

MINUTES  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #96  
 MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2000  
 WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

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

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bandopadhyay, S.  
 Box, Mark (B. Cooper)  
 Bruder, J.  
 Curda, L.  
 Davis, M.  
 Duffy, L.  
 Eicken, H.  
 Gardner, J.  
 Garza, D.  
 Hartman, C.  
 Illingworth, R.  
 Lin, C.  
 Lincoln, T.  
 Mason, J.  
 Mortensen, B.  
 McLean-Nelson, D.  
 McRoy, P.  
 Robinson, T.  
 Rosenberg, J.  
 Roth, M.  
 Rybkin, A.  
 Swazo, N.  
 Weber, J.  
 Wiens, J.  
 Zilberkant, E.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Amason, A.  
 Butcher, B.  
 Kramer, D.  
 Mammoon, T.  
 Murray, M.  
 McBeath, J.  
 Shepherd, J.

OTHERS PRESENT:

DeLaca, T.  
 Gregory, G.  
 Layral, S.  
 Martin, W.  
 McLean, D.  
 Reichardt, P.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Banks, S. - President, ASUAF (S. Pedersen)  
 Culbertson, S. - President, UAFSC  
 Collins, J. - Dean, SOM  
 Leipzig, J. - Dean, CLA  
 Tremarello, A - University Registrar

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

Graduate Student, GSO

B. The minutes to Meeting #95 (May 1, 2000) 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 amend the Graduate Degree Requirements.
2. Motion to amend the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies & Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty.
3. Motion to approve the deletion of the B.A. & B.S. in Physical Education & Exercise Science.
4. Motion to amend the policy on Minors available for the B.A. degree.
5. Motion to amend Article V: Committees, of the Bylaws.
6. Motion to approve the Certificate and AAS degree

concentration in Emergency Medical Services.

B. Motions pending: none

Larry Duffy indicated that the Administrative Committee approved a change to the AY2001-002 calendar so that spring break is in concurrence with the School District.

III A. Comments from Provost, Paul Reichardt -

Paul Reichardt indicated that Chancellor Lind was on his way to Anchorage and would not be at the Senate meeting. They discussed items to be brought up at the Senate meeting.

At this point the FY02 budget process is in the hands of the statewide administration. For the most part it is a matter of getting the agreed upon initiatives into the right format to be presented to the governor and legislature. One area of the budget that still needs some work is in the area of teacher preparation. The President looked at what had been presented under that initiative. He liked the ideas but did not see a coherent plan for the next step for UA to produce more and better teachers for the state. He would like those involved in the initiative to bring it into a more coherent focus. There was an education summit meeting last week and there will be a follow-up meeting on October 9th in Anchorage. In terms of the broad interest of the University there was a guideline issued to this group that there be delivered a distance delivered baccalaureate route to elementary teacher preparation. This is a change that comes as a result of pressures from K-6 principals and administrators throughout the state. We can't lengthen the time it takes for certification of teachers at the same time we are seeing a shortage of teachers.

At the October meeting the Board of Regent's will look at a draft of the operating and capital budget. There will then be a month in which things will be fine tuned. At the November meeting the budget will be adopted. The budget needs to be to the Governor by November 20th. Reichardt indicated that at this point the FY02 budget was pretty well fixed.

The FY03 budget process is in development. Statewide is reviewing the process from last year. They will be addressing the need to have budget development in the spring rather than during the summer. The Chancellor and Provost have address the need at UAF for a good process for annual budget development. We don't want the development of the budget to drive our academic planning. The process for developing the UAF Academic Action Plan started on September 15 at the Provost Council meeting. Reichardt asked the deans to spend the next month with their faculty developing broad program plans. He suggested that each unit come forward with two or three elements of an action plan for UAF. Deans will be expected to bring to the October Provost Council meeting initiatives that come out of their units and make them available to the entire community. The whole process will culminate with a dean/director's retreat in December. The intent is to develop a set of action plans (initiatives) for UAF. This will result in an academic planning process that will drive the FY03 budget process.

Provost Reichardt displayed an overhead which shows how UAF intends to do planning. A good part of all academic planning goes through the Faculty Senate. The other portion of planning goes through the Provost Council and it's working groups. At the beginning of the academic year he gave each of the working groups a list of tasks to look at this year. Most are academic in nature. There are a couple of groups that fall outside of academics--Student Services and Administrative Services. As the academic plan is developed it will go to

the Chancellor's Cabinet. At that level advisory committees give their input. All planning takes place under the umbrella of the mission statement and the strategic plan.

