

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral
312 Signers' Hall
474-7964 FYSENAT

For Audioconferencing: Bridge #: 1-800-910-9680
Anchorage: 561-9680

A G E N D A
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #67
Monday, November 11, 1996
1:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.
Wood Center Ballroom

1:30	I	Call to Order - Don Lynch	5 Min.
		A. Roll Call	
		B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #66	
		C. Adoption of Agenda	
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
		A. Motions Approved:	
		1. Motion to approve the AAS in Apprenticeship Technology.	
		2. Motion to amend the Associate of Arts requirements.	
		B. Motions Pending: none	
1:40	III	Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow & Provost Keating	10 Min.
		Questions	5 Min.
1:55	IV	Guest Speaker - April Crosby Assistant to the President University of Alaska Learning Cooperative	10 Min.
2:05	V	Governance Reports	
		A. ASUAF - C. Wheeler	5 Min.
		B. Staff Council - R. Pierce	5 Min.
		C. President's Report - D. Lynch (Attachment 67/1)	5 Min.
		D. President-Elect's Comments - J. Craven (Attachment 67/2)	5 Min.
2:25	VI	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:30	VII	Old Business	
		A. Motion to continue tabling of the Withdrawal/ No Basis grade issue until the December 9, 1996 face-to-face meeting, (Attachment 67/3), submitted by Curricular Affairs	5 Min.
		*****BREAK*****	5 Min.
2:40	VIII	New Business	
		A. Motion on when basic Core skills courses are accomplished (Attachment 67/4), submitted by Core Review	5 Min.
		B. Motion to eliminated registration signature requirement for continuing Graduate Students (Attachment 67/5), submitted by Graduate Curricular Affairs	5 Min.
		C. Motion to amend Section 3 (ARTICLE V: Committees) E., PERMANENT, 8. of the Bylaws (Attachment 67/6), submitted by Faculty Appeals & Oversight	5 Min.

- | | | | |
|------|----|---|---------|
| | D. | Resolution to recommend that returning faculty (after sabbatical leave) participate in the Faculty Seminar Series (Attachment 67/7) - R. Seifert | 5 Min. |
| | E. | Motion to amend Section 3 (ARTICLE V: Committees) A., of the Bylaws (Attachment 67/8), submitted by Administrative Committee | 5 Min. |
| | F. | Motion to appoint an ad hoc committee to study the structures of faculty governance at universities in which faculty are unionized (Attachment 67/9), submitted by Administrative Committee | 5 Min. |
| 3:10 | IX | Committee Reports | 30 Min. |
| | A. | Curricular Affairs - Maynard Perkins
(Attachment 67/10) | |
| | B. | Faculty Affairs - Dave Spell | |
| | C. | Graduate Curricular Affairs - Mark Tumeo
(Attachment 67/11) | |
| | D. | Scholarly Activities - Ron Barry | |
| | E. | CNCSHDR - Rudy Krejci | |
| | F. | Developmental Studies - Ron Illingworth | |
| | G. | Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Diane Bischak
(Attachment 67/12) | |

The idea of looking at a common grading system for all three Campuses reflects one result of these pressures. The faculty alliance has a committee working on this, as is our curricular affairs committee.

We are also being told to increase student retention and so deliver our courses so that students can graduate in four and a half years. This is part of being student friendly. Changes in policies regarding advising, etc., are related to this objective.

I am told that the Banner Program may be able to enforce pre-requisites. Therefore, each department should examine its pre-requisite requirements and be sure they remain valid. Enforcement, without advising, means that a student might be denied permission to enroll without, perhaps, any of us realizing it.

A subcommittee of the Board of Regents Academic Affairs Committee met by teleconference with the State Board of Education Nov. 4th. The purpose was to determine those areas in which the two had sufficient common interests to present a united front. The area highlighted in what I heard was developmental studies. According to President Komisar, preliminary data indicate that about 3,000 students are enrolled in developmental studies, and of these about half are fairly recent high school graduates. The establishment and enforcement of educational standards in the high schools, and subsequently at the University, may help alleviate the circumstance in which Alaskan high school graduates are not able to do college work. One thought is to make the transition from high school to college "seamless."

