

## FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral  
312 Signers' Hall  
474-7964 FYSENAT

## A G E N D A

## UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63

Monday, April 22, 1996

1:30 p.m. - 4:45 p.m.

Wood Center Ballroom

- |      |     |   |         |        |
|------|-----|---|---------|--------|
| 1:30 | I   | Call to Order - Eric Heyne  | 5 Min.  |        |
|      |     | A. Roll Call  |         |        |
|      |     | B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #62   |         |        |
|      |     | C. Adoption of Agenda   |         |        |
| 1:35 | II  | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions   | 5 Min.  |        |
|      | A.  | Motions Approved:   |         |        |
|      | 1.  | Motion to amend the UAF Governance Coordinating Procedure to delete the Library & Information Technology Users Committee.                                 |         |        |
|      | 2.  | Motion to suspend for one year the change in the last day of late registration.   |         |        |
|      | 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  |         | 5 Min. |
|      | A.  | ASUAF - A. Wells  |         |        |
|      | B.  | Staff Council - R. Pierce, President-Elect  | 5 Min.  |        |
|      | C.  | President's Report - E. Heyne (Attachment 63/1)   | 5 Min.  |        |
|      | D.  | Faculty Alliance meeting - D. Lynch (Attachment 63/2)   | 5 Min.  |        |
| 2:20 | V   | Public Comments/Questions   | 5 Min.  |        |
| 2:25 | VI  | Old Business  |         |        |
|      | A.  | Motion to recommend changes to proposed Regents' Policy on locus of tenure, submitted by Faculty Affairs (Attachment 63/3)                                | 10 Min. |        |
|      | B.  | Motion to recommend changes to proposed Regents' Policy on Post-Tenure Evaluation, submitted by Faculty Affairs (Attachment 63/4)                         | 20 Min. |        |
| 2:55 | VII | New Business  |         |        |
|      | A.  | Election for the 1996-97 UAF Faculty Senate President-Elect (Handout)   | 5 Min.  |        |
|      |     | *** BREAK***  | 5 Min.  |        |
|      | B.  | Resolution to ratify election of 1996-97 UAF Faculty Senate President-Elect (Attachment 63/5)   | 5 Min.  |        |
|      | C.  | Evaluating Educational Effectiveness - D. Thomas (Attachment 63/6)  | 10 Min. |        |
|      | D.  | Motion to amend the minimum high school gpa for admission to the concurrent enrollment (AHEAD) program, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 63/7) | 10 Min. |        |
|      | E.  | Motion to recommend changes to proposed Regents' Policy on Failure to Receive Tenure,   | 5 Min.  |        |

submitted by Faculty Affairs (Attachment 63/8)

- |      |      |   |         |
|------|------|---|---------|
| 3:35 | VIII | Discussion Items  |         |
|      | A.   | Report on Collection 2 & 3 - D. Lynch   | 10 Min. |
|      | B.   | Discussion of minimum class size policy -<br>E. Heyne (Attachment 63/9)       | 15 Min. |
|      | C.   | Report of the Program Assessment Task Force -<br>D. Thomas (Attachment 63/10) | 10 Min. |
|      | D.   | Status of college/school merit increase<br>procedures                         | 10 Min. |
| 4:20 | IX   | Committee Reports   | 15 Min. |
|      | A.   | Curricular Affairs - Dana Thomas<br>(Attachment 63/11)                        |         |
|      | B.   | Faculty Affairs - Barbara Alexander<br>(Attachment 63/12)                     |         |
|      | C.   | Scholarly Activities - Paul Layer   |         |
|      | D.   | Developmental Studies - Ron Illingworth                                       |         |
|      | E.   | Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Diane Bischak                                   |         |
|      | F.   | Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -<br>Rich Seifert               |         |
|      | G.   | Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - Michael Jennings                               |         |
| 4:35 | X    | Members' Comments/Questions   | 5 Min.  |
| 4:40 | XI   | Adjournment   |         |

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/1

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63

APRIL 22, 1996

PRESIDENT'S REPORT - Eric Heyne

By the time of our meeting, the Board of Regents will have met again, and the Academic and Student Affairs Committee will have had another look at faculty policy revisions, including locus of tenure and post-tenure evaluation. The Senate needs to take a position on these issues and stand by it for the next two months, building consensus with faculty at UAA and UAS.

On April 12th Don and I learned that the administrations of UAS and UAA were planning to spend all 2.6% of this year's salary raise money for equity, avoiding the problem of setting up an equity system in the short time available before the end of the contract period. I think this is a great idea, and I would love to see our administration follow suit, or at least make this option available to units that do not want to rush into implementing a merit pay policy.

