

DRAFT Minutes for UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #222
Monday, April 3, 2017
1:00 – 3:00 PM - Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order - Orion Lawlor
A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Members Present - continued
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (18)	MAY, Jeff (18)
AGUILAR-ISLAS, Ana (18) – Melissa Good	MEYER, Franz (17)
ANAHITA, Sine (18)	NEWBERRY, Rainer (17)
ANGER, Andy (18) – via Zoom	QUICK, Kate (18)
ARNDT, Kathy (17)	TILBURY, Jennifer (17)
BENOWITZ, Jeff (18)	TOPKOK, Sean (18)
BRET-HARTE, Donie (17) – Javier Fochesatto	TUTTLE, Siri (17)
COLLINS, Eric (17)	WILDFEUER, Sandra (18)
CROSKREY, Wendy (18)	WILLIAMS, Gordon (17)
CUNDIFF, Nicole (17)	ZHANG, Mingchu (18)
DIERENFIELD, Candi (17)	
FALLEN, Chris (18)	Members absent:
FARMER, Daryl (17)	AGGARWAL, Srijan (18)
GIFFORD, Valerie (17)	BACSUJLAKY, Mara (18)
HAMPTON, Don (17)	BOLTON, Bob (18)
HARDY, Cindy (17)	PETERSON, Rorik (17)
HARDY, Sarah (17)	REMBER, Rob (17)
HARNEY, Eileen (17)	
HARRIS, Norm (17) – via Zoom	
HIRSCH, Alex (18)	Others Present:
HUNT, Steve (18)	Dana Thomas, Susan Henrichs, Alex Fitts
ICKERT-BOND, Stefanie (18)	Chris Coffman, Debra Jones, Martha Mason
LAWLOR, Orion (17)	Karl Kowalski, Kayt Sunwood, Colby Freel
LILJEDAHL, Anna (18)	Ginny Kinne, Joy Morrison, Casey Byrne
MAIER, Jak (17)	Carla Browning (Zoom), Laura McCollough
MAKAREVICH, Roman (18)	Karina Gonzales, Chris Hartman
MATWEYOU, Julie (18) – via Zoom	Carol Gering
MAXWELL, David (18)	

B. Approval of [Minutes for Meeting #221](#)

The minutes for Meeting #221 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with one amendment: an item was added at the request of Sine A. regarding the program discontinuations of Sociology, and Economics. (This request was withdrawn at the end of the meeting due to time constraints and acknowledgement of a discussion at the next Administrative Committee meeting.)

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

Motions approved:

A. [Motion to approve Unit Criteria for DANSRD](#)

B. [Motion to amend Midterm Grade Reporting policy \(as amended\)](#)

Motions pending: None

III A. President's Remarks - Orion Lawlor

President Lawlor let everyone know he might need to cut participants' comments and discussion short to accommodate the packed agenda.

He was pleased to hear there will be cost benefit analyses done on Strategic Pathways Phase II recommendations. The final decisions will now happen in September, and he hopes this extension will provide a more reasonable time-frame for good decisions to be made.

B. President-Elect's Remarks - Chris Fallen

President-elect Fallen noted the election of the 2017-18 president-elect taking place today, with two outstanding candidates: Donie Bret-Harte and Gordon Williams. Donie could not be here today because of serving on the chancellor search committee (which is conducting finalist interviews today).

He noted that he and the new president-elect will be working on the 2017-18 committee assignments this month. They try their best to accommodate the preferences indicated by new and continuing members.

The [Arctic Broadband Forum](#) is coming up in May. (Flyers at the back table.)

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks - Dana Thomas

Chancellor Thomas noted that April is sexual assault awareness month. A national day of action is occurring tomorrow, and there will be information booths at Wood Center from 11 AM to 2 PM. There is an event at the Moore-Bartlett-Skarland complex from 4-6 PM.

