

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral
312 Signers' Hall
474-7964 FYSENAT

A G E N D A

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #61

Monday, February 5, 1996

1:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Wood Center Ballroom

- | | | | |
|------|-----|---|---------|
| 1:30 | I | Call to Order - Eric Heyne | 5 Min. |
| | | A. Roll Call | |
| | | B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #60 | |
| | | C. Adoption of Agenda | |
| 1:35 | II | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions | 5 Min. |
| | | A. Motions Approved: | |
| | | 1. Motion to adopt a policy statement on "Consensual Sexual (Amorous) Relations between Faculty and Students." | |
| | | 2. Motion on American Sign Language | |
| | | 3. Motion to adopt a Student Leadership Honors recognition policy | |
| | | 4. Motion to adopt new class schedule. | |
| | | B. Motions Pending: none | |
| 1:40 | III | Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow and Provost J. Keating | 15 Min. |
| | | Questions | 5 Min. |
| 2:00 | IV | Governance Reports | |
| | | A. ASUAF - J. Hayes | 5 Min. |
| | | B. Staff Council - M. Scholle | 5 Min. |
| | | C. President's Report - E. Heyne (Attachment 61/1) | 5 Min. |
| | | D. Faculty Alliance Report - D. Lynch (Handout) | 5 Min. |
| 2:20 | V | Public Comments/Questions | 5 Min. |
| 2:25 | | BREAK | 5 Min. |
| 2:30 | VI | New Business | |
| | | A. Motion to approve the BFA in Theatre (Attachment 61/2), submitted by Curricular Affairs | 5 Min. |
| | | B. Motion to approve the deletion of the M.Ed. in College Student Personnel Administration (Attachment 61/3), submitted by Graduate Curricular Affairs | 5 Min. |
| | | C. Motion to amend the guidelines for Faculty Role in the Evaluation of Administrators (Attachment 61/4), submitted by Faculty Appeals & Oversight | 5 Min. |
| | | D. Motions to amend Grade Appeals Policy (Attachment 61/5), submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 61/6), submitted by Faculty Appeals & Oversight | 10 Min. |
| 2:55 | VII | Committee Reports | 30 Min. |
| | | A. Curricular Affairs - Dana Thomas (Attachment 61/7) | |
| | | B. Faculty Affairs - Barbara Alexander | |
| | | C. Scholarly Activities - Paul Layer | |

- D. Graduate Curricular Affairs - Robert Carlson
- E. Developmental Studies - Ron Illingworth
- F. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Diane Bischak
- G. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -
Rich Seifert
- H. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - Michael Jennings

3:25	VIII	Discussion Items	
	A.	Board of Regents Policy Revisions	30 Min.
3:55	IX	Members' Comments/Questions	5 Min.
4:00	X	Adjournment	

ATTACHMENT 61/1
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #61
FEBRUARY 5, 1996

PRESIDENT'S REPORT - Eric Heyne

Over the next year or so we will determine the professional expectations for and working conditions of University of Alaska faculty for many years to come. We will do this either through union negotiation or through joint work on Regents' policies and UAF procedures, depending on how the union vote goes, but we will do it either way. In order to do a good job, we need to be aware of the political climate, the situation in academia nationwide, and the range of choices we have available. Educating ourselves on these issues is the most important task we face as Faculty Senators for the remainder of this year.

All over the country public higher education is being challenged. Our situation in Alaska is typical, with fiscally conservative legislators asking for more accountability and reluctant to fund anything better than a "generic university," as one representative described it--though at the recent American Association of Higher Education Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards I could find no other system whose budget had been nearly as constricted as ours over the last ten years. We are in the position of trying to save the university despite the efforts of the state government. It's nice to imagine future students and other citizens thanking us for our efforts ten or twenty years down the line, assuming we are able to accomplish something, but in the short term we're fighting a lonely battle.