The minutes from the September 20, 1996, meeting of this group indicate that the state is considering a new system of teacher certification which will involve a two to three year and then a five year evaluation of teachers with the state, not the University, certifying teachers. Sheri has a copy of these minutes.

The Regents will meet in Anchorage November 20, 21 and 22. The Alliance meets November 15th by audio conference.

We are half way through this semester and most committees are to be complimented on their diligence and attentiveness. It is a real and genuine pleasure to work with people like you and an honor to represent you.

ATTACHMENT 67/2
UAF FACULTY SENATE #67
NOVEMBER 11, 1996

Report by John Craven, President-Elect and Chair of the Administrative Committee

Alliance prior to each meeting of the UA Board of Regents. I have put forward for investigation the following: the Faculty Alliance meet the week before a BOR meeting and the senates and council meet two weeks before a BOR meeting. This is now the subject of discussions between the three members who will lead their senates or council next year: Cable Starlings, UAA; Dennis Russell, UAS; John Craven, UAF. It is clear that UAA and UAF meet the objective with no alteration of their existing or planned meeting dates, and we are awaiting word from UAS. The UAF Administrative Committee will bring the proposed meeting dates forward for your approval at an upcoming meeting.

2. A more ambitious undertaking is to attempt the creation of a uniform definition of letter grades at the three MAUs. It our opinion that we had better do it before the BOR decides to do it and much more as part of their drive for transparency between the three MAUs. Again, the three of us have undertaken an investigation, and the first thing I have proposed is that we review each other's present definitions and policies. I would hope that we can quickly move this to our Curricular Affairs Committee and Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee later this semester, but I am under no illusion that this will be easy.

THE UAF ISSUE OF ADVISING

It is understood within the administration that the Faculty Senate is silent on the subject of advising and this is included within the operating principle as the administration's drives to simplify student's life with regard to registration and related issues. I believe that the Senate should not remain silent on this issue.

The Graduate School Advisory Committee and the dean of the Graduate School have discussed a proposal that would affect any graduate student receiving funds from the state or an advisor's grant and/or contract, and this has since been reviewed by and is submitted for your consideration by the Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee. I am impressed with the speed with which the committee structure was able to respond.

I think the Faculty Senate should now proceed to build on Dana' Thomas' work and fully investigate the numerous comments and suggestions of faculty members with regard to the proposed new university policy being formulated at the administrative level. I, for one, do not want students paying no attention to graduation requirements that could have easily been pointed out by an effective advisor, and then appealing to the provost when the Graduation Office states that the student has not fulfilled the graduation requirements. Stated simply; if students really want the advising requirements eased, then ignorance of this University's policies for meeting graduation requirements will not be a defense in an appeal. However, sloppy advising could be, and that is an area we would have to address. This is not a simple issue, and perhaps that is why the Senate has remained silent. I think we can no longer do that, and am delighted with the attention it is being given by the Curricular Affairs Committee.

UPDATING COMMITTEES' DUTIES

You will note in our agenda two motions for amendments to the bylaws of the Faculty Senate, both intended by the committees to more clearly define their responsibilities. As author of the motion on duties of the Administrative Committee, I was motivated by the complete lack of specific tasks for this pivotal committee and the

unanimously approved by members of GCAC.

ATTACHMENT 67/6
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #67
 NOVEMBER 11, 1996
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend Section 3 (ARTICLE V: Committees) E., PERMANENT, 8. of the Bylaws as follows:

(()) = deletion
 CAPS = addition

The Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee shall be composed of two tenured faculty members, elected from each college/school and confirmed by the Faculty Senate, who shall serve for a two year term. Members' terms will be staggered to provide continuity. ((This committee will function as an appeal body for issues of faculty prerogative, oversee evaluation of academic administrators, and make recommendations to the Provost or Chancellor.))

A promotion/tenure appeals subcommittee composed of five tenured faculty will hear all promotion and/or tenure reconsideration requests and report its findings to the Chancellor according to University of Alaska Fairbanks Regulations, Section IV,B,4. THE SUBCOMMITTEE WILL BE SELECTED BY THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND WILL NOT INCLUDE FACULTY FROM THE UNITS IN WHICH THE REQUESTS FOR RECONSIDERATION ORIGINATED. NO TWO FACULTY FROM THE SAME UNIT, AS CURRENTLY ELECTED TO THE COMMITTEE, WILL BE SELECTED FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE.

