the variety of University outreach and partnership activities of faculty because it has the potential to integrate teaching, service, and academic research or creative activity. Faculty members who focus on community-engaged practice enhance both their scholarly knowledge and the well-being of the various communities with which they work. Community engagement is grounded in collaborative practice and shared leadership and focuses on the application of knowledge and processes to problems and concerns identified by the communities. Community engagement may be manifested in scholarly activities such as community-based research, community-engaged service, and curricular engagement when they demonstrably meet the principles of high-quality scholarship.

UAA highly values and encourages quality community engagement as part of faculty roles and responsibilities. For those faculty members who choose to undertake community-engaged scholarship through their teaching, service, academic research or creative activity, it should constitute a vital component of faculty evaluation considerations.8

The Scholarly Agenda

Faculty members may find the Scholarly Agenda, described in more detail in Appendix I, to be a useful tool for planning and explaining their work as a complement to their workload, activity report, and self-evaluation. While the use of a Scholarly Agenda is not required, faculty members who find it useful are encouraged to include it in their review file.9

IV. EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR PROGRESSION TOWARDS TENURE, TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

The decisions to retain, grant tenure to, or promote a faculty member are among the most vital that take place in a university. One of the hallmarks of a university of distinction is the quality of its faculty and their scholarly achievements as reflected in their teaching, academic research and creative activity, and public, professional, and university service. Therefore, it is to be expected that among faculty members there will be highly varied profiles of scholarly pursuits and achievement with respect to flexibility, breadth, and forms of scholarship. Judgments about the application of the University’s criteria of quality and significance of scholarly achievement

8 Community engagement receives special emphasis in these guidelines policies and procedures because it is a relatively new concept in describing faculty work and thus needs additional explanation. The special emphasis is not meant to imply that community engagement is more or less important than more traditional types of faculty work.

9 A faculty member’s choice to include or not include the Scholarly Agenda in their review file is not subject to substantive academic judgment.
within and among the components of faculty responsibility will vary with disciplines, craft, and professional fields, and with unit goals.

Those making progression towards tenure, tenure, and promotion recommendations have an obligation of stewardship to students, consumers of academic research and creative activity, the existing community of scholars, craft and professional practitioners, and the community at-large, to ensure the best faculty possible. The conscientious exercise of this responsibility requires that the University retain, tenure, and promote only those faculty members who have demonstrated a consistent pattern of high-quality scholarly achievement across the components of faculty responsibility, and whose expertise and achievement have contributed to the unit goals and institutional mission.

**Evaluation of Faculty Scholarship**

The various forms of scholarship—discovery, integration, application, engagement, and transformation/interpretation—result in a variety of scholarly activities and accomplishments demonstrated by evidence, which may arise from or be manifested in one’s teaching, academic research and creative activity, and service. The forms of scholarship do not necessarily correspond directly or uniquely to any particular one of the three components of faculty responsibilities. However, the division of faculty work responsibilities into three distinct components of teaching, academic research and creative activity, and service can serve to clarify the complexity of faculty scholarship and provide a framework for organizing and assessing scholarly work and accomplishments within the evaluation process.

Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that such classification is not always distinct, as some scholarly work may be integrative and contribute to multiple components (see figure below). For example, a faculty member may develop a novel approach to an instructional strategy or a set of curriculum materials in response to an identified student learning need within the discipline, and subsequently publish an article in an academic journal about the work and its impact on student learning and course outcomes. The resulting instructional strategy and curriculum materials may be categorized as an aspect of teaching, while the article is a dissemination product that can be categorized under academic research and creative activity.

What is critical to distinguish here is that the process of scholarly work may arise mainly from one of the components, while producing a variety of distinct outcomes and products that may contribute to the scholarly accomplishments in another component of faculty responsibilities. Moreover, as a faculty member develops professionally it is likely that the components of faculty

---

10 An activity undertaken by a faculty member in one portion of their workload may produce outcomes in other areas of that faculty member’s workload. The evaluation of a faculty member’s work is based on the resulting evidence (products, artifacts, and creative works). The faculty member and reviewers should use the nature of the outcome and the resulting products to differentiate among teaching, research, and service where needed.
responsibilities in which he or she is involved will increasingly serve to inform and mutually reinforce each other.

Because of the nature of scholarship, with its multiple forms and potential for integration, it is expected that throughout their careers faculty members will commit varying amounts of time, make unique contributions, and achieve a variety of outcomes within and across the components of faculty work, in accordance with their rank, position description, and assigned duties and workloads.  

a. Teaching and Learning

Teaching well is UAA’s primary mission. Teaching is a challenging and dynamic enterprise that encompasses a range of scholarly activities, from classroom instruction to including students in research, from mentoring to curriculum development, from participating in faculty development to the scholarship of teaching and beyond. Faculty members are expected to be reflective.

---

11 It is important to distinguish between what is commonly referred to as “scholarly teaching” and the “scholarship of teaching and learning” when describing and reviewing faculty work. Scholarly teaching means having a good understanding of the discipline and applying pedagogical techniques of demonstrated effectiveness to advance students' understanding of that discipline. Scholarly teaching would be demonstrated in the aspects outlined in the section on Teaching and Learning immediately following. The scholarship of teaching is a scholarly activity that has impact beyond a faculty member's students, typically via dissemination of reviewed products or artifacts. Scholarship of teaching would be demonstrated via evidence described in the following section on academic research and creative expression.
practitioners who continuously examine their effectiveness as educators. In addition, their teaching should reveal and develop diverse perspectives; encourage and facilitate inquiry, creativity, and life-long learning; and work to integrate the principles central to the vision, mission, and core values of UAA. (See Section I: Purpose)

When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness is an essential criterion for advancement. Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning and attainment of UAA’s Student Learning Outcomes. Teaching is much more than instruction in the classroom and lab, or via distance-delivery modes and technologies. The work of teaching includes curriculum writing, developing course materials, developing community-engaged learning opportunities for students, including service learning as part of classes, developing community internships for students, mentoring, planning and conducting workshops for colleagues, and other activities. Every faculty member engaged in teaching utilizes and combines these teaching activities in different ways at different times.

- It is expected that teaching will be demonstrated through some combination of one or more of the following six aspects. However, units may include different examples of the aspects or place different emphasis and value on certain aspects to reflect the particular needs and concerns of their respective discipline, craft, or professional field. The aspects of teaching are:

  **Instruction and Learning Experiences:** Teaching students in courses, laboratories, field experiences, clinics, studio classes or in web-based environments; teaching participants in workshops, retreats, seminars; managing a course [student assessment, student records, learning experiences]; applying effective instructional design strategies to teaching and learning; providing capstone, service learning or community engaged learning opportunities, incorporating active learning and/or research experiences in the curriculum.

  **Librarianship:** Selecting and acquiring collections and resources to support curriculum and research; overseeing library operations; providing instruction in library research methods; cataloging and classifying materials; creating and maintaining bibliographic support systems; creating bibliographies, web sites, and other research tools; developing and applying specialized information systems.

  **Building and Developing Curriculum and Learning Resources:** Developing and revising outcomes-based curriculum and assessment; shaping teaching materials, manuals, software; designing and implementing new or varied delivery modes, including web-based and new media technologies; constructing resources to support distributed education and independent learning; selecting, organizing, and providing access to information resources in support of learning goals.
Mentoring Students: Advising students for academic success and career planning; providing opportunities and supporting students’ research and scholarship; providing one-to-one instruction or tutoring; guiding capstone, service learning and independent study opportunities; and supervising research assistants and teaching assistants.

Advancing Teaching Excellence: Mentoring colleagues and observing their teaching; reviewing current literature and national standards in subject areas; planning and contributing to professional development activities related to teaching; shaping and improving assessment methods; consulting with colleagues on the selection and use of instructional tools, resources, and materials; conducting instructional and classroom inquiry; implementing ideas from professional development activities; using student feedback and self-reflection to enhance or change instructional practices.

Advancing Student Excellence: Writing letters of recommendation or nominating students for scholarships and awards; supporting students’ accomplishments, such as Student Showcase, Undergraduate Research Grants, or presentations at professional conferences; and serving as chair of graduate or undergraduate theses, and honors or capstone project committees.

b. Academic Research and Creative Activity

Academic research and creative activity are vital to the mission of UAA in order to advance knowledge, support teaching and learning, and promote the application of knowledge in ways that benefit our local communities and broader society. One of UAA’s research goals is to become a leader in research and research-centered undergraduate and graduate education. Faculty members with designated workload effort in this component of faculty work during the period of review are expected to engage in high-quality, significant academic research or creative activities as appropriate to their discipline, craft or professional field, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of their department, school, college, campus, and the University. Reviewers will evaluate a faculty member’s work based on the outcomes of that work as evidenced by products, artifacts, or creative works appropriate to the faculty member’s discipline, craft, or professional field.

Academic research and creative activity may be generated through all forms of scholarship—discovery, integration, transformation/interpretation, engagement, and application—and contributes to the generation and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline, craft or professional field as defined by the respective scholarly community. It is expected that academic research and creative activity will be demonstrated through some combination of one or more of the following six categories. However, units may include different examples of work within the categories or
place different emphasis and value on certain categories to reflect the particular needs and concerns of their respective discipline, craft, or professional fields.

*Conducting and Disseminating Academic Research:* Conducting basic and applied research and inquiry; community-engaged or participatory action research; writing books, monographs, textbooks; writing book chapters; editing books; writing papers in refereed journals and conference proceedings; presenting papers at professional meetings; writing translations, abstracts, and reviews; involving undergraduate or graduate students in ongoing research.

*Producing and Performing Creative Works:* Writing poems, plays, essays, musical scores; producing radio and television productions, films, and videos; engaging in competitions, commissions, exhibitions; directing, choreographing and performing creative works in music, theatre, or dance; designing and arranging creative works; creating and preparing software and electronically published documents; developing electronic and print information resources that support the curriculum.

*Developing and Disseminating Curriculum and Pedagogical Innovations:* Developing and disseminating creative approaches to teaching methods and techniques, including publication or presentation at professional meetings; developing of software and other technologies that advance student learning; writing grant proposals for the developing of curriculum or teaching methods and techniques; and participating in the supervision of student research, independent study or capstone projects, and in the mentoring of students that leads to the presentation of academic research and other creative works.

*Developing and Disseminating Innovations in Clinical and Craft Practice:* Developing and disseminating novel or creative approaches in clinical or craft practices, including publishing or presenting at professional meetings; the developing, producing, and disseminating of tools, technologies, or methods that enhance clinical or craft practice.

*Editing and Managing Creative Works:* Fulfilling major editorial assignments with academic, disciplinary, craft, and professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media; initiating or organizing scholarly conferences symposia, and other similar activities.

*Leading and Managing Funded Research Programs, Contracts, and Creative Projects:* Leading research projects or contracts, including multidisciplinary, multi-agency, or collaborative projects task forces; writing proposals to funding agencies (private, public, and internal); managing budgets of grants and contracts; selecting and supervising staff; preparing required reports.
c. Service

Public, professional, and university service are essential to creating an environment that supports scholarly excellence, enables shared governance, meets the internal operational needs of the University, and enhances the region, state, and world. All faculty members are expected to engage in public, professional, and university service activities, with increasing involvement at higher ranks, as appropriate to their discipline, craft or professional field, and the mission of their department, unit, campus and the University.

Public, professional, and university service can generally be demonstrated through the following broad categories. However, service activities within these categories can take a number of forms beyond those listed below. Units may identify additional forms of service and/or place different emphasis and value on certain categories to reflect the particular needs and concerns of their respective discipline, craft, or professional fields.

Public Service

(1) Service to Society:

Writing for popular and non-academic publications directed to specialized audiences; guiding technology transfer activities; collaborating or partnering with governments, education, health, cultural or other public institutions; committing expertise to community agencies or civic groups; testifying before legislative or congressional committees; providing public policy analysis, program evaluation, technical briefings for local, state, national, or international governmental agencies; serving on public boards, task forces, or committees; developing and offering training or professional development workshops and other demonstrations or dissemination of professional methods or techniques.