To save money, the UAF administration has decided to begin enforcing minimum enrollments more stringently than has been done in the past. Included in your agenda is a draft list of tasks, generated by the Chancellor, for faculty whose classes are cancelled for under-enrollment. The Senate needs to discuss the question of minimum class sizes, within the larger context of deciding what kind of university we want to be. We should take the lead on this issue, because it is academic policy, which we assert to be our prerogative, and because it goes to the heart of our working lives and the academic lives of our students. The UAF policy on minimum class sizes is very old, pre-dating the Senate, and if it is going to be enforced more strictly, it should be ratified or altered by the

Senate. Please do not consider this merely an argument over make-work for faculty whose classes are cancelled--the issue is much more important, and is central to larger questions of faculty workload and pedagogy.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/2

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63

APRIL 22, 1996

#### REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE

FACULTY ALLIANCE MEETING OF APRIL 12, 1996

Don Lynch, Pres. Elect UAF Faculty Senate

The Faculty Alliance meeting was attended by: Nan Myers (Statewide), Don Lynch (UAF), Pat Ivey (Governance), Eric Heyne (UAF), Cheryl Mann (UAA), Rita Johnson (UAS), Phil Slattery (UAS), Margaret Engel (UAA), and Richard Hacker (UAS). Patty Kastelic (Statewide) attend the last part of the meeting. The Alliance recommends that each Senate approve the attached Resolution passed by the UAA Assembly and request that it be included in University Regulations. The discussion of whether or not to recommend inclusion in Regents' Policy indicated that this might be a fruitless effort as it may contradict the Regents Constitution, Bylaws, and perhaps even the State Constitution. However, it can be placed in Regulations. As presently proposed:

"Regents' Policy and University Regulation, P01.02.01 Authority:

A. Regents' Policy: NOTHING CONTAINED IN THESE POLICIES WILL BE CONSTRUED TO RESTRICT THE POWER OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS TO PERIODICALLY CREATE, AMEND, OR REPEAL THE PROVISIONS HEREOF IN WHOLE OR IN PART."

Locus of Tenure: UAS has voted for tenure to be by MAU. UAA has not made a decision, is concerned about reasons for termination for cause. UAF has the matter under consideration and is to send our Faculty Affairs version on Wednesday, April 17.

Assessment Committee Report on measurements of educational effectiveness is to be made at the April 17 Board of Regents meeting.

Equity and Merit Raises. UAS believes that their Chancellor will recommend using the entire 2.6 percent for equity raises this year. UAA may recommend the same matter. UAF is moving with all deliberate speed on this matter. UAS will likely have a merit system in place next year.

UAA and UAS are both undergoing reorganizations which will probably result in the elimination of staff positions. UAF reorganization is to occur in 1996-97.

THE NEXT AND PROBABLY FINAL ALLIANCE MEETING WILL BE ON MAY 6TH. THIS IS THE LAST TIME THE FACULTY ALLIANCE WILL HAVE TO PREPARE COMMENTS ON COLLECTION THREE, SCHEDULED FOR REGENTS' APPROVAL ON JUNE 14, 15, AS WELL AS COMPENSATION ISSUES. THE PRINCIPLE FOCUS MUST BE ON COLLECTION THREE FOR THE JUNE REGENTS MEETING. NEWLY ELECTED SENATE OFFICERS SHOULD ATTEND.

Cheryl Mann, President, Faculty Alliance, and Don Lynch, UAF will attend the Regents meeting April 18, 19 in Anchorage.

Student Affairs Policy Drafts are under review and may be found on the internet at:

<http://sygov.swadm.alaska.edu/Tracking/Review/students.html>

-----  
From: Cheryl Mann

Subject: Document distribution

Dear Pat,

Today at the UAA Assembly meeting we passed a portion of the Principles on shared Governance that we got from Mississippi State and I wonder if it would be possible for each campus to get a copy of this message before the meeting tomorrow because I plan to discuss it during the UAA report.

Below is the Principle relating to communication with Governance bodies as we revised and passed it.

