```
FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
        Sheri Layral
        312 Signers' Hall
        474-7964   FYSENAT


For Audioconferencing:  Bridge #:  1-800-910-9620
                               Anchorage:  561-9620


A G E N D A
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
Monday, November 13, 1995
1:30 p.m. - 3:35 p.m.
Wood Center Ballroom



1:30    I       Call to Order - Eric Heyne                   5 Min.
                A.      Roll Call
                B.      Approval of Minutes to Meeting #58
                C.      Adoption of Agenda


1:35    II      Status of Chancellor's Office Actions        5 Min.
                A.      Motions Approved:  none
                B.      Motions Pending:  none


1:40    III     Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow             10 Min.
                Questions                                    5 Min.


1:55    IV      Governance Reports
                A.      ASUAF - J. Hayes                     5 Min.
                B.      Staff Council - M. Scholle           5 Min.
                C.      President's Report - E. Heyne       10 Min.
                        (Attachment 59/1)
                D.      Faculty Alliance meeting - D. Lynch 10 Min.
                        (Attachment 59/2)


2:25    V       Public Comments/Questions                    5 Min.


2:30    VI      Consent Agenda                               5 Min.
                A.      Resolution to confirm the Faculty Appeals
                        & Oversight Committee membership
                        (Attachment 59/3)
                B.      Resolution to confirm the Chemistry Department
                        Peer Review Committee (Attachment 59/4)
                C.      Resolution to confirm the Education Department
                        Peer Review Committee (Handout)
                D.      Motion to modify the deadline schedule for
                        add/drop, withdrawal, credit/audit, and
                        freshman low grade reports (Attachment 59/5)


2:35    VII     New Business
                A.      Motion to amend the policies on course       5 Min.
                        compression and course approval (Attachment
                        59/6), submitted by Curricular Affairs
                B.      Motion to amend statement on Interdisciplinary 5 Min.
                        Studies (Attachment 59/7), submitted by
                        Curricular Affairs
                C.      Motion on Amorous Relationships (Attachment   5 Min.
                        59/8),  submitted by Faculty Affairs
                D.      Resolution to endorse Systemwide Governance   5 Min.
                        Council Constitutional changes (Attachment 59/9),
                        submitted by Eric Heyne


2:55    VIII    Committee Reports                            30 Min.
                A.      Curricular Affairs - Dana Thomas
```

      B.   Faculty Affairs - Barbara Alexander
                  (Attachment 59/10)
      C.   Scholarly Activities - Paul Layer
      D.   Developmental Studies - Ron Illingworth
      E.   Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Diane Bischak
                  (Attachment 59/11)
      F.   Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -
                  Joan Moessner (Attachment 59/12)
      G.   Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - Michael Jennings
      H.   University-wide Promotion/Tenure - John Keller
                  1994-95 Annual Report (Attachment 59/13)

3:25   IX   Discussion Items
       A.   Search Committee for CRA Dean   5 Min.
              (Attachment 59/14a-d)
       B.   Report on the Faculty Work Load Model of Banner -
              D. Lynch   (Attachment 59/15a-b)

3:30   X   Members' Comments/Questions   5 Min.

3:35   XI   Adjournment

****
ATTACHMENT 59/1
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995

PRESIDENT'S REPORT - Eric Heyne

On Oct. 17 the Systemwide Governance Council met to consider,
among other things, fundamental changes to its constitution. Those
changes are included as an attachment to a motion under New
Business requesting that the Senate endorse the changes. Last year
President Read was directed to pursue changing the SGC because it
was not working well, and to divert some of its funds to the Faculty
Alliance, which was working well. These changes are in that
direction. Moreover, they reduce the number of scheduled meetings,
change the membership to include Faculty Alliance Members, and
make it clearer that the SGC is not a decision-making body nor the
next "higher" governance organization to the Alliance.

On Oct. 26 and 27 the Faculty Alliance met for two days in
Anchorage, the second day with a number of administrators including
President Komisar and Provost Keating. President-elect Lynch's
report details much of that discussion, so I won't repeat it. I second
his comment that the Alliance is functioning well, allowing us to
communicate with our peers at the other MAU's, and giving us a more
effective voice with Statewide and the Regents than we would have
alone--though that's not saying much.

We had the benefit at this meeting of a letter summarizing the
Faculty Affairs Committee's recommendations regarding the latest
draft of Regents policy on sexual harassment and dispute resolution.
A new draft, the one that will actually go before the Board for
approval, will be available for comment early next week. Contact
the Senate Office or Patty Kastelic's office in Statewide for a copy.

The third draft of another set of Regents academic policies,
including such matters as transfer among MAU's and maximum
number of credits for degrees, is currently available on the
Systemwide Governance home page, and a hard copy is available in
the Senate Office. You are encouraged to review individually all
Regents policies and provide comments to Alliance members or

directly to Statewide. We have at least two Senate committees
looking at each section of policy as it comes down the pike, but
there's no reason to limit ourselves to official committee reviews.

Several very important faculty issues are coming up for Regents'
review this year, including tenure (a report is due in June), workload
(our President is convinced that we need to increase our student
credit hour/faculty member ratio, and some regents want faculty
members to be more "accountable"), and indirect compensation
(Patty Kastelic will speak about this issue at our December
meeting). In addition, we have to decide what to do about the
compensation policy, in response to suggestions for implementation
that Provost Keating will offer in the next few weeks. We have
tentatively scheduled a meeting for May 13, to make up for the
canceled October meeting. By that time we will have to have
produced positions on tenure, workload, indirect compensation, and
the compensation policy--plus whatever else is thrown at us in the
meantime.

****
ATTACHMENT 59/2
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995

FACULTY ALLIANCE MEETING, ANCHORAGE, OCTOBER 26, 27, 1995
Donald F. Lynch, Ph.D., Pres. Elect, UAF Faculty Senate

My overall impression is that the nine members of the Faculty
Alliance worked together very smoothly as a team indicating that
the three Faculty Senates are in agreement on serious current
issues. Cheryl Mann of Anchorage is an excellent Chairperson and
good speaker, and Richard Hacker, Southeastern, is a master at the
art of amiable persuasion as is Phil Slattery of Sitka. Eric Heyne,
myself, and Mike Jennings represented the views of the UAF Faculty
Affairs committee regarding the proposed Grievance Policy, well
described by the commentary prepared by Mike Pippenger. Pat Ivey
was extremely helpful to the Alliance.

The Alliance members felt strongly that additional faculty
consultation is vitally necessary as part of the deliberations which
occur in the Statewide Academic Council which is composed of the
Provost, UAF, Provost UAA, the Dean of Academic Affairs, Southeast.
The Alliance also felt that the Regents at their last meeting had
invited faculty consultation, d this matter was to be taken up by
Cheryl Mann in contact with Regent Virginia Breeze. The idea here
was some form of faculty participation in the deliberations of the
Regents' Academic and Student Affairs Committee.

Friday, October 27th, was a meeting between the President, Provost,
UAF, and Patty Kastelic, Human Relations, and the Provost UAA. The
lengthy discussion covered numerous topics, and the Faculty
Alliance under Cheryl Mann's guidance sought to go through the
issues raised by the three Senates concerning the proposed new
Academic policies, Grievance and Termination for Cause policy,
maximum limits on credits allowed in a degree program, and
requests for further elucidation as to the intent various policies.