(2) Community-Engaged Service:

As a form of public service to society, community-engaged service is distinguished by its focus on collaborative, jointly developed projects designed to apply concepts, processes, or techniques to community-identified issues, concerns, or problems, which result in community change and development. It should be noted here, however, that the nature of community-engaged practice is often integrative across the components of one’s work in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and service. Therefore, depending on the breadth, form, and focus of the work, a community-engaged service activity may combine

---

12 UAA Definitions of Community Engagement, Curricular Engagement, Community-based Research, and Engaged Service. Approved by the UAA Faculty Senate and UAA Office of Academic Affairs and submitted by Nancy Andes, Professor of Sociology, and Director, Center for Community Engagement & Learning, May 8, 2007.
with or result in scholarly outcomes or products that could additionally or alternatively be represented as an aspect of teaching, or within a category of academic research and creative activity.

*Professional Service*
Faculty members engaged in professional service use their academic training, professional expertise, and experience to serve the discipline or society, while contributing to the institutional mission. The diversity of external needs, as well as faculty expertise and experience, leads to many different forms of professional service. Nevertheless, there are common distinguishing characteristics that define such service:

- Utilizes a faculty member’s academic, craft or professional expertise;
- Contributes to the discipline, craft, or professional field and/or the audience or clientele; and
- Demonstrates a clear relationship between the service activities and the goals and mission of the department, college, campus, or University.

*Service to the Discipline, Craft or Professional Field*
Writing peer reviews for discipline, craft or professional publications and funding organizations; performing editorial assignments for discipline, craft or professional publications; participating in academic, craft or professional conferences as panel organizer and/or discussant; providing professional reviews or critiques of materials at the request of discipline, craft, or professional colleagues at other universities or institutions; serving as an officer, or in another leadership capacity, for local, state, or national discipline, craft or professional organizations or associations.

*University Service*
University service includes service to the department, college, campus or University. Faculty members engaged in university service contribute to the shared governance system and institutional development through a variety of activities, including:

1. **Governance:**
   Fulfilling administrative or other directed responsibilities at the department, college, campus or university level, such as department chair, academic program coordinator, or center director; contributing to department, college, campus, University, or union policy development and governance activities; collaborating within and across campus communities on projects, initiatives, and other University-wide activities.

2. **Academic and Faculty Development:**
Mentoring other faculty members; participating in faculty, administrator, or staff search committees; organizing, directing and/or implementing faculty development activities; organizing, directing, and/or implementing academic development activities; and participating in academic program development and accreditation activities.

3) Student Success Support:
Sponsoring student organizations; developing outreach activities and programs that enhance the University’s ability to serve the needs of a diverse and non-traditional student body; developing and maintaining services and programs that support student engagement with the curriculum; facilitating activities that integrate residential living and learning on campus, or that engage non-resident students in campus activities.

4) Union/Union-related business
Serving in elected office as a campus representatives, member of a university appeals board, or university disciplinary committee; serving on joint labor-management committees and working groups/task forces.

Compensated Outside Activities

In accordance with Alaska State law and University policy, all outside compensated activities must be disclosed and may not be in conflict with or incompatible with a faculty member’s performance of his or her duties and responsibilities. As such activities are not part of the full-time commitments of a faculty member, they cannot be considered teaching, academic research or creative activity, or service within the University for the purposes of faculty evaluation. However, for those disciplines and units in which the direct practical experience that might be derived from such activities constitute valuable professional development, faculty members may request that it be considered for its contribution to the continuing development of disciplinary, craft or professional knowledge and skill.

Quality and Significance of Scholarship

A rigorous faculty evaluation and review process is one that distinguishes between the routine conduct and completion of one’s work assignments and responsibilities, and one’s scholarly accomplishments and outcomes which are the results of high-quality and substantive scholarly

---


14 As demonstrated by evidence (products, artifacts, and creative works) appropriate to the discipline, craft, or professional field.
work. The emphasis is on the critical assessment and evaluation of the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarly achievements by professional peers. Thus, the evaluation system must distinguish among the criteria that relate to the quality of a faculty member’s scholarly work, as well as the equally important criteria of the significance and relevance of this body of work to the department, school, college or campus, and institutional mission(s).

A consistent pattern of high-quality scholarship manifested across all dimensions of faculty work is more important than the quantity of work done, as it reflects the promise of continued professional development and scholarly achievement. The criteria for evaluating quality and significance of a faculty member’s scholarship include the following:

1. Reflects a high level of discipline-related expertise
   High-quality scholarship in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and service is grounded in and draws from the current literature, developments, practices, and knowledge-base in the respective discipline, craft, or professional field. Such scholarly work demonstrates an understanding of both depth and breadth of the subject-matter that supports the diverse learning needs of students, contributes generatively to the knowledge-base in the discipline, craft, or profession, and responds to identified needs and interests of a variety of community and professional organizations.

2. Establishes clear and relevant goals
   High-quality scholarship in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and service is derived from a systematic approach built on clearly established goals and carefully selected actions and activities. Such scholarly work demonstrates the selection of substantive content, problems, or questions appropriate to the varied contexts of teaching, and the framing and pursuit of intellectual, creative, or aesthetic inquiries and projects.

3. Uses appropriate methods and resources
   High-quality scholarship in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and service results from well-constructed methods and skillfully selected resources and materials that align with and support the purpose and goals of the specific project or activity. Such scholarly work demonstrates the effective use of pedagogical and curricular practices to maximize student learning; the organization and successful implementation of systematic inquiry, the research or creative activities that support the discovery, integration, application, engagement with or transformation/interpretation of knowledge; and the effective and collaborative participation with community and professional colleagues to address common concerns or issues.

4. Is effectively documented and communicated
High-quality scholarship in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and service is effectively communicated to appropriate audiences in ways that subject the intellectual, aesthetic, professional or instructional ideas, processes, outcomes, practices, or products to critical and independent consideration and review. Such scholarly work is publically communicated or disseminated through a variety of media and venues appropriate to, and accepted by, the intended audiences, be they from the discipline, craft, creative or professional field, students, or the community.

5. Results in positive impact or outcomes
High-quality scholarship in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and service is marked by scholars’ own critical reflection on and evaluation of their work; its impact on the intended audience; and its potential for generating new initiatives, understandings, practices, or lines of inquiry. Such scholarly work results in outcomes that are valued by those for whom it was intended; are clearly identifiable or measurable; and contribute to student learning and academic success, the knowledge or practice base of the discipline, the craft, the profession, or the community. In these varied ways, high-quality scholarship contributes to the mission or reputation of the department, college, campus and University.

6. Upholds professional ethical standards
High-quality scholarship conforms to and promotes the established ethical codes of conduct of the discipline, craft or professional field and University, including issues related to: intellectual property rights and protection of human and animal subjects; counseling students; and relationships with students, staff and faculty colleagues, and community participants, or others who participate in, benefit from, or are affected by the work.

V. ACADEMIC RANK, APPOINTMENT AND TENURE

Introduction
To be appointed to any faculty rank, a candidate must hold the appropriate professional or craft certification or terminal degree as defined by the accrediting agencies or associations in the respective professional, craft, or academic field. Regardless of the educational requirement or credential, the primary emphasis must rest on the individual's professional profile and the overriding necessity of maintaining well-qualified faculty within the unit and the University. The determination and definition of the appropriate professional or craft certification or terminal degree shall be made by the college in accordance with disciplinary requirements, faculty position, and University policies. Unit and department level guidelines should provide clear, objective criteria for each rank that are appropriate to the discipline and that conform to the guidelines-policies and procedures in this document.
Definitions of Academic Ranks and Appointments

Emeritus. Appointment as Professor Emeritus or Emerita is an honor conferred upon retiring faculty in recognition of a sustained record of outstanding scholarly and other accomplishments contributing to the excellence of the University of Alaska Anchorage. Appointment is made at the time of retirement or as near to it as may be practical, but no later than the date of the next commencement ceremony. The title Emeritus/Emerita is honorary and implies no stipend or salary.

Candidates for Emeritus appointment must be tenured, full-time faculty at the rank of Professor who are retiring after a minimum of ten years in the University of Alaska system with a record of outstanding service to the academy.

In exceptional circumstances, non-tenured faculty or faculty other than Professors, but who have a record of outstanding service to the academy, may also be nominated. After review by the peer groups, the Chancellor will make the final appointment. If the previous reviewers disagree, the Chancellor will make the decision in the best interests of UAA.

Faculty receiving recognition as Professor Emeritus/Emerita serve as goodwill ambassadors for UAA and are invited to continue their engagement with the university in such areas as research, teaching, guest lecturing, mentoring new faculty and students, alumni activities, consulting on current UAA issues, sharing institutional memory, and generally promoting UAA as an institution of distinction.

Distinguished Professor. The tenured appointment of Distinguished Teaching Professor, Distinguished Research Professor, Distinguished Service Professor, or University Professor may be given by action of the Board of Regents on recommendation of unit members and concurrence of the Chancellor and the President. The title of Distinguished Professor or University Professor is considered to be a rare and special achievement. Candidates to be considered for award of the title must be nominated by their department. Following the consideration of the recommendation by the faculty review process, the Chancellor will make the final recommendation to the Board of Regents.

Professor. Candidates for initial appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor must hold a terminal degree in the discipline or field and show clear and convincing evidence of an extensive record of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments in the responsibilities appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of their units. Candidates must have

---

15 Refer to section IV. Evaluation of Faculty for Progression towards Tenure, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review for the definition of quality and significance of scholarship.
gained recognition in their professional, craft or academic field by professional peers or community members external to the institution and demonstrate the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

At the rank of Professor, faculty members must demonstrate the following: a sustained record of excellence in teaching; contributions of high-quality and significance to the professional, craft, or academic field that have gained the recognition of peers or constituencies outside the institution; demonstrated record of effective leadership in University affairs and in a range of professional service activities; and a record of sustained professional growth with the promise for continuing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. In addition, candidates must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities. This will usually be in the area of their primary responsibility, or through their integration of scholarly accomplishments across these components. A candidate’s area of marked strength is one that draws on his or her unique talents to significantly advance the mission or reputation of the unit and institution. Candidates for promotion to Professor must have been previously awarded tenure, or must simultaneously stand for tenure.

Associate Professor. Candidates for initial appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must hold a terminal degree in the discipline or field and show clear and convincing evidence of high-quality and significant scholarly accomplishments in the responsibilities appropriate to their work assignments and the mission of their units. Candidates should demonstrate an emerging level of recognition within their professional, craft or academic field by professional peers or community members external to the institution.

At the rank of Associate Professor, faculty members must demonstrate the following: a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching; high-quality and significant scholarly contributions to the professional, craft, or academic field; high-quality scholarly contributions to the institution through university and professional service; and a strong record of professional growth with the promise for continuing accomplishment of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. In addition, candidates must demonstrate a marked strength in at least one of the components of faculty responsibilities, or through the integration of their scholarly accomplishments across the components, which advances the mission or reputation of the unit or institution. Non-tenured faculty undergoing review for promotion to Associate Professor shall also be reviewed for tenure. Promotion to Associate Professor shall not be made without prior or simultaneous award of tenure.

Assistant Professor. Candidates for initial appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor must hold the appropriate professional or craft certification or terminal degree in the discipline or field and show evidence of achievement, or definite promise (as evidenced by discipline-appropriate expectations as detailed in unit and department level guidelines), of sustained professional
growth and contributions of high-quality and significance\textsuperscript{15} to the professional, craft, or academic field and the University.

Candidates for promotion to Assistant Professor must show clear and convincing evidence of continuous professional growth in producing high-quality and significant scholarly achievements within and among the components of faculty work for which they are responsible. This will include a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching; scholarly contributions of quality and significance to the unit and institution through university service and professional service; and evidence of promise for the continued contribution of high-quality scholarly achievements in both these components in support the mission of the unit and University.

Instructor. Candidates for initial and continuing appointment at the rank of Instructor must hold the appropriate professional or craft certification or terminal degree in the discipline or field and show evidence of, or promise for, sustained professional growth and development of high-quality and significant\textsuperscript{15} scholarly accomplishments in teaching and effective contributions to the unit and institution through a variety of university and professional service activities.

**Definition of Tenure**

The awarding of tenure serves the best interests of the individual and the University’s institutional responsibility to create and disseminate knowledge in a democratic society. The decision to grant tenure to an individual faculty member is one that has an enduring impact on the continuing growth in capacity, achievement, and reputation of the University.