CONSULTATION. To facilitate open communication and effective university governance, the president and other administrative officers of the university will proactively exercise diligence in consulting with the faculty, APT and classified staff, students, and external constituents on issues affecting them. Consultation is characterized by early discussions with the affected constituencies, jointly formulated procedures for consultation, reasonable deadlines within the constraints of the academic calendar, access to appropriate information, adequate feedback, and timely communication of decisions to the affected constituencies.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/3

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63

APRIL 22, 1996

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY AFFAIRS

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the proposed language in Regents' Policy on locus of tenure (OX-01.05.2c) be amended as follows:

CAPS = Additions

[[ ]] = Deletions

Faculty will be tenured [[within an academic unit of a community college, extended college or campus, or school or college of an MAU within the University of Alaska]] AT THE LEVEL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS, THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE, OR THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SOUTHEAST. Faculty may transfer with tenure to another academic unit (E.G., DEPARTMENT, PROGRAM) in the same or another [[MAU]] UNIVERSITY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SYSTEM only upon the approval of the faculty and the Chancellor of the receiving academic unit.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Having been presented to the UAF Faculty Senate for formal review and recommendation, the most

recent revisions to Regents' Policy ("Collection III: Faculty Policies," 04.04.04-07 and 10.09.01, 4th Draft) are found unsatisfactory in locating tenure "within an academic unit of a community college, extended college or campus, or school or college of an MAU within the University of Alaska." Revised language in )X-01.05.2c, specifically the words "academic unit" and MAU," remain ambiguous and subject to interpretation which may undermine the award of tenure as a continuous appointment. "Academic unit" is, for the most part, an artificial administrative entity, all too readily subject to the contingencies of changing educational objectives and mission and corresponding reorganization of the academy. The UAF Faculty Senate's amendment to the proposed language, "at the level of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, The University of Alaska Anchorage, or the University of Alaska Southeast" seeks to assure that there will be no termination of an appointment with continuous tenure except as a bona fide format discontinuance of a program or department of instruction, which discontinuance must "be based essentially upon educational considerations, as determined primarily by the faculty as a whole or an appropriate committee thereof" (cf. AAUP Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure).

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/4  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63  
APRIL 22, 1996  
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY AFFAIRS

#### MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the proposed language in Regents' Policy on Post-Tenure Evaluation (P OX-01.06) be amended as follows:

CAPS = Additions  
[[ ]] = Deletions

Tenured faculty members, INCLUDING ADMINISTRATORS HOLDING TENURED FACULTY STATUS, will be evaluated intensively [[at least]] every five years by peer faculty and administrators HAVING LINE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF SUPERVISION (E.G., DEPARTMENT HEAD/CHAIR, SCHOOL/CAMPUS DIRECTOR, COLLEGE DEAN OF THE TENURED FACULTY MEMBER. INASMUCH AS DETERMINATION OF FACULTY STATUS IS PRIMARILY A FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY, ADMINISTRATORS PARTICIPATING IN THE POST-TENURE EVALUATION PROCESS SHOULD CONCUR WITH THE PEER FACULTY JUDGMENT EXCEPT IN RARE INSTANCES AND THEN ONLY BY PROVIDING COMPELLING REASONS IN WRITING AND IN DETAIL. These evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the criteria and process for evaluation in Regents' Policy, University Regulation, and MAU rules and procedures on evaluation of faculty. NEITHER THE CRITERIA NOR THE PROCESS OF POST-TENURE EVALUATION WILL BE CONSTRUED AS EQUIVALENT TO THE PROBATIONARY EVALUATION OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, THE AWARD OF TENURE ITSELF SERVING AS PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF A FACULTY MEMBER'S DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE AS TEACHER, SCHOLAR, AND CITIZEN OF THE ACADEMY AT LARGE. THEREFORE, POST-TENURE EVALUATION MUST BE ESPECIALLY

CAREFUL TO BE COMPLIANT WITH STANDARDS OF DUE PROCESS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM, I.E., TEACHING, RESEARCH, PUBLIC SERVICE, AND EXTRAMURAL ACTIVITIES FREE OF CAPRICIOUS INSTITUTIONAL CENSORSHIP OR DISCIPLINE. MAU rules and procedures will include a process for remediation to address situations in which the competence and/or performance of a faculty member is deemed to be unsatisfactory. At any time prior to the scheduled evaluation, the TENURED faculty member's Dean or Director may, as a result of [[other]] PEER FACULTY evaluations, initiate processes to improve faculty performance [[which could include the post-tenure review process]].