While not wishing to quote anyone in particular, my conclusions
regarding the direction of Regents' and Administration policies are
as follows:

- recognizing that the Governor's budget committee has determined
that funding for the University of Alaska is not critical to the future

of the state, the University should seek ways and means of increasing tuition income while maintaining or reducing direct instructional costs. Proposals suggest a possible ten percent reduction in state support for the University, or about 16 million dollars out of the current 167 million. Several means are seen as appropriate to achieving this objective:

a. the development of the Electronic Classroom, using CD-Roms, teleconferences, and E-Mail for courses in specific specialties on a statewide basis. These might include courses in Finance, a statewide BBA program, and the successful Medical Records Management distance delivery courses presently in existence in Southeastern. The idea is that the University can afford one good specialist in many fields, but not one for each Campus. Such courses might also be offered nationally and perhaps even internationally. The Provost UAF has available funds for the development of such courses which have a broad potential student audience.

b. improved coordination of academic programs among all three Campuses to insure that new programs are not duplicated, and that existing programs and degree requirements are coordinated and (perhaps standardized-Dfl comment).

c. restrictions on the maximum number of credit hours required for a degree program to insure that students can in all but professional degrees graduate with 132 credits. There is a two fold fear here: first, legislatures in some states, e.g. Florida, are mandating such limitations, and the same may happen in Alaska; and, second, faculty in some states have increased program credit hour requirements beyond that which is reasonable. (Dfl comment: there appears to be no evidence that U of A faculty have done so; existing professional degrees, including Music, will be approved as they stand since they meet national requirements.)

d. development of some means of insuring that courses in degree programs are in such a sequence that students can achieve their degrees in four or four and a half years. There have been consistent complaints that this is currently not the case in unspecified programs.

e. pursuing as yet unspecified policies to reduce the amount of time students take to complete a degree program. A federal study using data from 1988 and 1989 showed that students who declared majors in those years in a select set of disciplines failed to graduate within four and a half years, and most took very much longer. This study suggests, but does not prove, that the University of Alaska is encouraging students to use federal student loans and grants for entirely too many years. (Dfl Comment: alliance members, including yours truly, vigorously attacked these data as inadequate and deceiving.)

f. instituting a compensation program which will mandate that faculty must receive a better than satisfactory evaluation every year in order to receive any raise. There will be no more across the board raises. The system adopted in August and reaffirmed in September is designed to reward those who bring in federal grants and those who achieve increases in enrollments. Evidently, the idea here is that faculty are to be evaluated on an individual basis regarding both proposal successes and credit hours, with instructional achievements weighted by subject, course level, etc. The actual compensation proposal is a two part matter: one percent and one point six percent. The 1% is for retention, promotions, and market based salary adjustments in certain areas. The faculty receiving these raises are to be excluded from those

evaluated for raises under the 1.6% funds. In addition, faculty with
a high success rate in proposals may get their raises from federal
rather than state funds, and about twenty percent of the 1% money
may be available for other raises. In short, the total amount
available is greater than just 1.6% of last years faculty salary
budget. But rewards are to be based on proposals submitted and
funded, and total enrollments.

      g. to the maximum degree possible, develop common core
curricula (General Education Requirements) and major requirements
among all three campuses so that students can easily transfer
courses from one University of Alaska institution to another. In
pursuing this objective, policies are being developed which
potentially will standardize General Education Requirements. This
seems to be a particular concern of Southeastern and is motivated
by a desire to ease student transfers within the system.

      h. implementing Academic Policies, Regulations, and
Procedures which will achieve the above objectives.

General Conclusions

1. The meeting with the administration was on occasion somewhat
adversarial in nature, but the general tone was informational, not
personal. Statewide is approaching academic matters from the
viewpoint of national trends, developing federal policies, and
probable decreases in state funding for the University. The Faculty
Alliance is approaching academic matters from the viewpoint of the
three senates. These two are not in all cases in agreement, and,
therefore, there are conflicting viewpoints.

2. There appears at this moment to be a general desire on the part
of three Regents to have better communication with the Faculty.
However, there is agreement that there should not be a Faculty
Regent.

3. In working towards greater inter-Campus academic coordination,
the role of the Statewide Academic Council will probably become
more significant. It has replaced the position of Statewide
Academic Vice President .

4. As a Faculty, as a Senate, and as the Administrative Committee,
we simply must take these new proposed policies quite seriously.
They are part of a whole and must be considered in that fashion, not
in bits and pieces. For this reason, the work of the Faculty Affairs,
Scholarly Affairs and Curricular Affairs Committees achieves very
particular importance. We may expect the new policies, as hopefully
modified in the review process, to be adopted at the February
meeting of the Board of Regents.

5. the relegation of the University of Alaska to a priority lower than
that of primary and secondary education, the prison system, police
and fire protection, and other essential government activities, does
not bode well for future state funding given a potential decrease in
total general fund revenues of five hundred million dollars. This is a
problem which should be seriously addressed by the Senate
Legislative and Financial Affairs Committee.

6. Political Action on the part of faculty groups should, given the
potential seriousness of the state funding decrease, be a significant
matter for consideration. The Anchorage Campus already has an
organization to perform this function, as does the unionized faculty.
We in Fairbanks are not part of any similar organized effort,
although individuals certainly do have an impact on the political

process.

Some Quotations from Regents Policy, third draft:

Each MAU has the primary responsibility for ensuring that the
educational needs of its assigned service area are met, utilizing not
only its own educational resources but also those available
throughout the University of Alaska. (P.10 .02 01)

Duties of the Systemwide Academic Council include:

F. coordinate academic programs throughout the University of
Alaska and facilitate student progress toward degree completion or
other educational goals; and

G. review, revise, and administer faculty personnel policies and
procedures. (P. 10.02.02)

Statewide Instruction Programs

To provide access without unnecessary duplication of programs,
each MAU will have the responsibility of serving both local and
statewide constituencies. Each MAU will contribute to the
integrated instructional program of the University of Alaska through
practices such as:

A. sharing intellectual and material resources;

B. collaboration among units in teaching, research, and public
service;

C. establishing common curricula or reciprocity agreements for
meeting general education core requirements and core requirements
for similar academic degrees and certificates; and

D. coordinated planning to assure orderly and efficient changes in
educational programs in response to shifts in the needs of the state
and its people.

The University of Alaska will use distance delivery methods to
ensure maximum educational opportunities for all Alaskans,
regardless of geographic residence. (P. 10.04.01) Note: the verb will
should be understood as the older military shall, i.e. this is a direct
order!

The maximum numbers of credits which may be required...
        Bachelor's degree   132 credits
        Master's degree   45 credits
Exceptions to minimum or maximum credit hours may be made on the
recommendation of the Chancellor and approval of the President.
(P.10.04.02)
Note: this means according to informal statements that the current
programs in engineering and music will be approved.

It is in the interest of both the student and the University of Alaska
that its universities accept in transfer as much credit as is
appropriate to the student's new degree and graduation
requirements....the maximum articulation possible among degree and
certificate programs will be sought. (P.10.04.05)

A. 2. A student who has completed the general education
requirements at one University of Alaska university or community
college and transfers to another University of Alaska university or
community college will be considered to have completed the general
education requirements at all University of Alaska universities and

community colleges. (P. 10.04.05)

'The major administrative units of the University of Alaska will
cooperate in the establishment and delivery of educational courses
and programs to promote access, minimize duplication of effort, and
ensure the effective use of the University of Alaska's resources.
Inter-MAU use of faculty expertise, specialized equipment, and
library collections will be promoted, and collaborate with other
colleges and universities will be sought. (P.10.04.10)

Comment on proposed Grievance policy

Mike Pippenger correctly argued that the policy confuses a dispute
with a grievance. I argued that the mediation section will not work.
I argued forcibly against the Termination for Cause procedure. The
new revised policy is to contain a definition of Cause and should be
available in a week or so. I am concerned that this policy should
also contain other relevant policies, for example, procedures for
reprimands and the procedures by which a termination for cause is
established. This set of policies seems directed as much towards
Classified employees as faculty. Indeed, at one point, the statement
was made that faculty in practice would not fall under the three day
response rule, but that classified employees would. I suggest the
Grievance Policy also be reviewed by other governance groups if this
is not already being done.