He mentioned the [Week of the Arctic](#) coming up, and schedules for that have been provided at the back table. He noted two of the related events: a [film screening](#) at the Regal Theatre, and a [community celebration of the Arctic](#).

He encouraged faculty participation in the SP Phase II open forums taking place tomorrow and Wednesday, noting they have been advertised in the Cornerstone.

The chancellor search interviews taking place at this time will culminate in the selection of several finalists who will be selected for candidate forums.

B. Provost's Remarks - Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs announced that the Planning and Budget Committee will start meeting on Friday of this week, and recapped the membership which includes faculty, staff and administration. They will be considering proposed reductions, some proposed reallocations from a small central pullback that the Chancellor has been building into the budget planning efforts, and finally, the future of the institution and possible ways to adjust to the funding changes that have been coming their way.

ASUAF voted to have an in-person alternative for the Haven Training. This is slated to be offered in the fall. They will need faculty to engage in developing the one-credit course. She invited any faculty with an interest in Title IX and alcohol awareness training to get in touch with her.

C. Senate Members' Questions / Comments

Jeff B. asked Chancellor Thomas if he would lobby for them in their efforts to support legislation to add faculty and staff regents to the Board. The Chancellor responded that he's aware that it's been a topic for faculty for quite some time. As vice president, he supported adding the Chair of Faculty Alliance to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. He recognized some challenges they would need to overcome, and promised to give it some thought and comment at the next meeting.

Anna L. asked the Provost how well the recommendations coming out of the Budget and Planning Committee have been implemented in the final decision-making process which occurs later on. Provost Henrichs responded that its recommendations have been followed for the most part quite closely. It was, of course, easier in the times when budget increments were being discussed. At least 80-90% of those recommendations were followed. In terms of budget reductions, the OMB web site documents how whole series of PBC recommendations were dealt with. Generally, she has been satisfied that the committee has been listened to and had an impact.

V Guest Speaker: UA President Jim Johnsen
Topic: UA Budget
Questions & Answers

President Johnsen noted the levels of uncertainty and anxiety being felt at the international, national, state and university levels simultaneously. He acknowledged it is a very difficult time, but he appreciated the opportunity to speak about navigating together through the challenges while protecting the university's core values and purpose. He described the university's many strengths, particularly with regard to affordable education, and revenue generation for the state. He noted the university's status as the number one university in the world for arctic research, as well as UAF being counted among the top 20 small universities in the world.

He noted the value of higher education to the state and future generations. Academic freedom, diversity of thought, a mission of service to students and the state, the pursuit of knowledge and high quality of work accomplished at the university were mentioned as hallmarks of being Alaska's university.

But, a big challenge the university faces is the lack of a strong culture of education in Alaska, which also affects the university's ability to meet the state's needs for higher education. Other challenges include the state economy, the large geographical distances covered by the university system, and the low population. Not getting its full land grant has meant the university must rely more heavily upon the state for as much as 40% of its funding. The President spoke at length about other challenges which included: maintaining multiple systems used for many of the university's processes across the three universities; decreasing student enrollments; and meeting Title IX issues and requirements. Last but not least is the budget, which has been cut 14% over the last three years, and is facing further cuts this year coupled with rising fixed costs.

He talked about the proposal to eliminate statewide and adopt the Oregon model. He emphasized the necessary functions and staffing which are not duplicated across the state; e.g., land management, legal, government relations, audit, college savings plan, and foundation. In the areas of finance, academic affairs, IT, student services and human resources, the statewide roles are distinctively different from those at the campuses. He noted the reductions in staffing and finances that have already occurred at statewide over the last three years (funding reduced 37%, from \$29.4 million to 18.4 million; and staffing reduced 31%, from 280 to 194). If funding is again reduced this year, as expected, he said statewide will lead the system in making further cuts. Commenting on the proposal to cut statewide and reallocate dollars to faculty, he noted it makes the assumption that statewide's work is redundant with that done at the campuses, and disagreed with the notion that more faculty would mean higher enrollment and more research dollars. He thinks there is currently capacity for more students with the present faculty numbers. He commented on the Oregon system model, saying it was not intended for saving money, but rather to specifically enhance the distinction of the University of Oregon. He also stated many reasons why that approach did not make sense for Alaska. Two national experts, Dennis Jones and Aims McGuinness (both of NCHEMS, the [National Center for Higher](#)

[Education Management Systems](#)), have been invited to speak about the Oregon model to the Board of Regents at their June meeting. He invited faculty to hear them.