Once a TENURED faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation as a result of the intensive post-tenure review process, annual evaluations will take place until the TENURED faculty member receives a satisfactory POST-TENURE evaluation. THE YEAR IN WHICH A SATISFACTORY EVALUATION IS GIVEN WILL BE THE BASE YEAR FOR THE NEXT SCHEDULED INTENSIVE POST-TENURE REVIEW. Unsatisfactory evaluations REFLECTING [[AN]] THE TENURED FACULTY MEMBER'S unwillingness or inability to fulfill [[the]] A REASONABLE performance assignment for three consecutive years constitute grounds for termination for cause. 'CAUSE' SHALL BE UNDERSTOOD TO BE A DECLARATION OF INCOMPETENCE DIRECTLY AND SUBSTANTIALLY (1) IN THE FACULTY MEMBER'S RESPONSIBILITIES IN TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE, AND/OR (2) FOR MORAL TURPITUDE.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Regents' Policy revisions have been presented to the UAF Faculty Senate for formal review and recommendation on content. The section on Post-Tenure Evaluation is an entirely new addition to Regents' Policy concerning faculty status. The proposed amendment to policy seeks to highlight the UAF faculty perspective on the issue of post-tenure evaluation, and to do so in such a way as to safeguard the enduring attitude and standards endorsed by the American Association of University Professors and associated institutions of high education.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/5  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63  
APRIL 22, 1996  
SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION  
=====

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate ratifies the election of President-Elect on the basis of the following ballot.

BALLOT

PRESIDENT-ELECT

Please vote for ONE individual to serve as the President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate for 1996-97.

\_\_\_\_\_ John Craven, Professor

## Physics/GI

\_\_\_\_ Michael Jennings, Assistant Professor  
School of Education

\_\_\_\_

(Personal Statements follow)

\*\*\*\*\*

JOHN D. CRAVEN - PERSONAL STATEMENT

I joined UAF in July, 1991, after having spent the first 22 years of my post-graduate studies at my alma mater, the University of Iowa. My appointments in the Department of Physics were to the full-time research faculty, for which we investigated the aurora and related phenomena with Earth-orbiting NASA spacecraft. This work included the creation of proposals and designs, the construction, testing and flight of instruments or complete spacecraft, flight operations, data analysis and scientific publications. It also included significant program management and the occasional academic commitment to teach undergraduate physics courses. It was my auroral research that lead to UAF's <sup>3</sup>offer I couldn't refuse<sup>2</sup>; a second career (my first real job!), and the opportunity see more of the aurora from below. My UAF academic appointment as Professor of Physics is half-time in the Physics Department (9 months), teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in physics, and the remainder at the Geophysical Institute (12 months) for research and graduate student mentoring. I am a midwesterner by birth, with a generous but not fully matured mixture of conservative and liberal views about too many things, and a working temperament shaped through many years of association with NASA programs. The latter may not be reversible.

I have been a CNS representative on the Faculty Senate for three years, with early service as an alternate on the previous Graduate Council and as a member of the Senate's ad hoc Committee on the UA Learning Cooperative. I now serve on the progeny of that ad hoc committee, the Provost's ad hoc Committee on Distance Delivery and Technology Enhanced Education, and on the Senate's Curricular Affairs committee. Other experiences include numerous committees within CNS and the GI, the Chancellor's Task Force on Program Assessment, and the Graduate Program Review Committee for the English Department. All have aided me in my second post-graduate education.

My view of the Senate is that of an organization build upon the premise of a strong committee system, and I have had the good fortune to be a member of what I perceive as a wonderful example how shared governance can work at the committee level. I pointed out in a recent senate meeting that committees appear increasingly invisible to faculty members not participating in the Senate or its committees, and this is due in part to the lack of even the most elementary forms of meeting announcements. It was not always this way. Alternative interpretations may include the possibility that little work is being done or even needs to be done. I doubt the latter. We represent the faculty's contribution to shared governance and are expected to aid in the improvement of our university, but this can not exist in name only, it must be made to work, not in the dark but well illuminated and productive. If it is true that we have too many committees chasing too little work, that should be considered after the present faculty discussions about collective bargaining are

resolved. A negative vote opens the door to our reevaluation of our committee structure, while a positive vote will remove the option and make restructuring as certain as program assessment and declining state budgets. I fully expect, but certainly have no direct knowledge, that we would at least retain our role in academic and curricular affairs and other functions that do not directly impact us personally as faculty members. It probably means that those of us whose terms do not expire this spring could be at the table during formation of some new version of this body. In closing this topic, I do not forget that shared governance is a two-way street, and that the other lane has some potholes and detour signs in need of attention. Each side has its duties and obligations (clients and masters), and we need to take care that we pay some attention to the <sup>3</sup>art of the possible<sup>2</sup> when pressing our issues.