****
ATTACHMENT 59/3
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995
SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION
===========

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm
additional membership on the Faculty Appeals and Oversight
Committee membership indicated below:

        Dale Feist, Professor, CNS
        David Stone, Professor, CNS
        Joseph Niebauer, Professor, SFOS
        Brian Paust, Associate Professor, SFOS
        Mark Tumeo, Associate Professor, SOE
        Jonah Lee, Professor, SOE

****
ATTACHMENT 59/4
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995
SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION
===========

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the
Chemistry Department Peer Review Committee for the academic
year 1995-96 indicated below:

```
          Don Button, Chemistry
          Larry Duffy, Chemistry
          Dan Jaffe, Chemistry
          Rainer Newberry, Geology
          Channon Price, Physics
          David Shaw, Chemistry
          Richard Stolzberg, Chemistry

          EFFECTIVE:        Immediately

          RATIONALE:        According to UAF Regulations, units with less
                    than seven tenured faculty must have their Unit Peer
                    Review committees augmented with additional
                    appropriate faculty.  Presently the Chemistry Department
                    has six tenured faculty, one of whom is serving on the
                    University-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee.  Thus,
                    Chemistry has only five faculty eligible for serving on
                    the Unit Peer Review Committee this year.


************************
ATTACHMENT 59/5
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS


MOTION
=======

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to modify the deadline schedules for
add/drop, withdrawal, credit/audit, and freshman low grade reports
as indicated below:

[[    ]]  =  deletion
CAPS   =  addition


1.      Change Last Day to Add  from [[End of 1st week of instruction]]
        to:  SECOND FRIDAY AFTER 1ST DAY OF INSTRUCTION.
2.      Change Late Add from [[Until the 4th Friday after classes
        begin]] to:  4TH FRIDAY AFTER 1ST DAY OF INSTRUCTION.
3.      Change Drop  from [[Until the end of the 2nd week of
        Instruction]] to:  3RD FRIDAY AFTER 1ST DAY OF INSTRUCTION.
4.      Change Freshman Low Grade Reports  from [[4th week of
        classes]] to:  THE WEDNESDAY OF THE FOURTH FULL WEEK AFTER
        THE 1ST DAY OF INSTRUCTION.
5.      Change Withdrawal for Freshman and Non-degree Students
        from [[Until the 6th Friday after classes begin]] to:  6TH FRIDAY
AFTER 1ST DAY OF INSTRUCTION.
6.      Change Withdrawal (for all other students)  from [[Until the 4th
        Friday after classes begin]] to:  4TH FRIDAY AFTER 1ST DAY OF
        INSTRUCTION.
7.      Change Faculty Initiated Withdrawal  from [[Prior to the 4th
        Friday of classes]] to:  4TH FRIDAY AFTER 1ST DAY OF
        INSTRUCTION.
8.      Change Change from Credit to Audit  from [[Subsequent to the
        3rd Friday after Instruction begins]] to:  FOLLOWING 3RD FRIDAY
        AFTER 1ST DAY OF INSTRUCTION.
9.      Change Change from Credit to Audit After 3rd Friday of Class
        (freshmen and non-degree students)  from [[Same deadlines as
        Withdrawal but instructor's signature required]] to:  UNTIL THE
        6TH FRIDAY AFTER 1ST DAY OF INSTRUCTION.
10.     Change Change from Credit to Audit After 3rd Friday of Class
        (all others)  from  [[Same deadlines as Withdrawal but
```

          instructor's signature required]] to: 4TH FRIDAY AFTER 1ST DAY
          OF INSTRUCTION.

  Late withdrawal and late total withdrawal remain the same as
  printed (Until the Last Day of Instruction).

  Note: First day of instruction identified in catalog.

          EFFECTIVE: Fall 1996

          RATIONALE: To simplify the placement of dates and
                   make the calendar more comprehensible.

  ****
  ATTACHMENT 59/6
  UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
  NOVEMBER 13, 1995
  SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

  MOTION
  =======

  The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the policies on course
  compression and course approval by adding the following:

          Any course compressed to less than six weeks must be
          approved by the college or school's curriculum council.
          Furthermore, any core course compressed to less than 6 weeks
          must be approved by the Core Review Committee.

          Any new course proposal must indicate those course
          compression formats in which the course will be taught. Only
          those formats approved will be allowed for scheduling.

          EFFECTIVE: Fall 1996

          RATIONALE: There is no existing institutional policy
                   establishing an approval process for offering specific
                   courses in a compressed format. This lack of an approval
                   process has caused some faculty to question the
                   appropriateness of some compressed courses. The
                   proposed policy change implements an approval process
                   using the existing governance structure and places the
                   burden of review at the college/school level. A more
                   general review by the Core Curriculum Committee is
                   required for proposals to compress core courses because
                   of their common use across disciplines.

                   Courses currently offered in a compressed format were
                   not granted blanket approval so that individual colleges
                   and schools could review their current compressed
                   offerings. The proposed policy does not prohibit
                   colleges/schools from granting such a blanket approval
                   themselves.

  ****
  ATTACHMENT 59/7
  UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
  NOVEMBER 13, 1995
  SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

```
MOTION
=======
```

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the statement on
Interdisciplinary Studies as currently listed in the UAF Catalog with
the following noted changes:

[[   ]] = Deletions
CAPS = Additions

         Interdisciplinary Studies is a program available to UAF
students within the associate of applied science, bachelor of arts,
bachelor of science, and bachelor of technology degree options. The
interdisciplinary program option provides flexibility to students
with well-defined goals who do not fit into one of the established
majors offered by the university.

         A student may submit his/her proposal for an interdisciplinary
program upon completion of 15 credits at UAF [[and preferably 30
credits (for the associate¹s degree), or 60 credits (for the bachelor¹s
degree) prior to graduation.]], AND HE/SHE SHALL HAVE AT LEAST 30
CREDITS REMAINING IN HIS/HER PROPOSED DEGREE PROGRAM WHEN
SEEKING APPROVAL FOR AN INTERDISCIPLINARY DEGREE. The
proposed curriculum must differ significantly from established
degree programs at UAF and will require evidence that the necessary
facilities and faculty are available to ensure an approximation of a
normal undergraduate degree. All general requirements for the
[[A.A.S.,]] B.A., B.S., or B.T. degree must be met.

         In developing an interdisciplinary proposal, the student should
specify the degree (A.A.S., B.A., B.S., or B.T.), include an explanation
of how the proposed program differs substantially from established
UAF programs, and a discussion that current UAF resources are
adequate to meet the requirementS of the proposed program. (A
MINIMUM OF TWO DISCIPLINES IS REQUIRED FOR THE INTER-
DISCIPLINARY DEGREE). The student then obtains an advisory
committee of at least three faculty members from the appropriate
disciplines THERE SHALL BE AT LEAST ONE FORMAL MEETING WITH
THE FULL COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE STUDENT¹S PROPOSAL. The
committee will appoint a chair, review the proposed program, select
a degree title in concert with the student, and make its
recommendation. Applicants then submit to the Provost their
proposal for the program they wish to pursue, specifying the degree,
proposed curriculum WORKSHEET, and rationale. THE DEGREE IS
AWARDED THROUGH THE SCHOOL OR COLLEGE OF THE CHAIR OF THE
COMMITTEE, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE PROVOST.

         Students interested in pursuing an interdisciplinary A.A.S.,
B.A., B.S., or B.T. degree, or who want to explore this as a degree
option, can contact the Academic Advising Center to receive
assistance in finding faculty advisors and developing their
curriculum proposal.

         EFFECTIVE: Fall 1996

         RATIONALE: Clarification of procedures and requirements
                 for interdisciplinary degrees.


```
***********************
```
ATTACHMENT 59/8
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY AFFAIRS

MOTION
=======

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt a policy statement on
"Consensual Sexual (Amorous) Relations between Faculty and
Students" as formulated by the AAUP Council.

The UAF Faculty Senate so moves with the understanding that
adoption of the AAUP statement does not preclude amendments
consistent with the Faculty Affairs Committee's "Report on
Rationale and Options."

AAUP Policy Statement

on

Consensual Sexual Relations Between Faculty and Students

        Sexual relations between students and faculty members with
whom they also have an academic or evaluative relationship are
fraught with the potential for exploitation. The respect and trust
accorded a professor by a student, as well as the power exercised by
the professor in an academic or evaluative role, make voluntary
consent by the student suspect. Even when both parties have
initially consented, the development of a sexual relationship renders
both the faculty member and the institution vulnerable to possible
later allegations of sexual harassment in light of the significant
power differential that exists between faculty members and
students.

