

AGENDA

UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #218

Monday, November 07, 2016

1:00 - 3:00 PM - Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

<https://zoom.us/j/292409262>

*Phone numbers for Zoom included below**

- | | | | |
|------|-----|---|---------|
| 1:00 | I | Call to Order - Orion Lawlor | 4 Min. |
| | | A. Roll Call | |
| | | B. Approval of Minutes for Meeting #217 (linked) | |
| | | C. Adoption of Agenda | |
| 1:04 | II | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions | 1 Min. |
| | | A. Motions approved: None submitted | |
| | | B. Motions pending: None | |
| 1:05 | III | A. President's Remarks - Orion Lawlor (5 Min.) | 10 Min. |
| | | B. President-Elect's Remarks - Chris Fallen (5 Min.) | |
| 1:15 | IV | A. Interim Chancellor's Remarks - Dana Thomas (5 Min.) | 12 Min. |
| | | B. Provost's Remarks - Susan Henrichs (5 Min.) | |
| | | C. Senate Members' Questions / Comments (2 Min.) | |
| 1:27 | V | Public Comment | 5 Min. |
| 1:32 | VI | Governance Reports | 8 Min. |
| | | A. Research Report - VC Hinzman | |
| | | B. Staff Council - Faye Gallant | |
| | | C. ASUAF - Colby Freel | |
| | | D. UNAC - Chris Coffman | |
| | | UNAD Report - Katie Boylan | |
| | | UAFT - Kate Quick | |
| | | E. Athletics - Dani Sheppard | |
| | | F. Faculty Alliance Report - (Report from T. Smith linked) | |
| | | G. Senate Members' Questions / Comments | |
| 1:40 | VII | New Business: | 20 Min. |
| | | A. Resolution in Support of Allowing Candidates for Promotion, Tenure, or Comprehensive Review to Opt for Open Meetings , submitted by the Administrative Committee | |
| | | B. Motion to modify the Attendance Policy , submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee | |
| | | C. Motion to have F698 non-thesis course grades automatically be changed | |

from “deferred” to “pass” upon successful completion, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

2:00 BREAK

2:10 VIII Discussion Items 20 Min.

- A. [Draft Revisions for Academic Program Review Policy](#), submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee
- B. [President Johnsen’s Response to the Resolution on Strategic Pathways](#) (Memorandum linked)

2:30 IX Public Comments 5 Min.

2:35 X Members’ Comments/Questions/Announcements 15 Min.

- A. General Comments / Announcements
- B. Committee Chair / Convener Comments

(An active link is added if minutes are submitted.)

Standing Committees:

1. Administrative Committee - Chris Fallen ([Minutes for 09/30/2016](#) linked)
2. Curricular Affairs Committee - Jennie Carroll ([Minutes for 09/19/2016](#) and [Minutes for 10/03/2016](#) linked)
3. Faculty Affairs Committee - Andy Anger ([Minutes for 09/07/2016](#) linked)
4. Unit Criteria Committee - Mara Bacsujlaky ([Meeting Notes for 10/20/16](#) linked)

Permanent Committees:

5. Committee on the Status of Women - Ellen Lopez, Diana DiStefano
6. Core Review Committee - Andy Seitz ([Minutes for 09/12/2016](#) linked)
7. Curriculum Review Committee - Rainer Newberry
8. Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee - Franz Meyer
9. Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee - Donie Bret-Harte, Sean Topkok ([Minutes for 09/19/2016](#) linked)
10. Information Technology Committee - Siri Tuttle
11. Research Advisory Committee - Jamie Clark, Gordon Williams ([Minutes for 09/16/2016](#) linked)
12. Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee - Sandra Wildfeuer, Jennifer Tilbury
13. Faculty Administrator Review Committee (No Group A reviews in 2016-17)

2:50 XI Adjourn

*Phone numbers for Zoom Meeting: Dial: +1 408 638 0968 (US Toll) or +1 646 558 8656 (US Toll)

(If calling without a nationwide calling plan, toll charges are incurred.) Meeting ID: 292 409 262

Background:

The following resolution was first passed at Faculty Senate Meeting #146 in November 2007, and was endorsed by a letter distributed to the UAF faculty in Fall 2008. Since then the Provost has annually provided this resolution to all Faculty Review Committees. The Faculty Senate reaffirmed this resolution at Meeting #176 in September 2011, Meeting #184 in September 2012, Meeting #192 in September 2013, Meeting #200 in September 2014, and Meeting #208 in September 2015. For academic year 2016-2017, the Administrative Committee submits an updated resolution to the Faculty Senate Meeting #218 on November 7, 2016.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the members of Faculty Committees are called upon under the concept of shared governance to provide professional review of other faculty candidates undergoing Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Review (Pre and Post-tenure),

WHEREAS the faculty portion of the review process must be fair and reasonable in order to maintain the reputation of the University, and the integrity of the academic process,

WHEREAS open and transparent Committee deliberations facilitate fair and reasonable review,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly requests that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an “open” meeting, and that “mandatory closed” meetings be avoided, including during the 2016-17 review cycle.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty Committee meetings are “open” at the request of a candidate and are consistent with all other relevant UAF rules and procedures.
2. Open meetings provide strong incentives for fair and reasonable review, including the oversight of the candidate.
3. The Committee can query a candidate for clarification of the file, which will greatly reduce the number of false assumptions and errors during deliberation.
4. Open meetings are educational—candidates who opt to attend their review have the opportunity to learn about academic traditions and practices.
5. Attendance can reduce candidates' anxiety, and make them feel like a part of the process.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the catalog statement on attendance as indicated below:

Attendance

UAF is committed to student success and academic integrity. UAF faculty expect that students are committed to academic achievement. You are expected to adhere to the class attendance policies set by your instructors.