Committee members shall constitute a hearing panel pool to serve as needed on grievance hearing panels, AS SPECIFIED IN REGENTS' POLICY 04.08.08.VI.A.

Committee members shall oversee the process of evaluation of academic administrators.

A NON-RETENTION APPEALS SUBCOMMITTEE COMPOSED OF FIVE TENURED FACULTY WILL HEAR ALL NON-RETENTION RECONSIDERATION REQUESTS AND REPORT ITS FINDINGS TO THE CHANCELLOR. THIS SUBCOMMITTEE WILL CONDUCT BUSINESS IN THE SAME FASHION AS THE PROMOTION/TENURE RECONSIDERATION SUBCOMMITTEE, I.E., WILL REVIEW THE AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS AND MAKE A DETERMINATION ON WHETHER OR NOT APPROPRIATE POLICY AND DUE PROCESS WAS FOLLOWED.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS SHALL REVIEW ISSUES DEALING WITH FACULTY PREROGATIVE AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY CHANGES TO THE FACULTY SENATE.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: This motion clarifies the charge of the committee as currently stated in the Bylaws. It also adds a non-retention appeals subcommittee to hear non-retention reconsideration requests. This will provide an avenue for appeals by non-retained faculty

group about the policy itself (implications and consequences for students, effect on retention rates, accuracy of catalog to inform students, etc.) and about the process through which this policy became effective (i.e., whose responsibility is it to make decisions regarding policy?).

Action: Curricular Affairs wants to see a copy of the Chancellor's original statement before making any response. Request that this statement be available to committee members before the next meeting.

5. Proposal from CORE Review Committee to change university requirements for Fall 1997. "The Committee proposes that beginning Fall 1997 incoming students be required to successfully accomplish English 111X and Communication 131X (or 141X) prior to enrollment in Oral Intensive ("O") or Written Intensive ("W") courses."

Discussion revolved around advantages and disadvantages of implementing this policy (e.g., Would the acceptance of this proposal require that additional instructors be hired for English 111X and Communication courses? Could this requirement be determined instead by individual departments?). There was confusion about the policy as presented because the proposal itself states only that the courses be taken prior to enrollment in Oral or Written intensive courses, but the discussion of the problem states that these courses "should be accomplished as a requirement in the student's first year of classes."

Action: A motion to accept the proposal, as presented, was defeated unanimously.

6. Proposal from CORE Review Committee to change the prerequisite requirements for the 300 level values and choice courses (PHIL 322X, PS 300X, and COMM 300X).

Discussion revolved around the following issues:

1. There has been no discussion of this proposal with the Political Science Department.
2. This course was designed as ³a capstone course² (because CORE courses are integrated vertically) and therefore should be taken after completion of the other CORE courses.
3. There should be some type of agreement about the prerequisites among the two (and in the future, three) departments offering this course.

Action:

- Motion to accept proposal, as presented, was defeated unanimously.
- Recommendation was made that Sheri be asked to set up a meeting between representatives from the Departments of Philosophy, Political Science, and Communication so that a discussion can occur at this level before there is additional discussion of the CORE Review Committee's recommendation.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45.

ATTACHMENT 67/11
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #67
 NOVEMBER 11, 1996
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee Report - Mark Tumeo, Chair

Minutes of the October 28 Meeting of the Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee

Members Present: James Beget, Mark Tumeo, Peter Schweitzer, John Kelly, Kara Nance, ex-officio John Craven, ex-officio Joe Kan, ex-officio Dennis Stephens (alt: Tamara Lincoln), ex-officio Gayle Gregory, ex-officio Marcus Ortelee

Members Absent: NONE

The meeting was called to order at 12:10 p.m. in the Chancellor's Conf. Room

Item 1: First order of business was a discussion of the idea of eliminating the requirement of an advisor's signature for class registration for continuing graduate students. The discussion first focused on what the original purpose of the signature was and what the goal was in eliminating the signature requirement.