Higher education is not alone, of course, as all manner of social goods funded by government find themselves under siege. The case of universities might be best compared to that of health care. As faculty we are being asked to put ourselves in a profit-accountability mode, to be more productive, to treat students as consumers for whom we must compete. This is much like the situation of doctors today, finding themselves working for HMO's and asked to treat patients as consumers. In the process many doctors find themselves forbidden to provide the kind of care they believe necessary, as their professional judgment and relationships with their patients are undercut by the profit requirements of the HMO. As educators and researchers we are increasingly finding our professional judgment and relationships with our students undercut by the profit requirements of the public university. Many believe that health care in this country is degenerating, and some of us are beginning to see how higher education may likewise degenerate.

This isn't the case everywhere, thank goodness. In Georgia, for instance, the governor and the system leadership are committed to maintaining and even increasing the quality of their public universities, and they seem to be winning the battle against more short-sighted politicians. It remains to be seen what we can accomplish in Alaska, although the evidence of continual erosion over the last ten years is not encouraging.

Part of the attack on faculty is the demand for greater accountability, expressed through such mechanisms as tougher post-tenure review, more quantitative workload definitions, and merit pay as a tool for identifying both excellence and incompetence. Another kind of demand is the pressure to cut costs through technological innovation and interdepartmental, interdisciplinary, and intercampus cooperation. Any one of these five demands would represent a significant challenge for University of Alaska faculty--and we have to face all five at once. The primary mechanisms for Regents and administrators to achieve their changes are Regents' Policy changes, including Program Assessment and revisions to existing policies on faculty appointments and workload, compensation, and institutional structure. This is going on even as we speak. If we don't speak up and represent our interests, administrators will have grounds for claiming our approval of what they impose.

Here are some of my personal views on suggested changes.

Post-tenure review: we already have a system for regular review of tenured faculty. Regents want teeth in it, and are writing it into their policy this spring. I think the vast majority of faculty are willing to be accountable for doing their jobs, and would like to see the few cases of genuine "deadwood" dealt with as much as any Regent would. We need to make the whole post-tenure review process an occasion to publicize our success, recognize and support changes in academic careers, and mentor faculty who could use help in some aspect of their jobs. We should avoid constituting post-tenure review as primarily a way to "weed out" certain faculty, as an age-discriminatory process, as a threat to the institution of tenure, or as a method for administrators to punish faculty members. Plenty of other universities have strong post-tenure review processes in place, and we need to consult them for suggestions. We need to have our say on this now, while policy is being formulated by Statewide.

Workload and productivity: last year a Senate committee worked long and hard on a quantitative definition of workload, based on a CNS model. Personally, I do not think a quantitative model will work for the whole university, and there was some evidence in support of this position presented at the AAHE conference. However, we do need to develop a statement about the variety and intensity of faculty workload, and a model for how units such as departments, schools, and colleges can be responsible for fulfilling their academic missions. We need to do this in order to avoid a cookie-cutter model for all individual faculty, such as a minimum teaching load or a minimum research output. Academia is beginning to talk more about the varieties of scholarship, as Russel Edgerton explained to us in his visit last year, and we need to take advantage of that discussion to illustrate, in turn, the variety of missions served by different academic units within the university. If we are to remain a real university, fulfilling a wide range of research, teaching, and service functions, rather than just an extension of K-12, we must convince the public of the value of what we do and how our separate missions contribute to the quality of life in Alaska. That means, among other things, showing how teaching, research,

and service support each other, and how they are made up of a wide variety of classroom, advising, field, outreach, publication, dissemination, and other activities.

Compensation: we are being forced to undergo a major cultural change at UA, from across-the-board raises and a generous benefits package, to merit-based raises and a reduced benefits package. This is painful, to say the least, and it's not going to stop hurting for a while. I learned at AAHE that a lot of universities, more than I realized, have long operated with a merit raise system. However, I have yet to see any information on how a university successfully shifted from across-the-board to merit-based. So far we have been on our own, as schools and colleges have been setting up faculty committees to institute the new Regents' Policy on compensation. I have no ideas at all about how to do this. But I hope we link it to the other discussions currently going on about workload and evaluation, so that we at least have a coherent and unified procedure. One of the great dangers in setting up policy for all three of the issues I've discussed is that more faculty "productivity" will be wasted than gained by frequent and time-consuming evaluations.

