

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #77 on February 9, 1998:

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Certificate program in Microcomputer Support Specialist.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal #28 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers¹ Hall.

Signed: John D. Craven, President, UAF Faculty Senate Date: 2/11/98

Approved: Joan Wadlow, Chancellor Date: 3/2/98

Executive Summary
Certificate, Microcomputer Support Specialist
33 credits

As computers become indispensable in our daily lives, agencies and businesses are discovering that providing ongoing support for computer users is an absolute necessity. The critical need for well-trained professionals with the requisite technical computer knowledge and people support skills is becoming every more apparent. Thus, the objective of this Certificate program is to provide the essential elements of both technical knowledge and interpersonal skills for a new cadre of microcomputer support specialists who can fill permanent staff positions, like the new State of Alaska Microcomputer/Network Technician I and II, or develop private microcomputer support enterprises throughout Alaska.

As one of the programs approved last year for funding through the President's Reallocation Fund, this program meets the criteria for being collaborative statewide, focused on vocational/technical training, and utilizing alternative modes of delivery. The group of faculty and staff who compose the committee making this project proposal come from all three MAUs. Microcomputer support represents an area of vocational/technical expertise that is increasingly desired and needed within the state but which is not currently satisfied by any University of Alaska program. And, there is a direct relationship between the requirements of the courses and the expected skills and knowledge the student will need on the job; the program will be competency based, individualized, and available at a distance through a variety of delivery modes.

The program staff developed a questionnaire regarding microcomputer classes that was sent to 1247 people in state government, educational institutions, libraries, military bases,

private corporations and businesses including Native corporations: 257 responses were received for a response rate of 21%. About 78% of the respondents indicated there was a need for a program leading to a certificate as a microcomputer support specialist, and 84% said it would be helpful to have a person trained in this area working for their organization; 58% said, if they were in a position to hire staff, they would seek to hire someone with such a certificate. Finally 56% said they themselves would be interested in obtaining a microcomputer specialist certificate.

A great number of students have already inquired about this program, having heard by word of mouth, apparently, of its imminent availability. Extended campus directors, faculty in this area, and others have told us that many potential students are waiting to enroll. Therefore, it is anticipated that a sufficient number of students will enroll in the program. In fact, the opposite problem of having too many students too quickly may materialize.

Students will be required, at minimum, to complete a 9 credit core to earn the Certificate. If they have prior experience and/or can demonstrate their competencies in the required subject area, all the remaining credits may be waived; however, many will need to take all 33 credits of course work. Courses are being redesigned for distance delivery during the Fall 1997 and Spring 1998 semesters; and equivalencies across all three MAUs have been determined. The Certificate will not be available for matriculation until all approvals have been achieved hopefully by the Fall 1998 semester.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #77 on February 9, 1998:

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the A.A.S. in Microcomputer Support Specialist.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal #29 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers¹ Hall.

Signed: John D. Craven, President, UAF Faculty Senate Date: 2/11/98

Approved: Joan Wadlow, Chancellor Date: 3/2/98

Executive Summary
A.A.S., Microcomputer Support Specialist
60 credits

As computers become indispensable in our daily lives, agencies and businesses are discovering that providing ongoing support for computer users is an absolute necessity. The critical need for well-trained professionals with the requisite technical computer knowledge and people support skills is becoming every more apparent. Thus, the objective of this A.A.S. program is to build on

the Certificate for Microcomputer Support Specialist and provide additional skill development in the major area as well as associate level general education requirements. Completion of this A.A.S. degree is not a preparation for a computer science baccalaureate degree.

As one of the programs approved last year for funding through the President's Reallocation Fund, this program meets the criteria for being collaborative statewide, focused on vocational/technical training, and utilizing alternative modes of delivery. The group of faculty and staff who compose the committee making this project proposal come from all three MAUs. Microcomputer support represents an area of vocational/technical expertise that is increasingly desired and needed within the state but which is not currently satisfied by any University of Alaska program. And, there is a direct relationship between the requirements of the courses and the expected skills and knowledge the student will need on the job; the program will be competency based, individualized, and available at a distance through a variety of delivery modes.