President Johnsen expressed his confidence in the Strategic Pathways process as a means to meet the university mission at lower cost in a time of daunting challenges. The process is inclusive of faculty, staff and students from each of the three universities. The recommendations are largely based on the inputs received. He noted that while there are some decisions that should be left to the individual campuses, there are others that require the statewide perspective. When he's asked if there are three universities or one, he responds "yes" -- one university where it makes sense for our students and the state, and three where it makes sense for our students and the state. He referenced the one university vs. three with regard to accreditation as an example. He then spoke about the controversial decision to consolidate the administration of the three schools of education at UAS. The regents made the decision based upon the model of the UAA Nursing program. The \$1 million contribution is an endowment that will generate approximately \$40,000 annually. They felt outside pressure from superintendents across the state to go with one school that would be placed at the campus most likely to make it a top priority. Accreditation is the first issue being addressed. The goal for completing the implementation process is fall 2018.

President Johnsen shared about ways the Strategic Pathways process is improving. Instead of one public forum, they are having meetings at each university on each of the program phases; and where appropriate, they are having cost benefit analyses done. They are seeking formal review by governance groups, and on the administrative side, they are seeking consolidation of as many back room processes as they can to free up people and resources for the frontline of those who interface with students. Programs such as RAHI and ANSEP were given as examples of frontline efforts. Dual and concurrent enrollment with several schools districts was mentioned.

He spoke about the land grant deficit, and the efforts being made to rectify that situation by creating a federal program (as allowed for in the Alaska Constitution). The federal delegation from Alaska is very supportive, though the effort will take time.

Finally, he spoke about the challenge of the state budget, and provided the current budget numbers being discussed at the legislature. The \$325 million figure in the House of Representatives amounts to a cut because of fixed cost increases. The Senate is at \$309 million, which is an additional 5% reduction. Even at \$325 million the university would have to make further cuts. The Board of Regents will meet on April 13 to discuss the budget situation. He encouraged people to contact their legislators and urge them to keep the \$325 million figure, if possible. He encouraged faculty to keep a vision of the university and its future before them, in spite of the difficulties being faced.

Jeff B. commented on the draft bill to add faculty and staff members to the Board of Regents. He asked President Johnsen if he will lobby for the bill once it's been formalized. President Johnsen said he will think about it, and provided some of the legal reasons and conflicts of

interest that stand in its way. The heart of the question is how we strengthen the faculty voice and presence in Regents' meetings. Chair Gloria O'Neill is interested in expanding the role of governance in BOR meetings. The proposed legislation is one means to address the important issue, but he believes there are also other ways to effectively address it.

Jeff B. countered that these issues have been dealt with already for the existing student regent seat on the BOR. Johnsen responded that students are not employees, which is a big difference from faculty and staff. In terms of intent, however, he feels they are on the same page.

Anna L. noted that she had provided feedback and ideas about the budget to the Chancellor, following the forum he held on that topic. She was told that the Chancellor did not have the power to address her ideas, and so she asked President Johnsen where she could provide them for his (and the Board's) consideration. He responded that he would be happy to take her comments and ideas, or anyone else's, via email: ua.president@alaska.edu.

