

MINUTES
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #61
 MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1996
 WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

I The meeting was called to order by President Heyne at 1:30 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alexander, B.
 Bandopadhyay, S.
 Bischak, D. (Abramowicz, K.)
 Biswas, N.
 Braddock, J.
 Carlson, R.
 Craven, J.
 Curda, L. (Bye, D.)
 He'bert, M.
 Heyne, E.
 Illingworth, R.
 Jennings, M.
 Juday, G.
 Layer, P.
 Lynch, D.
 McBeath, G. (Naske, C.)
 McFadden, T.
 McLean-Nelson, D.
 Morgan, J. (Allen, J.)
 Nance, K.
 Perkins, M.
 Pippenger, M.
 RaLonde, R
 Reynolds, J.
 Schatz, M.
 Summerville, S.
 Swazo, N.
 Thomas, D.
 Wade, C.
 Walworth, J

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Beget, J.
 Creed, J.
 Gerlach, C.
 Hallsten, D.
 Kelley, J.
 Seifert, R.
 Weingartner, T.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ducharme, J.
 Gabrielli, R.
 Gregory, G.
 Keating, J.
 Layral, S.
 Wadlow, J.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT: NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:
 Hayes, J. - President, ASUAF (A. Wells) 1 graduate student
 Scholle, M. - President, UAFSC Alexander, V. - Dean, SFOS
 Hedahl, G. - Dean, CLA
 Tremarello, A - Director, A&R

B. The minutes to Meeting #60 (December 4, 1995) were approved as distributed via e-mail.

C. The agenda was approved as distributed via e-mail.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

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

III Remarks by Chancellor Wadlow:

Chancellor Wadlow commented on the CRA Executive Dean in relation to Board of Regents decisions. The guiding action to date with respect to the Executive Dean of CRA is that of April 1992 when the Board specifically said that the College will be led by an Executive Dean which reports directly to the Chancellor. This relates to Item VIII, Board of Regents policy review. The issue of academic structure is being addressed in the policies and it is possible there will be additional provisions in the policies. Any action needs to be consistent with Board of Regents policy. She suggested that we continue to have full communication between her and the leadership of the Senate. She felt that things can be worked out by the end of the semester.

The Chancellor highlighted certain activities requiring a great deal of attention at UAF including enrollment, recruitment, and retention. Enrollment, recruitment and retention have to be one of UAF's top priorities. There is an emphasis on enrollment because tuition comprises a significant portion of our budget. If the revenue goes down then there are consequence for the entire university. In Fairbanks, for spring, there is a drop of about 1% in head count, in credit hours 2.5%, an increase in full-time students and a decrease in part-time students. The figures for rural Alaska are not expected to drop. The Chancellor has looked at the reports department heads have submitted about the recruitment activities. She is impressed with the array. She has also met with a group of Anchorage leaders and discussed how to increase the number of Anchorage students attending UAF. They urged more contact with the high schools.

The Enrollment Strategy Board is concentrating on retention. One focus was on the importance of advising and taking steps at the department level to personalize the advising service provided students.

The Regents had a special meeting last week to review and approve a revised schedule for renovation of student housing on campus. The plan will accelerate the renewal of the upper dorms and delay some of the improvement in the lower dorms. There are more students living in the upper campus. There will be more revenue sooner because the renovated dorms will have higher rates. When we renew a building we will do a job that will last more than five or six years.

In legislative circles the heat is being turned up on the perceived high costs of UAF within the entire UA system. There may be more demand for UAF courses to be delivered throughout the state of Alaska. The expected attack on UAF costs is a little more intense this year and it is coming from some of the powerful leaders in the legislature. We are working on a strategy to address this.

The Strategic Plan and Goals for the Year 2000--The Chancellor is reconvening the groups that developed the strategic plan in 1992-93. John Whitehead is the chair and it will reconvene two times. One to get an update on what has been accomplished pursuant to the goals for the year 2000 and then a week later to give an analysis and evaluation of how well we have done and what shifts they would recommend to be made in emphasis.

At the undergraduate level, through the use of private funds, next year UAF is able to increase the amount of scholarships awarded to potential National Merit Scholars. There will be a series of graduate level fellowships and tuition support, which primarily are due to gifts from EAGLE & TOTE.