For the individual faculty member, tenure is the acceptance of an on-going obligation to continued scholarly performance and achievement at a high level of professional competency. Tenure is not automatic and is not based on years of service. Therefore, it should not be recommended as a routine matter of course. Rather, tenure shall be granted to those faculty members who have provided evidence that demonstrates a sustained record of high-quality and significant scholarly performance and the promise of long-range contributions to the educational mission, reputation, and quality of the University.

It is the faculty member’s responsibility to establish a case that supports the awarding of tenure. Therefore, a candidate must provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that she or he has met or exceeded\textsuperscript{16} the unit and University criteria for the appointed rank; that this record of scholarly

\textsuperscript{15} The use of “met or exceeded” is not meant to imply a de facto standard that a faculty member must exceed the criteria to be promoted in rank or to be granted tenure. Meeting the established criteria is sufficient.
achievement has contributed to the unit and institutional missions; and that such scholarly accomplishments are likely to continue into the future.

**Consideration of Time in Rank for Mandatory Tenure Review**\(\textsuperscript{17}\)

A faculty member may submit a file and request a review for tenure in any year of service. However, he or she must be reviewed no later than the mandatory year of review. A faculty member evaluated for tenure prior to the mandatory year for review shall be evaluated on the basis of performance expectations that would exist at the time of mandatory tenure review.

Initial appointment to the rank of Professor may be made with or without tenure. Faculty initially appointed to the rank of Professor without tenure shall be reviewed for tenure no later than the second consecutive year of service. Appointment to the rank of Professor may continue beyond the third year only with tenure.

Initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor may be made with or without tenure. Faculty initially appointed to the rank of Associate Professor without tenure must be reviewed for tenure no later than the fourth consecutive year of service. Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor may continue beyond the fifth year only with tenure.

All non-tenured faculty members appointed to a tenure-track position at the rank of Instructor\(\textsuperscript{18}\) or Assistant Professor must be reviewed for tenure no later than the seventh consecutive year of service. Appointments to these ranks may continue beyond the eighth year of service only with tenure.

For the purposes of determining the mandatory year of tenure review, all consecutive years of service, including periods of leave of absence at full salary and sabbatical leave, will be included. Periods of leave of absence at partial or no salary will not be included unless requested in writing by the faculty member and approved at the time the leave is granted by the chancellor or the chancellor’s designee. A partial year of service that includes at least one semester of full-time faculty service may be counted as a full year of service when it has also been used to determine eligibility for any sabbatical leave upon approval by the chancellor or the chancellor’s designee. Periods of officially requested and approved parental, family, or medical leave, whether paid or unpaid, shall be excluded from the determination of the mandatory year for review.

\(\textsuperscript{17}\) The information in this section related to appointment, tenure, and time in rank considerations is summarized from BOR P 04.04. As such, they are subject to change only by action of the UA Board of Regents.

\(\textsuperscript{18}\) Note that UNAC-represented faculty members cannot be in a tenure-track position at the rank of Instructor.
At the time of hire, a faculty member may negotiate up to three years of service from a prior institution be counted toward their faculty service at the University. New faculty hires should be notified of this possibility by their hiring unit administrator. Any prior years of service which are granted should be documented in the faculty member’s initial letter of appointment.

Denial of Tenure

Faculty who are not awarded tenure by the end of their mandatory year of review shall be offered a terminal appointment for one additional year of service. If a faculty member chooses to stand for tenure prior to the mandatory year and the Chancellor’s decision is to deny tenure, the faculty member may continue as a tenure-track faculty member, but may not stand again for tenure prior to the mandatory year.

VI. EVALUATION PROCESS AND REVIEW CYCLE

Introduction

The decision to grant tenure and/or promote a faculty member shall be based on the performance of the work that the faculty member has been employed to do, his or her performance with respect to unit and University expectations for high-quality scholarly accomplishments in accordance with faculty rank, and the broader responsibilities expected of all members of the faculty academic community (see Section III: Faculty Roles and Responsibilities). Although the review for promotion and tenure might happen simultaneously, the awarding of tenure and promotion in rank are two separate actions.

Types of Evaluation

Annual Review. In an academic year or work year in which a tenure-track or tenured faculty member is not scheduled for comprehensive fourth year, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review, the faculty member shall receive an annual review. The faculty member shall submit an Annual Activity Report or Annual Activity File in accordance with the applicable collective bargaining agreement. The evaluation will be completed by the Dean, Director, or designee, of the faculty member’s unit, and in the case of community campus faculty members by the Campus Director or designee. The annual review should evaluate and provide feedback on the faculty member’s performance. Where relevant, the review should include feedback on the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

Note that while these are two separate decisions, non-tenured faculty undergoing review for promotion to Associate Professor shall also be reviewed for tenure. Promotion to Associate Professor shall not be made without prior or simultaneous award of tenure.
Comprehensive Fourth Year Review. During the fourth year of a tenure-track appointment a faculty member shall undergo a comprehensive and diagnostic review by peer review committees, unit administrators, and the Provost. The faculty member may also request that the review proceed to the Chancellor. The purpose of this review is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate’s progress toward tenure and promotion, and to notify him or her of any gaps or areas that need to be strengthened, as well as areas of strength to be sustained and enhanced. Once the faculty member begins the comprehensive review process, he or she may not request that it be converted to a tenure or promotion review. The faculty member is required to submit a Full File for this review (see following section).

Tenure Review. Tenure review is conducted to determine whether a tenure-track faculty member’s work has demonstrated a consistent pattern of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service, as appropriate to his or her appointment, faculty rank, and position. The deciding factor in tenure decisions is whether the faculty member’s scholarly achievements have contributed in sufficiently significant ways to the University mission, so as to merit the right to continuous employment at the institution. The faculty member is required to submit a Full File for this review. The Chancellor makes the final decision on tenure, giving due consideration to the recommendations of the peer review committees and appropriate administrators, and other relevant sources.

Promotion Review. Tenure-track and tenured faculty being considered for advancement in rank shall receive a promotion review. The promotion review is a summative assessment of a faculty member’s scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service, as appropriate to his or her appointment and position. The evidence for this review shall cover the time period since the candidate’s most recent tenure or promotion review was initiated, or since initial appointment to a tenure-track position if there has been no promotion. The deciding factor in promotion decisions is whether the faculty member’s scholarly achievements have met the established unit and University criteria so as to merit appointment at a higher academic rank. For this review, the faculty member will be required to submit a Full File.

Post-tenure Review. Tenured faculty undergo comprehensive post-tenure review periodically in accordance with the relevant CBA. The post-tenure review process should provide formative feedback to faculty to assist their continued development and production of high-quality and significant scholarly achievements. Where applicable, the post-tenure review should assess progress toward promotion. The faculty member will submit a Full File for this review, as described in this document and in the appropriate CBA. A post-tenure evaluation that is unsatisfactory at the conclusion of the review process requires a professional development plan and subsequent review in accordance with the provisions of the applicable CBA.
Faculty represented by UNAC undergo comprehensive post-tenure review by the unit peer committee and the Dean, Director, or designee once every six years. If evaluations by the unit peer review committee and the Dean, Director or designee are satisfactory, the review is complete and proceeds no further. If evaluation by either the peer review committee or the Dean, Director, or designee is unsatisfactory, the review proceeds to the university-wide committee and the provost. The review may proceed to the Chancellor only at the written request of the unit member.

Faculty represented by UAFT undergo comprehensive post-tenure review by the appropriate Dean, Director, or designee once every five years. If evaluation by the Dean, Director, or designee is satisfactory, the review is complete and proceeds no further. If the evaluation is unsatisfactory, the faculty member may request further review by the university-wide faculty review committee and the Provost. At any time prior to a scheduled evaluation, the faculty member’s Dean, Director, or designee may, as a result of other evaluations, initiate the post-tenure review process. A comprehensive post-tenure review may also be conducted upon the written request of the faculty member.

Distinguished Professor Review. A department may initiate the recommendation for the appointment of a faculty member as a University Professor, Distinguished Teaching Professor, Distinguished Research Professor, or Distinguished Service Professor. Such nominations consist of a letter in support of this recommendation, which may be accompanied by other letters written by faculty members and civic leaders. The letters of support should include evidence relative to the specific appointment area of teaching, research, service, or all of these in the case of the rank of University Professor. Nominations are directed to the nominee’s Dean, Director, or Campus Director, who forwards them to the Provost with his or her recommendation. The Provost refers nominations to the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee for its recommendation. The Provost then forwards nominations and recommendations to the Chancellor, who will make the final decision regarding recommendation to the Board of Regents.

Professor Emeritus Review. Faculty retiring from UAA may be nominated by peers or unit administrators for appointment to the rank of Professor Emeritus or Professor Emerita by peers (including faculty retirees and emeriti) or unit administrators. Self-nomination is not appropriate for Emeritus status, but candidates would be expected to provide assistance in developing the dossier. The nominator(s) will submit a dossier providing documentation of scholarly and other achievements across the course of the candidate’s career. The dossier will be reviewed by peer.
review committees, unit administrators, the Provost and the Chancellor. Based on the evidence presented, reviewers will determine whether the candidate has achieved a sustained record of outstanding scholarly and other accomplishments contributing to the mission, reputation, and quality of the University.

At a minimum, the dossier should include the candidate’s curriculum vitae, voluntary and/or solicited letters of support, and selected documentation of accomplishments that define sustained, outstanding performance. Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Broad internal and, when appropriate, external support for the nomination.
- Past reviews that demonstrate consistent performance at or above expectations for the rank of Professor.
- Evidence of actions promoting UAA’s reputation as an institution of quality and distinction.

For purposes of evaluation, a “sustained record of outstanding scholarly accomplishments” means that there is substantial evidence of maturity and growth over time. The record should show significant impact on and relevance to both academy and society, and serve as an example for others. Largely, this determination will be made by peers and administrators at the unit level, where the criteria for “outstanding” will be defined.

**Review Cycle**

Except in the case of a mandatory review, the candidate has the responsibility of notifying the unit Dean or Director, and if applicable the Campus Director, of his or her intent to stand for promotion and/or tenure *in the next academic year*. Notification must be made in writing and before the end of the current appointment period.

A candidate requesting review for tenure may use either the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect during the candidate’s first academic year of service in the tenure-track position, or the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect the year the candidate requests consideration.

A candidate requesting review for promotion may use either the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect during the candidate’s first academic year of service at his or her current tenured or tenure-track faculty rank or after the last comprehensive post-tenure review, whichever is most recent, or the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect the year the candidate requests consideration.

If a candidate requests or is required to undergo simultaneous consideration for tenure and promotion, the candidate must select a single set of criteria.
A candidate undergoing a mandatory comprehensive post-tenure review may use either the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect during the candidate’s first academic year of service after his or her last major review (i.e. tenure, promotion, or comprehensive post-tenure review), or the unit faculty evaluation criteria in effect the year of the required post-tenure review.

Faculty who have questions about the faculty evaluation guidelines, policies, and procedures that apply in their particular circumstance should consult the Office of Academic Affairs.

The candidate must notify the unit Dean or Director, or Campus Director, of his or her decision regarding the selection of evaluation criteria.

a. Annual Review.

Faculty will submit their Annual Review File to the office of the Dean or Campus Director in accordance with the calendar published by the Office of Academic Affairs. The annual review is conducted by the appropriate Dean, Director, or Designee as provided in the applicable collective bargaining agreement.

b. Comprehensive Fourth Year, Promotion, and Tenure Review

Candidates will submit their Full File to the office of the dean or campus director in accordance with the calendar published by the Office of Academic Affairs. The faculty evaluation process will then proceed as follows:

a) Campus Director (for community campus faculty only)
b) Unit peer review committee(s) in accordance with the unit guidelines
c) Dean
d) University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
e) Provost
f) Chancellor (except in the case of Fourth-Year Comprehensive review, which will proceed to this level of review only at the request of the faculty member)

c. Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review

Candidates will submit their Full File to the office of the Dean or Campus Director in accordance with the calendar published by the Office of Academic Affairs.