Ken A. asked if student regents abstain from voting when items that present conflicts of interest come up to the Board. President Johnsen responded that they absolutely do if there's a legal conflict of interest. Ken commented that it would seem there is always a conflict of interest because the vast majority of what the Board deals with concerns the university and the students. The President noted that there are specific cases where regents or students might need to declare a conflict of interest; but most seeming conflicts for a student regent (e.g., tuition increases, where they are one among thousands of students) get washed out. The case would be similar for faculty and staff. The President added that the heart of the matter is how faculty can have a greater voice in the Board of Regents' considerations.

VI Public Comment

No public comments were made.

VII Election of 2017-18 President-Elect

Personal Statements:

A. [Donie Bret-Harte](#)

B. [Gordon Williams](#)

The election was held by means of secret ballot. Ballots were counted over the meeting break, and Donie Bret-Harte was elected by the majority.

BREAK (followed by announcement of election results)

VIII Governance Reports

A. [Research Report](#) - VC Hinzman (linked)

B. Staff Council - Nate Bauer

No report was available from Staff Council.

C. ASUAF - Colby Freel

Colby spoke about the follow-up feedback opportunity afforded to students on the Strategic Pathway II options. He also remarked upon the voluntary resolution agreement reached between the university and the Office of Civil Rights, noting the related processes need to be re-evaluated regularly. He also shared about the recent student government election and actions concerning the now-reduced Student Rec Center student fee.

Jeff B. asked about the UAF survey the students did regarding athletics. Colby noted the survey included student athletes and shared some of the more general results.

Candi D. complimented Colby on his professionalism and service on behalf of student government.

Ken A. asked Colby for some clarifications regarding the SRC fee as it related to paying off bonds. Colby explained the old \$75 fee paid for both the bonds and building facilities. The new \$30 fee will pay for supporting present needs of the facility.

D. UNAC - Chris Coffman UNAD Report - Katie Boylan UAFT - Kate Quick

Chris C. reported that United Academics has reached an impasse in negotiations with the university administration, and has requested mediation by the Alaska Labor Relations Agency. Information has gone out to the membership and is posted on the [UNAC web site](#).

She expressed the strong opposition that United Academics holds regarding the proposed discontinuation of the Extension Research Program. She noted that this opposition stems from the fact that United Academics has found no evidence that this program exists at UAF, by which it was specifically meant they have found no evidence that it was created through the formal channels through which program approvals must go. UNAC thus considers the Research Extension Program to be a nonexistent program that was named as such outside of official processes to create a pretext for the future elimination of tenured and tenure-track faculty members. This move is in direct violation of the collective bargaining agreement that stipulates in Article 10 (Reduction in Force) that tenured faculty should be the last to go in cases of program discontinuation or reduction. This is viewed as both a direct attack on the institution of tenure itself, and on the value of research across all disciplines in higher education. For these reasons, United Academics urged senators to vote against the program discontinuation.

E. Athletics - Dani Sheppard

No report was available.

F. [Faculty Alliance Report](#) - Tara Smith (linked)

G. Senate Members' Questions / Comments

There were no comments or questions from senate members.

IX New Business

A. [Motion to confirm Outstanding Senate Service of the Year Award](#), submitted by the OSSYA Committee

The motion confirming Dr. Sine Anahita to be the recipient of the Outstanding Senate Service of the Year Award was unanimously approved and heartily applauded.

B. [Motion to approve a new Minor in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Studies](#), submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

CAC Chair Eileen Harney introduced the motion and described the course requirements and faculty support for it. With no objections, the new Minor was approved unanimously.

C. [Resolution of Support for a Faculty Board of Regents Member](#), submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Jeff B. described the rationale behind the resolution which had been amended to include support for a staff regent, as well. A series of amendments were approved without objections. The resolution was approved unanimously with the friendly amendments made on the floor.

D. [Motion to move Ethics under Baccalaureate Requirements and Library Science under Associate Requirements](#), submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Rainer N. explained the need for the need to move Ethics out of the General Education Requirements and into the Baccalaureate requirements, in order to align the GERs across the system. The Ethics courses are typically 300-level courses, and not introductory types of courses as the GERs are intended to be. The move also ensures more students working on baccalaureate degrees actually take an Ethics course.