Collaboration and technological enhancement: if we don't take an active role in discussions on these issues, we'll find them imposed on us in short order. Don't wait to be told how you must use new technology, or that you must cooperate with another department to administer a program--actively look for ways to do such things effectively. The provost's new Distance Delivery and Technology-Enhanced Education Working Group is one forum, but don't hesitate to develop your own initiatives, as individual faculty members and especially as departments.

If the faculty become unionized, all these issues will still be up for negotiation, though perhaps not under the aegis of the Faculty Senate. There's no way around it: faculty are going to be forced to defend their view of the university, account for their activities in a profit-maximizing debate, and justify their belief that education is not simply an industrial product. This is frustrating and often demeaning. But I think we'll do best if we swallow our pride, recognize that faculty credibility is under attack everywhere, and go at the job as non-defensively as we can. The first step in recovering the public's trust is to do good work. And while we're at it, we can try to structure our job conditions to make that good work known to administrators, Regents, and legislators. That's our task in faculty governance this year.

ATTACHMENT 61/2
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #61
FEBRUARY 5, 1996
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the BFA in Theatre.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal on file in the
Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR THE BOARD OF REGENTS

The Bachelor of Fine Arts is a professionally oriented degree designed to prepare students for careers in theatrical design. This degree is also the usual prerequisite for graduate studies in theatre. The B.F.A. in Theatrical Design's main objective is to give a more thorough and concentrated focus into the various methods, bases, and applications of all theatrical design.

Theatre UAF has unique opportunities open for our design students. Our audience counts/house records are steadily growing; interest is rising and our program is expanding. Through a portfolio/interview enrollment, the B.F.A. program presented here will aid in drawing in new students as well as in retaining those we have due to the larger demand of graduate schools requiring a B.F.A. of their applicants.

Resources and equipment needs will barely be effected; in fact, in the long run, design faculty will be able to take on a more supervisory role in the design process; thereby allowing them more time to teach more classes.

This program will aid the department's productions better, will supply a more qualified "labor force" for the mounting of departmental productions, and will aid the community by offering them (Fairbanks Drama Association, Fairbanks Light Opera Theatre, etc.) a variety of better-trained designers willing to work in exchange for resume credits.

In conclusion, I feel that because all the pieces are already in place for the B.F.A. program in Theatre, we should take advantage of it and add the program to attract more students into our already growing program.

ATTACHMENT 61/3
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #61
FEBRUARY 5, 1996
SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the deletion of the M.Ed. in College Student Personnel Administration.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR THE BOARD OF REGENTS

Program/Degree:

M.Ed. - College Student Personnel Administration

Identification of Program:

This program is designed to train educators to be able to function in student service positions in higher education. This

training would include specifically: history, philosophy, and contemporary issues in higher education; management concepts; principles of educational psychology, measurement, and research, and supervised laboratory experiences in college student personnel agencies.

Reasons for Requesting Deletion of Program:

This program has not been available for several years and has no students enrolled. The people who developed this program sequence are no longer at the university, and there is no intent to revive the degree sequence.

ATTACHMENT 61/4
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #61
FEBRUARY 5, 1996
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the guidelines for Faculty Role in the Evaluation of Administrators endorsed at the Faculty Senate Meeting #23 on December 17, 1990 as indicated below.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: These amendments delete from the list of administrators to be evaluated those administrative positions that no longer exist and add existing administrative positions.

[[]] = Deletion
CAPS = Addition

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY ROLE IN THE EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

1. All faculty in a given administrative unit will have the opportunity to provide anonymous written input into the evaluation of their EXECUTIVE DEAN, dean or director, associate dean or director, deputy director, and department head. In small units, interviews with individual faculty members may also be appropriate.
2. A representative sample of faculty will be asked to provide written input into the evaluation of the [[Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Research]] PROVOST. The Faculty Senate and its leadership will be included in this sample, as well as any ad hoc groups and individuals who have worked closely with the administrators during the time covered by the evaluation.
3. In each evaluation cycle, a uniform procedure will be used in all academic units to obtain faculty input.
4. The procedure for evaluation of the Chancellor is codified in Board of Regents' policy. The Faculty Senate urges the Regents

and the President to consult with faculty as a crucial part of this evaluation.