The program staff developed a questionnaire regarding microcomputer classes that was sent to 1247 people in state government, educational institutions, libraries, military bases, private corporations and businesses including Native corporations: 257 responses were received for a response rate of 21%. About 78% of the respondents indicated there was a need for a program leading to a certificate as a microcomputer support specialist, and 84% said it would be helpful to have a person trained in this area working for their organization; 58% said, if they were in a position to hire staff, they would seek to hire someone with such a certificate. Finally 56% said they themselves would be interested in obtaining a microcomputer specialist certificate.

A great number of students have already inquired about this program, having heard by word of mouth, apparently, of its imminent availability. Extended campus directors, faculty in this area, and others have told us that many potential students are waiting to enroll. Therefore, it is anticipated that a sufficient number of students will enroll in the program. In fact, the opposite problem of having too many students too quickly may materialize.

The A.A.S. will require general education and computer courses beyond the Certificate to total 60 credits. Courses are currently being redesigned for distance delivery during the Fall 1997 and Spring 1998 semesters; and equivalencies across all three MAUs have been determined. The A.A.S. degree will not be available for matriculation until all approvals have been achieved hopefully by the Fall 1998 semester.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #77 on February 9, 1998:

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Ph.D. program in Marine Biology.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents¹ Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal #44 on file in the

Governance Office, 312 Signers¹ Hall.

Signed: John D. Craven, President, UAF Faculty Senate Date: 2/11/98

Approved: Joan Wadlow, Chancellor Date: 3/3/98

Executive Summary Ph.D. Degree Program in Marine Biology

We propose a Ph.D. degree program in Marine Biology, to be housed within the Graduate Program in Marine Sciences and Limnology (GPMSL) and the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences (SFOS). Our goals are to attract students with excellent qualifications; offer them unique opportunities to conduct research in the Arctic, Bering Sea, and Gulf of Alaska regions; help them to develop expertise in research through courses and mentorship; facilitate their authorship of important contributions to Marine Biology, increase SFOS capability to address significant problems of Alaska's marine life; and educate professionals who are especially well-qualified to address these problems. The Strategic Plan: UAF 2000 states that the university should "become the world's leader in arctic research and graduate education." Assuming that this will remain an important UAF goal into the next century, a new Marine Biology Ph.D. program will contribute by attracting outstanding students, who will conduct high-quality research in the Arctic and elsewhere.

The doctoral degree program will educate students using both course work and a research-based thesis. The program is flexibly designed and modeled after the successful GPMSL doctoral program in Oceanography. Like all biological fields, Marine Biology requires collaborative research in many different areas in order to understand the demands placed upon the organism and how it has adapted to the environment. It can include studies in modern methods of molecular biology as well as classical methods of physiology or genetics. Courses offered by the other UAF graduate programs, in addition to a wide range of courses within SFOS, will enable Marine Biology Ph.D. students to attain both breadth and depth of knowledge. The opportunities for collaboration with researchers in Oceanography and Fisheries within SFOS, and with faculty from the Biology and Wildlife Department, the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, and other UAF departments and institutes will be especially valuable to Marine Biology students.

The strong, extramurally-funded Marine Biology research programs of GPMSL faculty are crucial to the success of the Marine Biology Ph.D. program. SFOS has several outstanding research facilities for marine biological research which provide opportunities to conduct research at a wide range of sites along Alaska's coastline. These include the Seward Marine Center; the Kasitsna Bay Laboratory, located near Seldovia; the Juneau Center for Fisheries and Ocean Sciences; and the Fisheries Industrial Technology Center in Kodiak. Marine Biology Ph.D. students will also have the opportunity to use the Seward SeaLife Center, which is being built by a private foundation and will open in the Spring of 1998. The SeaLife center will have state-of-the-art research facilities for captive studies of marine mammals and sea birds and will also support field research in the nearby fjords.