The motion was approved unanimously.

E. [Motion to Endorse UAF Academic Misconduct Policy](#), submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Eileen H. introduced the motion which Curricular Affairs had worked on with the Dean of Students, Laura McCollough. She described the informal resolution and formal resolution pieces of the policy and the rationale behind the associated informal and formal procedures.

A change to the title of the policy was made and approved to include the word “student” with reference to the policy.

Dean of Students Laura McCollough clarified that the goal with this document is provide a clear path if academic misconduct occurs in the classroom. It does not supplant the Student Code of Conduct or Board of Regent policy. She also clarified the options in the procedures are not meant to limit what faculty may or may not do. She mentioned there is now an academic integrity class online that students may be referred to by instructors.

Ken A. noted that the policy also does not prohibit individual faculty from making things more specific in their syllabi for their course (e.g., cheating in their particular course means a zero for the entire course, not simply for a specific assignment). Laura M. noted they want to work together with faculty on their educational goals for students (not just sanctions) resulting from infractions.

The reasoning behind why options A and B occur in the informal process, while options C, D, and E occur in the formal process, was discussed at length. An amendment was approved to add language in the informal procedures section specifying that options C, D and E are part of the formal process.

Sine A. questioned the extent to which a dean might be able to overturn a grade under this policy (section 3, Appeal Rights). An amendment was proposed to remove Section 3 entirely, which was passed with no objections.

The majority approved the policy as amended; with two nay votes.

F. [Motion to amend Admissions Policy for Pre-Majors](#), submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Sandra W. introduced the motion and provided background for the proposed changes. Ginny Kinne, Academic Advising Center director, commented on the procedures for pre-majors as they affect advisors at the Center, as well as noting that the advisors are in full support of the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

G. [Motion to amend Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions \(other than grades\)](#), submitted by the Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee

Sandra W. described her committee’s efforts on this policy which had continued from last year to the present. Many of the revisions are in line with those that occurred to the grade appeals policy. Definitions have been updated.

The definition terms Academic Leader vs. Department Chair were discussed. Sandra explained that the term Academic Leader is in line with Board of Regents policy. An amendment was

proposed to reinstate some the clarifying language that had been struck through in the definition of “Academic Leader,” and to remove the word “administrative” from it, as well.

Clarification was sought about items #3 under Section III. Procedures, subsection A. Informal Procedures. A minor edit was approved (“invites” was replaced with “notifies”).

The motion was approved unanimously, as amended.

H. [Motion to amend the Academic Program Review Process - Revised 03/15/2017](#), submitted by the Faculty Affairs Committee

Sine A. explained the additional paragraph that has been added to the revised policy. The change reflects the new process currently in use.

With no objections, the revision was approved unanimously.

I. [Motion to approve the discontinuation of Extension Research Program](#), submitted by the Administrative Committee

Candi D. introduced the motion and provided the background on it. She noted that they have a number of programs in Cooperative Extension that are not identified on a web site, per se, as they may be grant-funded and may occur in other parts of the state. She noted their current budget crisis. Debra Jones, the faculty lead on the committee which was behind the action concerning the Research Extension Program, described the actions that led to the decision reflected in the motion.

Chris C., speaking as the UNAC ex officio member, commented that calling Research Extension a “program” is not a semantic issue but rather a legal one. She recommended this discussion be taken up at the May meeting, since the meeting was well into overtime.

A motion was made and seconded to table the motion. By majority vote the motion was tabled.

X Members’ Comments/Questions/Announcements

Sine A. withdrew the item regarding the program discontinuations of Sociology, and Economics, noting the Provost had indicated she would bring it up with the Administrative Committee.