---

21 The calendar will be established in conformity with the requirements of the Collective Bargaining Agreements between the UAFT and the University of Alaska and between the UNAC and the University of Alaska.
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The faculty evaluation process will then proceed as follows:

a) Faculty represented by UNAC will be reviewed by the unit peer review committee and the Dean, Director, or designee. If these reviews are satisfactory, the review is complete and proceeds no further. An unsatisfactory review by either the peer review committee or the Dean, Director, or designee will proceed to the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Provost. The review may proceed to the Chancellor only at the written request of the faculty member.

b) Faculty represented by UAFT will be reviewed by the appropriate Dean, Campus Director, or designee. If the review is satisfactory, it is complete and proceeds no further. If the review is unsatisfactory, the faculty member may request further review by the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Provost.

**Promotion and Tenure Review Process for Faculty with Joint Appointments**

If a faculty member has a joint appointment with 50% effort assigned to each of two promotion- and tenure-granting academic units, then the faculty member may initiate his or her application for candidacy in either unit. The evaluation review file will be submitted to unit peer review committees and the Dean, Director, or designee for each unit in accordance with the type of review and the relevant CBA. The file is reviewed first in the unit in which the candidate initiated the process. The resulting findings and recommendations will be inserted into the file and provided to the candidate before the file proceeds to the second unit for review by the peer review committee and the Dean. The recommendations by the second unit will be inserted into the file and provided to the candidate before the file proceeds through the remaining levels of review.

For faculty members with a joint appointment that has more than 50% effort assigned to a single promotion- and tenure-granting academic unit, the faculty member must initiate his or her application for candidacy in the unit in which they are assigned the most effort. This unit conducts the review but must include a tenured faculty member from the minority unit as a voting member on the unit peer review committee for the candidate’s file. The file will proceed to both Deans for their respective reviews and then continue through the remaining levels of review.

**Right of Grievance and Complaint**

The candidate will have access to all information used in the evaluation, be notified of all peer committee meetings, and be provided copies of all findings and recommendations. Candidates have the rights of grievance and complaint. They have the opportunity to submit a written
response to the findings and recommendations at each review level for consideration at the next
level of review.

A UNAC-represented faculty member may appeal the final decision of a completed review via the
grievance process or complaint process set forth in the applicable article of the Collective
Bargaining Agreement between the UNAC and the University of Alaska.

A UAFT-represented faculty member may appeal the final decision of a completed review via the
grievance procedure set forth in the applicable article of the Collective Bargaining Agreement
between the UAFT and the University of Alaska.

Full and Abbreviated Files

Candidates need to provide accurate, thorough, and clear documentation of achievements for
review at the departmental, college, and university levels. Faculty members who are candidates
for comprehensive fourth year, tenure, promotion or comprehensive post-tenure review shall
prepare a complete Full File that describes and documents their scholarly achievements in each
of the three components of faculty responsibilities, teaching, academic research or creative
activity, and professional and university service, appropriate to their position and appointment.
Faculty members scheduled for annual review shall submit an annual activity file as specified in
the applicable collective bargaining agreement.

Reviewers at any level of the review process may verify evidence in the file. If reviewers find a
discrepancy in the file, this will be documented in the recommendation.

At the time of his or her response to a review, the candidate may submit additional evidence or
documentation that was not available at the time of submission if it is related to scholarly
accomplishments previously included and documented in the file.

It is strongly encouraged that files be submitted in digital or electronic format. The University is
likewise strongly encouraged to develop an appropriate system for consistently creating and
managing electronic files.

a. Full File

The Full File showcases a faculty member’s scholarly achievements and provides evidence
supporting scholarly accomplishments in the responsibilities of teaching, academic research or

---

22 The concept and description of the Full File and its development has been adopted with significant modifications
from the Retention, Tenure and Promotion Guidelines of the California State University-Monterey Bay.
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creative activity, and professional and university service. The file makes faculty work visible by
creating a coherent narrative for reflecting upon, documenting, and assessing scholarly
achievements in each of these areas. However, in evaluating a faculty member’s scholarly
achievements, it is more important to focus on the criteria of quality and significance than on
categorizing the work or achievement.

Candidates undergoing comprehensive fourth year, tenure, promotion, or comprehensive post-
tenure review shall prepare a Full File that highlights a selective sample of their scholarly work,
with narrative sections that provide context and continuity for the selected materials. The file has
three sections and shall include:

1. A Table of Contents of file sections and all supporting documentation in each section;

2. Section I: Introductory materials, including:
   a) Initial Letter of Appointment, if necessary for documenting prior years of service;
   b) Curriculum Vitae;
   c) Verification of certificates, licenses and degrees (not required for post-tenure review)
   d) Annual Workloads for the period under review, signed by the candidate and the
      appropriate designated administrators;
   e) Annual Activity Reports for the period under review, signed by the candidate and the
      appropriate designated administrators;
   f) Feedback from the appropriate designated administrators in response to the Annual
      Activity Reports for the period under review; and
   g) Copies of findings and recommendations from the most recent annual, comprehensive
      fourth year, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review(s), whichever are applicable.

3. Section II: Self evaluation; and

4. Section III: File sections that describe and document high-quality and significant scholarly
achievements in each of the relevant areas of responsibility of teaching, academic research or
creative activity, and professional and university service.

   a. Within the teaching section of the file, candidates are required to include:
      i. All IDEA student evaluations from the period under review (or for all years of
         service if candidate has been in faculty rank fewer than six years). If no IDEA
         evaluations exist for a given course, than an alternative student evaluation should
         be included. (Candidates should note and explain any missing evaluations or
         assessments,); and;
ii. a selected example of syllabi from each of the courses he or she has taught. In the case of community campus faculty, or others, who have taught more than eight different and separate courses during the review period, selected representational examples should be included to reflect the scope of content and/or disciplinary areas.

b. Documentation should be limited to the period under review, which includes the years since the candidate was hired in a tenure-track position at UAA, or since the last review for tenure and/or promotion.

c. If the candidate was hired with any number of years credited towards tenure or promotion, documentation should be included from those years as well.

b. Annual Review File

Tenure-track faculty scheduled for annual review shall prepare an abbreviated file. The file shall contain:

1. Curriculum Vitae;
2. Brief self-evaluation narrative;
3. Annual Activity Report for the past year;
4. Additional documentation at the discretion of the faculty member.

Candidates may wish to review these guidelines and procedures before preparing their file sections. In addition, prior to their first review, candidates shall attend a training session, offered annually, on how to document their scholarly work, and how reviewers evaluate the diverse kinds of evidence being presented. Candidates are also required to attend a training session prior to subsequent reviews if there have been substantial changes to the faculty evaluation policies and procedures.

c. Descriptions of Full File Elements

Table of Contents and Introductory Materials

The first section of the Full File shall include a Table of Contents of all materials in the file, followed by introductory documents (see previous description) that provide the context for the subsequent descriptions and evidence of scholarly achievements.

Self Evaluation

The Full File shall include an integrative narrative, of no more than five pages, that synthesizes and interconnects the candidate's scholarly achievements within the context of her or his professional goals and aspirations as outlined in the relevant scholarly agenda(s), and the actual
designated responsibilities outlined in the relevant workloads and activity reports for the period under review. Furthermore, the integrative narrative should draw together the sections of the file and tie the faculty member’s scholarship and scholarly achievements during this period to the Department, Unit, and University mission and goals. The candidate should discuss achievements outside of the period of review only for the explicit purpose of demonstrating consistency of performance. Such discussion should be brief. The narrative should emphasize collaborative, interdisciplinary, engaged or integrative activities when these have been a part of the faculty member’s scholarship. It shall also provide an opportunity to reflect on professional growth and accomplishments in accordance with unit and University criteria of high-quality and significant scholarly work for tenure and promotion, as well as the criteria of the appropriate faculty rank that is the focus of the review.

File Sections

The Full File shall include sections describing and documenting selected scholarly achievements in each of the areas of faculty responsibilities – teaching, academic research or creative activity, and professional and university service – as appropriate to the candidate’s position, appointment, and workloads during the period under review. A candidate whose workload agreements during the review period did not include one of the areas of faculty responsibilities (teaching, academic research or creative activity, or service) may nevertheless include a section with documentation regarding scholarly achievements in that area.

Evidence shall consist of carefully selected examples of the candidate’s most accomplished scholarly work, not an exhaustive compilation of materials. Nevertheless, the selections must be sufficient to make it possible to document a consistent pattern of quality scholarly achievement over time. Documentation within each of the file sections shall focus on the quality and significance of the scholarly activity using an appropriate combination of narrative and illustrative materials. It shall focus on documenting the scholarly activities and accomplishments of the individual faculty member rather than on documenting the generalized results of a project or a program. Similarly, in documenting collaborative scholarly work, the faculty member shall focus on his or her personal role and contributions to the collaborative process and outcomes. Candidates are encouraged to highlight scholarly activities which represent integrative, interdisciplinary, collaborative, or engaged work, as well as those activities that make significant contributions to the attainment of department, unit/campus, or University missions or goals.

d. Descriptions of Annual Review Elements

Self-Evaluation
The Annual Review shall include a brief self-evaluation that synthesizes the candidate’s scholarly achievements and contributions in each area of responsibility, in accordance with their workload agreements during the period of review. The self-evaluation shall also summarize progress toward tenure or promotion, where applicable, as well as progress in any areas identified from previous recommendations as needing improvement.

Optional Selected Documentation

The faculty member may, at his or her discretion, include selected evidence to support the self-evaluation. Selected documentation should be kept to a minimum and focus on providing supporting evidence of scholarly accomplishments only in those cases where the curriculum vitae and/or the Annual Activity Reports cannot fully reflect the quality or significance of the scholarly work.

Review and Approval of Changes to University-wide Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures

Any faculty member, administrator, academic unit, administrative unit, or faculty union may propose changes to these guidelines using the following process.

A proposed change is to be submitted in writing to the Provost. The Provost will coordinate a review of the proposed change by the University administration, the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee, and UNAC and UAFT. The Provost will share any suggestions for modifications and other comments with the proposer of the change. A proposed change will be implemented only upon the approval of the Provost, the UAA Faculty Senate, UNAC, and UAFT.

Relationship of Unit Documents to University-wide Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures

The primary responsibility for faculty evaluation decisions related to the hiring, progression towards tenure, tenure, and promotion of faculty members resides in the unit. Therefore, each unit is expected to:

- Establish comprehensive unit-specific evaluation guidelines and procedures for all facets of the faculty evaluation process, including hiring; annual and comprehensive fourth-year reviews; and promotion, tenure, post-tenure, distinguished, and emeritus reviews. Unit guidelines may authorize the development of department and division-level guidelines to ensure the inclusion of disciplinary, craft, or professional perspectives.

---

The UAA Faculty Senate’s University-wide Faculty Evaluation committee is charged with advising the Provost and the Senate on promotion and tenure guidelines.
• Establish unit policies and procedures that ensure the inclusion of community campus faculty representation on peer review committees generally, and for the specific cases where unit committees will be reviewing the file of a community campus faculty member.

• Establish policies and procedures for ensuring that all faculty and administrators who serve as reviewers have received the required mandatory reviewer training in accordance with these guidelines and procedures (see section VII. Roles and Responsibilities of Reviewers).

• Establish performance expectations for each rank. These expectations must conform to University Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures, Board of Regent’s policies, and other relevant governance and regulatory policies and guidelines.

• Ensure that the unit faculty evaluation guidelines conform to the University Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures with special regard to the mission of the University and its regulatory documents; the definition of scholarship; the focus on community engagement in its variety of forms; the responsibilities of faculty; the criteria for assessing the quality and significance of scholarship; and the standard procedures for faculty evaluation. Conforming unit guidelines will use the University-wide aspects of teaching, categories of academic research and creative activity and the categories of public, professional and university service as the basis for amplification and detailing of the range of faculty scholarly work appropriate to the profession, craft, or discipline and unique mission of the unit. Unit guidelines should, for example, define appropriate evidence of academic research and creative activity (such as journal publications or musical compositions), appropriate methods of external review of the evidence (such as peer review or critical review), and appropriate avenues of dissemination for artifacts (such as class A journals or juried exhibitions).

• Develop profiles establishing unit expectations for faculty performance at each rank, including Emeritus, and for post-tenure review in the areas of faculty responsibilities of teaching, academic research and creative activity, and public, professional and university service, with expectations of continuous growth and productivity reflected in the profiles. This must include specific profiles for community campus faculty members, when they are reviewed by the unit. Faculty from the community campuses must be substantively involved in the development of the faculty profiles within the unit, and shall lead the development of the profiles specific to their work. Provide specific examples of acceptable evidence and forms of documentation for each area of faculty responsibilities.