In summary, the signature requirement was seen as an attempt to ensure that 1) graduate students get advising and work closely with their advisor and committee in course selection; and 2) the university and/or grants which pay tuition are not paying for courses that are not reasonably related to the progress of the student. However, it was the consensus of the committee that the requirement for signatures for registration did not meet either of these goals, and could be construed as paternalistic towards graduate students. However, removal of the signature requirement leaves concern about oversight of the classes being taken by those graduate students receiving research or teaching assistantships, fellowships or tuition scholarships.

After further discussion of the role of faculty advisors and the necessity for advisors to play a pro-active role in reaching out to students to track class enrollment, progress and performance, and discussion on the necessity for the University to be clear about what courses a student can take when the UAF or a research grant is paying for tuition, the following motion was made by John Kelly and seconded by Kara Nance:

**** Motion ****

That the requirement for an advisor's signature on a registration form be eliminated for all continuing graduate students, effective Fall, 1997.

Furthermore, it will become policy of the University of Alaska Fairbanks that all graduate research assistantships, teaching assistantships, fellowship and tuition scholarship stipend letters contain the following language:

tuition paid as part of graduate assistantships, fellowships, or tuition scholarships covers only courses approved by the student's Advisory Committee.

The motion passed without objection.

Item 2: The committee then returned to it's ongoing discussion of thesis vs. projects as part of hing#

to examine the current procedures as given in Regents' Policy, University Regulations, and other policy documents for tenure, promotion, and nonretention of faculty, as well as the grievance procedure for faculty; Faculty Ethics (chair: Meriam Karlsson) should determine if a Faculty Senate ethics policy is necessary and, if so, draft one.

There was discussion on why a faculty ethics policy had been brought into consideration at this time, what should go into such a policy, and the relationship between any new policy and the aspects of faculty ethics that are currently mentioned in policy, such as plagiarism, consensual amorous relations with students, and disclosure of outside consulting activities.

3. Mark Tumeo reported on the activities of the 1995-1996 Promotion/Tenure Appeals Subcommittee (referred to above as the subcommittee on exclusive reconsideration for tenure and promotion). The subcommittee was asked to review three reconsideration requests for denial of tenure and promotion. The subcommittee voted 1-4 against one individual's request for reconsideration. The subcommittee voted unanimously in favor of reconsideration for two other individuals. Subsequently, the Chancellor reconsidered both cases, granting tenure in one case and denying it in the other.

4. A motion to clarify and modify the charge of the committee that had been postponed from the previous year's committee was moved, seconded, and approved. It will be brought forward to the next Administrative Committee meeting.

New business:

There was no new business. The meeting adjourned at 12:01 PM.

ATTACHMENT 67/13

UAF FACULTY SENATE #67

NOVEMBER 11, 1996

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT

Report for Faculty Senate Committees on Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement and Scholarly Activities

Minutes, October 28th 1996

First we discussed the concept of a Faculty Seminar. It was moved to propose to the Administrative Committee, adoption as a procedure to expand the obligations of faculty returning from sabbatical to encourage them very strongly to participate in the faculty seminar series. The motion was unanimous. The motion was made by Linda Curda, seconded by Tom Robinson to present this to the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee. Tentative wording of the motion: Current UAF procedures call for faculty returning from a sabbatical leave to submit a written report. The Faculty Development, Improvement, and Assessment Committee recommends that an oral report to the Faculty of the University, one in the series of Faculty Seminars sponsored jointly by the Faculty Senate and the Academic Unit in which the faculty member holds their appointment, be a new requirement of the returning sabbatical leave faculty member. (That is the motion.) The rationale: this fosters intellectual exchange within UAF academic community, reinforces the legitimacy of sabbatical leaves to reinvigorate faculty, and provides opportunities to share UAF's research and scholarly traditions and experiences

with the broader constituencies of UAF and the community statewide.

Next, we discussed at length the building of a Faculty Development policy, one of the major charges for our committee this year. Dean David Porter discussed one of the problems he sees in the utilization of existing data on faculty performance and student opinĳ

enrollment in "O" and "W" courses.

Professor McBeath said the CA Committee held up this motion based on the outdated understanding that space was limited in the lower courses and that students could not get access in a timely manner. He was informed by both myself, as member of Comm faculty, coordinator of the CORE courses in Comm., and advisor Â