Peter McRoy asked about the role of the Faculty Senate in early levels of planning. Reichardt indicated that the Faculty Senate has representation at all levels up to the Chancellor's cabinet.

Provost Reichardt then spoke on the Strategic Plan. Six working groups met over the summer to work on a revised draft of the Strategic Plan. Two groups are doing some revision work to develop a more focused plan. At the end of the month a revised draft of the Strategic Plan 2005 will be on the web for review.

Provost Reichardt has initiated an academic leadership institute. The institute is an experiment in getting a group of interested UAF people together to explore the concept of leadership in an academic setting. This year the group will meet one Saturday each month. Each session will have a theme, a guest speaker or presenter, and small groups working on case studies. Ten members will make up the first academy including seven faculty and three staff. Provost Reichardt hopes to hold some version of this leadership academy each year.

#### -----

#### UAF's Academic Leadership Institute

September 19, 2000  
Paul Reichardt

This academic year I am organizing and hosting the first UAF Academic Leadership Institute. The institute will consist of nine half-day meetings (one Saturday morning each month) at which a group of ten UAF faculty and staff, along with facilitators, will explore the concept of leadership in an academic setting. The "course" consists of a required reading list of about a half dozen books on leadership and higher education and the series of meetings, each of which will contain a presentation by an invited speaker/leader, a question and answer session on that month's topic, and group work on a case study. The ten faculty and staff who are "enrolled" in this year's institute were selected, pretty much on a first-come-first-served basis, from those who responded within a few days to an invitation which was sent to Deans, Directors, and the Faculty Senate for distribution at the end of August.

The impetus for this institute comes partially from an experience which I share with many other academic administrators: little or no preparation for formal academic leadership. However, it also derives in part from my belief that academic leadership comes in many different forms from people in many different positions within academia. This institute is an experiment in exploring how we might develop thinking about and preparing for academic leadership at UAF. My hope is that this year's institute will be successful enough that we will continue it in some form in the future.

-----

On November 9th there will be a Department Chair workshop. Two different sessions are planned with one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Provost Reichardt hopes to have a workshop each semester. The agenda for this first one is the role of department chairs, division coordinators, and program managers. It will be run as a panel discussion. Another topic will be the position of department chair with respect to outcomes assessment.

Included in the agenda is a summary report of the 1999/2000 faculty review.

John Bruder asked about the Bachelor of Education degree. He asked if this would be a statewide program. Provost Reichardt stated that was the guidelines issued by the President. Bruder also asked about the priority of distance delivering the BAS degree. Larry Duffy asked about NCATE accreditation standards that are necessary for the degree to meet. Reichardt indicated that it has been mandated by the State of Alaska that our teacher preparation program must meet NCATE standards. The Instructional Working Group is looking at the NCATE standards in relations to the BAS degree. Debi McLean-Nelson said that the BAS remains a fifth year program. Reichardt clarified that the BAS itself is a four year degree and the teacher preparation/certification is an additional fifth year. The mandate now is for a baccalaureate route to certification for elementary teachers. It is not clear that we can develop an eight semester course of study that meets the Core requirements, the state content standards, and the NCATE standards.

#### B. Guest Speaker - Dr. Ted DeLaca, Director, Office of Arctic Research

Ted DeLaca spoke about the need to reorganize the Office of Arctic Research to create an Office of Sponsored Programs. A memo outlining the changes was attached to the agenda.

The role of the Office of Arctic Research was a multitude of things relating to preparing proposal, making sure they met institutional and government regulations. The university does much more than arctic research. Over time they have increased their responsibilities, for example, intellectual properties, technology transfer and the EPSCoR program. In addition there was an increased focus on the part of federal administration on compliance issues. There was also an opportunity to take on a new area of information gathering and the development of grant applications to private foundations. Often times the role of the Office of Arctic Research is unclear nor the relationship of it's director to the administration. DeLaca wrote a proposal to the Chancellor and Provost. The proposal has been taken to the deans and directors for comments. A presentation was made to the Research Working Groups a month ago. The general outcome of those representatives felt it would be in the university's best interest to go forward with the proposal to create a formal Office of Sponsored Programs. The primary focus would be sponsored programs, not just arctic research.

DeLaca reviewed the need for programs and communications that would be enhanced including information access, proposal development, coordination of EPSCoR activities, and electronic grant administration. Research integrity and compliance issues continue to be areas of concern.