Discounting the state politics of salary issues common to many state institutions, I have always believed that the <sup>3</sup>gowned<sup>2</sup> university faculty and many others within the university possess one of the finest forms of employment possible. We have, for example, a version of flex-time that is the envy of many and, yet, it is one source of our dubious reputation with some from the <sup>3</sup>town.<sup>2</sup> Few would turn down our health and retirement package. How do our fees for parking compare with those at other universities? We do not have to like some of the particulars and we have every right to improve our positions, but we must keep some sense of perspective, for the arguments amongst ourselves are heard by others. Tenure is a foreign word to most outside our halls, and now it seems even the Board of Regents needs a regular refresher course. Tenure is privilege bestowed upon us to protect our intellectual discourse about that which we are knowledgeable. It is loaded with obligations. We owe it to the citizens of this state to demonstrate the benefits of academic freedom and tenure through education, our active presence in the community and state, and, forgive me, a good old-fashion sales job.

A wise state-supported university must make certain that its undergraduate programs are solid and well thought of. It does no good to talk about building a strong research university if the citizens of the state perceive that this is being done at the expense of the undergraduate programs and facilities, or, worse, if people believe that a good undergraduate education means leaving Alaska. It's much like politics: remember your base constituency. Our task as faculty members is to strongly assist in this effort, for in the end it is our performance that makes the difference. Do good work with the students in the classroom, help to secure a firm base of programs, and also continue to distinguish ourselves within the state by maintaining strong research programs. I believe that the latter cannot succeed without the former. I do not mean to suggest that the administration should avoid advertising our graduate programs and emphasizing UAF's unique contributions, but the research institutes are very good at maintaining visibility (e.g., <sup>3</sup>From the center of the Earth ....<sup>2</sup>) on a daily basis and can eclipse the more humble efforts of individual colleges and schools within UAF. As a member of the Faculty Senate, I believe it is our obligation to provide leadership and encouragement. I am not a great fan of the contemporary vocabulary of product, production, profits, performance, etc., but we must face the fact that the quiet, monastic college don of the past is past, and we must include in our service a service to the enhancement of our collective reputation in an energetic, but dignified and intellectually honest manner. Another option is to leave it totally to the administration, but some within our ranks always say there is too much administration. Perhaps the administration needs to spend a bit more time demonstrating just how their contributions are vital and productive, as we are repeatedly asked to do. Their work can then be better



appreciated. I have summarized my position about the GI's large staff by saying that I am certain there are too many staff members, but that I know very well all those I work with are vital to our success.

I recall with private glee the rousing report at our last meeting by the director of the alumni association on how their target was to do without any state support. Now that is knowing one's constituency, trusting in their underlying interest in UAF, and going to work. Great. Let's do our part in our own way within our institutions.

#### MICHAEL JENNINGS - PERSONAL STATEMENT

I will bring to the position a good deal of institutional history, from a variety of perspectives. I have been a student here, receiving a BA in Alaska Native Studies, a Masters in cross-cultural Education, from UAF. My graduate work was done in social policy at the University of British Columbia and although I am relatively new to the faculty I have been a statewide system officer and an administrator at Tanana Valley Community College. These vantage points allow me to see the University in its component parts as well as a whole.

Additionally, my background in personnel and labor relations should prove beneficial in this period of union organization and system wide policy revision. Should you have any questions concerning my interest in serving or my qualification for this position, please feel free to contact me at my office number, 6454. Thank you for your consideration.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/6  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63  
APRIL 22, 1996

#### MOTION =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend the adoption of a policy on evaluating educational effectiveness as described below.

EFFECTIVE:       Immediately  
                                Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE:       In order to maintain our institutional accreditation, UAF must develop and implement a process of educational evaluation. In addition, the UA Board of Regents has a draft policy requiring such a process which they will consider at their June meeting. Copies of the accreditation standards and proposed BOR policy are available at the Faculty Development Office. The provost has named the following team to coordinate UAF's effort in this regard; Dana Thomas (Chair), Paul Reichardt, Joan Worley, Jin Brown, Meriam Karlsson, Ralph Gabrielli, and Ron Johnson. This team offers the proposed UAF policy below to begin our development and implementation of an educational effectiveness evaluation process. Evaluating educational effectiveness methods may include, but are not limited to, interviews, transcript analyses including persistence, performance, and course taking patterns, student self-evaluations, standardized tests, portfolio

samples, capstone courses, course grades, exit surveys, and graduate employee or employer surveys. The Office of Faculty Development will arrange a workshop this fall for training faculty in this area.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### UAF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION POLICY

In accordance with its mission, the University of Alaska Fairbanks has a continuing responsibility to review and improve performance of students, faculty, and programs. UAF therefore establishes the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation to describe the effects of curriculum, instruction, and other institutional programs. The process will be useful for curricular and institutional reform and will be consistent with UA Board of Regents Policy and institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