Remarks by Provost Jack Keating:

Of importance to all faculty include the various policies before the Board of Regents. The policies on structure will go to the Board of Regents at their February meeting. The most important set of policies are the Faculty Policies. The first draft has been out for review since November. Comments were due in January to formalize a 2nd draft for the Board of Regents February meeting. The 2nd draft is not significantly different. One issue of concern to UAF, instructors being on tenure-track, is now out of the 2nd draft. There will be a period of about three months for comments before they are sent to the Board of Regents in June.

The second point is what is happening on the salary raises. The raise procedure will be discussed over this semester. Raises will be retroactive to January 1, 1996. The Provost has established a central committee, asking all the Deans and Directors for names. This committee's main task is to make sure there is communication between the units and to help with equity issues. On the salary raises there are two strands. For a full year it would be 1% given for equity, retention, and promotion. Funding for promotions will not be out of this year's amount. It will be half a percent this year because it is a half a year. So this year will deal almost totally on equity issues this year. Additionally, there is a percent given to meritorious performance. Each of the units will establish their own committees of faculty, so that the faculty own the process. We are not dictating a process for each unit, since many have different criteria. The idea is to get as many faculty as possible in the review process and then make recommendations back to the Provost's office. The first step is to get everybody's faculty lines accurately recorded as we have them in Institutional Research.

IV Governance Reports

A. ASUAF - A. Wells

Anita Wells is a member of the ASUAF Senate and was recently elected to chair the Academic Affairs Committee. As part of her job she will be giving a report to the UAF Faculty Senate. One of the important things going on with the Student Senate is a new committee called the Senate Action Committee. The purpose is to get students at large and student organizations together to solve various problems of concern to students on campus. This would include recycling, student apathy, retention, residence halls, food in the commons, tuition hikes, program assessment, parking--anything that concerns students. They are trying to get students united together, hopefully decrease the student apathy, which will greatly increase student retention and pride in UAF.

The Student Senate is sending two delegates to the Board of Regents meeting in Juneau. They will lobby legislators on student concerns and will be asking for a tuition freeze.

The Student Recreation Board is lacking a faculty member. They would have full voting rights. The meetings are 7:30-8:30 Monday mornings, about every other week.

Please encourage students in class to vote in the ASUAF elections February 20-21. Last semester the elections were very close.

B. Staff Council - M. Scholle

Eric indicated that Marie was the newly elected chair of the Statewide System Governance Council.

Marie indicated at the December Staff Council meeting Mr. Moyer came to discuss how the University fits into the Knowles administration. The discussion was less than successful and prompted a three-page letter from the staff to Governor Knowles. Recently, Marie has been notified that she has a meeting with the Lt. Governor on February 15th. Marie hopes to also have representatives from the faculty and students to meet with the Lt. Governor and to discuss with her some of the issue that are important to the University. Governance representatives will also be talking with various legislators including the House Finance Committee members. They will be lobbying hard for issues pertaining to the University as a whole. This year all the Staff Alliance representatives from all the MAUs will be meeting in Juneau and will have a big face-to-face meeting. They will be lobbying the legislature as UA, not UAF, not UAA, not UAS. They will be bringing the concerns of the entire university, so will be there on a forceful front. The Staff Alliance will be meeting with the Faculty Alliance and the Student Network for a convocation with Chancellor Lind to discuss the issues and strategies so that when we go to the legislature everybody will be on the same page.

C. President's Report - E. Heyne

Eric's report was attached to the Senate agenda. He recently attended the AAHE meeting where he was immersed in the nationwide perspective on issues that UAF is going through. He hopes to be a resource, to help faculty understand the changes, and provide a sounding board for discussion.

Eric also indicated that the Student Recreation Center Board needs a faculty representative. If you are interested or know someone who is willing to serve, please let us know. This voice on the SRC Board is the faculty opportunity to provide input. We also need nominations for President-Elect at our next meeting.

D. Faculty Alliance Report - D. Lynch

Don highlighted his written reports on the Faculty Alliance, Provost Council, and Systems Governance meetings. These were distributed as a Senate Handout as follows.

Report on Faculty Alliance meeting of January 26, 1996--The Faculty Alliance, composed of three representatives from each Campus Senate, considered comments which had been submitted regarding Academic Policies. The Alliance discussed these comments, particularly the Quimby report, J. McBeath's letter, and the letter by McNutt, Jeffries, Lingle, and Lummerzheim to Akosofu. In general, the comments propose a five year rather than three year intense post tenure review and object to denying research faculty tenure. There is also concern over the provision that Chancellors in making tenure and retention decisions may use other relevant sources of information.

