

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Meeting – November 9, 2016

Minutes:

Meeting began at 2:15 p.m. in the Kayak Room

Present:

- Committee Members: Andy Anger, JAK Maier, Debu Misra, Jeff May, Val Gifford, Jeff Benowitz, Sine Anahita, Troy Bouffard, Josh Greenberg
- Dean Paul Layer, Administrative Ex Temp Member

Approval of Meeting Agenda:

Debu would like us to review at a future meeting (not for this meeting today)

- (1) a review of the UAF policies for categories of Suma Cum Laude, Magna Cum Laude, etc. Andy and Sine responded that we are not the proper Committee for this. Paul thought this sounded like work for Curriculum Affairs Committee rather than the Faculty Affairs Committee. Debu mentioned that FAC can review the changes and make recommendations through the ADCOM for forwarding it to a different committee.
- (2) A review of the bylaws of the Faculty Administrative Review Committee (FARC)

Sine asked that we table the discussion planned regarding mandatory reporting of Title IX violations because the University is hiring a new EEO/Title IX Director and that may eliminate the perceived problems.

With these changes there was a motion to approve the meeting agenda and it was supported.

Review and Approval of October Meeting Minutes:

Andy moved that we adopt the minutes (with corrections added to them). The rest of the Committee seconded the motion. Minutes were approved.

Old Business:

1. Revisions to Academic Program Review

Background:

At the Faculty Senate meeting earlier this week, proposed changes of the Program Review process made by Andy, Sine, and members of the CAC were discussed. There appeared to be some strong opposition from Faculty Senators that serve on the Program Review Committees who said that the changes proposed would apply to all program reviews and their belief was that they would unduly bog down an already time consuming process. There was particular concern voiced over the language about allowing

the President of the Senate to review the Committee findings and write their own report. No decisions were made.

Discussion of the Program Review policy resumed.

- Andy began by explaining the revisions thus far. The bold black wording was suggested by CAC in the first round. A committee comprised of CAC and FAC added the wording and changes in red. CAC added wording and changes in purple font.
- One of the changes to the program review process made by Vice Provost Fitts and denoted in black was to remove the statement, “Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action”. Debu voiced concern regarding any revision that remove Faculty Senate from controlling the decision to eliminate a program. He argued this should not be given to the Chancellor because the Chancellor is not going to be focused on the impacts as the Faculty Senate would be. Specifically, the Faculty is responsible for ensuring the academic integrity of the university is maintained.
- Sine expressed that the process needs to be controlled by the faculty through the Faculty Senate. She spoke to how in the past there was always a faculty member on the review process. The current process is focused too much on expediency of process. Sine shared her Sociology Program’s experience that the current special program review process is not really open to discussion and input from faculty.
- Several committee members described how we might accomplish the need for efficient regular program review with the concern that special review be more open, deliberative, and open to faculty involvement. To accommodate this, we need to have policies that match two different tracks: (1) a process for regular program review – make this one very efficient; and (2) a process for special program review – make this one be very thorough because the stakes for the program and students are higher.
- There was discussion that part of the problem is that currently there is no “special” program review. It is all considered program review and governed by the same policy. When asked, Alex Fitts is of the opinion that there is no “Special Program Review”. It is all Program Review. Josh stated that this is what he was told as well. So, we may need to take that up with the Office of the Provost to see if it is possible to create a separate process for “special” reviews.
- Debu wants the document to add a statement that says that if a program is to be deleted the decision must be supported by a vote of the Faculty Senate. To accomplish this we should move the proposed deleted language about Faculty Senate action in paragraph 3(d) to paragraph 4. This was a motion, it was seconded, discussed, and unanimously passed.

- Val moved to have a friendly amendment of paragraph 3(d) be amended to delete the word “action” and insert the word “Faculty Senate vote” because what is meant by “action” is vague and not unanimously understood. Faculty Senate “action” refers to a Faculty Senate vote. This motion was seconded by JAK and there was Committee discussion on it. The friendly amendment was voted on and passed.
- Coming back to the original discussion, Sine proposed that the Program Review Process be different for regularly scheduled program review and special program review outside of the normal scheduled review. Andy responded that we would not likely accomplish that this semester and should just make sure the policy changes applied to general program review get passed. To that, JAK and Sine voiced a desire to put an “if/then” statement in the document that says that if the Program Review process indicates that major changes or termination of the program are needed then the matter be moved into a different more thorough and involved “special process.” (Possible language - “If a program is in danger of being discontinued or having major changes, then that program will be directed into Special Program Review subject to a different process.”)
- Paul explained that program review is time consuming because as many as 30 programs are reviewed annually. So the process needs to be efficient. But, the review committee already takes extra steps and considerations when the review indicates that major changes may be in order. So he understands if there is a desire to create and spell that out. Paul reminded that the process needs to be efficient and not overburden those that will be using the process.
- Andy expressed opposition to include any new “if/then” statement for fear that it would stall out any changes to Program Review and will not get passed this semester (and therefore not help the programs under review in the Spring). Sine disagreed and thinks this is worth the risk, and urged inserting the if/then language and then reserving for a later date developing what the Special Review Process would look like.
- Time to vote: Sine moved that we insert a new bullet in Paragraph (1) under “Discontinue Program” add an “if then” statement at the end of paragraph 1 that says if the Review Committee recommends major changes or to discontinue a program it would then go into a new special review program. Debu seconded the motion.
- Discussion:
 - JAK voiced that the process include this because she feels that if we would have taken this approach in the beginning it would not have had so much opposition from the Review Committee because it leaves the run of the mill reviews largely unchanged.
 - Jeff B. voiced support
 - Debu voiced support
 - Sine explained why she supports it.

- Andy voiced opposition for fear that any new provisions will only further prevent any changes from getting approved this semester.
- Vote:
 - All in favor except for Andy

Jeff M. moved that we strike the language in paragraph 1 that says “The recommendation shall be shared with the Faculty Senate President who has the option to respond to the provost within two weeks.” (in red font).

- Sine seconded the motion and commented that this seemed to be the most problematic language based on the recent comments at Faculty Senate. There was no further discussion.
- Voted: All in favor; Debu abstaining from vote.

Debu moved to move this document forward to Faculty Senate with these new changes. JAK seconded the motion. No discussion. Voted: All in favor.

2. Scheduling next FAC meeting.

- Next meeting scheduled for December 7, 2016 at 2:15 to 3:15 p.m. Location to be announced.

3. Report and Update on Faculty Overload Benefit Rate Issue

- Andy reported back on progress on the discussion of the Faculty Benefit rate. Discussions are progressing and they are having good discussion of the implications of the changes. The process has many contracts with the federal government and the benefit has to be approved by the federal government because it impacts their contracts. Andy said the meeting he had went well and the others seemed open and willing to consider it.
- Andy described the significance of overload benefit rates. I didn't catch any of the details for these minutes.

4. Blue Book Revision Update

- No news about this topic, so no discussion today

5. Adjunct Faculty Update

- Their contract is extended until 2018, so there is no rush in addressing these issues now because they are set per the CBA in place, and as we discussed earlier how this was a CBA issue

6. Peer Review and Promotion Processes for Term Faculty

- Jeff B. gave a short update
- We decided to keep this on our agenda so that we can keep getting updates from Jeff B. on how this process is going.

Next meeting time: November 7, 2016 at 2:15 p.m.