The university shall ensure the academic freedom of the academic community in the development and maintenance of this process.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

- 1) Student Information - Students will be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.
- 2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum - Evaluation of the CORE curriculum will include assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.
- 3) Programmatic Evaluation - Each degree and certificate program will establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.
- 4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning - An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of those activities and student support services impacting a student's education shall be conducted.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/7

UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63

APRIL 22, 1996

SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

#### MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the minimum high school cumulative grade point average for admission to the concurrent enrollment (AHEAD) program from 2.5 to 3.0.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately  
Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The Chancellor approved our previous request but included a note requesting a higher gpa. The

Curricular Affairs Committee concluded that the purpose of the AHEAD program was to work with exceptional high school students. Other options are still available for high school students with a lower gpa to enroll in individual UAF courses.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/8  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63  
APRIL 22, 1996  
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY AFFAIRS

MOTION  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the proposed language in Regents' Policy on Tenure (0X.01.05) be amended as follows:

CAPS = Additions  
[[ ]] = Deletions

Proposed Regent's Policy 0X.01.05  
F.5. Failure to Receive Tenure.  
{Rearranged}

[[A faculty member may stand]] A CANDIDATE STANDING for tenure prior to the mandatory year of review [[In so doing, the candidate]] MUST PROCEED THROUGH ALL STEPS [[may withdraw at any step]] in the process. [[prior to review by the Chancellor.]] If the decision of the Chancellor is to deny tenure, the faculty member [[shall be offered a terminal appointment]] WILL CONTINUE TO SERVE AS TENURE TRACK FACULTY SUBJECT TO REGENTS' POLICY 0X.01.07 (Termination of Faculty Appointment), BUT MAY NOT STAND AGAIN FOR TENURE PRIOR TO THE MANDATORY YEAR OF REVIEW. THE DECISION OF THE CHANCELLOR IN THIS INSTANCE IS FINAL.

A faculty member must stand for tenure BY OR in the mandatory review year. [[as defined in section 4.b.(1-4) above.]] If tenure is not awarded IN THE MANDATORY YEAR, the faculty member [[shall]] WILL be offered a terminal appointment for one additional year of service.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The previous wording of this policy stated that a faculty member denied tenure prior to the mandatory year MAY continue as a tenure track faculty, implying the Chancellor could, outside of Regent's Policy 0X.01.07 (Termination of Faculty Appointment), issue a terminal contract upon the denial of early tenure. Provost Keating stated in a previous UAF Faculty Senate meeting that was not the intent of the proposed policy. Hence, this change in wording better reflects the intention on the proposed policy.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/9  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63  
APRIL 22, 1996  
SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

According to university guidelines, a minimum number of students must register for a class to keep it open. Twenty students are needed to keep a 100-level class open, 12 for a 200-level class, 10 students for a 300-level class, eight for a senior-level class and six for a graduate course.

#### CHANCELLOR'S DRAFT LIST OF ALTERNATIVE ASSIGNMENTS FOR FACULTY WHOSE CLASSES ARE UNDER ENROLLED.

1. Track National Merit Scholars currently enrolled at UAF and graduates
2. Aide to Dean Kirts in work of Enrollment Strategy Board (ESB)
3. Develop brochure of graduate students on named private gift awards
4. Conduct exit interviews of students and track those who left previous semester
5. Develop video on Rasmuson Fisheries Center graduate student projects
6. Aide to Wanda Martin on student advising effectiveness
7. Become sponsor of Student Ambassadors working with Saichi Obu
8. Aide to Chancellor for Rural Educator Preparation Partnership implementation
9. Teach courses in units other than own
10. Develop projects to expand UAF contacts with international students
11. Analyze projects in Projects, Planning & Facilities, e.g., calculate saving in energy modifications
12. Develop plan for improved signs on campus (signage)
13. Assist URIA implement strategy for improved UAF's public image
14. Aide to Administrative Services in developing a strategic plan for utilities
15. Teach non-credit courses
16. Assist units/individuals in writing grant proposals
17. Assist in preparation of handbook on proposal writing

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/10  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63  
APRIL 22, 1996

#### REPORT OF THE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT TASK FORCE

December 21, 1995

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

##### Preamble

The Program Assessment Task Force was appointed by Chancellor Wadlow in Fall of 1995 to review previous efforts to formally identify cost savings and opportunities for increased efficiency. The task force was also charged with recommending to the chancellor any actions which should be taken to improve UAF's operations and identify options to be considered when UAF makes further budget reductions and/or reallocations.