The Juneau and Anchorage Senates are considering taking Senate positions on the new Academic Policies. The Alliance will met in Juneau February 14 in conjunction with the Regents and will attempt to meet important legislators. The issue of which legislators to meet was left open.

Report on Provost Councils' meeting of January 10, 1996-- Information on faculty salaries has been provided to Deans who are to check the data for accuracy and add time in grade. These are to be used for determine salary equity under the guidance of faculty committees to be formed within each unit. The Provost will form an overall Faculty review group for the Campus. Faculty reviews for raises should consider the members entire career plus one year. Deans need to watch workload assignments rather carefully and contracts should come with a workload statement.

Presentation by BANNER representatives suggest the Student Information System, which includes faculty workloads, may be operational within two years. Cliff Lando is UAF's representative on these matters and comments should be directed to him. To make this system really cost effective will require that each faculty member have a "486" computer.

Presentation by Shari Jordan described the forty-five member Northern Alaska Spatial Data Users group associated with UAF's Image Processing and Geographic Information System Laboratory.

Pre-Senate Meeting with Chancellor and Provost, January 15, 1996--The Accreditation Team recommends a report on UAF's accomplishments in meeting the six goals of the UAF Strategic Plan. The Senate may want to help in this report process.

Systems Governance Meeting, January 19, 1996--Discussed the proposed reorganization of the Anchorage Campus. Anchorage is concerned solely with salary equity questions and will not implement the merit pay raise system for three years.

The Juneau Faculty Senate is dealing with the Regents' salary recommendations and has a plan regarding salary equity and restructuring of academic units. Juneau wishes to lobby for a new cafeteria. Appropriate \$1,500 from its funds for using WEB Server.

There was considerable discussion as to whether or not the modification to the staff salary schedule passed by the Regents in August had followed the proper procedures for faculty consultation. Statewide argued that it had, faculty disagreed. Discussed arrangements for meeting legislators in Juneau, February 15-16, 1996.

Don also put together Highlights of Regents' Policies Concerning Faculty. This Handout is included under Agenda Item VIII, A. It includes comments on Collection One and Two and comments on the 1st draft of Collection Three. What they have done is to divide the new program plan and reorganization into three parts. The documents are lengthy and have been prepared by a committee at the statewide level. The normal procedure is to circulate them to the Board of Regents and let people have whatever input they want. The Senates in both Juneau and Anchorage are considering taking positions on these documents. We are not asked as a Senate to take a position, what they are asking for is public comments.

V Public Comments/Questions - none

VI New Business

A. Motion to approve the BFA in Theatre, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Dana Thomas presented the motion and indicated that his committee had discussed the proposal. Dana indicated that Theatre ranked in the bottom 10% in terms of the number of majors, the number of graduates, and the number of student credit hours produced. There are two ways of looking at this proposal. One, this is an opportunity to turn some of that around, and encourage people to major that are not now because this new major is a more standard avenue to graduate study in theatre. The second point of view is that we are encouraging a program that has not been producing. Dana also indicated that all the courses exist and that the program is a matter of rearranging them. If the courses are already offered, the faculty already there, and the infrastructure already there, it's effectively a no-cost proposal. Dean Hedahl indicated that the students would take more credits in Theatre, but those courses are already offered. They would have a B.F.A. which is a major without a minor. The courses are already part of the regular rotation. The motion passed 18 yes, 5 nays, and 4 abstained.

MOTION PASSED

=====

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.

B. Motion to approve the deletion of the M.Ed. in College Student Personnel Administration, submitted by Graduate Curricular Affairs

Robert Carlson indicated that this request was submitted by the school because it has not been offered recently and they wanted to get it off the books. The motion passed without opposition.

MOTION PASSED

=====

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.

C. Motion to amend the guidelines for Faculty Role in the Evaluation of Administrators, submitted by Faculty Appeals & Oversight

Eric indicated that he had talked with Diane Bischak who was not able to attend the Senate meeting. This motion attempts to get the Executive Dean listed in the evaluation of administrators in the right place. Eric felt that the Senate should defer this until we get the final Regents' decision on what these positions will be called. The Executive Dean presumably will not be evaluated for a few years, there is no hurry. The Senate moved to table the motion.

MOTION TABLED

=====

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

D. Motions to amend Grade Appeals Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Dana Thomas indicated there were two motions, one from Curricular Affairs and one by Faculty Appeals & Oversight. Dana addressed the Curricular Affairs motion and indicated that it was largely a housekeeping issue. They wanted to address the faculty member being the department head or dean. They also had not dealt with the NB grade. So these changes take care of issues that arose. Maynard Perkins submitted an amendment to the definition of Department Head to include Campus Directors for courses whose faculty members are under the College of Rural Alaska. The amendment passed with one nay. The motion then passed unanimously.