- A. General Comments / Announcements
- B. Information Item: [Faculty Senate Election Results](#)
- C. Committee Chair Comments
(An active link is added if minutes are submitted.)

Franz M. commented briefly about the upcoming student course evaluations, urging faculty to update any special questions they’ve added to their surveys. He also reminded them they can

do their course evaluations during class. If anyone has any questions or concerns, he invited their emails.

Chancellor Thomas made a quick announcement about news he just received from Miles Baker concerning a bill just filed by the Alaska Senate (SB 103) to phase out the Alaska Performance Scholars Program. He encouraged senators to share their opinions with their legislators.

Standing Committees:

1. Administrative Committee - Chris Fallen (Minutes of [02/24/2017](#) linked)
2. Curricular Affairs Committee - Eileen Harney (Minutes of [01/13/2017](#) and [02/03/2017](#) and [02/17/2017](#) linked)
3. Faculty Affairs Committee - Andy Anger (Minutes of [02/08/2017](#) linked)
4. Unit Criteria Committee - Mara Bacsujlaky (Minutes of [02/16/2017](#) linked)

Permanent Committees:

5. Committee on the Status of Women - Ellen Lopez, Diana DiStefano (Minutes for [03/09/2017](#) linked)
6. Core Review Committee - Andy Seitz (Minutes for [02/24/2017](#) 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 [12/02/2016](#) and [01/30/2017](#) and [02/20/2017](#) linked)
10. Information Technology Committee - Siri Tuttle
11. Research Advisory Committee - Jamie Clark, Gordon Williams (Minutes for [02/20/2017](#) linked)
12. Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee - Sandra Wildfeuer, Jennifer Tilbury (Minutes for [02/16/2017](#) linked)
13. Faculty Administrator Review Committee (No Group A reviews in 2016-17)

XI Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:28 PM.

The following motions do not reflect amendments made at the meeting. For final versions of the motions, see [the signed motions posted online](#).

Motion to Confirm Outstanding Senate Service of the Year Award

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the nomination of Dr. Sine Anahita for the Outstanding Senate Service of the Year for 2016-2017.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The screening committee has carefully reviewed the nominations according to the award criteria, and with concurrence of the Faculty Senate President, forwards the nomination of Sine Anahita for confirmation by the Faculty Senate. Procedures stipulate that a simple majority vote of the Senate shall confirm the nomination, and a formal resolution shall be prepared for presentation to the recipient at the May meeting.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new Minor in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Studies, housed in the College of Liberal Arts (English Department).

Effective: Fall 2017

Rationale: The proposal for the new minor has been reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Review and Curricular Affairs Committees. The proposal (#87-UNP) is on file in the Governance Office, 312B Signers' Hall.

Overview:

Objectives of the minor:

The minor in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Studies will allow students to broaden and deepen their understanding and knowledge of earlier cultures and civilizations in the Western tradition. Students will take courses in at least three of the noted disciplines. This will provide students with the opportunity to examine multiple aspects of the particular time periods within the scope of the minor. The courses in the minor will explore both dominant and marginalized, threatened, or suppressed constructs, movements, and beliefs of each time period as well as notable influences of and interactions with other cultures and regions. Such engagement not only will ensure a better grasp of the cultures and civilizations studied, but it will also instill a stronger appreciation for the ways in which contemporary North American society perpetuates cultural elements and practices of earlier traditions.

No additional resources (budget, facilities/space, faculty) are required at this time since all of these classes are already regularly offered by the various departments. Any enrollment increase will result in additional tuition revenues.

The interdisciplinary nature of the minor has the additional benefits of increased communication between faculty and students in different departments and scholarly collaboration across disciplines.

Relationship to Purposes of the University:

This minor will respond to student interest in and demand for further access to classes in these time periods. In order to enroll in a few of these classes and use them for electives, current students have to be highly organized, skilled at navigating the catalog and course schedule for several years into the future, and aware of their interests in Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the

Early Modern period almost from the outset of their college careers. The structure of this minor will lay out the current and future offerings in a clear manner and provide space in their degree for the desired strong foundation in and understanding of the Western tradition.