Five students transferred to the Interdisciplinary Studies Ph.D. program in 1995 to pursue studies in Marine Biology, with major advisors and a "home base" in GPMSL. Four of these students have

completed the program and moved on to professional positions; one is still in progress. Four additional students, now enrolled in either Oceanography, have expressed interest in transferring to the Marine Biology Ph.D. program if it becomes available. SFOS and GPMSL have the faculty, the courses, the facilities, and the experience to offer an excellent Ph.D. program in Marine Biology without additional cost to the university.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #77 on February 9, 1998:

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the following policy on Stacked and Cross-listed courses to be included in the UAF Catalog under the Course Numbers section of the Course Descriptions (p. 133 of current UAF Catalog) and to amend the 600-699--Graduate courses paragraph as follows:

"A few well-qualified undergraduates may be admitted to graduate courses with APPROVAL OF THE INSTRUCTOR. [[the permission of the head of the department in which the course is offered. Admission to graduate courses cross-listed with undergraduate courses requires graduate standing or permission of the instructor.]] A STUDENT MAY NOT APPLY SUCH A COURSE TO BOTH A BACCALAUREATE AND A GRADUATE DEGREE."

Stacked and Cross-listed Courses

The same course is sometimes offered by more than one discipline. Such offerings are referred to as "cross-listed" courses and are designated in the class listings by "cross-listed with _____".

Courses are also sometimes offered simultaneously at different levels (100/200 or 400/600, for example) with higher level credit requiring additional effort and possibly higher order prerequisites from the student. Such courses are referred to as "Stacked" courses and are designated in the class listings by "Stacked with _____". In the case of 400/600 level stacked courses, graduate standing or permission of the instructor is required for graduate enrollment and a higher level of effort and performance is required on the part of students earning graduate credit.

Courses simultaneously stacked and cross-listed will be designated in the class listing as "stacked with _____ and cross-listed with _____".

In all cases, the course syllabus (not the catalog) must stipulate the course content and requirements for each level and/or discipline. The catalog should indicate if there is a difference in content.

Note: this proposal extends, modifies and partially rescinds Senate policy concerning double listing of 400/600 courses enacted on Feb. 14, 1994 during Meeting # 47.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: As more departments add 400/600 courses, a clearer catalog description of this method of combining offerings is needed, as is a better way of designating them than the "same as ____" used in the current UAF catalog. Similar comments pertain to other stacked offerings. Students need to understand the nature of these courses and the difference between levels of credit deriving from them.

This proposal will eliminate the prohibition against undergraduates (or anyone else not already enrolled in a graduate program) taking 400/600 courses for graduate credit which is embodied in policy enacted by the Senate in meeting #47. There seems to be little logic in treating these graduate offerings differently from all others and it is often desirable to encourage exceptionally well-qualified undergraduates to expand their horizons by taking graduate courses.

It should be noted that the additional effort required for higher level credit must be clearly spelled out in the course syllabus. This reduces the opportunity for later conflicts by providing students with a clear understanding of the differences in requirements and grading. This will be given serious consideration in the approval process for such courses.

Signed: John D. Craven, President, UAF Faculty Senate

Date: 2/11/98

Approved: Joan Wadlow, Chancellor

Date: 3/3/98

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #77 on February 9, 1998:

MOTION PASSED (AS AMENDED)

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate has reviewed the draft course definitions submitted by the UA Faculty Alliance and moves to make the following recommendations:

CAPS = Insertion
[[]] = Deletion

DRAFT

A. Course Numbering System

Each course offered by the University is identified by the department designator and a three-digit course number. The designator commonly abbreviates the name of a discipline or department (for example, ENGL for English). In general, the first numeral of the three-digit course number indicates the course level and the year in which the course is ordinarily taken. For example, ENGL 111 is a 100-level course and is ordinarily taken by first-year (freshman) students, and ENGL 318 is a 300-level course taken by

third-year (junior) students.