MOTION PASSED (unanimous)
=====

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, OR THE CAMPUS DIRECTOR IF THE FACULTY MEMBER IS IN THE COLLEGE OF RURAL ALASKA).

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.

Motion to amend Grade Appeals Policy, submitted by Faculty Appeals & Oversight

There was discussion on combining this motion with the previous motion from Curricular Affairs. Because it came from a different committee it was considered separately. The purpose of this motion was to dovetail the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee with the Grade Appeals process. Dana Thomas opposed the motion because it was a student based appeal and there was a concern by his committee on the availability of faculty members especially in the summer months. An amendment adding the option "if available" passed without objection. The motion then passed without opposition. Janice Reynolds pointed out that students need to be aware that while there is a grade appeals process, no matter what the committee decides, the grade may not always be changed. The grade appeals process has limited ramifications.

MOTION PASSED

=====

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. IF AVAILABLE, 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. IF AVAILABLE,

THIS MEMBER IS 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 IF ONE IS AVAILABLE.

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.

VII Committee Reports

A. CURRICULAR AFFAIRS - Dana Thomas

The Curricular Affairs Committee report was attached to the agenda. Dana indicated that the Curricular Affairs committee would be meeting again on Thursday, February 8th and 22nd. Items to be discussed include the Justice program admissions request and the AHEAD program. Glenn Juday will chair the February 8th meeting.

B. FACULTY AFFAIRS - Barbara Alexander

Barbara indicated that the two issues are more as a follow up than needing further action. The committee is very concerned about policy reviews. At their December 11th meeting the committee looked again at the motion passed by the Senate at the December 4th meeting pertaining to censure. Policy changes under way, policies pending and action to be taken don't seem to take into account that existing policies should be respected. So in view of expecting something, the resolution is meant for the record on the question of the role of the Senate. Actions taken as well as well as follow up are of great significance.

The second issue raised is compensation review and implementation. The main reason for a review and follow up is the concern to stay on record has to do with the current mandate to get committee that will deal with the compensation issue. Again the intent of the committee's stressing the question here of issues of faculty governance at large. They take their responsibilities to deal with currently proposed reviews or solutions and there seems to be a conflict. They are looking in the long run, at the way in which our resolutions have been acted upon.

Eric stated that we have tried hard to let the Regents know our feelings. We have the issue of communication between faculty and the Regents' being discussed in a committee now. We have made it clear both individually and collectively that we think the way they handled the compensation policy was a disgrace. The Provost indicated that the Regents want to see their policy work for one year.

There was further discussion on the issue of compensation and the Senate's previous resolution of censure.

Eric formed an Ad Hoc Committee on Revising UAF Rules & Procedures to accommodate the existing administrative positions.

Don Lynch, Norman Swazo, Ron Illingworth and Maynard Perkins will be on this committee.

The following Faculty Affairs report was submitted as a handout at the Faculty Senate meeting by Barbara Alexander.

"Collections" I, II, III: Policy Reviews and Schedule

The Faculty Affairs Committee met twice since the last Senate meeting, on Dec. 11 and Jan. 29 and has continued the debate on currently proposed policy reviews and changes. Committee members continue to urge ALL UA FACULTY to respond to the Regents' and the Administration's request for faculty recommendations!!! Committee members are particularly interested in changes of those policies affecting tenure and promotion review, workload, unit criteria (0X.01.xx and 0X.02.xx).

Policies for Hiring of Administrators Supervising Faculty

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate passed a motion of censure of Chancellor Joan Wadlow on Dec. 4, 1995; and,

WHEREAS Chancellor Wadlow has not formally responded to the Senate to said motion; and,

WHEREAS the issue of search procedures for administrative positions remains unresolved;

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that Chancellor Wadlow (a) provide the Senate with a formal response (written or oral) to the Dec. 4 Senate vote of censure; and (b) that she and the Senate come to agreement on the search procedure for appointments of any administrative officer with line authority appointed by the Chancellor and whose primary responsibility is supervision of faculty.

Compensation Review and Implementation

Several members of the committee reported recent requests from College and/or Division Administrators soliciting nominations for ad hoc committees of faculty on implementation of new compensation policy. The Faculty Affairs Committee requests a roll call vote to determine whether the Senate sustains its prior resolution on compensation from Sept. 18, 1995.

C. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES - Paul Layer

No report was given.

D. GRADUATE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS - Robert Carlson

The Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee is primarily a reactive one which meets to consider various proposals. They are considering three issues: 1) course compression for graduate courses; 2) differentiation of 400/600 level courses; and 3) consideration for who takes graduate courses and should their be a prerequisite.

E. DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES - Ron Illingworth

The Developmental Studies Committee will meet on February 6, 1996.

F. FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT - Diane Bischak

No report was available.

G. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT -
Rich Seifert

No report was available.

H. LEGISLATIVE & FISCAL AFFAIRS - Michael Jennings

They are working on items to be discussed with legislators in Juneau. The administrations priorities are fixed costs and the salary raise issue. The Committee encourages all faculty to review the Board of Regents' policy changes.

VIII Discussion Items

A. Board of Regents Policy Revisions

The Senate moved to go into Committee of the Whole for the purposes of discussion of the Board of Regents policy & regulations review.

Eric indicated that the Senate had a lot of input into the Grievance Policy and Collection 1. The Senate needs to look at Collection 3 closely. Formal Governance review for Collection 3 is from February 26 to May 8. This is a skeleton policy for the whole system, meant to be supplemented by specifics at each MAU. This is intended to be vary broad and plain to accommodate all MAU's.

Discussion by the Committee of the Whole included faculty evaluation and workloads, tenure for instructors, tenure and appeals process, and post-tenure review.

Following are the comments presented to the Senate as a Handout from Don Lynch.

HIGHLIGHTS OF REGENTS' POLICIES CONCERNING FACULTY - D. Lynch
[based on draft 1]

Introduction

The Regent's have divided policies affecting faculty into three groups called Collections One, Two, and Three. Collections One and Two have essentially been approved as has the new Grievance Policy, although final confirmation, as far as I know, has not yet occurred. Collection Three is currently under review by our Faculty Affairs Committee.

Title: Academic and Faculty Policy Review
Regent's Action: Collection 1 - February 16, 1996
Collection 2 - April 19, 1996

Collection 3 - June 7, 1996

The policy coordinator is Nanne Myers, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Purpose of these academic policies:

"A firm direction has been taken in these revisions toward more collaboration between separately accredited components of the University of Alaska." (Cover letter page 1) The changes are intended to:

"Redirect academic policies to enhance and support student access to resources of all MAUs so that their educational goals may be better met

"Emphasize and support the accountability of the President for the overall academic program...." (Cover letter page 1)

Budgetary implications:

- a. Promotion of more effective use of academic resources.
- b. Reallocation of funds to support distance delivery and innovation in non-classroom instructional methods.
- c. Reallocation of funds in support of the community college mission.
- d. More expenditures on inter-MAU communication.
(Cover letter page 2)

COLLECTION ONE: ESTABLISHES POLICIES DESIGNED TO COORDINATE PROGRAMS AMONGST ALL MAUS

Highlights from Collection 1: The title Instructor is made an academic rank and one holding this rank can be considered for tenure. Those holding special ranks, including Research (employed primarily to conduct research and supported primarily by research funds) are not entitled to consideration for tenure (page 5).

"...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..." (p. 15, Policy 10.04.01). Such collaboration will include sharing resources, establishing common curricula, coordinating planning, and "collaboration among units in teaching, research and public service..." (p. 15).

Both minima and maxima credits are established for various degrees (p. 16). A common core curriculum and credit transfer policy is established for all units of the University (p. 18, 19).

COLLECTION TWO: MEASURES ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS AND ESTABLISHES RESEARCH POLICIES

Measurement of Academic Effectiveness

"...each MAU will regularly undertake studies of the impact of its academic programs on its students and graduates. MAUs will describe achievements expected of their students and adopt reliable procedures for assessing those achievements. Assessment practices will be coordinated among MAUs. An annual report on the implementation of assessment practices will be provided to the Board of Regents. Assessment outcomes will be used in program and institutional planning." (p. 1, Policy 10.06.02)

Research

Theses which cannot be published because they contain proprietary

or classified information will not be accepted as satisfying degree requirements (p. 2, 3).

Inventions and patents based on use of University facilities by faculty, staff and students will be assigned to the University of Alaska (p. 4, Policy 10.07.05). "The University...will not assert ownership of copyrightable materials produced by faculty members as a part of their normal teaching and scholarly activities." Copyright ownership of all materials developed from funded research will be the property of the University or in terms of the research contract (p. 5).