Furthermore, the minor aims to follow the directives of Interim Chancellor Thomas and Provost Henrichs to highlight our faculty members' strengths and areas of expertise and to utilize them in new ways. This minor will connect students and faculty across departments and will allow opportunities for interdisciplinary scholarship and collaboration.

Proposed Catalog Layout:

Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Studies

The minor in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Studies will provide students with a background in the Western tradition in disciplines that emphasizes key artistic, literary, philosophical, political, religious, and social movements in these time periods. Students will gain a better understanding of the workings and struggles, advancements and achievements, and conflicts and prejudices of these civilizations and cultures. The curriculum requires that students take classes in at least three fields of study and thereby ensures that students will engage in a well-rounded examination of these time periods.

1. Complete the following:

HUM F201X Unity in the Arts---3 Credits

2. Complete five of the following:

Only two electives from this list can be from any one discipline.

ART F261X History of World Art---3 Credits

ART F364 Italian Renaissance Art---3 Credits*

ENGL F301 Continental Literature in Translation: The Ancient World---3 Credits*

ENGL F302 Continental Literature in Translation: Medieval and Renaissance---3 Credits*

ENGL F308 Survey of British Literature: *Beowulf* to the Romantic Period---3 Credits

ENGL F415 Studies in 17th- and 18th-Century British Literature---3 Credits**

ENGL F420 Studies in Medieval and 16th Century British Literature---3 Credits**

ENGL F422 Shakespeare: History, Plays and Tragedies---3 Credits

ENGL F425 Shakespeare: Comedies and Non-Dramatic Poetry---3 Credits

HIST F101 Western Civilization---3 Credits

HIST F401 Renaissance and Reformation Europe---3 Credits*

HIST F402 Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Europe---3 Credits*

MUS F221 History of Western Music I---3 Credits

MUS F421 Music Before 1620---3 Credits*

MUS F422 Music in the 17th and 18th Centuries---3 Credits*

PHIL F351 History of Ancient Greek Philosophy---3 Credits

PHIL F352 History of Modern Philosophy---3 Credits

PHIL F411/PS F411 Classical Political Theory---3 Credits*
PS F411/PHIL F411 Classical Political Theory---3 Credits*
PHIL F412/PS F412 Modern Political Theory---3 Credits*
PS F412/PHIL F412 Modern Political Theory---3 Credits*

3. Minimum credits required---18 credits

* Course offered every two years

** Course offered every three years

RESOLUTION

of Support for a Faculty Board of Regents Member

WHEREAS, State of Alaska Statute AS 14.40.120 in combination with AS 14.40.130 codifies the composition of the University of Alaska Board of Regents to include a student Regent, but currently does not include any faculty Regents; and

WHEREAS, the outcome of a survey [reported](#)¹ by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) reveals that many universities have included faculty members in their governing boards.

WHEREAS, the current faculty of the University of Alaska have a wealth of institutional knowledge and serve a vital role in promoting the health and well being of our State's University; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the UAF Faculty Senate goes on record to support the modification of the State of Alaska Statute, as needed, to legislate the addition of a faculty member to serve on the University of Alaska Board of Regents.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to place the Ethics requirement under Baccalaureate Degree Requirements and the Library Science requirement under Associate Degree Requirements and Baccalaureate Degree Requirements and to remove Ethics and Library Science requirements from the General Education Requirements (GERs). Students pursuing Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degrees will no longer be required to take Ethics; however, they will need to fulfill the Library Science requirement as part of the Associate Degree Requirements. All students pursuing Baccalaureate degrees will be required to fulfill both the Ethics and Library Science requirements.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2017

RATIONALE: The new classification list system for the General Education Requirements (GERs) implemented in 2016-2017 was intended to meet the charge to faculty across the UA system by the UA Board of Regents (BOR) to develop and adopt common GERs. (See BOR's resolution at the April 3-4, 2014 meeting.)