        In their relationships with students, members of the faculty
are expected to be aware of their professional responsibilities and
avoid apparent or actual conflict of interest, favoritism, or bias.
When a sexual relationship exists, effective steps should be taken to
ensure unbiased evaluation or supervision of the student.

        EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor Approval

                    * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

                    FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT

            RATIONALE AND OPTIONS FOR A UAF POLICY ON
    "CONSENSUAL SEXUAL (AMOROUS) FACULTY-STUDENT RELATIONS"

Rationale

        Chancellor Joan K. Wadlow has solicited the UAF faculty's
engagement in the task of developing and adopting during the current
academic year a policy on consensual sexual (amorous) relations
between faculty and students (hereafter, CSAR). The Chancellor
cites the 1995 AAUP statement that "sexual relations between
students and faculty members with whom they also have an
academic or evaluative relationship are fraught with the potential
for exploitation." "Such amorous relationships," Dr. Wadlow
observes, "even with so-called voluntary consent by the student,
greatly increase the chances of abuse of power or a perception of
abuse. In either case, the university and individuals suffer."

        The Chancellor's statements serve to underscore the following

implicit claims:

  (1) that faculty have a moral responsibility to the university
community at large; i.e., that in addition to acknowledged rights as
teachers and scholars in the academic institution as such, certain
obligations accrue to faculty in their exercise of the duties of
office (faculty), obligations in the performance of office in relation
to a community wherein there may be occasions of misperception
about when one acts "as private person" and when one acts "as
faculty person";

  (2) that there are undesirable/unwanted consequences of
CSAR, that these consequences are perceived to be
undesirable/unwanted by the university community taken as a moral
community, in which community faculty are governed in conduct by a
professional ethic, notwithstanding any abiding personal ethic;

  (3) that this professional ethic includes a comportment of
respect for students, which comportment in practice eschews any
exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students
(see AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics, 1987);

  (4) that the moral responsibility invested in the faculty office
is such that the discharge of that responsibility is subject to
measures of accountability;

  (5) that CSAR is an issue of moral probity in particular
because such relations otherwise transpose the faculty person into a
situation of legal accountability under existing university policy
and state statutes governing sexual harassment;

  (6) that faculty, in their moral autonomy (i.e., voluntary,
intentional action) share in a causal responsibility for the
occurrence of undesirable/unwanted consequences of CSAR (in a
situation of actual litigation for cause, prosecution would likely
seek legal remedy under mens rea doctrine, i.e., there was on the
part of the faculty person a combination of "voluntary conduct" and
"foresight of consequences").

Options

  General Comments:

  The UAF Faculty Senate may decide to forego entirely any
explicit policy statement on CSAR, notwithstanding the request of
the Chancellor. Should the Senate choose to develop such a policy,
then a policy statement on CSAR may be written either as (a) a
component of existing UAF Sexual Harassment Policy, or (b) a policy
distinct from the Sexual Harassment Policy.

  Options include:

(A) permitting CSAR, with the expectation that the faculty person
will have taken steps to eliminate any present and/or future
academic-contextual conflict of interest and assure unbiased
evaluation of the student with whom there exists a CSAR. This
option seeks to avoid infringement upon a private relation
understood to be protected as a matter of civil right, i.e., right to
privacy and right to associate (a point of view upheld by federal
court decision in 1983, in Naragon v. Wharton, and upheld in a
judgment rendered by the U>S> Supreme Court in 1984, in Roberts v.
United States Jaycees). This option also presumes that such CSAR
are undertaken legally, i.e., the student has attained to the age of
consent established by state statute and has indeed freely consented
to such a relationship.

(B) Alternatively, the UAF Senate may adopt a policy that speaks to
CSAR only in those cases in which the faculty person as teacher "is
in a position to evaluate the student, and, in other cases, when a
substantial risk exists that the student would feel pressured to
consent to the relationship." [P. DeChiara, "The Need for Universities
to Have Rules on Consensual Sexual Relationships Between Faculty
Members and Students." Columbia Journal of Law and Social
Problems, 21:2(1988), pp. 137-160.] Distinctions may or may not be
made here between "undergraduate" student and "graduate" student,
the prohibition extending (i) only to the former group, (ii) to both
groups, or (iii) to a student regardless of level of enrollment but
who is in an "evaluative" academic relation (teacher, supervisor)
with the faculty person. At issue here is some assessment of a
CSAR "degenerating" into a situation of sexual harassment. This
strategy acts preemptively on the part of the potential victim of
sexual harassment, i.e., the student, accounting for the various
procedural and social barriers to effective and successful grievance.

(C) Alternatively, the UAF Senate may adopt a policy which
expressly prohibits all CSAR, stating appropriate rationale and
identifying "remedial measures" (e.g., raging from official reprimand
to dismissal). In this policy option, it is recognized that the right to
privacy "is not absolute," that "A compelling state interest may
permit certain infringements of that right," so that "The asymmetry
of power between faculty members and students, and the fact that
what appears to be an adult, consensual, and private relationship
may actually be the product of implicit or explicit duress, may
present such a 'compelling interest'." [E. Keller, "Consensual
Relationships and Institutional Policy."] Such "compelling interest"
accords with the provision in Title IX of the Education Amendments
of 1972 which "gives harassment victims the right to bring a private
lawsuit against a university" (Alexander v. Yale University), thus
making a faculty person's engagement in CSAR ramify at cost to the
larger university community.

        Option A: UAF may decide to appropriate the AAUP Council's
CSAR policy statement (see Academe, Sept/Oct 1995, p. 62).

****
ATTACHMENT 59/9
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995

RESOLUTION
===========

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate moves to endorse the
proposed changes to the System Governance Council Constitution.

        RATIONALE: The changes reflect the relative importance and
                success of the Faculty Alliance, as well as the Coalition
                of Student Leaders and the Staff Alliance, and make the
                Systemwide Governance Council more of a coordinating
                group for those three organizations.

                ****

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COUNCIL:

1.   Change the membership from one faculty, one staff and one
student from UAA, UAF and UAS, one student from a rural site and
one staff from Statewide Administration, to "the Alliance of Faculty
Senates, the Coalition of Student Leaders, and the Staff Alliance."

2.   Replace the Council chair with the heads of the other system
governance groups who would moderate meetings on a rotating basis.

3.   Meetings could be called by the president or one of the heads of
any one of the other system governance groups, or by the president
of the Board of Regents.

4.   Amend voting to add, "The Council shall take no legislative
action on system issues other than endorsement of the actions of
the other system governance groups or to coordinate actions
between them unless specifically directed by the president of the
Board of Regents, the president of the university, or the Council co-
chairs."

5.   Reduce the minimum number of meetings per year from six to
four and specify meetings only by audio or video conference.

6.   Reduce the Council budget from $6,200 to a maximum of
$3,000 and divide the balance equally between the Alliance of
Faculty Senates, the Staff Alliance, or the Coalition of Student
Leaders.

If these changes meet with the approval of the System Governance
Council necessary constitutional changes will be drafted and
submitted to the Council for first reading according to the
constitution and bylaws.

****
CAPS IN TEXT = ADDITIONS
((   )) = DELETIONS

                        The System Governance Council
                                   of the
                             University of Alaska

                                 Constitution

ARTICLE I. INTENT

It is the intent of the Board of Regents:1) that the faculty, staff and
students shall share in the governance of the university, 2) that
shared governance is an integral part of the business of the
university, and 3) that participators in shared governance are
empowered by the Board of Regents to carry out their governance
responsibilities to the best of their abilities without interference
or fear of reprisal.

ARTICLE II. NAME

The Board of Regents hereby establishes a mechanism for system
governance consisting of faculty, staff and student representatives
which shall be called the System Governance Council, hereinafter
"Council."