• Submit unit guidelines and procedures through the appropriate Dean to the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee and Provost for review and approval as described below.

Relationship of Departmental Documents to Unit Documents
With unit authorization, a department may develop department-specific guidelines. These
guidelines may include procedures for departmental peer review if the department has a
sufficient number of faculty members to conduct such reviews in a fair, rigorous, and on-going
manner. If a department opts to establish departmental review, the resulting guidelines for
faculty evaluation must be in accordance with and aligned to unit guidelines and University-wide
guidelines. The department will be expected to establish comprehensive
department-specific evaluation profiles and guidelines that parallel those of the unit with respect
to outlining the scope and range of faculty scholarly work; establish profiles of expectations for
rank; and delineate acceptable forms of evidence and documentation appropriate to the
profession, craft, or discipline.

All departmental guidelines must be submitted through the authorizing unit and the appropriate
Dean to the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Provost for review and
approval as described below.

**Review and Approval of Unit and Departmental Documents**

All proposed unit and departmental documents are initiated by unit or departmental faculty and
forwarded through the appropriate route to the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee and
the Provost. Each level may review and comment in writing on the proposed documents.
Any comments will be shared with prior levels of review and the originating unit or department.

The University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee will review the proposed documents and any
comments and recommend approval or disapproval to the Provost. Should the University-wide
Faculty Evaluation Committee recommend disapproval, it will provide the Provost and previous
review levels written reasons for its recommendation. Should the Provost not approve the
proposed documents, the Provost will provide in writing specific reasons for the disapproval and
suggestions for changes needed to obtain approval to all prior levels of review and the
originating unit or department.

Prior to a decision to approve proposed documents, the Provost will share the documents with
the appropriate leadership of the UAFT and UNAC for their review and comment and will
consider those comments in the decision. The UAFT and UNAC will respond to any request for
review in a timely fashion.

The approval of unit and departmental guidelines through the faculty evaluation system supports
the continuity of and adherence to the departmental guidelines by subsequent levels of review
over time and helps ensure conformity to the university-wide Faculty Evaluation Policies and
Procedures guidelines.
VII. ANNUAL WORKLOADS AND ACTIVITY REPORTS

Introduction

Two key documents serve to guide, support, and document the faculty member’s career development and accomplishments: the Annual Workload and the Annual Activity Report. While these two documents are complementary, they are distinct. Together, they strive to balance and guide the complex and necessary interplay between the individual faculty member’s scholarly and professional goals and pursuits and the needs, goals, and mission of the University. When combined with the integrated narrative of the scholarly file, the two documents provide a view of the faculty member’s career plans and goals, short-term work and accomplishment in relationship to those goals, and a view of future steps.

Faculty members may also find the scholarly agenda, described in more detail in Appendix I, to be a useful tool for planning and explaining their work beyond the planning and explanation already represented by their workload, activity report, and self-evaluation. While the use of a scholarly agenda is not required, faculty members who find it useful are encouraged to include it in their review file.

Annual Workload

Individual faculty members shall confer with the department chair, Campus Director or President, or designated administrator in order to prepare the proposed workload. To ensure this workload development process strikes a balance between the individual member’s academic freedom and professional aspirations, and the unit’s operational requirements, it must:
- a. recognize the individual’s career development needs,
- b. respect the diversity of individual faculty interests and talents, and
- c. advance the unit mission and programmatic goals.

The resulting workload should provide the faculty member with the opportunity to meet the established University and unit criteria for progression towards tenure, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review.

24 See the discussion on p. 33.

25 The process for developing and approving the annual workload is detailed in the Collective Bargaining Agreements between the UAFT and the University of Alaska and between the UNAC and the University of Alaska. Faculty members and University administrators should refer to and follow the governing collective bargaining agreement in the development of workloads.
The written and signed Annual Workload serves as the contractual agreement outlining the faculty member’s specific teaching, academic research or creative activity, and public, professional and university service activities expected for the specified time period.

Annual Activity Report

The Annual Activity Report provides a summary of the outcomes of a faculty member’s work in a given year. It is directly connected to and viewed in the context of the Annual Workload.

VIII. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF REVIEWERS AND CANDIDATES

Introduction

A robust faculty evaluation and review process should be conducted in a manner consistent with the application of sound professional judgment within a context of clear policies and delineated criteria of quality and merit. In this way, the process is more likely to result in a shared sense of validity, fairness, and trust with respect to both the process and the outcomes. To this end, all participants, members of peer review committees, academic administrators, and candidates have designated roles and responsibilities.

It is the responsibility of the members of the peer review committees and administrators to adhere to the policies and guidelines for conducting the review; carefully review and evaluate each candidate's file using the appropriate unit and University criteria of quality and merit; and make recommendations regarding progression towards tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review before the recommendation is reviewed and a decision made by the Chancellor.

The candidate under review has the responsibility to adhere to the policies and procedures, including notifying administration of intent (except for mandatory reviews), and developing and submitting a file appropriate to the type for review.

Election and Composition of Peer Review Committees

a. Eligibility

---

26 Review committee members must meet the requirements of the Collective Bargaining Agreements between the UAFT and the University of Alaska and between the UNAC and the University of Alaska.
All department, unit, and University faculty evaluation committees and the Faculty Evaluation Appeals Committee shall be composed of tenured faculty members. Those not eligible to serve include:

- A faculty member who is on an approved leave of absence or sabbatical;
- A faculty member who has been elected to serve, or is currently serving, on a peer review committee at a preceding or subsequent level of review;
- Tenured faculty who are under consideration for promotion;
- A faculty member who has an administrative workload of more than 50%.

On all department, unit, and University faculty committees, only those faculty members who are at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion may vote on the candidate’s file.

The decision of the department, unit, and University faculty committees to recommend or not recommend promotion, tenure, or progression towards tenure must be based on the committee members’ review of the evidence presented in the candidate’s file.

Faculty evaluation committees may determine whether discussions will be open or closed to the public and the candidate. The vote of the peer review committee, however, shall be closed to the public and the candidate.

On all faculty evaluation committees, only faculty members who have completed the required reviewer training within the last four years, or more recently if there has been a subsequent change in the policies and guidelines, are eligible to serve. Any faculty member elected or appointed to a committee who has not completed the training must do so before being seated and commencing any committee activities (see section below).

b. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee

The guidelines establishing the selection process and composition of the University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee (UFEC) shall be determined by the UAA Faculty Senate, subject to the approval of the UAA Chancellor. The process for establishing and revising the guidelines must provide for consultation and approval by the faculty assembly of Prince William Sound Community College.

The University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee has the following responsibilities:

- Review and recommend policies on appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and termination of faculty;
• Review department, division, and unit evaluation policies, procedures, and criteria for consistency with the University policies outlined herein, and make recommendations regarding revisions, and approval/non-approval to the Provost.

• Review the recommendations of the previous levels of review to examine their consistency in applying unit and University guidelines, policies and procedures; and policies;

• Provide a University-wide, institutional-level perspective in the evaluation of faculty under review and make recommendations to the Provost.

Ethical Standards for Reviewers

All persons serving as reviewers, including faculty members and administrators, are expected to conduct themselves according to the ethical standards and guidelines, policies and procedures of the University, as outlined in this and other pertinent policy documents. As faculty evaluation is a key facet in personnel decision-making, the process must be conducted with due diligence to maintain the confidentiality of the candidate and the committees’ deliberations.

Reviewers may not move, remove, or copy any portion of the evaluation review file, including all material submitted by the candidate in the file.

Reviewers must disclose to the committee any potential for conflict of interest in a particular case. Committee members must use due diligence in considering whether recusal is warranted. Conflict of interest disclosures and committee decisions regarding recusal must be included in the committee report of findings and recommendations. The candidate will be informed of the members of their review committees in a timely fashion and may request recusal of a member of a review committee based on possible bias or personal interest in a timely fashion. In the case of a disagreement about the possible recusal of a review committee member, the Provost or designee will make a determination based on the evidence of bias or personal interest presented by the committee member and candidate.

Ethical Standards for Candidates

All candidates standing for promotion and/or tenure, progression towards tenure reviews, and post-tenure reviews are expected to conduct themselves according to the ethical standards and guidelines of the University, as outlined in this and other pertinent policy documents. The faculty evaluation process is a vital component in personnel decisions. Therefore, candidates must ensure that the materials and documents they submit as evidence are factually accurate and fairly represent the scope and outcomes of their faculty work for the period under review.
Mandatory Training of All Reviewers

All persons serving as reviewers, including faculty members and unit administrators, shall attend a training session prior to the first time they serve on any faculty evaluation committee or review faculty files, or if four years or more have passed since the last time they attended training. All reviewers must also attend a training session if there have been substantive changes in policy since their last training. The purpose of the training is to ensure consistent, rigorous, and fair application of unit and University Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures faculty evaluation guidelines across the University, with emphasis on how candidates document their scholarship and how reviewers evaluate the diverse kinds of evidence of scholarly work being presented. The training shall be conducted each fall, will be coordinated by Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate, and will include representatives from UNAC and UAFT.

Continuous Renewal

To ensure the continuous renewal and enhancement of the faculty evaluation processes within the University, each level of review will provide copies of their findings and recommendations, as well as any response made by the faculty member being reviewed to the succeeding level of review and to the levels of review that preceded them in the review process. This will assist each level of review in enhancing its processes, examining and considering evidence, and rigorously, fairly, and consistently applying unit and University criteria for quality and significance of scholarly work. All reviewers are reminded that the material being shared is only to be used for the purposes of conducting the review and normalizing interpretation of review guidelines, policies and procedures and criteria across multiple levels of review.

The entirety of these guidelines, policies and procedures shall be reviewed in four years from their effective date to determine effectiveness. Subsequent review and consideration for revision will be made on a regular basis every six years.
Appendix I – The Scholarly Agenda

A Scholarly Agenda is a faculty member’s proposed program of scholarly work, outlining his or her professional and discipline-based foci, goals, and proposed contributions to scholarship over a three- to five-year period. In this way, the Agenda serves as the foundation for establishing and maintaining a productive and meaningful career. As each faculty member is primarily responsible for planning and guiding his or her own career, the development and enactment of a Scholarly Agenda is an essential and on-going responsibility for all faculty members.

Establishing a Scholarly Agenda provides a faculty member the opportunity to identify and define his or her professional goals and focus of scholarly efforts within the framework of departmental, unit, and University goals and mission. It is not designed to limit or inhibit a faculty member’s academic freedom nor constrain his or her scholarship. Rather, it allows the faculty member to articulate how to direct and develop his or her unique array of talents and expertise. The Agenda, therefore, should be specific regarding aspirations, goals, priorities, and scholarly activities, but not a list of tasks or expected outcomes. Over the course of one’s academic career, one’s scholarly interests, priorities, and relative areas of emphasis evolve and change. For this reason, it is expected that faculty members will revisit and revise their Scholarly Agenda every three to five years.

Upon initial appointment and at regular intervals, each tenure-track faculty member shall develop a Scholarly Agenda that sets forth his or her vision and aspirations for scholarly work during a given three- to five-year period. A Scholarly Agenda should provide the faculty member with a guiding framework from which to continuously chart his or her career, and give explicit voice to these aspirations when negotiating and establishing workloads within the unit. The Scholarly Agenda should engage the faculty member in examining the following considerations:

- What are the current intellectual, creative, craft, or professional practice questions, issues or problems with which I am currently engaged or want to be engaged?
- What are my long-term goals for making contributions to these questions, issues or problems through my teaching, academic research or creative activity, professional or craft practice, community engagement, and professional and university service?
- What are my general responsibilities as a faculty member and what relative emphases should I place upon teaching, academic research, creative activity, professional or craft practice, community engagement, and professional or university service?

27 The concept of the Scholarly Agenda and its development has been adapted and synthesized from Portland State University, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases (1996) and the Retention, Tenure and Promotion Guidelines of the California State University-Monterey Bay.
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How do these scholarly activities relate to and enhance departmental and unit missions and programmatic goals, and the larger University mission?