The University will implement programs of equal educational opportunity (p. 7-8). Textbooks, etc., must avoid materials which "reflect bias towards any person or group...based on their sex or minority status." (p. 9)

Authorizes athletic programs (p. 9-13).

University regulations regarding Patents authorize the appointment of a Director of Intellectual Property and Licensing and an Intellectual Property Committee to evaluate patents, royalties, etc., and make recommendations to the President (p. 15-22, Regulation 10.07.05).

"The university will not assert ownership of copyrightable materials produced by faculty members as part of their normal teaching and scholarly activities at the university and which do not result from project [sic] specifically funded in whole or in part by the university or by a sponsor of the university." (p. 20-21, Regulation 10.07.05, D, 2, a).

Comment: This appears to beg the question of who owns the copyrights, who obtains the royalties from courses developed in part by University funds but based on faculty resources, e.g. courses placed on CD Rom discs, television, etc.

COLLECTION THREE: FACULTY POLICIES AND ACCOMPANYING REGULATIONS

These are presently under revision based on comments from the Statewide Academic Council.

"Titles of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor will be used to denote rank of tenured faculty." (p. 1)
"Notification of the year of mandatory/tenure/review will be made in the contract for initial appointment." (p. 2) "Time spent in a non-tenure track term appointment will not count in the calculation of the time for mandatory review for tenure..." (p. 3) "Non-tenure track appointments may be made for a period up to but not longer than three years..." (p. 3) Other academic titles which may be used, but do not qualify for tenure include those with the terms affiliate, visiting, research, and clinical. (p. 4)

Adjunct faculty will be appointed to teach on a per course basis not to exceed fifteen credit hours during an academic year. (p.5)

FACULTY EVALUATION IS POLICY 0X.01.03, PAGES 7-27.

Purpose of evaluation is to assess the degree to which the individual has met professional obligations, has continued professional development, prospects for continued development, and possible changes in emphasis needed for continued "growth." (p. 8)

Chancellor's make decisions regarding promotion of tenure track faculty based on recommendations of faculty, administrators, and other relevant sources (p. 10, Policy 0X.01.03.C.1).

Tenure tract instructors and assistant professors will be reviewed for tenure no later than the seventh consecutive year of service. (p. 15-16)

POST-TENURE EVALUATION (Policy 0X.01.06)

"Tenured faculty members will be evaluated intensively at least every three years.... Once a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation, annual evaluations will take place until the faculty member receives a satisfactory evaluation. If evaluations are unsatisfactory for three years, grounds exist for termination for cause." (p. 17, Policy 0X.01.06)

Discontinuance of Program

"When a decision is made to discontinue a program...a good faith effort will be made to place tenured faculty in another program where appropriate." (p. 19) "Should the program be reactivated within two years, previously tenured faculty members will be invited to return..." (p. 20) Faculty member when offered the opportunity to return, has thirty days in which to respond. (p. 20)

"When a decision is made to reduce a program a good faith effort will be made to retain tenured faculty in preference to non-tenured faculty, or to place tenured faculty in another program where appropriate." (p. 20)

"Following a declaration of financial exigency according to Regents Policy, University Regulations, and MAU rules and procedures, faculty members are entitled to a minimum of sixty calendar days notice in advance of the cessation of their employment." (p. 21)

Sabbatical leave policies follow.

OVERALL COMMENTS BY D. LYNCH

These policies, as I interpret them, are designed to provide flexibility in academic programs so that changes can be accommodated by making programs statewide, using distance delivery techniques, transferring faculty from one program to another, discontinuing programs, establishing easy transfers or core curricula from one campus to another, and for eliminating tenured faculty with unfavorable post tenure reviews. In addition, the policies also vest authority in the Statewide Administration for reporting on academic achievements or failures in order to reallocate resources from one branch or program to another, assess where the greatest needs are for faculty and programs and where they do not exist, and to determine the university's interests in copyrights, patents, and royalties. Flexibility in academic programs under the supervision of the Statewide President seems to be the theme.

IX Members' Comments/Questions

John Craven indicated that the chairs of all committees need to notify the Governance Office of meetings. The Governance Office then distributes Public Meeting Notices.

X Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Tapes of this Faculty Senate meeting are in the Governance Office,
312 Signers' Hall if anyone wishes to listen to the complete tapes.

Submitted by Sheri Layral, Faculty Senate Secretary.