Ted DeLaca announced that Dr. David Clark, Director, Office of Research Affairs from Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke's Medical Center will be on campus October 12 to discuss the ramifications of non-compliance.

#### IV Governance Reports

##### A. ASUAF - S. Pedersen

Solveig Pedersen, Vice-President of the student body, addressed the

Senate. ASUAF is redesigning their web site and includes a new student web server. Other areas they are working on include a student saver program. This is a program which provides students discounts at local businesses. President Stacy Banks will be attending the System Academic Council meeting.

B. Staff Council - S. Culbertson

Scott Culbertson, President of Staff Council, spoke about issues that they are following. Last spring statewide administration began a system of reclassification of staff positions. Staff Council will be looking closely at SB #9 dealing with the PERS system. This bill allows those in school districts the ability to buy into the retirement system for the three months they are off contract. Staff Council is also soliciting slides for their calendar. The deadline is October 27th.

Larry Duffy indicated that thanks to Staff Council and Staff Alliance, we now have an official university holiday for Martin Luther King Day.

C. President's Comments - L. Duffy

A report was included in the agenda. Larry Duffy emphasized the importance of faculty involvement in governance at the department level. He also spoke about the draft mission statement and the value statements. These will be important as the initiatives are developed. Ron Gatterdam will be working with Dana Thomas on accreditation. Dean Carla Kirts has asked for interested faculty to serve on a search committee for the Dean of Enrollment Management.

V Consent Agenda

A. Motion to withdraw the motion to amend the Faculty Senate Constitution, submitted by Faculty Affairs

The motion was approved with the adoption of the agenda.

MOTION PASSED

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to withdraw the motion to amend the Constitution presented at the May 5, 2000 meeting concerning research faculty membership on the Senate.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The Faculty Affairs Committee discussion raised several issues with this motion as presented and they will study the issue further before bringing it back to the Senate.

\*\*\*\*\*

VI New Business

A. Motion on Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions, Faculty Appeals & Oversight

Larry Duffy introduced the motion for a general appeals policy for academic decisions beyond grade appeals. The motion passed without objection.

## MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the following Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions.

EFFECTIVE:           Immediately  
                                  Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE:           This motion will bring UAF into compliance with  
                                  the new UA Regulation 09.03.02 and extend  
                                  UAF's appeals policy beyond grade appeals.

\*\*\*\*\*

APPEALS POLICY FOR ACADEMIC DECISIONS  
Other Than Assignment of Grades

I.           Introduction

The University of Alaska is committed to the ideal of academic freedom and so recognizes that academic decisions (i.e., non-admission to or dismissal from any UAF program) are a faculty responsibility. Therefore, the University administration shall not influence or affect the review of academic decisions.

The following procedures are designed to provide a means for students to seek review of academic decisions alleged to be arbitrary and capricious. Before taking formal action, a student must attempt to resolve the issue informally. 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.           As used in the schedule for review of academic decisions, a class day is any day of scheduled instruction, excluding Saturday and Sunday, included on the academic calendar in effect at the time of a review. Final examination periods are counted as class days.
- B.           "Department Chair" 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).
- C.           The "dean/director" is the administrative head of the college or school offering the course or program from which the academic decision or action arises. For students at extended campuses the director of the campus may substitute for the dean/director of the unit offering the course or program.
- D.           The next regular semester is the fall or spring semester following that in which the disputed academic decision was made. For example, it would be the fall semester for a final grade issued for a course completed during the previous spring semester or summer session. The spring semester is the next regular semester for an academic decision made during the previous fall semester.

### III. Procedures

A. A student wishing to appeal an academic decision other than a grade assignment must first request an informal review of the decision.

1. Notification must be received by the Provost within 15 days from the first day of instruction of the semester in which the decision takes effect.
2. 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 Provost, after review of supporting documentation provided by the student, may adjust the deadlines 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.
3. The Provost will request the appropriate department chair or dean to conduct an informal review of the decision and a determination of whether the original decision should be overturned or changed in any way. This review shall take no more than ten (10) days.
4. The Provost will consult with the student on the department chair/dean's recommendation. If the student does not find that recommendation acceptable, he/she may request the Provost to conduct a formal review.

B. The formal review will be conducted as follows.

1. This review is initiated by the student through a signed, written request to the Provost.
  - a. The student's request for review may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and available from the Office of the Provost.
  - b. By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the review of the decision, and that the university's administration can not influence or affect the outcome of the review.
  - c. The request for a formal review must be received no later than 10 days after the student has learned the outcome of the informal review (IIIA4).
  - d. The request must detail the basis for the allegation that the decision was made on a basis other than sound professional judgment based upon standard academic policies, procedures and practices.
2. The Provost will appoint a 5 member review committee composed of the following:
  - a. One tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the decision was made.