The resulting Agenda should reflect the unique strengths, talents, and expertise of the individual faculty member and her or his professional development goals and needs. While the Agenda establishes a guiding framework for a three- to five-year period, it should remain flexible and open to change in response to unanticipated opportunities and needs of both the individual and the institution.

Faculty are encouraged to refer to prior reviews and recommendations to identify strengths that should be recognized and advanced, and areas that may benefit from more focused experiences, mentoring or professional development. Once the faculty member has written the Scholarly Agenda, it is shared and discussed with his or her Department Chair, Campus Director or President, Dean, or the respective administrator’s designee, as part of the planning process for establishing the Annual Workload.

Departments and units generally are more effective at accomplishing their wide-ranging missions when they encourage diverse Scholarly Agendas across the membership of the faculty. Therefore, faculty interaction and dialogue should be encouraged so that individual faculty may draw on the shared expertise of departmental or unit peers in the development and refining of Scholarly Agendas. This joint career development process promotes both individual and institutional development, and contributes to the intellectual, academic, professional, craft, and creative climate of the department, the unit, the campuses, and the University.

Primarily, the Scholarly Agenda is developmental, not evaluative. In the faculty evaluation and review process, an individual’s contributions to scholarship should be evaluated in the context of the quality and significance of the work presented for evaluation. While it is included in the Evaluation Review File, the Agenda is intended to provide insight into and context for the individual member’s goals, intellectual interests and connections to departmental and University missions and needs. However, the Scholarly Agenda shall not be considered, nor be construed, as establishing an evidentiary base for evaluation purposes.
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NWCCU Accreditation

Institutional Accreditation Self-Study Kick Off
Friday, September 9, 2016, 9:00 a.m. --12:30 p.m. in LIB 307
What do student learning and student achievement look like at UAA? How do we define student success?

Fall 2015/Spring 2016 Core Theme Indicator Rationale Discussions: The Accreditation Steering Committee Outreach Team held meetings with governance and leadership groups to gather input on how the Core Theme indicators are meaningful and useful to understanding the extent of mission fulfillment. Their input contributed to re-articulating the final rationale for the indicators.

Spring 2016 Core Theme Analysis: The same leadership and governance groups will analyze the indicator data relative to the rationale. They were sent a survey, and their responses will be a component of how UAA understands the extent to which it is meeting its mission.

The groups consulted to date include the Administrative Services Senior Executive Team, Advancement Leadership Team, Community Engagement Council, Diversity Action Council, Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee, Faculty Senate Committee on Research and Creative Activity, Faculty Senate Diversity Committee, Faculty Senate Student Academic Support and Success Committee, Research Council, Staff Council, Student Affairs Leadership Team, and student governance USUAA.

Academic Policy

Academic Dispute Resolution Process Review Task Force: The colleges and campuses have submitted the names of faculty, who will be trained to serve on Final Grade Academic Decision Review committees. There will be an initial training for faculty and administrators on Thursday, May 5th from 9:00 to 1:00 in LIB 307. Please contact the chairs, Professor Terry Kelly in CAS or Professor Dennis Drinka in CBPP with questions. For more information about the Task Force: http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/academicaffairs/Task-Forces-and-Working-Groups/academic-dispute-resolution-process-review-task-force.cfm

Fall 2016 Credit Hour Review: In compliance with the NWCCU and federal regulations, UAA sampled 90 sections across the colleges from the Fall 2016 schedule. Of the sampling of course sections, eight were identified where the required minimum contact hours did not match the scheduled contact hours. Of those, six (6) were found to be in compliance, one (1) was rescheduled to meet the appropriate contact hours, and one (1) was revised to reflect current practice.

Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee
http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/academic_assessment_committee/

Annual Academic Assessment Survey (Deadline: June 15, 2015): The Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee’s Annual Academic Assessment Survey goes live on April 1, 2016. This institutional-level survey captures general information about progress on academic program student learning outcomes assessment, including actions taken to improve student learning. All programs, including those with suspended admissions, must submit a response by June 15, 2016, and the survey is accessed on the AAC’s website https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/academic_assessment_committee/annual_surveys.cfm. Please note
there should be only one response per assessment plan. (Some programs are assessed together according to a shared assessment plan, such as a BA and BS in the same discipline.)

**Annual Program Student Learning Outcomes Reports:** All active programs, i.e. those admitting students, must submit to the dean an annual report on assessment activities, guided by the program's program student learning outcomes assessment plan. Programs often submit a draft report before faculty go off contract in May, and continue faculty discussions in early fall, before finalizing these reports. A new SharePoint site is planned for uploading the reports, and information about this site will be included in OAA's May Faculty Senate report.

**Curriculum Mapping and General Education Workshop Series:** As part of implementing the revised approach to general education assessment, Dan Kline, General Education Director, offered the January 7 CAFE workshop *GER Assessment: From Curriculum Mapping to Shared Assessment.* More than twenty faculty members participated from across the institution, including the community campuses. Dan will facilitate a series of follow-on focused sessions, moving toward the GER assessment pilot this summer. Topics will include common rubrics, moving from assignments to assessment, and gathering student work.

**Academic Assessment Committee Workshop:** The Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee will hold the workshop “Closing the Loop and Telling the Story” on April 15 at 10:00 a.m. in LIB 307.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/25</td>
<td>10:00-11:30</td>
<td>RH 111</td>
<td>GER: Using the Shared Rubric and Designing Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15</td>
<td>9:00-10:00</td>
<td>LIB 307</td>
<td>GER: Gathering and Selecting Student Artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00-11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC: Closing the Loop and Telling the Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>10:00-11:30</td>
<td>LIB 307</td>
<td>GER: Planning for the Summer 2016 GER Assessment Pilot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cyclical Academic Program Review**

**2016 Academic Program Review Status:** The deans submitted their commendations and recommendations to OAA on Friday, March 25. The programs have two weeks to submit any responses to OAA.

**2017 Academic Program Review Schedule:** The Program Review schedule for AY17 is posted at [http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/undergraduate-academic-affairs/program-review.cfm](http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/undergraduate-academic-affairs/program-review.cfm).

**Program Approval Status**

**Program Prioritization:** Colleges are reporting on the effectiveness of activities implementing the decisions relative to the *transform* and *further review* categories.

**University Success Course Committee**

The University Success Course Committee finalized the CCG for a temporary course to be piloted in Fall 2016. The course is *GUID A194 College and University Studies.* The committee charge and minutes from the meetings can be found here: [http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/academicaffairs/Task-Forces-and-Working-Groups/university-success-course-committee.cfm](http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/academicaffairs/Task-Forces-and-Working-Groups/university-success-course-committee.cfm).

**Specialized Program Accreditation**

- The Medical Assisting AAS program was granted continuing accreditation in March.
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- Academic Affairs is responsible for oversight of program accreditation and maintaining a repository of program accreditation communication and documentation. Please allow time for OAA to review materials prior to the submission deadline, and work with the office when you are planning site visit schedules.

**International and Intercultural Affairs**

- **International and Intercultural Partnerships**: UAA recently established international partnerships with University of Tromsø the Arctic University of Norway, the University of Stavanger (Norway) and Iwate University (Japan). The updated list of UAA international partnership agreements can be found on the OAA website Policies & Procedures page at: [https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/academicaffairs/policy-procedures.cfm](https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/academicaffairs/policy-procedures.cfm).
Administration

- **Spring Hooding and Commencement Ceremonies – Apr. 30 and May 1**
  Hooding will be held Saturday, Apr. 30, 3 p.m. in the Wendy Williamson Auditorium. Commencement will take place Sunday, May 1, 1 p.m. in the Alaska Airlines Center. The faculty RSVP page for these spring ceremonies is now open on the commencement website. Please respond by April 22 to assure adequate seating is reserved.

  Regalia is required for both events and may be purchased or rented from the [campus bookstore](#) prior to April 15.

  Faculty lounges and seating will be behind the stage as they were in May 2015. Please wear comfortable footwear as you will be lead downstairs to form the honor aisle during the recessional.

  For more information, please visit the [Commencement website](#).

Alumni Relations

- **College of Health Alumni Night**
  The Health Professionals alumni chapter held a reception for all College of Health alumni on Mar. 22. The event invited alumni back to the state’s health campus to see the new Parrish Bridge, explore the Health Sciences Building and learn more about future opportunities to connect with the Health Professionals chapter.

- **Volunteers Needed for Commencement Weekend**
  Commencement weekend is coming up quickly, and alumni are encouraged to take part. Alumni Relations is currently seeking volunteers to represent their colleges at both the Saturday hooding ceremony on Apr. 30 and at Commencement on May 1.

Development

- **Individual Donors**
  - **Edward and Mary Jane Phelps** contributed at the Leadership Circle giving level ($20,000 or greater) to support Frank and Jennie Clark Memorial Scholarship.
  - **Joseph E. Usibelli and Peggy Shumaker** donated at the Aurora Circle giving level ($10,000-$19,999) to the Eva Saulitis Endowment Scholarship.

- **Corporate and Foundation Gifts**
  - **Wells Fargo** pledged $180,000 to support the Building Futures fund for Seawolf Athletics and donated $10,000 to Lemonade Day Alaska.
  - **Providence Health & Services Alaska** donated $70,000 to support PWSC’s healthcare related learning programs and careers in the Valdez area.
  - **Alaska Kidney Foundation** donated $40,404.040 to award Alaska Kidney Foundation Scholarships.
  - **LGL Alaska Research Associates** donated $15,000 to the LGL Alaska Graduate Ecology Research Award.
**Phonathon Program**

Now in its 12th year, the UAA Student Phonathon started calling alumni the week of September 20, 2015, with a fundraising goal for fall semester of $81,500 and for spring semester of $48,000. We successfully raised $77,800 in the fall and are well on our way this spring with a total to date of $33,025.00 from 405 donors.

Many donors are understanding the plight of our students financial and tuition concerns and are generously giving to the UAA General Scholarship fund. The UAA’s General Scholarships consider all students who apply, regardless to their specific degree program and in the past 4 years has given out over $65,000 in awards to eligible students. Phonathon is pleased that this has shown to be one of our most successful scholarship funds in the call center.

---

**University Relations**

**Advertising**
- Amazing Stories ads currently running include Dispatch [online video ad featuring USUAA president Jonathon Taylor](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=example).
- Ads in the works include a recruitment print ad in a teen-geared 61 Degrees magazine and two general recruitment television spots.

**CMS Migration** - [UAA’s homepage gets a new student-centric look March 28](https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/)

What’s next?

On their own schedule, web authors and administrative assistants are updating the still-private, migrated sites. Units inform IT when they are ready to go live and IT flips their pages in the new CMS.

Open work sessions on the new CMS are scheduled every Friday (except April 1) from 8:30-11:15 a.m. in Beatrice McDonald Hall (BMH) Room 232. Web authors can work alone, collaborate with other CMS authors, and also get guidance from an expert experienced in the new CMS.

All units will go live no later than June 30, 2016.

**Hashtags**
- Share photos, posts, thoughts and school spirit via social media - #UAA, #UAAmazing, #SeawolfNation and #Seawolfinit

**Media**
- UAA has been mentioned in more than 500 news stories (excluding athletics coverage) in March. Some highlights include:
  - The majority of opinion columns and letters to the editor in the Alaska Dispatch News have favored the university. Those writers included: Orson Smith, professor emeritus; Marian Elliott, UAA alumna and retired elementary school teacher; Dermot Cole, Dispatch columnist; Dan Kline, UAA English professor; and AEDC board members James Hasle, Marilyn Romano, Raquel Edelen and Michael Prozeralik.
  - The Justice Center’s sexual violence study received thorough Alaska media coverage and some national coverage.
o ISER (particularly Gunnar Knapp) continues to be No. 1 expert source on Alaska economy cited in Alaska and national stories, including MSN.com.

o Average snowfall map created by Brian Brettschneider featured on WashingtonPost.com.