B. Course Level Expectations

Students are expected to demonstrate learning skills commensurate with the appropriate course level, and are expected to meet, prior to registering, prerequisites for all courses as listed with the course descriptions. Prerequisites indicate the preparation and/or background necessary to undertake academic study. If a student has not taken and passed the necessary prerequisites, but feels confident of performing the course work, the student may request permission from the instructor of the course to enroll in the class. An instructor withdrawal may be initiated for those students who enroll without either prerequisites or instructor permission. Courses numbered 001-049 are career development courses intended to fulfill special needs of students or the community and are not designed as preparation for 100-level college work. They are offered for Continuing Education Units (CEU) or for non-credit. Courses numbered 050-099 usually cover basic or developmental material and are intended to help prepare students to enter 100-level college courses. They are applicable to some vocational certificates. The 100-level courses generally require learning basic concepts. The 200-, 300-, and 400-level courses require increasing sophistication in the ability to extract, summarize, evaluate, and apply relevant class material. The 500-level courses are specifically designed for professional development at the post-baccalaureate level, while the 600-level courses for advanced degrees demand rigorous analysis, synthesis, and research skills.

C. Non-degree and Preparatory Courses

001-049: Career development or community interest courses.

Courses are intended to fulfill special needs of students or the community and are not designed as preparation for 100-level college work. Career development courses are offered for Continuing Education Units (CEU). One CEU is granted for satisfactory completion of 10 contact hours of classroom instruction or for 20 contact hours of laboratory or clinical instruction. Community interest courses ARE not offered for credit. THEY ARE not applicable to any degree requirements (even by petition)

050-099. Remedial or Preparatory Courses.

Courses applicable to some vocational certificates but not to any associate degrees, baccalaureate degrees, master's degrees, or professional certificates. These are developmental courses that provide supplemental preparation for introductory college courses.

D. Academic Credit Courses

Lower Division Courses

100-199: Freshman-level courses.

These courses are applicable to ALL certificates, associate, and baccalaureate degrees. They introduce a field of knowledge and/or develop basic skills. These are usually foundation or survey courses.

200-299: Sophomore-level courses.

These courses are applicable to ALL certificates, associate, and baccalaureate degrees. They provide more depth than 100-level courses and/or build upon 100-level courses. These courses may connect foundation or survey courses with advanced work in a given field, require previous college experience, or develop advanced skills.

Upper Division Courses

As a general guideline upper division courses require at least junior standing or equivalent experience in addition to any stated prerequisites. The student is expected to have adequate preparations and background to complete courses at this level. [[Freshman and sophomore students are required to obtain special permission to take any upper division courses.]] Upper-division courses may not be used as prerequisites for lower-division courses.

300-399: Junior-level courses.

These courses are applicable to [[associate and]] baccalaureate degrees, and may BE APPLICABLE TO SOME ASSOCIATE DEGREES. THEY MAY also be applied to graduation requirements for some master's degrees with prior approval of the student's Graduate Study Committee. They may not be applied to both a baccalaureate and a master's degree. These courses build upon previous course work and require familiarity with the concepts, methods and vocabulary of the discipline.

400-499: Senior-level courses.

These courses are applicable to the baccalaureate degree and may be applicable to some associates degrees. They may also be applied to graduation requirements for some master's degrees with prior approval of the student's Graduate Study Committee. They may not be applied to both a baccalaureate and a master's degree. These courses require the ability to analyze, synthesize, compare and contrast, research, create, innovate, develop, elaborate, transform, and/or apply course material to solving complex problems. These courses [[are]] generally [[supported by]] REQUIRE a substantial [[body of]] BACKGROUND OF STUDY IN lower-level courses.

600-699: Graduate-level courses.

These courses are for post-baccalaureate study towards advanced degrees with approval of the student's Graduate Study Committee. A few well qualified undergraduates may be admitted to graduate courses with APPROVAL OF THE INSTRUCTOR. [[appropriate approval in the department in which the course is offered. Admission to graduate courses cross-listed with undergraduate courses requires graduate standing or permission of the instructor.]] THESE COURSES MAY BE USED TO MEET GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS FOR BACCALAUREATE DEGREES UPON APPROVAL OF THE DEPARTMENT IN WHICH THE COURSE IS OFFERED. A STUDENT MAY NOT APPLY SUCH A COURSE [[These courses may not be applied]] to both a baccalaureate and a graduate degree.

D. Professional Development Courses.

500-599: Professional development courses.