- b. Two tenure-track faculty members from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the decision was made. 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 decision was made. If available, this member is to be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.
  - d. The fifth member to be appointed by the Provost will be a non-voting student representative.
  - e. The campus judicial officer or his/her designee shall serve as a nonvoting facilitator for appeals hearings. This individual shall serve in an advisory role to help preserve consistent hearing protocol and records.
  - f. The department chair of the program in which the decision was made will act as the program's monitor of all proceedings.
3. The committee must schedule a mutually agreeable date, time and location for the appeal hearing within 10 working days of receipt of the student's formal request.
- a. During this and 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 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.
    - 2) The request was not made within the policy deadlines.
  - 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.
4. 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 program 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 a representative of the program 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.
5. The final decision of the committee will be made in private by a majority vote.
- a. Actions which the committee can take if it accepts the student's allegation may include, but are not limited to, the following:
    - 1) direct the program to reconsider the decision,
    - 2) provide a final alternative decision.
  - b. The academic decision review committee proceedings will result in the preparation of written findings and conclusions.
  - c. A formal, written report of the decision must be forwarded to the student, program/department chair, dean and Provost within five days of the meeting. The Provost shall then be responsible for communicating the decision to other relevant offices (e.g., Admissions, Registrar).
  - d. The decision of the committee is final.
- C. The entire process must be completed by the end of the semester in which the decision first took effect.

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Motion to amend the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies & Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty, Faculty Appeals & Oversight

Norm Swazo indicated that this motion was to put the use of standards and indices back into the regulations. Larry Duffy indicated that this motion was approved by the Senate last year on a temporary basis pending further committee review. Paul Reichardt asked that we see how well the election process goes this year and if necessary look at ways to speed up the election process. The motion passed without objection.

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty: Initial Appointment, Annual Review, Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Sabbatical Leave as attached.

EFFECTIVE:           Immediately  
                          Upon Chancellor's Approval

RATIONALE:           Unit Criteria as a component of evaluation, tenure, and promotion was apparently removed from the last "Blue Book" due to an erroneous belief that the faculty union contracts rendered them void or redundant in the "Blue Book". This is emphatically not the case, and so we have reinserted the relevant paragraphs on Unit Criteria from the previous "Blue Book".

\*\*\*\*\*

[[ ]] =           Deletion  
CAPS =   Addition

### III.     PERIODIC EVALUATION OF FACULTY

- B.     UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES. UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES ARE THE RECOGNIZED VALUES USED BY A FACULTY WITHIN A SPECIFIC DISCIPLINE TO ELUCIDATE, BUT NOT REPLACE, THE GENERAL FACULTY CRITERIA ESTABLISHED IN A., ABOVE, FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE ON AN ONGOING BASIS AND FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AND SABBATICAL REVIEW.

UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES MAY BE, BUT ARE NOT REQUIRED TO BE, DEVELOPED BY THOSE UNITS WISHING TO DO SO. UNITS THAT CHOOSE NOT TO DEVELOP DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES MUST FILE A STATEMENT SO STATING WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE WHICH SHALL SERVE AS THE OFFICIAL REPOSITORY FOR APPROVED UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES.

UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES, IF DESIRED, WILL BE DEVELOPED BY THE FACULTY IN A DISCIPLINE. AFTER APPROVAL BY A MAJORITY OF THE DISCIPLINE FACULTY, THE UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES WILL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE COGNIZANT DEAN WHO WILL FORWARD THE UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES TO THE PROVOST. THE PROVOST WILL REVIEW FOR CONSISTENCY WITH POLICY AND WILL FORWARD THESE STANDARDS AND INDICES TO THE SENATE FOR ITS AND THE CHANCELLOR'S APPROVAL.

UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES WILL BE REVIEWED PERIODICALLY BY THE FACULTY OF THE UNIT. REVISION OF UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES MUST FOLLOW THE ESTABLISHED REVIEW PROCESS. IF THE UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES ARE NOT REVISED, A STATEMENT OF REAFFIRMATION OF THE CURRENT UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES MUST BE FILED WITH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE, FOLLOWING THE REVIEW.