ARTICLE III. AUTHORITY, ROLE

A. Authority

The Council receives its authority by policy 03.01.01 of the
University of Alaska Board of Regents which derives its authority
from the Constitution and statutes of the State of Alaska. The
Council shall carry out its functions subject to the authority of the
Board of Regents and the President of the University.

B. Role

The Council shall provide an opportunity for faculty, staff and
students to interact with the university president, regents and
others regularly to discuss matters including, but not limited to, the
following: policies and procedures for, and participating in, the
university budget process; the framing of long range plans;
university development; enhancing the university's public image and
educating the public. The Council shall communicate the results of
those discussions to the university community. The Council may
also coordinate matters of mutual concern to the Alliance of Faculty
Senates, the Staff Alliance and the Coalition of Student Leaders.

ARTICLE VI. MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION

A. Voting membership

The voting membership of the Council shall consist of ((one faculty,
one staff, and one student representative each from the University
of Alaska Anchorage, the University of Alaska Fairbanks, and the
University of Alaska Southeast, one staff representative from
Statewide Administration Assembly and one additional at-large
student representative)) THE ALLIANCE OF FACULTY SENATES, THE
COALITION OF STUDENT LEADERS, AND THE STAFF ALLIANCE.

((Voting members shall communicate their governance activities to
their constituencies, and to their supervisors or professors as
appropriate, on a regular basis)).

((B. Selection

Faculty and staff representatives to the Council shall be selected in
such a manner as prescribed by the local governance groups. Student
representatives shall be selected by the Coalition of Student
Leaders as prescribed in the Coalition Constitution.))

((C. Terms of office

Representatives to the Council shall serve a minimum of a one year
term.))

((D. Qualifications

Representatives to the Council should have prior shared governance
experience wherever possible.))

((E. Recall of members

Any member may be recalled by the body by which the member was
chosen. The local constituent body shall select a replacement to
complete the term of office.))

B. ((F.)) Ex-officio, non-voting membership

Ex-officio, non-voting membership in the Council shall include the
President of the University, the chancellor or other administrative
officer from each MAU, and any other such person or persons as the
President may designate, and such others as determined by the
Council.

C. ((G.)) ((Official Spokesperson)) OFFICERS

        1. ((Election))

((The official spokesperson for the Council shall be elected by
and from the voting membership by a majority vote.))   THE
SPOKESPERSON OF THE ALLIANCE OF FACULTY SENATES, THE
SPOKESPERSON OF THE COALITION OF STUDENT LEADERS AND
THE CHAIR OF THE STAFF ALLIANCE SHALL SERVE AS COUNCIL
CO-CHAIRS.

2. Duties

((The official spokesperson for the)) Council CO-CHAIRS shall
(a) preside over all meetings of the Council ON A ROTATING
BASIS. b) represent the Council, and c) serve as primary
Council contactS to the President of the University and the
Board of Regents.

D. ((H.)) Task Forces

The Board of Regents, the President of the University, or the Council
may establish task forces to consider complex system issues
pursuant to Council responsibilities. These task forces shall, in all
cases, include governance representatives appointed by the Council.
These task forces are a formal part of shared governance, and as
such, are subject to the Alaska Open Meeting Law, per V.C., below.

ARTICLE V. MEETINGS

A. Regular and special meetings

The Council shall meet a minimum of ((six)) FOUR times per year BY
AUDIO OR VIDEO CONFERENCE. At least once per year, all governance
group spokespersons shall meet with the President of the University
to identify system issues and plan for the coming year. Special
Council meetings may be called by the Board of Regents, the
President of the University, the ((spokesperson)) CO-CHAIRS of the
Council, or on petition of one-third ((of the membership)) of the
Council MEMBERSHIP.

B. Voting

Voting shall be by simple majority of the full voting membership
except for amendments to the constitutions or bylaws. Amendments
to the Council constitution affecting membership rights shall
require a consensus with no negative votes. THE COUNCIL SHALL
TAKE NO LEGISLATIVE ACTION ON SYSTEM ISSUES OTHER THAN
ENDORSEMENT OF THE ACTIONS OF THE OTHER SYSTEM GOVERNANCE
GROUPS OR TO COORDINATE ACTIONS BETWEEN THEM UNLESS
SPECIFICALLY DIRECTED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF
REGENTS, THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OR THE COUNCIL CO-
CHAIRS.

C. Open Meetings

All meetings of the Council are subject to the Alaska Open Meetings
Law, AS 44.62.3101 and any additions or exemptions thereto, and
Regents' Policy 02.06.01 and university regulations 02.06.01 through
02.06.04. This means that meetings of the Council are open to the
public, agendas must be posted, and meeting records kept. Council
activities shall be regularly communicated to the university
community.

ARTICLE VI. QUORUM

A minimum of a simple majority of the voting membership shall
constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VII. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

The parliamentary authority shall be the latest edition of Robert's
Rules of Order.

ARTICLE VIII. CONSTITUTIONS AND BYLAWS,AMENDMENTS, APPROVAL

A. Constitutions and bylaws

The Council constitution and bylaws, once passed by the Council,
shall be transmitted to the President of the University for approval
and to the Board of Regents for action. Copies of Council
constitutions and bylaws shall be maintained in the system
governance office.

B. Amendments; distribution prior to voting

Amendments to the constitution and bylaws shall be sent to all
members of the Council at least 30 days prior to the meeting at
which they will be considered. Amendments to the Council
constitution affecting membership rights shall require consensus
with no negative vote.

C. Transmittal to the President and Board of Regents for approval

Amendments passed by the Council shall be sent to the President of
the University for approval and for transmission to the Board of
Regents.

ARTICLE IX. REVIEW AND TRANSMITTAL OF PROPOSALS

A. Review

Administrative proposals and issues affecting the university system
or system community shall be submitted to the executive officer
who shall send the items to the ((Council)) ALLIANCE OF FACULTY
SENATES, THE COALITION OF STUDENT LEADERS, THE STAFF
ALLIANCE, AND THEIR RESPECTIVE LOCAL GOVERNANCE GROUPS for
review as appropriate. THE COUNCIL CO-CHAIRS MAY SCHEDULE THE
PROPOSALS FOR FACULTY, STUDENT AND STAFF LEADER DISCUSSION
AT A COUNCIL MEETING AND ((The Council shall)) respond to these
proposals and issues within 40 days after receipt from the
executive officer. Those administrative proposals submitted in the
summer months shall be acted upon by the Council by October 15.
Responses shall be transmitted to the executive officer for
compilation and submission to the President of the University.
Proposals requiring immediate implementation for compliance with
state or federal law shall be submitted to the Council for review,
but may be implemented prior to their action.

B. Transmittal to the President

The executive officer shall submit the original proposal, together
with the majority and minority views, in writing to the President of
the University for information or action as appropriate.

C. Transmittal to the Board of Regents

The ((spokesperson)) CO-CHAIRS for the Council may present Council
views, including majority and minority views, in writing directly to
the Board of Regents as a regular agenda item of the Board on any
issue within the purview of shared governance. The Council may
also present its views to Board committees as appropriate.

ARTICLE X. ACTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT, AND BOARD OF REGENTS

A. Action by the President The President of the University shall, in
writing, approve, disapprove, or modify a Council actopm, and notify
the ((spokesperson)) COUNCIL CO-CHAIRS and the executive officer
within forty-five (45) days of receiving notification of the action
((by)) FROM the executive officer.

B. Modifications by the President

The President of the University may modify a Council action if the
modification does not effectively contravene or nullify the purpose
or principle involved in the action.

C. Disapprovals

The President of the University shall inform the Council of the
reasons for any disapproval or modification within one month of
disapproving or modifying a Council action.

D. Board of Regents notification and action

Council actions which are modified or disapproved by the President
of the University, together with the statement of reasons, shall be
placed on the next Board of Regents' meeting agenda for the
information of the Board if requested by the Council. At the request
of either the President of the University or the Council, the Council
action which has been modified or disapproved shall be brought
before the Board for action. The decision of the Board of Regents is
final.