These courses are intended as post-baccalaureate education for various professional groups who desire to continue their education at a level distinct from graduate-level education. Courses are neither graduate nor undergraduate in nature. [[They are not applicable to any grading system.]] These 500-level courses shall not be stacked with any credit courses numbered 050-499 or 600-699. NO [[The]] 500-level (special topics and independent study) courses shall [[not]] apply toward any UNIVERSITY degree, UNIVERSITY certification or UNIVERSITY credential program, and are not interchangeable with 600-level courses for graduate degree programs. Courses may be graded Pass/No Pass or, if the course includes an evaluation component, by letter grading. The measurement of student effort is indicated by professional development credits. One credit requires at least 12.5 classroom contact hours, two credits at least 25 classroom contact hours, three credits at least 37.5 classroom contact hours, etc. These courses will be provided on a self-support basis.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Curricular Affairs and the Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs reviewed the entire text of the motion and made several recommendations, by section.

Upper division courses--The committee recommended that the third sentence be deleted. In the opinion of the committee, this language is unduly restrictive of student choice, as currently UAF lower-division students do take upper division courses without "special" permission.

300-399: Junior-level courses.--The committee recommended that the phrase marked for deletion (also be applied to graduation requirements for some master's degrees with prior approval of the student's Graduate Study Committee) be retained. This should be reinstated in the text and transformed into a sentence: "They may also be applied to graduation requirements....." The reasoning of the committee was that under current UAF policy, graduate students are allowed to apply a junior-level course to degree requirements, with the approval of their committee.

400-499: Senior-level courses.--The committee recommended the retention of the phrase marked deletion: (and may be applicable to some associates degrees). The committee also found this proposal to be unusually restrictive. Under current UAF policy, students may use senior-level courses to meet associate degree requirements.

500-599: Professional development courses.--The committee recommended the deletion of the third sentence. In the opinion of the committee, this statement is unnecessary. The committee also recommended changes to the fifth sentence. The argument for this change was to improve clarity.

600-699: Graduate-level courses.--Change suggested by the UAF Graduate and Professional Curricular Affairs Committee.

The prohibition on courses being used for both baccalaureate and advanced degrees is not to be applied

to courses listed in a catalog as repeatable.

Signed: John D. Craven, President, UAF Faculty Senate

Date: 2/11/98

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #77 on February 9, 1998:

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to modify the date of Freshman Low Grade notification to the 6th Friday following the first day of classes.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 1998

RATIONALE: The present policy, which provides for reporting of low grades at the end of the 4th week of classes, was set to coincide with the last day to withdraw. At that time, the deadline for freshman withdrawals was the end of the 6th week of classes. In an action during the 1996-97 academic year, however, the senate changed the withdrawal deadline to the 9th Friday after classes begin, without changing the date for freshman low grade notification.

Signed: John D. Craven, President, UAF Faculty Senate

Date: 2/11/98

Approved: Joan Wadlow, Chancellor

Date: 3/2/98

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #77 on February 9, 1998:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF UNITED ACADEMICS ONGOING NEGOTIATIONS
1/22/98

Whereas United Academics is a democratic organization founded to protect the professional integrity of the faculty;

Whereas United Academics is an organization with a profound interest in maintaining effective faculty governance throughout the University system;

Whereas United Academics and the UAF Faculty Senate both strongly support academic freedom;

Whereas both the UAF Faculty Senate and United Academics are democratically run organizations acting on behalf of the faculty for complementary interests;

Whereas United Academics takes an active part in constructively critiquing and advising the administration of the University of Alaska on a wide variety of matters of interest to faculty members;

Whereas United Academics seeks to support student and staff constituencies in matters of mutual interest;

Whereas both United Academics and the UAF Faculty Senate share an intense interest in current and future funding of the University, the consequences to academic programs of that funding, and the application of those resources to the living and working conditions of the faculty and their families;

Whereas both United Academics and the UAF Faculty Senate recognize the critical central role of faculty governance in assuring academic quality;

Whereas the issue of declining faculty morale is of great concern to both United Academics and the UAF Faculty Senate;

Whereas there is an emerging and highly successful working relationship between United Academics and the UAF Faculty Senate in areas of mutual concern;

Whereas United Academics has been engaged for well over a year in a good faith effort to negotiate contract with the administration of the University of Alaska;

Therefore be it resolved that the UAF Faculty Senate shares the United Academics position protecting the faculty's rights and responsibilities in curricular review, assurance of the quality of academic programs, and granting of degrees at the University;

Furthermore be it resolved that the UAF Faculty Senate supports the efforts of United Academics to successfully negotiate a fair, equitable, and timely collective bargaining agreement with the administration of the University of Alaska.