##### Guiding Principles

The task force used three guiding principles during its deliberations:  
\*minimize impact on students

- \*minimize impact on faculty who are central to UAF's missions
- \*provide effective management of activities and programs directly related to #1 and #2

#### Recommendations

- \*Use external standards to identify reductions in administrative and student services
- \*Examine the service component of each faculty member's workload
- \*Review all coordinating centers
- \*Move all UAF publications to self-support
- \*Systematically review the productivity of organized research units
- \*Employ an instructional model to evaluate productivity of instructional programs
- \*Consider implementing some form of zero-based budgeting
- \*Review UAF's smallest academic departments and programs
- \*Examine the cost-effectiveness of "site-based" programs
- \*Consider systemwide restructuring of two large "redundant" programs

February 7, 1996

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Task Force on Program Assessment  
 John Craven, Professor, Physics Department  
 Charlie Dexter, Professor, Downtown Campus  
 John Phillips, Director, Physical Plant  
 Paul Reichardt, Dean, College of Natural Sciences  
 Peggy Shumaker, Professor, English Department  
 Dana Thomas, Associate Professor, Department  
 Mathematical Sciences

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

SUBJECT: Your Report

I have begun discussions with senior administrators regarding your report. As the starting point, I selected certain ideas from the ten listed in the Executive Summary and suggestions drawn from previous studies that you consider to be worth a follow-up. Here is what has been put into action and some of my preliminary thoughts.

1. Under-enrolled classes: I agree with you that minimums need to be observed. The first reports from deans to the Provost on this matter illustrate the challenge of achieving this objective while also providing required courses in low enrollment majors and a course schedule that allows students to graduate in the expected time period. There are options schools and colleges must explore, including a proactive strategy that avoids under enrolled classes. But I suspect that will not be sufficient so a combination of measures may be needed. These might include, but not be confined to, assigning additional instructional responsibilities at some time to compensate for a low enrollment class that is taught or a class canceled due to inadequate enrollment; alternative assignments throughout the university to carry out priority projects that financial constraints have delayed or prevented (I have already received a number of possibilities); teaching in other units where demand is higher (the Regents have also suggested this); delivering more courses to rural Alaska or to Anchorage; or alerting students during early registration that certain courses will be offered only if

enrollment reaches a minimum by a certain date prior to the beginning of the semester (these would likely be courses that have not enrolled sufficient numbers in the past).

2. Intercollegiate Athletics: The Athletic Department has already been assigned a reduction of \$200,000 resulting from Program Assessment, which it will meet on schedule. Other cost savings will be explored just like we are doing throughout the university. Because of a frequent suggestion to reduce the number of intercollegiate sports, I am asking for legal advice as to how this strategy would impact our NCAA standing. Further, before another sport is added for gender equity, I am also asking for legal advice regarding our compliance with NCAA gender equity requirements. Yet, I want to emphasize that as chancellor, I will continue to support intercollegiate athletics unless the Board of Regents should mandate elimination some time in the future. In my view, intercollegiate athletics offers a valuable experience for some students; it is an activity found in most universities like UAF, and it generates community support for UAF. I also expect private sector support, both financial and in-kind, to continue and to grow. The CCHA membership fee, for example, was entirely paid by private contributions. Shortly, the UAF athletic program will undergo an external review. All these things considered, I see no need for any additional internal reviews. As we continue to deal with the two issues noted above, i.e., the number of sports and the gender issue, I will be in contact with UAF's Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, its faculty chair, and the UAF Faculty Athletic Representative.

3. Zero-based budgeting; This was a popular concept in past years, particularly during the Carter years in Georgia and in Washington. Vice Chancellor Rice therefore conducted some academic research to find out about the practical results. Frankly, I find them disappointing. Instead, I think that certain of your other suggestions (Numbers 4-6 below, for example) will accomplish much more at UAF. These are the strategies I will initiate in conjunction with policies and procedures of the Board of Regents and Statewide.

4. <sup>3</sup>Consolidate research administration functions<sup>2</sup>: Your recommendation will be implemented selectively in the coming months. This matter needs coordination with Banner implementation. Provost Keating is in charge.

5. <sup>3</sup>External standards<sup>2</sup> will begin to be used in identifying cost-savings in student services. Dean Kirts is in charge and will implement them over the next six months as we examine ways to become more service oriented. The NACUBO <sup>3</sup>benchmarks<sup>2</sup> are already being used in Administrative Services, as you noted, and they will continue to be used. So that the UAF community is better informed, Vice Chancellor Rice will report in future issues of Cornerstone.