ARTICLE XI. HANDBOOK

The Council shall annually submit a directory of Council members, a
description of the Council and how it works, and the annual Council
calendar to the executive officer for inclusion in the governance
handbook. This handbook shall be distributed to the Board of Regents
and to the shared governance groups.

ARTICLE XII. REPORTS

The Council shall annually prepare a report of activities. These shall
be submitted to the executive officer for compilation ((into a single
annual report of governance activities)) for submission to the
President of the University and the Board of Regents. The executive
officer shall maintain system governance communications via
electronic mail and prepare system governance news for inclusion in
electronic and printed newsletters.

****
ATTACHMENT 59/10
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995
COMMITTEE REPORT

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Barbara Alexander, Chair

The Faculty Affairs' Committee convened to address issues currently
under discussion and critical to faculty: consequences and
implications of new compensation policy, new evaluation process
and workload distribution, tenure and promotion process, appeals

and grievance policies. The Committee also responded to the
Chancellor's "need for policy" memorandum Re: "Amorous
Relationships" and "Sexual Harassment". General agreement as to
the severity of the issue was expressed, but there was also the
recognition that policies other than the most generally phrased
appeal to professional integrity would not necessarily resolve
conflict situations already created. The committee's motion to
adopt the AAUP policy statement on "Concensual Sexual (Amorous)
Relations between Faculty and Students" is included in the Senate
agenda as attachment 59/8.

Members of the Committee responded to other policy review issues
with serious concern and expressed consternation regarding the
review process and its intent. Examining the Draft re: Dispute
resolution policy and regulation, considerable discrepancies from
established policies such as AAUP and AFT were noted.
Recommendations and clarifications were forwarded for
presentation at the Alliance Meeting in Anchorage on Oct. 26 and 27.

It appears to be of utmost importance that all faculty be fully
informed and keep especially alert to the intents and motivations
behind so many major policy reviews and changes so soon after
Program Assessment and Recommendations following the change in
policy governing financial exigency.

****
ATTACHMENT 59/11
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995
COMMITTEE REPORT

FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT - Diane Bischak, Chair

The Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee has met three times.
In the first meeting a chair was selected and the charge of the
committee was discussed. This discussion continued through the
second meeting. At the third meeting the following motion was
approved:

The UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee moves to adopt
the following as the charge of this committee.

(1) A promotion/tenure appeals subcommittee composed of five
tenured faculty will hear all promotion and 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.

(2) Committee members shall constitute a hearing panel to serve as
needed on grievance hearing panels.

(3) Committee members shall oversee the process of evaluation of
academic administrators.

(4) 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.

(5) Committee members shall review issues dealing with faculty
prerogative and make recommendations for policy changes to the
Faculty Senate.

The following two motions were also approved and will be brought
before the Senate at the next meeting:

Motion to amend the Grade Appeals Policy so that three of the
tenure-track faculty members selected for a grade review
committee (one member under point III.B.3.b. and one each under
points c. and d.) will be drawn from the Faculty Appeals and
Oversight Committee.

Motion to amend point (2) in the guidelines for Faculty Role in the
Evaluation of Administrators endorsed by the Faculty Senate on
December 17, 1990 to include administrator positions that currently
exist and to exclude those that no longer exist.

Staggered terms for members were also determined and are as
follows:

1 year terms: David Crawford, Mark Tumeo, Brian Paust, Daniel
Walsh, Meriam Karlsson, Walt Peterson, David Stone, Marvin Falk,
Greg Goering.

2 year terms: Wayne Vandre, Jonah Lee, Joseph Niebauer, V. Kamath,
Alan Jubenville, DeAnne Hallsten, Dale Feist, Nag Rao, Diane Bischak.

****
ATTACHMENT 59/12
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995
COMMITTEE REPORT

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT - Victoria
Moessner, Chair

This semester the Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement
Committee has discussed the following items:

1.   Featured Faculty -- The Committee at present is finished with
the project and it is in the hands of the Provost's Office for
implementation.

2.   Office of Faculty Development -- so far the committee has
talked with Dana Thomas about his role in faculty development and
upcoming reaccreditation.

3.   November 10, the Committee will be meeting with John Morack
about his role in Faculty Development. At that meeting we will also
hear from former committee heads for the Usibelli awards about
possible recommendations to improve the award process.

****
ATTACHMENT 59/13
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995
COMMITTEE REPORT

                UNIVERSITY-WIDE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

                    Annual Report, 1994-95 Academic Year

 This report consists of three sections: statistical information,
 comments and recommendations, and committee operating rules.

 I.   STATISTICAL INFORMATION

 Tenure:

 The campus-wide P/T committee evaluated 28 files for tenure. Of
 these 28 candidates, 13 were in their year of mandatory review.
 Twenty were concurrent candidates for promotion to associate
 professor and three to full professor. Twenty-four files came to the
 committee with support from all levels. The P/T committee
 supported 22 of these candidates by unanimous vote, one by a 9 to 1
 vote, and one by a 7 to 3 vote. Two files had split support at earlier
 levels, and the committee supported one by a 8 to 1 vote, and did
 note support the other file with a 0 to 8 vote. Table 1 presents
 these data more concisely.

                Table 1. Tenure Statistics (1994-95)

                Total number of files   28
                Concurrent with promotion   23
                Mandatory year   13

                Supported by:
                Head, peer comm., dean, P/T comm.   24
                Head, peer, P/T comm.   1
                Head   1
                No support   0
                Withdrew   2

 Promotion:

 The campus-wide P/T committee evaluated 34 candidates for
 promotion, including 23 who were candidates for concurrent tenure.
 Of these, 21 were candidates for promotion to associate professor
 and 13 to full professor. Of the 34 files, 22 were supported at all
 levels of review including the P/T committee. One candidate
 received support from the department head, a split (2 to 2) peer
 vote, and negative support from the P/T committee. One candidate
 received support from all levels of review except for a 4 to 5
 negative vote of the P/T committee. One candidate had support only
 from the dean and a 4 to 4 P/T committee vote. One candidate was
 supported only by the department head. Two candidates were
 supported at all levels except by the peer committee. One candidate
 was supported only by the department head and the P/T committee.
 One candidate was supported by all levels except the dean. Table 2
 summarizes these data.

                Table 2. Promotion Statistics (1994-95)

                Total number of files   34
                Concurrent with tenure   23
                Associate   21
                Full   13

                Supported by:
                Head, peer comm., dean, P/T comm.   22
                Head, Dean, P/T comm.   2
                Head, peer, P/T comm.   1

```
                Dean, split peer                                1
                Head, peer, Dean                               1
                Head, split peer                               1
                Head, split P/T comm                    1
                Head only                                      1
                Withdrew                                       4
```

The Chancellor differed with the P/T committee on five cases; a
tenure vote in which the committee voted 8 yes and 1 no, and four
promotion votes. Table 3 shows the outcomes of those promotion
files.

        Table 3. Cases in which the Chancellor and the P/T committee
        reached opposite conclusions on promotion files (1994-95)

P/T Committee vote	Chancellor decision	Chancellor agreed with
No	Yes	Head
Split No	Yes	Head, peer comm., dean
Split yes	No	Head
Split yes	No	Dean

Statistics from the previous four years, showing the cases in which
the Chancellor's decision differed from that of the Promotion and
Tenure Committee, are given in Table 4:

Table 4. Cases in which the Chancellor and P/T Committee reached
          opposite conclusions (1991-1994)

Academic Yr.	P/T Committee	Chancellor	# cases
1990-91:	split	yes	1 case
	yes	no	2 cases
	no	yes	2 cases
1991-92:	split	no	1 case
	yes	no	1 case
	no	yes	2 cases
1992-93:	split (majority negative)	yes	1 case
	no	yes	1 case
1993-94:	split (majority negative)	yes	1 case
	split (majority positive)	no	1 case

Tenure and promotion data for the 1994-95 academic year were
provided by the governance office. Data for 1990-91, 1991-92, and
1993-94 were taken from the University-wide P/T committee
1992-93 and 1993-94 annual reports.