Signed: John D. Craven, President, UAF Faculty Senate

Date: 2/11/98

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #77 on February 9, 1998:

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves that drafting of the UAF academic calendar be the responsibility of the Senate's administrative committee, based upon information supplied by the Office of the Registrar. The draft calendar would then be approved by the UAF Faculty Senate, the UAF Staff Council, and ASUAF, with the UAF Coordinating Committee responsible for coordinating the three reviews and submitting the completed calendar to the chancellor. The final draft submitted to the Chancellor cannot violate relevant UAF rules regarding the number of days instruction and related rules unless the UAF Faculty Senate provides a needed one-time dispensation required by extraordinary circumstances.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The UAF Governance Coordinating Committee has failed to abide by certain UAF rules regarding the

calendar or to ask the Senate for revisions to the rules. Neither has it submitted its drafts to the three governance groups for their concurrence. Recent policies by the Board of Regents have made it increasingly difficult to maintain our high level of student contact hours and still satisfy the Regents' demand that we specify the exact day being added to the calendar to make up for the loss of instruction on Civil Rights Day.

Signed: John D. Craven, President, UAF Faculty Senate Date: 2/11/98

Approved*: Joan Wadlow, Chancellor Date: 3/16/98

*With understanding that Senate motion does not put UAF at variance with BOR policy/action(s).

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #77 on February 9, 1998:

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the proposed amendments to the Faculty Alliance Constitution.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

Signed: John D. Craven, President, UAF Faculty Senate Date: 2/11/98

(()) = deletions
CAPS = additions

University of Alaska
FACULTY ALLIANCE

Constitution
Proposed Revisions

ARTICLE I. INTENT

It is the intent of the Board of Regents: 1) that the faculty shall share in the governance of the university, 2) that shared governance is an integral part of the business of the university, and 3) that participators in shared governance are empowered by the Board of Regents to carry out their governance responsibilities to the best of their abilities without interference or fear of reprisal.

ARTICLE II. NAME

The Board of Regents hereby establishes a mechanism for faculty system governance consisting of an Alliance, hereinafter "Alliance."

ARTICLE III. AUTHORITY, PURPOSES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Authority

The Alliance receives its authority by policy 03.01.01 of the University of Alaska Board of Regents which derives its authority from the Constitution and statutes of the State of Alaska. The Alliance shall carry out its functions subject to the authority of the Board of Regents and the President of the University.

B. Purposes

1. Representation

To provide official representation for the faculty of the University of Alaska in matters which affect the general welfare of the University and its educational purposes and effectiveness.

2. Consultation

To provide consultation to the President of the University and the Board of Regents ((on academic matters and faculty welfare issues)).

3. Communication

To serve as an instrument by which information which is of interest and concern to the university system faculty may be freely collected, disseminated, coordinated, and discussed.

C. Responsibilities

The Alliance recognizes the faculty of the individual academic major administrative units as having the primary responsibility and authority for recommending the establishment of degree requirements; implementing the degree requirements; establishing the curriculum, the subject matter and methods for instruction; determining when established degree requirements are met; and recommending to the President of the Board of Regents the granting of degrees thus achieved. The Alliance shall have AN advisory and coordinating role in academic affairs; no action of the Alliance shall abridge individual academic major administrative unit's authority in academic matters OR BARGAINING UNIT AUTHORITY REGARDING SUBJECTS OF MANDATORY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

When issues have statewide impact, the responsibilities of the Alliance may include, but are not limited to: 1) coordination on matters relating to academic affairs such as academic program review; the addition, deletion or merging of academic programs; curriculum; subject matter and methods of instruction, those aspects of student life relating to the educational process such as degree requirements, grading policy, course coordination and transfer, student probation and suspension, standards of admission and scholastic standards; and faculty welfare issues, including, but not limited to compensation, benefits, appointments, reappointments and termination, workload, promotions, the granting of tenure, dismissal, ethics, and 2) other matters relating to the general welfare of the university, its educational purposes and effectiveness.