5. The administrative characteristics that faculty will have the opportunity to comment upon will include at least the following:

Administrative Tasks

Building and maintaining excellence
Resource allocation

Leadership

Maintenance of strong faculty morale
Problem resolution
Delegation of duties to appropriate colleagues
Building a team

Providing a means to involve department heads and other faculty in decisionmaking

Skills as a mediator between faculty and administration/
community/legislature
General leadership abilities

Academic Contributions

General Comments

ATTACHMENT 61/5

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #61

FEBRUARY 5, 1996

SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Grade Appeals Policy as indicated below.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The existing appeals policy defines the letter grades A, B, C, D, F and Pass as being subject to appeal, while the I and NB are explicitly exempted. However, as the NB is a permanent grade, it too must be subject to appeal. It is recommended that Paragraph II.A. be revised.

The policy does not provide a course of action for the case in which an instructor whose grade is being appealed is no longer an employee of the university but who is willing to participate in the appeals procedure. It is recommended that Paragraph III.A.5.c. be inserted.

It appears that grade appeals committees are not always making certain that the student's request for a review is valid. The committee recommends that the first sentence of Paragraph III.B.4.c be revised.

The present policy does not identify a clear course of action for cases in which the instructor is either the dean or the department head. It is recommended that the present Paragraphs III.B.3-6 be renumbered III.B.4-7, and that a new Paragraph III.B.3 be inserted.

[[]] = Deletions

CAPS = Additions

GRADE APPEALS POLICY

I. Introduction

The University of Alaska is committed to the ideal of academic freedom and so recognizes that the assignment of grades is a faculty responsibility. Therefore, the University administration shall not influence or affect an assigned grade or the review of an assigned grade.

The following procedures are designed to provide a means for students to seek review of final course grades alleged to be arbitrary and capricious. Before taking formal action, a student must attempt to resolve the issue informally with the instructor of the course. A student who files a written request for review under the following procedures shall be expected to abide by the final disposition of the review, as provided below, and may not seek further review of the matter under any other procedure within the university.

II. Definitions

A. A "grade" refers to FINAL letter grades A, B, C, D, F, NB and Pass. The [[NB (no basis) and]] I (incomplete) [[designators are not grades and, therefore, are]] DESIGNATES A TEMPORARY GRADE, NOT A FINAL GRADE, SO IT IS not subject to appeal.

B. For the purpose of this procedure, "arbitrary and capricious" grading means:

1. the assignment of a course grade to a student on some basis other than performance in the course, or
2. the assignment of a course grade to a student by resorting to standards different from those which were applied to other students in that course, or
3. the assignment of a course grade by a substantial, unreasonable and unannounced departure from the instructor's previously articulated standards.

C. "Grading errors" denotes errors in the calculation of grades rather than errors in judgment.

D. All references to duration in "days" refers to university working days, which exclude weekends, holidays and days in which the university is officially closed.

E. "Department head" for the purposes of this policy denotes the administrative head of the academic unit offering the course (e.g., head, chair or coordinator of an academic department).

III. Procedures

A. Errors by an instructor in determining and recording a grade or by the university staff in transcribing the grade are sources of error that can be readily corrected through the student's prompt attention

following the normal change of grade procedure.

1. It is a student's obligation to notify the instructor of any possible error immediately by the most direct means available. If this is through an oral conversation and/or the issue is not immediately resolved, it is the student's responsibility to provide the instructor with a signed, written request for review of the grade, with a copy to the unit department head and the dean of the college or school in which the course was offered.

2. Notification must be received by the instructor and/or department head within 20 days from the first day of instruction of the next regular semester (i.e., fall semester for grade issued at the end of the previous spring semester or summer session; spring semester for grade issued at the end of the previous fall semester).

3. The instructor is responsible for notifying the student in writing of his or her final judgment concerning the grade in question within 10 days of receipt of the request, and for promptly submitting the appropriate change of grade form to the Director of Admissions and Records if an error occurred.

4. If the student does not receive a response from the instructor or the unit department head by the required deadline, the student must seek the assistance of the dean of the college or school in which the course was offered.