II.   COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Some of the following comments were presented in this committee's
1994 annual report. They are repeated because the number of
individuals actually reading them was probably limited, and because
they may be helpful to faculty preparing promotion and/or tenure
files.

1.   Those preparing tenure and promotion files should make sure
that their files are well organized and easy to read and understand.
Some files were difficult to review because of poor organization,
while others were a pleasure to read. Put most recent annual
evaluation first, not last. Make the previous annual reviews easy to

find. Basic information needed to fill in the promotion/tenure
worksheet (copy attached) should be readily available to evaluators,
possibly in the form of a table. Units (department heads) should look
at a file and make sure the candidate supplies one which is well-
organized and well-documented. File quantity is not necessarily
related to file quality. Specifically, committee members have
commented that:

     a) A file should contain a table of annual workload
distributions and average distributions over the relevant time
period. There should be consistency between workload distributions
and evaluation.

     b)   A file and one's vita should have complete bibliographic
references including page numbers and should not have
abbreviations.

     c) The research section should separate paper submissions,
refereed journal articles, proceedings papers, books, abstracts, and
other manuscripts, and have information on journal or proceedings
quality. If no other measure is available, total citations a journal
receives vs. others in the field may be helpful.

     d) Reporting of citation analyses, and the number of reprint
requests should be encouraged as a way to evaluate research. This
would be helpful to the reader as well as the individual writing the
file.

     e) What constitutes a publication? How should abstracts,
conference proceedings, and journal articles be counted? What
should be the relative weighting? These items need to be defined by
departments, but should be in writing so that everyone knows,
particularly the individual preparing a file and file evaluators.

     f) It would be helpful to know the significance of the ordering
of authors.

     g) A file should have a statistical compilation of student
evaluations of teaching, specifically, the mean of items 1 through 4
of the general evaluation.

     h) Peer/head evaluation of teaching should be required. It
does not always appear. It is crucial that files have measures of
teaching quality other than student evaluations. There is concern
that many individuals who look at Student Evaluation of Teaching
(SET) results have an imperfect understanding of statistics and the
significance of decile rankings. They just "look for a lot of black on
the right hand side of the form". UAF previously used an evaluation
process that explicitly showed a confidence interval with the mean
value of the response to each question. Confidence intervals are
essential to evaluating SET results and should be part of the SET
data. It is misleading to publish mean values to two decimal places
without confidence intervals.

     i) It would be helpful to have a table of annual evaluation
results/ratings by year.

     j) Definitions of words for evaluation need to be clarified and
standardized, as does the ranking of words; for example, "sustained,
satisfactory, excellent, good, and very good".

     k) The term "sustained" is difficult to precisely define.
Perhaps it should be related to some minimum time in rank. It was
suggested that sustained effort cannot be evaluated in less time
than 5 years at assistant professor rank and 5 more years at

associate professor rank before promotion may be appropriate.

        l) Units should be careful to follow a set of rules or
procedures consistently. There should be a focus on teaching,
research, and service. Personality should not be an issue.

        m) Peer reports need to be specific when noting defects of a
candidate's file. Comments like "too early" or "not ready" are
inadequate. Comments need to be performance related, specific, and
related to policies and procedures guidelines for promotion and
tenure at UAF.

        n) Peer committee members should sign yes or no on the
committee report. Minority opinions should not be suppressed,
whether positive or negative.

        o) Promotion/tenure and peer committee members should not
abstain except in the case of "double-dipping" in the evaluation
process. Department heads should not vote on peer committees for
cases involving faculty that they previously evaluated.

        p) The committee guidelines and/or university policy should
be amended/clarified to define who has access to promotion and
tenure files and committee voting records. Promotion and tenure
files are currently archived with restricted access. It seems
consistent that only candidates have access to committee voting
results on their files alone. This year, a candidate dissatisfied with
the committee vote tried to obtain the committee's complete voting
record. A friend of that candidate demanded, of a committee
member, to know how certain committee members voted.

        q) Guidelines for tenure and/or promotion review are
presently distributed in mid-September and files are due by the
second week of October. This leaves inadequate time for file
preparation. The committee believes that it would be helpful to
make this information available in May rather than in September.

2.   The committee again received excellent logistical support
from the Governance Office.

III.   COMMITTEE OPERATING RULES

The operating rules for 1994-95 were unchanged relative to those in
effect for 1993-94.

The rules appeared to provide a good operating framework but will
be reviewed by the 1995-96 committee for possible modifications.

                John Aspnes
                Professor and Head of Electrical Engineering
                Chair, University-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee,
                        1993-1995
                October 21, 1995

****
ATTACHMENT 59/14a
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 18, 1995

TO: Chancellor Wadlow

FROM: Administrative Committee, UAF Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Appointment of search committee for CRA executive dean

The members of the Administrative Committee request that you add
one additional faculty member to the search committee for the CRA
executive dean, from the list of faculty generated as a result of CRA
faculty nominations last month.

We also request that you ask the committee members to vote to
confirm the appointed chair of that committee.

We believe that these actions would bring the establishment of that
committee within the guidelines of Senate policy passed on
November 11, 1991, and subsequently accepted as university
regulation. We understand your contention that this "executive dean"
position does not fall under the guidelines for "policy for the search
committees for Deans/Directors," but we disagree. There does not
seem to be any compelling reason to set aside university policy in
this instance, and doing so creates an impression of high-handedness
and lack of good faith, which we're sure you would agree is not fair
to your effort to appoint a representative search committee.

We make this request from the Administrative Committee because
the CRA dean search has already begun, and the Senate is not
scheduled to meet until November 13. If you decide not to make the
requested changes, we anticipate bringing this before the Senate as
a resolution on November 13.

****
ATTACHMENT 59/14b

October 25, 1995

MEMORANDUM

TO: Administrative Committee
                    UAF Faculty Senate
                    University of Alaska Fairbanks

FROM: Joan K. Wadlow, Chancellor
                    University of Alaska Fairbanks

SUBJECT: CRA Executive Dean Search

I received your October 18 memorandum about the search committee
for the CRA executive Dean. As you note, I do not consider the
position of executive dean to fall under the guidelines for search
committees for deans/directors. The position of Executive Dean,
which reports to the chancellor, is different by design from the
deans/directors to who the current Senate policy for search
committees refers. I also recognize that you disagree.

Search committees that reflect the many constituencies connected
with a program are normally more effective. Also, smaller search
committees can function easier, optimize the valuable time of

committee members, and reduce costs. I believe we have a balanced
committee in the relatively small (10-person) composition of the
CRA Executive Dean search committee. For instance, someone from
each of the six campuses is a member; the Council of CRA, which is
established by BOR policy, is represented; ACE, the unit which will
soon join with CRA, is represented; student, faculty, staff,
administration, is represented; the directors, who have a special
"community college" mission regarding the communities they serve,
are represented; the variety of academic curriculum including
general education and vocational education, was taken into account;
and there is at least one faculty, student and staff. The committee
chair, who also holds faculty rank, is experienced with searches and
has support staff in her office to help facilitate the work. The
single largest component of the committee is faculty.

I do not intend, therefore, to change the committee composition at
this time.

I have made the chair aware of your request that the committee
confirm the appointed chair, and the committee may act accordingly.

It seems to me that the goal we should all strive to achieve is an
effective search which recognizes the great diversity of programs,
responsibilities and geography in the CRA and ACE and which also
meets UAF's equal opportunity/affirmative action guidelines. The
committee has been working hard to do this and deserves our
support. The interview process the committee proposes, for
example, will be open to all of CRA and ACE, thus involving every
faculty (and staff and student) who wishes to be part.

I hope this addresses your points.

JKW/kjm

cc   Prof. Sharon West

****
ATTACHMENT 59/14c

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chancellor Wadlow

FROM: CRA Faculty Council

SUBJECT: Appointment of Search Committee for CRA Executive
                Dean

DATE : October 26, 1995

The CRA Faculty Council supports the memo submitted by the Faculty
Senate Administrative Committee to you re appointment of a search
committee for the CRA Executive Dean and urges you to implement
the solution suggested in the memo. Additionally, we request that
the search not be limited to the UAF community but at least be
extended statewide.