Representatives shall promote maximum dissemination of information to the local faculty senates and before voting in the Alliance.

ARTICLE IV. MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION

A. Membership

The membership of the Alliance shall consist of three faculty each from the University of Alaska Anchorage, University of Alaska Fairbanks and University of Alaska Southeast.

If issues require special knowledge, one or more of the three votes from each campus may be designated to alternate faculty members.

B. Selection

Representatives to the Alliance shall be selected in such a manner as prescribed by the UAA Faculty Senate, the UAF Faculty Senate and the UAS Faculty Council, hereinafter "local faculty governance groups".

C. Term of service

The term of service shall be one year.

D. Recall of members

Any member may be recalled by the local faculty governance group by which the member was chosen. The method of recall shall be determined by the local faculty governance group. That local faculty governance group shall select a replacement to complete the term of office.

E. Official Spokesperson

1. Election

The official spokesperson of the Alliance is the Alliance Chair. The Chair shall be elected by and from the voting membership by a majority vote, with at least one vote from each MAU required.

2. Duties

The Alliance Chair shall a) preside over all meetings of the Alliance and b) represent the Alliance, except that the Chair is required to present majority and minority opinions regardless of personal opinion. The chair may delegate these duties to another Alliance member.

F. Task Forces

The Alliance may establish task forces independently or in response to requests of the Board of Regents or the President of the University to consider complex system wide issues relating primarily to academic matters or faculty welfare issues.

Issues and suggestions of the task force, from whatever source, shall be referred to local faculty senates and council before action occurs at the Alliance level.

ARTICLE V. MEETINGS

A. Regular and special meetings

The Alliance shall have ((four)) A MINIMUM OF EIGHT regular meetings during the academic year. At least once per semester, the Alliance shall meet with the President of the University to identify system issues and plan for the coming year. Special Alliance meetings may be called by the Board of Regents, the President of the University, the Chair of the Alliance, or on petition of one-third of the membership of the Alliance.

B. Voting

Voting shall be by simple majority of the full voting membership to include at least one member from each MAU, except for amendments to the Alliance constitution or bylaws. Amendments to membership rights require a unanimous vote.

Representatives may defer voting pending action by local faculty senates and council on the issue.

ARTICLE VI. QUORUM

A minimum of a simple majority of the voting membership to include at least one member from each MAU shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VII. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

The parliamentary authority shall be the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

ARTICLE VIII. CONSTITUTIONS AND BYLAWS, AMENDMENTS, APPROVAL

A. Constitutions and bylaws

The constitution and bylaws, once passed by the Alliance, shall be transmitted to the President of the University for approval and to the Board of Regents for action. Copies of the Alliance constitution and bylaws shall be maintained in the system governance office.

B. Amendments; distribution prior to voting

Amendments to the constitution and bylaws shall be sent to Alliance members and to the local faculty senates and council at least 30 days prior to the Alliance meeting at which they will be considered. Amendments to the constitution require seven Alliance member votes.

ARTICLE IX. REVIEW AND TRANSMITTAL OF PROPOSALS

A. Review

Submission of administrative proposals and issues affecting the statewide university system faculty shall be in accordance with University Regulation 03.01.01. Those administrative proposals submitted in the summer months shall be acted upon

by the local faculty senates and council, and the Alliance by October 15. Proposals relating to faculty requiring immediate implementation for compliance with state or federal law shall be submitted to the Faculty Alliance for review, and may be implemented prior to Alliance action but do not represent official action until the local senates and council are involved in the actions.

B. Transmittal to the President

The system governance executive officer shall submit the original proposal in writing, together with faculty governance input, including majority and minority viewpoints, to the President of the University for information or action.

C. Transmittal to the Board of Regents

The Chair of the Alliance shall present Alliance views. The Chair shall present the minority viewpoint to the Board of Regents if requested by the minority in writing to the Chair before the meeting.