- Social Media
  o Facebook: 14,533
    
    Facebook Campaigns
    o Pick.Click.Give,
    o UAA Amazing Stories: Jonathon Taylor (video)
    o Stalking the Bogeyman (video)
    Each campaign has performed well, but the two video campaigns collectively have reached more than 77,000 followers and earned more than 37,000 video views.

  o Twitter: 4,956
    
    Facebook/Twitter: Top posts
    o UAA Women’s Basketball team heading to the National Title game
    o Seawolf Weekly: Student and alumna partnership to bring local produce to campus
    o Mongolian student traveling to UAA to earn her civil engineering degree
    o UAA community members named in the Alaska Journal of Commerce’s Top 40 Under 40
    o Q&A with student body president Jonathon Taylor
    Seawolf weekly stories on social media this month earned a total follower reach of more than 22,000 and more than 500 engagements.

  o Instagram: 1,570
    
    Instagram: Top Posts
    o Video 1: Dog mushing on campus
    o Video 2: Friday snow
    Video is a top performer on Instagram and as our audience continues to grow they are becoming more engaged with our content.

  o LinkedIn: 30,760
    
    LinkedIn: Top Posts
    o UAA’s 1+1 program
    o Al and Ann Parrish bridge dedication
    o Alaska Budget discussion with Gunnar Knapp
    o Top 40 Under 40
    o Robots
    LinkedIn’s follower numbers are always high, partly because of LinkedIn’s algorithm of adding people to pages based on their interests, but despite the head start, the UAA LinkedIn community is highly engaged and this month’s top stories garnered a reach of more than 21,000.

Community total: 52,088
Total monthly growth: 2.04%
• Storytelling
  o Top 15 Green & Gold stories from the past 30 days:
    o Bridging Al and Ann Parrishes’ two worlds 1,331 views
    ISER’s Gunnar Knapp explains the Alaska budget gap in minutes 1,234 views
    o 2016 ’Top Forty Under 40’ includes 12 with UAA ties 880 views
      What to know about Senshido 788 views
    o UAA student, alumna offer local veggies on campus 615 views
    o Agreement offers chemical engineering degree for Alaskans 419 views
  o March HOMETOWN NEWS columns in the Alaska Dispatch News
    o Hometown U: Bringing robots home (3-6-2016)
    o Hometown U: Does corporate responsibility pay? An experiment (3-13-2016)
    o Hometown U: Physics, from intro to theoretical at warp speed (3-20-2016)

# # #
Two new Student Affairs Assessment reports are now available online (click on the UAA Reports tab): https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/studentaffairs/assessment/past-assessment-projects.cfm.

SAAT First Year Experience Interview Project Report:
The Division of Student Access, Advising and Transition (SAAT) seeks to continually improve the first year experience for students at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA). An interview project was conducted with first-year and second-year students to gain deeper insight into students’ individual perceptions, investigate how students experience their transition into the university, and explore factors that positively and negatively affect their first-year experience. Individual interviews with were conducted in March 2015 with 15 UAA students during which approximately nine hours of conversation was documented.

UAA Academic Advising Student Experience Survey:
This survey focuses on capturing the student voice to ensure quality and consistent academic advising across advising centers. Findings are based on the 518 responses to the UAA Academic Advising Student Experience Survey (response rate = 12.4%). The survey was administered to participants of 4,167 academic advising appointments recorded through either UAOnline iAdvise or Banner between October 26 and December 4, 2015.

On March 10, a group of 25 student affairs staff participated in a webinar entitled “A Data Driven Approach: Measuring & Demonstrating the Impact of Student Affairs” and a discussion regarding strategies for effectively providing evidence of student learning outside of the classroom and the impact of Student Affairs programs. These conversations perpetuate Student Affairs’ culture of evidence to measure and assess annual goals, support the student affairs student outcomes, and assist students to articulate the learning and development occurring through their co-curricular experiences and the connections with their academic coursework. Resources from this event can be found on the Advancing Staff Excellence website: https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/studentaffairs/advancingstaffexcellence/index.cfm.

Student Affairs now invites all UAA faculty and staff to participate in the ‘Did You Know?’ email campaign. Two days each week, the Student Affairs’ Assessment Team (A-Team) publishes facts and figures about divisional efforts and the UAA student experience through the ‘Did You Know?’ email campaign. The A-Team launched ‘Did You Know?’ in January 2015 to facilitate the sharing of assessment data and provide Student Affairs staff with regular, digestible assessment data and resources related to student affairs programs, campus resources and the student experience. Visit the SA Assessment website for more information on how to subscribe or new the archive: https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/studentaffairs/assessment/past-assessment-projects.cfm.

The Student Affairs Annual Gathering has been scheduled for Tuesday, May 3, 2016 from 11:30 am – 1:30 pm.
Registration for fall semester is here! Are your students Registration Ready? Whether they are in a class you teach, or advise, or are a student employee – ask them. If they are not ready – point them toward Enrollment Services and we will get them ready to register on time in April.

The fall 2016 schedule became viewable on March 21, and students could immediately use Schedule Planner. Priority Registration begins April 1 for graduate students and continues: Seniors April 4; Juniors April 3; Sophomores April 6; and Freshmen April 7. New students in the admission process can register April 11 and open registration for all students begins April 18.

Every office in Enrollment Services is engaged in the Registration Ready Campaign – focused on clearing barriers students have to registering in April. Each office’s action is noted below.

**Admissions**
Registration Ready – has phoned all students that still have missing documents for their spring application for admission. Submission of those documents opens fall registration for them and allows financial aid to be disbursed if they are an aid applicant.

Implementation of the Customer Relationship Management software for Admissions and New Student Recruitment is progressing well. The interface between the CRM and Banner has been established and tested. Project Manager Cathy Ewing is working with Institutional Research to design reports that will be easily accessible, providing meaningful data for everyone involved in recruitment, admissions, and matriculation of new students. The new application for admission and the student portal are nearing completion of “first drafts” and have integrated UAA’s brand and website style.

**Office of the Registrar**
Registration Ready – has contacted and cleared all students with registration holds for missing information, and has hosted several events to increase student awareness and use of helpful tools such as Degree Works and Schedule Planner.

The fourth annual Degree Works pizza party was held March 9 with 214 students in attendance. Similar to past events, students were lined-up and eagerly awaiting the event before the doors opened.

Schedule Planner and Early Registration Awareness events on March 21 and 22 were attended by about 350 students. Additional events to promote early registration and Schedule Planner are taking place in March. They include meetings with advisors and presentations at student housing, ANSEP, and a Registration Brown Bag.

**Student Financial Assistance**
Registration Ready – cleared all students in verification, allowing spring aid to pay. Staff are also contacting students with an unpaid balance that are also aid eligible to help them through the aid process so they can pay their balance and register.

Student Financial Assistance continues to promote high impact practices and incorporate assessment. This year a work-study student and senior English major designed and led workshops to assist students in writing scholarship essays and aid with the application process. Early findings suggest a marked improvement in the quality and clarity of essays from workshop attendees compared to non-attendees. Tutelage included working with rubrics, targeting appropriate audience, focused statements and grammatical conventions.

**Military and Veteran Student Services (MVSS)**
MVSS is actively recruiting veteran students to serve as peer mentors through our VA Work Study Program. These more senior/experienced students will serve as mentors to our new military and veteran students.

**Student Information**
Registration Ready – is contacting over 1,945 students with holds prohibiting registration for next fall and providing them the information they need to clear the hold.

The Office of Student Information participated in three Kids2College presentations to Title IV elementary schools in Anchorage. It was meaningful service in our community that will help younger students set their sights on higher education.
On March 25, Student Access, Advising and Transition held their spring division-wide meeting. The meeting was focused on professional development and the staff developed ten guiding principles for professionalism. Staff reflected about what it means to value others and empower themselves, each other, and students to reach their greatest potential.

Academic Advising & Career Development (AACD)
Career Development co-sponsored Career Networking Nights with UAA’s Global Logistics Association on March 3 in the Den. Students networked with employers in a relaxed, educational setting on campus. The We’re Hiring Fair will be held on April 7 in the Student Union from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Career Development will be hosting over 40 companies/organizations that are offering full-time, part-time, seasonal, and internship opportunities for UAA students.

Native Student Services (NSS)
In collaboration with the Bering Straits School District (BSSD), Native Student Services (NSS) will be coordinating an early registration for 21 graduation seniors. With funds provided by the Norton Sound Economic Development Corporation (NSEDN), these First-Time Fall Semester Freshmen will be flown to Anchorage during the third and fourth week of April for an on-site advising and registration.

New Student Orientation (NSO)
Howl Days (orientation for new students) begins its new season with the first event scheduled for Thursday, May 12.

New Student Recruitment (NSR)
Office of New Student Recruitment hosted a table at the Alaska Airlines Center for the state high school basketball games. With 5,000 people in attendance each day for the two weekend series UAA was visible by a high number of people. Rural Alaska turned out in force to cheer on teams from Anaktuvuk Pass, King Cove, Noorvik, Ninilchik, Scammon Bay, Newhalen, Buckland, and Nikolaevsk to name a few.

UAA TRiO Programs

Educational Opportunity Center (EOC)
Educational Talent Search (ETS)
Student Support Services (SSS)
Educational Talent Search staff, Project Director Megan Tompkins and Educational Advisor Kelly Foran, presented at the Alaska Postsecondary Access and Completion Network 2016 Conference March 22-23 in Anchorage. Their topic was “Building Self-Sufficiency and Confidence During the Transition to College.”
Dean of Students Office: Student Conduct; Alcohol, Drug, and Wellness Education; and Care Team

The Care Team Coordinator presented at the Club Council March meeting to outline the Care Team referral process so as to increase student/peer referrals.

The Care Team supported a movie presentation regarding Adverse Childhood Effects called *Paper Tigers* sponsored by the Alaska Children’s Trust, Anchorage Suicide Prevention Coalition, College of Education and the Multicultural Center.

Continuing the weekly Care Team Book Club in partnership with Commuter Student Services Daily Den Activities on Thursday Afternoons.

Continued work on the Statewide Behavior Intervention and Threat Assessment Coalition is moving forward on the conference featuring Brian Van Brunt, Ed.D; from the National Association for Behavior Intervention Teams (NaBITA) to present a two day training on forming, growing, and managing Behavior Intervention Teams and how to conduct a Threat Assessment in the Spring of 2016.

Multicultural Center (MCC)

On Friday March 4, MCC collaborated with the UAA College of Education and Alaska Children’s Trust to host a screening of the film *Paper Tigers*. Approximately 40 participants viewed the film, which featured six high school students who overcame Adverse Childhood Experiences by attending a school that implemented innovative techniques that treated the student, rather than the behavior.

The MCC recently completed their Mid-Term Nights of Achievement study halls March 7 – 10, sponsored by the Anchorage Alumni Chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity who provides food for the study halls.

The AHAINA Men and Women of Excellence Program is scheduled for Saturday, April 2 from 11:00 am – 1:00 pm at Lucy Cuddy Hall. This event allows students who have earned at minimum 3.0 GPA and between 60 – 90 credits to compete for the Man and Woman of Excellence Award that will be announced at this event.

Commuter Student Services (SU&CSS)

Coordinated UAA's annual spring semester celebration of WinterFest. Events Included:

The USUAA “Light it Up” laser dance comedy show with Demetri Martin, *The Northern Light* Light App release party, and Banff Film festival.

USUAA worked with the Chancellor’s office to present “Chat with the Chancellor” which featured the UAA Cabinet answering questions from students, faculty, and staff. Approximately 125 people attended the program in the Student Union Den.

Two all-student staff training sessions were held this month. The topics were “Taking Initiative” and “Customer Service.”

*The Northern Light* sent a reporter and photographer to the Women’s Basketball Division II Elite Eight playoffs in South Dakota. Plans are underway to send reporters to Indianapolis to cover the final championship game.

The Student Union was the site for the Alaska Gaming Convention, the Mapworks Appreciation reception, numerous meetings and workshops. The Union Station coffee shop has instituted a customer survey – access is available through the customer’s receipt.

Upcoming Events:

- Kentucky Derby Social: April 1
- USUAA Student elections April 5 & 6
- Greek Week: April 4 – 9
- Commuter Student Appreciation Week: April 4 – 8
- Student Showcase: April 7 – 8
- Juried Student Art Exhibit opens April 13
- Blues Night: April 15

Student Life & Leadership (SL&L) and Student Union &
To: Tara Smith, President – Faculty Senate
From: Pat Shier, CIO/Associate Vice Chancellor for ITS
Date: March 28, 2016
Subject: Second Spring 2016 Faculty Senate Report

Spring 2016 Information Technology Changes and Events

Executive Summary

Budget considerations are driving change for IT Services (ITS), just as in every other department. Areas of focus are Computer Labs, Audio Visual Services, Desktop Support Services and telecommunications. ITS is experiencing significant increased demand as departments seek to automate or innovate in response to budget pressures. In order to meet this new demand, we are working with customers to re-think almost every aspect of our current service portfolio. In some cases it means accelerating reform efforts already underway. In some cases it means considering which services cannot be continued or must be curtailed in favor of other more pressing needs.