General Absences: If you miss class, you are responsible for conferring with your instructor as soon as possible concerning your absence, and to discuss the possibilities for arranging alternative learning opportunities. Note that some departments drop students who miss the first day of class and who fail to obtain their instructor's prior approval for the absence.

UAF-Sanctioned Absences: If you are scheduled to miss class for an academic requirement or to represent UAF in an official capacity (e.g., NCAA athletic competition, music performance), you must notify your instructor in writing ~~by the first Wednesday of~~ **within the first five days classes are in session in** the semester in which the absences will occur. The notification should list all scheduled absences and bear the signature of a UAF school official.

Instructors are encouraged to make reasonable accommodations for students who miss class to participate in these official, UAF-recognized activities. However, it is your responsibility to follow up the notification of absence by discussing alternative learning opportunities with your instructors before the end of the drop/add period (typically the second Friday of the semester). Doing so will allow you to drop the class and to add another if, after a good faith effort, you and your instructor cannot arrange for comparable learning opportunities that would enable you to be successful in the class.

Effective: Spring 2017

Rationale: Due to schedule alignment across the UA system, UAF classes now start on a Monday instead of a Thursday, giving students just two class days to notify their instructors instead of the previous five class days. This revision will ensure that students have the full five days to notify their instructors of their participation in official, UAF-recognized activities.

Motion from GAAC concerning F698 course grading.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to authorize the Office of the Registrar to automatically change all pass/fail project credits (F698) on a student's record that are graded "DF" (Deferred) to the grade of "P" (Pass) once the project has been fully approved and accepted by the Graduate School. The responsibility for changing the "DF" grade for **letter-graded** F698 project credits will continue to be the responsibility of the instructor of record.

Effective: Fall 2017

Rationale:

The DF (Deferred) grade indicates that the course requirements may extend beyond the end of one semester; e.g., thesis, project, research courses, internships, etc. A final grade and credit will be withheld without penalty until the course requirements are met within an approved time. Currently, the Registrar's Office changes all F699 (thesis) DF grades to "P" (Pass) after the thesis has been fully approved and accepted by the Graduate School. However, project credits (F698) must be changed from DF to P by a "Change of Grade" form signed by the instructor. It is often difficult to get the instructor to submit a Change of Grade form in a timely manner, and this potentially can hold up a student receiving their diploma. It would be more efficient if the Registrar's Office could change F698 project credits that are graded DF to P once the project has been fully approved and accepted by the Graduate School.

Twenty-six departments were contacted regarding their input on changing the requirement from having an instructor change the DF grade to P to having the Office of the Registrar make the change after receiving confirmation from the Graduate School that the project has been approved and accepted. Of the 18 departments that responded to the survey, only one department (the Art Department) would like to continue offering letter grades every semester for their project students. Departments that offer letter grades for F698 are not included in this motion and their instructors will continue to be responsible for submitting grades every semester. The Office of the Registrar would prefer that all F698 credits be offered by P/F. If departments want to offer a project option with a letter grade they could offer this as a separate course with a different number (i.e., Computer Science uses CS 690 and CS 691 as Seminar/Project credits.)

SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO PROGRAM REVIEW - FOR DISCUSSION (ADDITIONS IN BOLD ITALICS; DELETIONS CROSSED OUT.)

Background: Given the potential for program elimination during the ongoing budget crisis, and the need for establishing a clear process, a meeting took place with Vice-Provost Alex Fitts, Provost Susan Henrichs, and the chairs of several Faculty Senate committees. At this meeting revised language that clarifies the role of the Faculty Senate in program deletions was discussed. The proposed revised program review process (below) is a result of that meeting and subsequent changes proposed by FAC and endorsed by CAC with additional CAC changes.

The ~~new~~ program review process will be completed as follows:

1. An initial ~~brief~~ review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit provided ~~two-page brief~~ narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere at UA, and any special circumstances that explain features of the centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary (see attached program review template for more details). The information reviewed meets the Board of Regents Policy and Regulation (10.06; attached). A single Faculty Program Review Committee comprised of one ~~tenured~~ faculty representative **selected by the Faculty Senate** from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus ~~five CRCD representatives~~ **one representative from CRCD and one representative from CTC** will review the materials and make the following recommendations:

- Continue program
- Continue program but improve outcomes assessment process and reporting
- Continue program but improve other specific areas
- **Modify program through consolidation with another program or other significant re-organization**
- **Suspend admissions to program or**
- Discontinue program

The Faculty Program Review Committee shall allow up to two representatives from the program under review to attend the meeting and to answer questions. The Faculty Program Review Committee will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review. The recommendation shall be shared with the Faculty Senate President who has the option to respond within two weeks.

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and four administrative representatives from CRCD will review the recommendations of the **Faculty** Program Review Committee, may request additional information ~~from about~~ the program, and will state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.

3. The Provost in consultation with the Chancellor's Cabinet will review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee, **the Faculty Senate**, and the Administrative Program Review Committee and take one of the following actions:

- a) Program continuation is confirmed ~~until the next review cycle~~.
- b) Program continuation with an action plan prepared by the program and Dean to meet improvements needed by the next review cycle. Annual progress reports will be required in some cases. Actions may also include further review by an ad hoc committee.
- c) **Other actions, such as a major program restructuring. An action plan will be required by the end of the next regular academic semester after a request for restructuring or similar action is made.**
- d.) Recommend to discontinue program. ~~Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, w-When~~ appropriate, admissions may be suspended pending action.

4. **Faculty Senate reviews the recommendations to discontinue or suspend programs and states their collective agreement or disagreement with the Provost's recommendation. If the Faculty Senate disagrees, it will provide an alternate recommendation.**

5. The Chancellor reviews all levels of recommendations and decides whether to recommend program discontinuation to the Board of Regents.