ARTICLE X. ACTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF REGENTS

A. Action by the President

The President of the University shall, in writing, approve, disapprove, or modify an Alliance action, and notify the Chair and the system governance executive officer within forty-five (45) days of receiving notification of the action by the system governance executive officer.

B. Modifications by the President

The President of the University may modify an Alliance action if the modification does not effectively contravene or nullify the purpose or principle involved in the action.

C. Disapproval's

The President of the University shall inform the Alliance of the reasons for any disapproval or modification within one month of disapproving or modifying an Alliance action.

D. Board of Regents notification and action

Alliance actions which are modified or disapproved by the President of the University, together with the statement of reasons, shall be placed on the next Board of Regents' meeting agenda for the information of the Board if requested by the Alliance. At the request of either the President of the University or the Alliance, the Alliance action which has been modified or disapproved shall be brought before the Board for action. The decision of the Board of Regents is final.

ARTICLE XI. HANDBOOK

The Alliance shall annually submit a directory of Alliance members, a description of the Alliance and how it works, and the annual Alliance calendar to the system governance executive officer for inclusion in the governance handbook. This handbook shall be distributed to the Board of Regents and to the shared governance groups.

ARTICLE XII. REPORTS

The Alliance shall ((annually)) prepare ((a)) reportS of activities TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS PRIOR TO EACH MEETING OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS. ((This)) THESE reportS shall be submitted to the system governance executive officer for compilation into ((a)) single ((annual)) reportS of governance activities for submission to the President of the University and the Board of Regents. The system governance executive officer shall maintain Alliance ELECTRONIC communications ((via vax, the vax bulletin board)) and prepare system governance news for inclusion in ((vax)) ELECTRONIC and printed newsletters.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #77 on February 9, 1998:

MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to affirm the Faculty Alliance motion passed on January 22. It is imperative that there be faculty representation on a systemwide Presidential search committee.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

Signed: John D. Craven, President, UAF Faculty Senate

Date: 2/11/98

MOTION:

=====

"The Faculty Alliance of the University of Alaska, by unanimous vote, expresses its astonishment and deep regret that the University of Alaska's Board of Regents intent to proceed on its own to screen, interview, and select the University's next president while offering only token participation to the University's faculty. Should this decision stand in the form implied by the Board's motion of 14 January, 1998, it will do harm to the morale of the academic institution, demean its reputation, and make more difficult the work of the new president of the Regents' institution as he or she struggles to gain the respect of its faculty and become president of the University of Alaska. These are not the attributes of leadership we expect of the Board of Regents and the procedure would call into question the academic standards of any person who would accept the position as president. We urge you to consider that a successful search cannot be defined merely by the attributes of the individual who accepts the position. Of at least as great relevance to a successful search is a process that unites the university community in a common purpose, resulting in a president with broad-based support among the various university constituencies. In the end, a successful search is one in which the process ultimately forges a stronger and more resilient institution. In the end, a successful search is one in which the process is fully integrated with the principles of shared governance. This action is effective January 22, 1998."

Rationale:

- A. It is the general practice of most colleges and universities to form presidential search committees out of representatives from their diverse constituent groups: faculty, staff, administrators, students, community representatives, and members of the board. The president of our University will be working with all of these groups and their collective assessment should be allowed to narrow the pool of candidates to those whom all or most of these groups could work with comfortably and profitably in the years to come.

Further, most prospective candidates expect to deal with search committees of this type. What message is sent to the candidates when the Board is its own search committee? (1) It does not trust or respect the judgment of its own personnel. (2) It and it alone will be making many of the decisions which this person will be executing. (3) It will be micro-managing the operations of the University.

- B. The Board may find that its search procedure discourages and alienates able candidates, who are looking for a cooperative and supportive environment. This is especially true when they will be faced with the fiscal and organizational challenges of this university.
- C. Finally, this action of the Board harms the morale of the University's faculty. To be excluded in this way from the presidential search speaks eloquently to the University community of the Board's evaluation of faculty. The Board's action says they, not we, are the university. It is the Board's vision, not our shared vision that will determine the University's shape in the years to come.