1. The number and character of PC labs is unsustainable. We have over 1,200 end-user devices across the campuses - many of which receive little attention from users and support staff. We are still gathering information. Look for a more detailed report in the next edition.

2. UAA uses about 16,000 hours of Video Conference Service per academic year. Did you know that there are about 100 Video Conference rooms across UAA, representing over 52,000 hours of useable Video Conference time? The cost for each minute is about $.80 – far above benchmarks. This does not include any budget for keeping the 100 or so rooms up to date or maintain the software needed to assure good service. More, ITS is still receiving requests to add more equipment to the Video Conference network. And yet, we are seeing a great increase in demand for these services as a method to reach more students. We are continuing to meet with requestors in order to match needs with appropriate technology, including alternatives to traditional Video Conference services.

3. We are re-imagining how we dispatch a variety of services, right down to the number and kind of vehicles needed to transport computing equipment, and cross-training staff and student workers in anticipation of having fewer specialists available to answer service calls.
4. **OU Campus – New CMS.** In addition to the departments that have already moved, you will notice a new look and feel in these pages:
   a. [https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/directory.cshtml](https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/directory.cshtml) New Directory page
   b. [https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/a-to-z.cshtml](https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/a-to-z.cshtml) New A-Z search page
   c. [https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/](https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/) New UAA home page

Students and parents use web pages to make enrollment decisions. There remains a great deal of work to transition the thousands of web pages and related content. Most departments will have to rely on additional outside help in one form or another. ITS has enlisted a number of student workers to assist. Please make this transition a priority for your department. Delays in transition mean your web pages are not mobile friendly, lack modern web analytics and other tools, and make it necessary to support both the old and the new systems – with duplicated support costs – longer than necessary. Training sessions for the new tool is scheduled continuously and advertised on the ITS web site.

**Keeping Existing Services Operating**

1. We are still waiting to hear more from OIT about the implementation schedule. Most locations should be able to connect to the new bandwidth simply. Some will require addition of new equipment or trenching-in new fiber connections.

**Clearing the Decks (minor changes from prior report – in red.)**

1. ITS remains in the area of >98% effort supporting and remediating existing systems. Best practice for day to day operations is in the neighborhood of 65-70%, with the balance invested in innovation.
2. We remain concerned about the absence of true fail-over resiliency in some systems, and continue to investigate options, such as Software as a Service (SaaS) delivery, in concert with user groups.
3. Mailbox Overload: attached is a draft description of an email archiving strategy that will provide real $$ savings to UAA in terms of avoided costs for added storage space. Please read this important proposal and share it with your constituents. ITS received helpful feedback from members, and all plans will be vetted through existing UA document retention policy.

**What Do We Already Own? (unchanged – but vital information. Please review.)**

1. Several departments and IR have lead the way in applying the new Office 365 software suite to existing challenges that would have required additional software purchases. One large research grant project is hosted almost entirely in the Office 365 UAA cloud. Please contact me directly if you would like to learn more about this secure, valuable service we already own. [http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/informationtechnologyservices/office-365.cfm](http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/informationtechnologyservices/office-365.cfm)

2. Voice Mail alternative; Lync services and Skype for Business (Reprise) Remember, you can have all your voice mails delivered as sound files to your email inbox. It is easy to listen to them on your smartphone, PC/Mac or tablet. Also – there is likely no need for your department to spend any money on web conferencing software or licenses such as Citrix Go To Meeting, WebEx, Jabber or Skype. Note that Skype was acquired by Microsoft and has been combined with Lync, thus providing us with “Skype for Business.” Skype for Business is a very capable service we already own, accessed from your desktop using your UAA credentials and password. We can help you discover how to use it, and also trouble-shoot any problems you may experience. Here is a link to the UAA Skype for
(Did you know you can record Skype for Business sessions?)

Pat Shier, CIO/Associate Vice Chancellor
CAFE’s Associate Director and Director of UAA’s Difficult Dialogues initiative, Libby Roderick, presented a workshop at the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education conference in mid-March. Approximately 100 university leaders responsible for ensuring diversity, inclusivity and equity attended the session and over 50 (including the U.S. Undersecretary of Education Ted Mitchell) requested additional UAA faculty development materials on the subject.

In partnership with the Varsity Sports Grill and UAA Conferences and Catering, CAFE launched a new faculty mixer series designed to build community and provide cross-disciplinary networking opportunities for faculty. The first event, held at the Grill, drew approximately 50 people. A second faculty mixer is scheduled for April 15, 3:30-5:00, at the Varsity Sports Grill. Future mixers may be held that focus on specific faculty cohorts, such as international faculty, research faculty, etc.

CAFE has continued to support UAA’s ongoing efforts around the General Education Requirements assessment through ex officio participation in the GERA Task Force and promotion of sessions led and sponsored by Dan Kline (Director of General Education), Susan Kalina (Vice Provost of Undergraduate Academic Affairs), and the Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee.

In support of the new Office of the Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Alaska Native and Diversity Issues, CAFE handled registration logistics for a National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI) training for students on prejudice and discrimination reduction in late February. We are continuing to interface with Jeane Breinig’s office to support these kinds of sessions in the future, including those focused on faculty.

CAFE staff has continued to interface with the Faculty Senate Diversity Committee in support of their work, particularly related to mentoring and support of international and intercultural faculty.

On March 25, CAFE joined with Faculty Services and the Senior Associate Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences to offer the annual session on Promotion and Tenure, as well as a session on submitting P & T files electronically. Both sessions were recorded and will be made available to faculty who missed or would like to revisit the sessions.

At their request, CAFE has offered workshops for Biology Department post docs on professional development pathways, active learning, and inclusive approaches to teaching and learning.
The faculty writing group working from the book *12 Weeks to Your Journal Article* led by Professor Ray Ball continues to go well. Participants report feeling supported in their scholarly writing efforts.

The Making Learning Visible Scholarship of Teaching and Learning cohort is advancing, with 9 of 11 participants making exceptional progress on their projects. Three of these will be featured at CAFE’s April 1 Faculty Development Awards and Celebration.

Academic Innovations and eLearning’s next cohort of Tech Fellows will have a focus on Making Learning Visible, with a requirement for developing a scholarship of teaching and learning inquiry project. CAFE’s MLV Faculty Associates partnered with AI&e to develop the RFP for Tech Fellows and participated in the selection of participants for the next two year cycle.

On April 8, Sandra Ehrlich-Mathiesen, a faculty member in the College of Business and Public Policy, and Caroline Wilson, WWAMI, will be offering a session on effective instructor facilitation skills that are necessary for Team-Based Learning and other “flipped” learning environments.

CAFE has continued to coordinate the Conversations with the Provost series. Multiple faculty cohorts (general faculty; new faculty; recently promoted/tenured faculty; faculty with 15+ years at UAA; and sessions for all faculty) have connected with Provost Gingerich for candid conversations on a range of issues. The next session will be the evening of April 13. Though this session is directed toward adjunct and term faculty, it is open to other faculty members who may not yet have attended another session.

---

The Center has our end of the year Community Engagement Forum on Friday, April 22nd, from 2-4:30 pm. The first hour is the awards and acknowledgements of faculty, students, and community partners over this past year, followed by refreshments and a poster session.

The Selkregg Award winner will be announced at the Community Engagement Forum from 2:00-3:00 pm. Eight faculty applications were received from across the curriculum: English, Engineering, Human Services, History, Psychology, Journalism & Communication, Education-Teaching & Learning, and ISER. The selected faculty will receive the $5,000 award. Kathryn Ohle, the 2015 Selkregg winner, is continuing to have children’s books translated into Alaska Native languages and placed in the hands of children. She is beginning to do research on how the books are used, and she is positioned to apply for a larger grant to have larger print runs for printed books in addition to the electronic versions available through Unite For Literacy. A short video of Dr. Ohle’s project will be shown at the Community Engagement Forum.

Approximately 25 Community Engaged Student Assistants (CESAs) will display posters of their work supporting faculty and their community partners this year at the Poster Session following the Community Engagement Forum on April 22nd. The Poster Session will be from 3:00-4:30 with refreshments in the atrium area outside of LIB 307. The posters will be moved to the first floor of the library that afternoon and will be on display through April 29th.
A faculty group for Community Engaged Research & Scholarship has been meeting throughout the year to write articles on community engagement at UAA from multiple perspectives for a special issue journal. We have interest from the Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship for their Fall and Spring issues in 2016-17, to publish accepted articles in two segments with a footnote linking the two.

The Faculty UAA Community Engagement Council continues to meet monthly and to work on assessment plans for community engagement across the curriculum as well as accreditation data for Core Theme 5 “Public Square.” As requested by Faculty Senate, Clare Dannenberg and Christy McDowell, two Council members, will be completing an assessment project of our course designation for community-engaged and service-learning courses in late spring and early summer. Christy McDowell will take over the Chair position of the Council for 2016-2018 from Deborah Periman, who has served as Chair for the past two years. Irasema Ortega will be the Chair-Elect.

Planning is underway for a May Faculty Intensive for Community Engaged Teaching & Scholarship for the week of May 9-13. Specific information will be announced soon.

ACADEMIC INNOVATIONS & eLEARNING

Professional Development:
- The professional development monthly focus topic for March was on “ePortfolios”. In April we will spotlight “Inclusivity”, including inclusive design, accessibility and cultural considerations.
  - Workshops
    - April 6, 2016: Creating Accessible Documents for Online Course Design
    - April 12, 2016: Universal Design for Learning in Higher Education
    - April 15, 2016: Moving to the new Refworks-webinar

Academic Technologies:
- Summer 2016 courses were successfully loaded into Blackboard.
- The annual Blackboard course purge will take place on April 15, 2016.

ePortfolios:
- We have secured guest speakers John Ittelson and Joan Watson for the eWolf annual two-day intensive training scheduled for May 5-6, 2016.
- Wrap-up for the promotion and tenure pilot is on the horizon. Next steps are examining/understanding what enhancements are needed.
- Early discussions are being held, led by Diane Hirshberg and supported by the Provost, to examine how the portfolio could be used to support annual activity reporting (AAR).
- UAA Faculty work will be highlighted in AAEEBL's (http://www.aaeebl.org/) ePortfolio Field Guide.
- The 2016 AHAINA Scholarship process, “powered” by eWolf, is complete.
ACADEMIC INNOVATIONS & eLEARNING (continued)

Title III
- Administrative structure and processes are mostly complete. The Steering Committee has been identified and will meet this month.
- Introduction to Student Affairs leadership team is complete; we are beginning introductions to individual areas of student affairs.
- Working with Alaska Native Studies (AKNS) on orientation modules for students to allow them to transition smoothly to university.
- Research and relationship building around cultural responsiveness in online learning and student affairs is begun.
- Work has begun on Online Master Course (OMC) model.
- Extensive work on designing the Innovation Design Studio has begun.

Instructional Design Services:
- UAA Instructional Designers as a group continue concrete efforts on developing a collective resource repository and collaborative efforts to reduce duplication and isolation.
- Instructional Design workflow reached benchmark of first full draft and continues in development.

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

- Institutional Research has continued to expand its SharePoint site. Tools available include those for section and budget management, enrollment monitoring, and completion information. For questions, concerns, or a virtual tour of the data, please contact Erin Holmes at ejholmes@uaa.alaska.edu.

BOOKS OF THE YEAR

- Books of the Year Art Exhibit: "Identities." Students in Dr. Herminia Din's ART 491 course are developing an art show inspired by the 2015 - 17 Books of the Year theme, "Negotiating Identity in America." Students curate the exhibit with their own work and design all promotional materials including a final professional quality catalogue of the exhibit. The show will be held on the third floor of the UAA / APU Consortium Library from March 28 – April 8. An opening reception, in which students will present their pieces and reflections on the overall project, will be on Friday, April 1 from 5:30 – 7:30 pm. Please plan on attending to support the students' efforts and talents.