UNIT STANDARDS AND INDICES, WHEN DEVELOPED BY THE FACULTY AND APPROVED BY THE SENATE AND THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE, MUST BE USED IN THE REVIEW PROCESSES BY ALL LEVELS OF REVIEW. THEIR USE IS NOT OPTIONAL.

IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CANDIDATE FOR TENURE OR PROMOTION TO INCLUDE THESE APPROVED STANDARDS AND INDICES IN THE APPLICATION FILE.

IV. EVALUATION PROCESS FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND POST TENURE REVIEW

- A. Linkage of Promotion/Tenure. An award of tenure is concurrent with promotion and vice versa. Any faculty member applying for promotion to the associate level must also apply for tenure; and a faculty member at the rank of assistant professor may not apply for tenure without concurrently seeking advancement to the rank of associate professor.
- B. Faculty with Academic Rank
1. Criteria and Eligibility. A record of continuing effective performance shall be expected. Procedures, performance criteria and requirements are set forth in the applicable union contracts, UAF Faculty Policies, and in policies of the Board of Regents and the regulations of the University system currently in effect and as they may change.
  2. Review Process. Promotion and tenure of a faculty member results from a multi-level process of evaluation beginning in the academic unit of the candidate.
    - a. Constitution and Operation of the University-wide Peer Review committees.
      - (1) For the purpose of evaluation for tenure and/or promotion of members of the United Academics bargaining unit, a list of the names of seven tenured unit members will be presented BY THE UAF FACULTY SENATE to the Provost who will select the committee or committees. Each unit peer review committee may nominate one of its members to serve. The list will be determined from those nominees by vote of all faculty who serve on unit peer review committees. Faculty shall remain on the list for a term of two years with the terms being staggered. No specific peer review committee can be represented by more than one person. A faculty member may not stand for promotion during the term of appointment to the list.
      - (2) For the purpose of pre or post tenure evaluation of members of the United Academics bargaining unit, a list of the names of seven faculty members will be presented BY THE UAF FACULTY SENATE to the Provost who will select the committee or committees. Each unit peer

review committee may nominate one of its members to serve. The list will be determined from those nominees by vote of all faculty who serve on unit peer review committees. Faculty shall remain on the list for a term of two years with the terms being staggered. No more than one faculty member on the list can be a member of any specific peer review committee. A faculty member may not stand for post tenure review during the term of appointment to the list.

- (3) For the purpose of evaluation for tenure and/or promotion of members of the ACCFT bargaining unit, a list of the names of nine faculty members will be presented BY THE CRA EXECUTIVE DEAN to the Provost who will select the committee or committees. The list will be selected from the tenured faculty in the ACCFT bargaining unit by vote of those faculty. Faculty shall remain on the list for a term of two years with the terms being staggered. A faculty member may not stand for promotion during the term of appointment to the list. The Provost will appoint two members from the United Academics University-wide Promotion/Tenure Committee to serve on the ACCFT Promotion/Tenure Committee.

\*\*\*\*\*

## VII Committee Reports

### A. Curricular Affairs - R. Illingworth

A report was attached to the agenda.

### B. Faculty Affairs - P. McRoy

A report was attached to the agenda.

### C. Core Review - J. Brown

No report was available.

### D. Curriculum Review - S. Bandopadhyay

No report was available.

### E. Developmental Studies - J. Weber

A report was attached to the agenda.

### F. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - G. Chukwu

A report was attached to the agenda.

G. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -  
T. Robinson

A report was attached to the agenda.

H. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee - J. Gardner

A report was attached to the agenda.

VIII Public Comments/Questions - none

X Discussion Items

A. Evaluation Process for Administrators

Norm Swazo indicated that the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee would like to bring these guidelines forward to the Senate. They will be discussing changes in committee meetings and will bring this back to the Senate at the October meeting.

Peter McRoy asked what is the expected outcome of such a review process. Norm Swazo indicated that this gives faculty involvement in assuring performance accountability for administrators. Larry Duffy asked that Senator's take this issue back to their department for comments.

X Members' Comments/Questions -

Sukumar Bandopahyay has agreed to be on the search committee for the Dean of Enrollment Management.

Peter McRoy raised the question of the Faculty Senate's involvement in the budget process. Larry Duffy indicated that the Senators need to communicate to him and also through their departments and deans.

Mike Davis asked about the Senate involvement in legislative elections. Norm Swazo indicated that Gerry McBeath as head of the union's Political Action Committee was organizing meetings with legislative candidates. The idea was to coordinate their activities with Faculty Affairs.

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 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.