6. <sup>3</sup>Systematically review the productivity of organized research units<sup>2</sup>: This will be implemented by Provost Keating. Your criteria are a good start. Proposal submission will be added and possibly other factors proposed by directors and faculty. Some universities add the external research dollars generated per space unit.

7. <sup>3</sup>Employ an instructional model to evaluate productivity of instructional programs<sup>2</sup>: Since the Clemson model is based on a small number of institutions, the Provost is identifying additional comparator institutions. I want this to move quickly because, in the absence of another acceptable model, we are using the Clemson information.

8. You call for UAF publications to become self supporting. This recommendation is complicated by several other recent happenings. Program Assessment recommendations calling for reductions in graphic services and publications (communications), the accreditation report calling for dissemination of more information about UAF progress toward its Goals for 2000, and the Task Force on Communications that I set up pursuant to Program Assessment and whose report last fall caused quite a stir. Selecting a proper course is also complicated by limitations in the financial reporting information which does not adequately sort publications for classroom from other publications and the growing blurring of lines among various <sup>3</sup>publication<sup>2</sup> activities. Yet, I think there is some progress and I expect to provide some directions soon to the senior administrators so we can begin to reduce personnel costs budgeted on Fund 1.

I am continuing to consider your other recommendations and analyses. The information about UAF's smallest academic programs prompts me to stress that certain ones on your list are unique to UAF and are clearly ones that Alaska wants and needs. Two examples that come to mind (and there are others at UAF) are Native Studies and Mining. When others make simplistic cost comparisons of UAF with other universities, we need be very frank about and emphasize aggressively the contributions made by certain small and sometimes costly programs. I keep saying that above all, UAF should not be penalized for meeting a state need. If you have ideas to become more effective in making this case, I'd welcome them.

Please look at this memo as first response to your report. And, thank you again.

JKW/mjb

cc: Provost John Keating  
Vice Chancellor Michael Rice  
Dean Carla Kirts  
Associate Vice Chancellor Karen Cedzo  
Executive Dean Ralph Gabrielli

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/11  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63  
APRIL 22, 1996  
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

CURRICULAR AFFAIRS REPORT FOR THE APRIL SENATE MEETING -  
Dana Thomas, Chair

The Curricular Affairs Committee met on April 1 (no fooling) and April 15. The following list summarizes our discussions and actions:

1) A proposal to allow the transfer of course credits with a grade of D from other UA institutions was discussed and declined.

2) The approval process of instructors teaching MATH, ENGLISH, ETC. via distance delivery or at branch campuses - no action taken.

3) A proposal concerning recognizing a second minor and a requirement for establishing a time in program or completed credit hour maximum for declaring a minor was discussed and declined.

4) A proposal from Accounting to reinstate Accounting 101-102 until these courses can be dealt with by distance and branch campuses was discussed and approved. A proposal to delete this course had been previously accepted by Curricular Review; further review indicated that an extended phase out period was required.

Our committee will be taking up the following issues in upcoming meetings. Any interested individuals or groups are welcome at our meetings. This list may serve as recommendations for review next year as well.

- a. Incomplete grade policy
- b. Credit by exam
- c. Academic standards (probation, disqualification, Chancellor's and Dean's lists) - including development of policies for summer and/or terms of less than a full semester; policies for graduate and non-degree students
- d. Change of grade policy
- e. Credit/contact hours - level/lecture/lab hours/delivery method
- f. Petitions
- g. Admission and registration
  - Associate degree requirements/restrictions
  - Non-degree requirements/restrictions
- h. No Basis grade
- i. Academic bankruptcy
- j. Auditing
- k. Credit/No Credit option

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 63/12  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63  
 APRIL 22, 1996  
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY AFFAIRS

#### FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT - Barbara Alexander, Chair

Faculty Affairs Committee deliberations were focused upon the issues concerning "tenure" as presented in the last drafts of Collection III. Members expressed their most serious concern about the change proposed for "locus of tenure" and the newly proposed policy on "post-tenure evaluation." The Committee is submitting motions both of which take into account AAUP policies concerning academic standards, with special attention to the protection of academic freedom.

The question of administrative status (MAU) for the Prince William Sound Community College with reference to the locus of tenure needs to be clarified and possibly spelled out explicitly in the text of the motion.

Also discussed were the most current suggestions regarding implementation of equity and/or merit salary increases. Both, UAA and UAS Faculty Senates are attempting to resolve the controversies regarding this issue.