5. If the instructor is no longer an employee of the university or is otherwise unavailable, the student must bring the matter to the attention of the unit department head who will make every effort to contact the instructor.

a. If the instructor can not be contacted but course records are available, the department head may correct a grading error through the regular change of grade process on behalf of the instructor.

b. If the instructor can not be contacted and course records are either unavailable or indecisive, the student may request a review following the procedure outlined below.

C. IF THE INSTRUCTOR CAN BE CONTACTED AND ELECTS TO PARTICIPATE, THEN A CONSTRUCTIVE PARTICIPATION IS TO BE WELCOMED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE. THE PROCEDURES OF PARAGRAPH III.A.5.a OR PARAGRAPH III.A.5.b WILL BE INSTITUTED IF THE INSTRUCTOR WITHDRAWS FROM PARTICIPATION.

6. There may be extenuating circumstances when the deadlines cannot be met due to illness, mail disruption, or other situations over which the student may have no control. In such a case, upon request from the student, the dean of students, after review of supporting documentation provided by the student, may recommend to the grade appeals committee that the deadlines be adjusted accordingly. An extension of the deadline will be limited to one semester but every effort should be made to complete the appeal process within the current semester.

B. If no such error occurred, the remaining option is by review for alleged arbitrary and capricious grading, or for instances where the course instructor is unavailable and satisfaction is not forthcoming from the appropriate department head.

1. This review is initiated by the student through a signed, written request to the department head with a copy to the dean of the college or school in which the course was offered.

a. The student's request for review may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and available at the Admissions and Records Office.

b. By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the review of the grade, and that the university's administration can not influence or affect the outcome of the review.

c. The request for a review must be received no later than 45 days after the first day of instruction in the next regular semester (i.e., fall semester for grade issued at the end of the previous spring semester or summer session; spring semester for grade issued at the end of the previous fall semester).

d. The request must detail the basis for the allegation that a grade was improper and the result of arbitrary and capricious grading and must present the relevant evidence.

2. It is the responsibility of the department head to formally notify both the instructor who issued the grade and the dean of the unit's college or school that a request for a review of grade has been received.

3. IF THE INSTRUCTOR OF THE COURSE IS ALSO THE DEPARTMENT HEAD, THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE WILL DESIGNATE ANOTHER DEPARTMENT HEAD WITHIN THE COLLEGE TO ACT AS THE DEPARTMENT'S REPRESENTATIVE FOR ALL PROCEEDINGS. IF THE INSTRUCTOR OF THE COURSE IS ALSO THE DEAN OF THE COLLEGE, THE PROVOST WILL DESIGNATE ANOTHER DEAN WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY TO ACT AS THE COLLEGE'S MONITOR OF ALL PROCEEDINGS.

4. [[3.]] The dean will appoint a 5 member review committee composed of the following:

a. One tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the course was offered (other than the instructor of the course).

b. Two tenure-track faculty members from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the course was offered.

c. One tenure track faculty member from outside the college or school in which the course was offered.

d. At the option of the student whose grade is being reviewed, the fifth member to be appointed by the dean will be a student or another tenure track faculty member outside the college or school in which the course was offered.

e. The campus judicial officer or his/her designee shall serve as a nonvoting facilitator for grade appeals hearings. This individual shall serve in an advisory role to help preserve consistent hearing protocol and records.

5. [[4.]] The committee must meet within 10 days of receipt of the student's request.

a. During this and any subsequent meetings, all parties involved shall protect the confidentiality of the matter according to the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and any other applicable federal, state or university policies.

b. Throughout the proceedings, the committee will encourage a

mutually agreeable resolution.

c. THE MANDATORY FIRST ITEM OF BUSINESS At this meeting[[,]] IS FOR the committee [[will]] TO rule on the validity of the student's request. Grounds for dismissal of the request for review are:

- 1) This is not the first properly prepared request for appeal of the particular grade.
- 2) The actions of the instructor do not constitute arbitrary and capricious grading, as defined herein.
- 3) The request was not made within the policy deadlines.
- 4) The student has not taken prior action to resolve the grade conflict with the instructor, as described under section III, A.

d. In the event that the committee votes to dismiss the request, a written notice of dismissal must be forwarded to the student, instructor, department head and dean within five days of the decision, and will state clearly the reasoning for the dismissal of the request.

