

## **Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Meeting – November 8, 2017**

### **Minutes:**

Meeting began at 1:00 p.m., Duckering Building, Room 531. Notes by Jeff May

### **Present:**

- Committee Members: Andy Anger, Josh Greenberg, Jeff May, Sine Anahita, Gordon Williams, Aatur Chowdhury, Debu Misra, Courtney Carothers
- Dean Paul Layer

### **Approval of Meeting Agenda:**

Meeting agenda approved.

### **Approval of Minutes from last Meeting:**

Minutes discussed and approved.

### **Continued Business:**

#### **1. Grade Appeal Process**

FAC reviewed the proposed policy language changes that would developed in consultation with UA Legal Counsel during a recent meeting with them.

Discussed the request to change “advocate” to “supporter” in the new process. This was viewed as appropriate because the person assisting is in more of a support role than a representative role. These support persons are not there to advocate or represent the student or the instructor. The supporters are not to address the committee. We discussed how to make this role clear in the policy. The following language was agreed upon:

*Both the student and the instructor may be accompanied by a supporter. Supporters for the student or instructor may speak only at the discretion of the committee. Supporters shall not act as representatives.*

Discussed UA Legal Counsel’s desire to have the hearing with both student and instructor at the same time. This important to due process. That is clarified in the new proposed policy amendments.

Discussed adjusting the bottom paragraph of page 1. Decided to keep all language except the last clause “... and may not seek further review of the matter under any other procedure within the university.” This language will be removed to suggest finality of the process when decided by the Grade Appeals Group.

There was a Motion to move this document with these changes to ADCOM. Jeff moved. Gordon seconded. All in favor.

Sine will send a courtesy copy to UAF General Council to respond to if there are any glaring issues.

## **2. Shared Governance Discussion:**

Sine explained her reaction to the recent guest speaker from University of Oregon on Title IX issues. The speaker spoke of the importance of getting faculty involved in the creation of Title IX policies for UA. That speaker discussed how the Title IX can and should be changed to not make instructors mandatory reporters. Sine used this as an example of better shared governance (creating a Title IX policy with faculty input).

The group discussed the University First Year Experience Course proposed by Vice Provost Alex Fitts during the most recent Faculty Senate meeting. In the past, the class has been optional and few students that need it have taken it. In the past the class was free to these students. Now the will be a one-credit course that will be required of these at-risk students. There was some debate about whether the one credit class will meet the goal of the course and whether this proposal is being driven by the Provost office or is it the result of perceived needs by faculty. Have faculty had a part in developing it?

## **3. Ownership Rights on Courses Developed at the University Discussion**

Sine Anahita reported on some new information she obtained from talking with eLearning about ownership rights for courses developed with eLearning assistance.

- The CBA speaks of three classifications of work: (1) Independent Efforts; (2) University-Supported Efforts; and (3) University-Sponsored Efforts. See e.g. AAUP/AFT CBA, Section 14.3.
- eLearning apparently has not been asking faculty to sign development contracts as university-sponsored in recent years (stopped doing that about 4 years ago). Since that time, development contracts and teaching contracts as overload assignments have been jointly issued by eLearning and college. Faculty are able to negotiate with deans about terms of contracts, including whether project will be university-sponsored or university-supported.
- Sine reported that eLearning has just recently tried to arrange University-Sponsored course development with one of her colleagues (what they used to do).
- Sine also reported that there is a way that Departments can contact eLearning to find out how courses were developed and which were University-sponsored

Andy Anger spoke of the Applied Business Program's experience. To consistently offer online courses with revolving adjunct faculty, they specifically clarify that the University retains the right to offer that course if the faculty member leaves the University or no longer teaches the course. The departing faculty member also retains the ability to use those course materials when they leave. This was felt necessary to balance the interests of the faculty and the Program.

There was brief discussion about where the FAC Committee should go from here. Jeff May voiced that it was not his interest in taking a position on rights, as much as a desire that the FAC collect the relevant information and disseminate it out to the faculty so that they have a better understanding of the issue and the applicable rules before they develop courses (particularly in the online environment). The meeting ended before a decision on this topic was completed.