We are aware that you have declined to honor the request of the
Faculty Senate in this matter but ask your reconsideration of your
position as well as the scope of the search.

```
*************************
```
ATTACHMENT 59/14d

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #30 on
November 11, 1991:

MOTION PASSED (with 1 abstention and 1 nay)
==============

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the following policy for
the search committees for Deans/Directors.

        The faculty of the college, school, institute or other academic
unit shall elect faculty to serve as members of the Dean/Director
Search Committee. Elected faculty members serving on the Search
Committee must constitute a majority of Committee membership.

        The chairperson of the Search Committee shall be nominated
by the Vice Chancellor or Academic Affairs or the Vice Chancellor
for Research, as appropriate, subect to confirmation by the elected
faculty members.

        The size of the Search Committee shall be determined by the
VCAA or the VCR, as appropriate, but the membership shall not have
less than five elected faculty members.

        The Search Committee may include other members such as a
student representative from the unit, a staff representative from
the unit, a faculty members from outside the unit and a public
member from the community.

GUIDELINES:

1.   A staff representative shall be elected by the staff from the
unit for which the Dean/Director is being appointed.

2.   Alternates may be selected to serve, only in the event an
elected representative cannot or will not serve. Alternates are not
to serve as part-time substitutes but rather as replacements for
representatives of the aforementioned situations.

3.   Search committees should have membership with good
judgement, ability to act on behalf of UAF and be cognizant of their
overall responsibility to their unit and to UAF.

4.   Committee members should reflect a diversity of interests and
elected faculty members should reflect the diversity and cross-
section of their school/college/institute/unit.

        EFFECTIVE: Immediately

        RATIONALE: The UAF Administration has not followed the
                intent of the Senate Resolution passed on September 17,
                1990. This motion has been discussed with the VCAA and
                should be acceptable to the UAF Senate and the UAF
                Administration.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #20 on
September 17, 1990:

RESOLUTION   (unanimous approval)
===========

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate strongly recommends
        that search committees for deans and directors be composed in
        majority of faculty elected from and by the faculty from units
        for which the dean or director is to be selected and that each
        committee elect their own Chair.

****
ATTACHMENT 59/15a
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995

REPORT ON THE FACULTY WORK LOAD MODEL OF BANNER
Meeting of October 2, l395, by D.F. Lynch
Reference: Faculty Load Module, Banner Student 2.0 User Manual,
March 1994, Confidential

I attended the meeting of the Banner group in the extremely well
equipped computer lab of the Butrovich Building the afternoon of
October 1st. Approximately twenty five people were in attendance.
Cheryl Mann, President of the UAA Faculty Senate, and Rita Dursi
Johnson, President of the UAS Faculty Senate participated by
telephone. I attended half the meeting as President Elect of the UAF
Faculty Senate. NO OTHER FACULTY WERE PRESENT.

The Banner Faculty Work Load Module is a comprehensive personnel
records and assignment model designed specifically to:

- schedule classes and instructors for those classes

- assess faculty performance against assigned work load statements

- determine faculty performance as measured against specific work
load formulae and criteria

The Model includes one section for non-instructional assignments
and performance. It does not contain any specific section covering
Research, Public Service, University Service. The formulae implicit
in the model, as used as illustrations, relates totally to instruction.
It is comprehensive, and should enable Institutional Research to
correlate faculty performance as measured in weighted credit hours
directly to individual courses. The Model does not contain
information on faculty capabilities, but only instructional
assignments for a given semester.

As a management device, as a means for scheduling teachers and
course assignments, it is seriously deficient. Instead, it is a record
keeping computer model which may ease the production of
instructionally related historical data for Institutional Research.

Cheryl Mann presented the viewpoint that the formulae and
assignments are properly determined by Faculty. The answer was
that the model will use the formulae, etc., as presented by a as yet
unestablished Workload Committee. The participants commented
that each faculty member has an individual workload assignment and
that there are no standardized measures. As I understood it,

bargaining unit faculty would be excluded from the determinations
or the Workload Committee.

Personal Comment: I would like to know why we need to spend the
time and money involving in implementing this new Faculty Workload
Module, what use is to be made of it, and who is to use it. It seems
designed for a large school district, not for a University with a wide
range of obligations from funded research to vocational training and
extension work.

****
ATTACHMENT 59/15b
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #59
NOVEMBER 13, 1995

MEMORANDUM

TO: Cheryl Mann
                Don Lynch

FROM: Rita Dursi Johnson, President, UAS Faculty Senate

DATE: November 3, 1995

SUBJECT: Report of Banner Faculty Load Module Meeting 11/02/95

I attended this session by audioconference, as did Cheryl Mann and
Don Lynch. The meeting was to cover and explanation of the process
and the information contained in that module.

Prior to the meeting, I met with the UAS personnel guru, Tom Dienst,
who demonstrated the current system and explained the data
currently retained. There are the usual hire dates, department, and
rank fields, as well as the normal personnel fields (salary, benefits
package, etc.). Essentially, the only data on workload currently
gathered is "Workload Distribution" which consists of six categories
(instruction, research, management, university service, public
service, and other). A percentage is entered in as many categories
as apply to each faculty, based on the Faculty Workload agreements
completed by faculty at the beginning of each academic year. The
percentages must total 100 percent. This data is gathered by the
Statewide Office of Institutional Research and used in the annual
document "UA in Review."

The University has purchased three modules of Banner for
administrative purposes. There is Financial module, a Personnel (or
HR) module, and a Student module. The Faculty Workload module is
part of the last. The entire module is for the purpose of registering
students and providing other student information, scheduling
classes, and for faculty information including workload.

Per Carol Berg, the SCT (vendor) representative, the purpose of this
meeting was to explain what the system can do and how it does it--
not at the "this is now you input data" level but at the process level.
Then, she said, a work team must be developed to decide exactly how
UA will use this module and to answer questions about issues that
arise. This means that the work team makes decisions on a wide
range of things, from which of all the available processes within the
module it wishes to use, and what changes might need to be made to
the generic screens, to which departments enters the data, to which
department "owns" particular data (i.e., has ultimately

responsibility for ensuring the data's accuracy), to deciding policy
issues such as how to describe the specific aspects of faculty tasks.

Pat Pitney of the Statewide Office of Institutional Research is the
Chairperson of the work team, but the team members have not yet
been named. Choosing the team members will happen over the next
four-six weeks.

Cheryl quite aptly summed up the module as a way to generate
statistical data, and advocated that when the time came for defining
productivity measures for workload that faculty must be involved.

The more pertinent points from the session:

1.   The module will require setting up of "rules" for computing
faculty load. An example of a rule is "teaching nine credit per term."
Carol Berg was greeted with loud hoots when she asked "What is the
rule now for computing faculty load." Across UA, she was told, there
is no universal agreement, no standard; that each faculty has his or
her own circumstance which may change each semester.

2.   The module allows credit for non-instructional activity. Rules
must be set up for this but are as flexible as "advises X number of
students" or "manages Education program." Research and service
would be included here.

3.   There is a field that allows textual comments to be input.
This is an example of an area where the UA work team will have to
make decisions--who can input something, and what kinds of things
can (or can't) be input. (Use of this field might be equivalent to
placing a document into someone's file without that someone's
knowledge.)

4.   There are two ways to enter data in order to compute
workload. One is by "workload rule" which means in this module one
term or semester, and the second is by "contract" which is defined
as including more than one semester. Cheryl questioned the
capability of the system to handle changes in either method.
According to Carol Berg, both the "workload" and the "contract" can
be changed mid-stream.

There was a lengthy discussion on integrating this module with the
"HR" module. Such an integration is not automatic, and the work
team will have to make decisions about where such integration must
be made. The point of having such integration is to have the ability
to determine what has been paid, and what it was paid form [sic],
i.e., to determine the cost of instruction.

Anyone interested in serving on the work team needs to contact Pat
Pitney at 474-5889.