6. [[5.]] Acceptance for consideration of the student's request will result in the following:

- a. A request for and receipt of a formal response from the instructor to the student's allegation.
- b. A second meeting scheduled to meet within 10 days of the decision to review the request.
 - 1) The student and instructor will be invited to attend the meeting.
 - 2) The meeting will be closed to outside participation, and neither the student nor instructor may be accompanied by an advocate or representative. Other matters of format will be announced in advance.
 - 3) The proceedings will be tape recorded and the tapes will be stored with the campus Judicial Officer.
 - 4) The meeting must be informal, non-confrontational and fact-finding, where both the student and instructor may provide additional relevant and useful information and can provide clarification of facts for materials previously submitted.

7. [[6.]] The final decision of the committee will be made in private by a majority vote.

- a. The committee is not authorized to award a grade (letter or pass/fail) or take any action with regard to the instructor.
- b. Actions which the committee can take if it accepts the student's allegation of arbitrary and capricious grading must be directed towards a fair and just resolution, and may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - 1) direct the instructor to grade again the student's work under the supervision of the department head,
 - 2) direct the instructor to administer a new final examination and/or paper in the course,

3) direct a change of the student's registration status (i.e., withdrawn, audit, dropped) in the course.

c. A formal, written report of the decision must be forwarded to the student, instructor, department head, dean and Director of Admissions and Records within five days of the meeting.

d. The decision of the committee is final.

ATTACHMENT 61/6

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #61

FEBRUARY 5, 1996

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Grade Appeals Policy III. B. 3. as indicated below.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Currently, the UAF Grade Appeals Policy does not specify how the faculty members of grade appeals review committees will be selected. The Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee functions as an appeal body for issues of faculty prerogative, and thus grade appeals are included in its mandate. This motion requires that the unit dean select two of the four faculty members appointed to any grade appeals review committee from among the members of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee. If the student requests that the fifth member be a faculty member, the unit dean will also select that faculty member from the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee. The unit dean will appoint the other two faculty members on a committee at his or her discretion.

CAPS = addition

GRADE APPEALS POLICY

III. Procedures

B. 3. The dean will appoint a 5 member review committee composed of the following:

a. One tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the course was offered (other than the instructor of the course).

b. Two tenure-track faculty members from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the course was offered. ONE OF THESE TWO MEMBERS WILL BE SELECTED FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE UAF FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.

c. One tenure track faculty member from outside the college or

school in which the course was offered, TO BE SELECTED FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE UAF FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.

d. At the option of the student whose grade is being reviewed, the fifth member to be appointed by the dean will be a student or another tenure track faculty member outside the college or school in which the course was offered. IF THE FIFTH MEMBER IS A FACULTY MEMBER, THIS MEMBER WILL BE SELECTED FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE UAF FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.

e. The campus judicial officer or his/her designee shall serve as a nonvoting facilitator for grade appeals hearings. This individual shall serve in an advisory role to help preserve consistent hearing protocol and records.

ATTACHMENT 61/7

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #61

FEBRUARY 5, 1996

SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

CURRICULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT - Dana Thomas, Chair

Since the last senate meeting the Curricular Affairs Committee has met twice; December 7, 1995 and January 25, 1996. We prepared the following motions for the Senate's consideration:

- a. Several revisions of the grade appeals policy
- b. A new BFA degree program for Theatre.

We have also approved a change in the Geography B.S. program and approved required coursework for a B.T. degree associated with a Physician's Assistant Certificate.

We have named Madeline Schatz as the committee's representative to the Ad Hoc Committee on Unit Criteria.

In addition, we discussed Justice's admission requirement proposal and offered several suggested changes.

Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday February 8 at 11:00. At this meeting we plan to consider the following:

1. A revised Justice proposal for admission requirements.
2. Concurrent enrollment, the AHEAD program.

Dana Thomas will be out of town for the February 8 meeting. If you have any questions or comments for the committee please contact acting chair, Glen Juday.