When the UAF Faculty Senate approved the criteria for courses within the GER lists on November 9, 2015, it also voted to retain the Ethics requirement.

The Ethics and Library Science requirements are UAF-specific requirements and do not have counterparts in the GERs of UAA or UAS and, therefore, the UAF GERs do not fully align with the other universities' GERs.

All Ethics courses are at the 300-level and require "junior standing", which demands that a student have at least 60 credits; this is also the minimum number of credits to complete an Associate degree. This may result in unintentional burdens on students seeking Associate degrees.

Library Science courses are at the 100-level and have no prerequisites, which make the Library Science requirement a reasonable expectation for both Associate and Baccalaureate degrees.

Furthermore, the placement of Library Sciences under the Associate Degree Requirements ensures that all transfer students who have completed the GERs at UAS or UAA or have completed equivalent courses at a college or university outside the UA system will still need to fulfill the Library Science requirement.

Finally, the placement of Ethics and Library Sciences under the Baccalaureate Degree Requirements ensures that all students, including transfer students and those who complete the GERs at UAS or UAA, will take courses which we see as essential for students pursuing Baccalaureate degrees at a research institution.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to endorse the Academic Misconduct Policy as shown below.

Effective: Fall 2017

Rationale: The policy and procedures outlined below are the result of extensive collaboration among pertinent staff and administration, faculty, and student representatives. The policy provides clarification of the standards to which students are expected to adhere and details the consequences of violating those standards. The policy also outlines steps for faculty seeking an informal or formal resolution to matters of academic misconduct.

UAF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY

The faculty, staff, administration, and students of the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) consider academic honesty and integrity fundamental to the mission of higher education and promote the highest ethical and professional standards of behavior in the classroom. Accordingly, UAF has developed procedures that address academic misconduct. Students who violate these standards commit academic misconduct and shall be subject to academic and/or disciplinary sanctions.

UAF defines academic misconduct as attempting or helping another to obtain grades, grants, or class credit through fraudulent means. Broad categories of misconduct include cheating, plagiarizing, committing forgery or falsification, facilitating or aiding academic dishonesty, submitting duplicate assignments without the express permission of both instructors, stealing instructional materials or tests, altering grades or files and misusing research data in reporting results. An instructor may create special rules for a class and list them in the syllabus and/or in directions for assignments. Violation of class-specific rules also constitutes academic misconduct.

Below are specific examples for some of the aforementioned categories. A given activity may fall under several different categories

Cheating: attempting to give or use materials, information, notes, study aids, or other devices not authorized by the course instructor. Examples of cheating include copying from another student's paper or receiving unauthorized assistance during a quiz, test or examination; taking an examination or test for another student; using books, notes, or other devices, such as calculators, during a quiz or test, unless authorized by the instructor; acquiring or distributing without authorization copies of tests or examinations before the scheduled exercise; and copying reports, laboratory work, or computer programs or files from other students.

Plagiarism: presenting the work of another as one's own. Examples of plagiarism include submitting as one's own work that of another student, a ghost writer, or a commercial writing service; directly quoting from a source without acknowledgment; paraphrasing or summarizing another's work without acknowledging the source; using facts, figures, graphs, charts, or other information without acknowledging the source. Plagiarism may be verbal or written and may include computer programs and files, research designs, distinctive figures of speech, ideas and images or any other information that belongs to another person and is not acknowledged as such.

Falsification: inventing or unauthorized altering of any information or citation in an academic work. Examples of falsification include inventing or counterfeiting data or research procedures; falsely citing a source of information; altering the record of, or reporting false information about, practicum or clinical experiences; altering grade reports or other academic records; submitting a false excuse for absence or tardiness; altering a returned examination paper to obtain a better grade.

Tampering: interfering with, altering or attempting to alter academic records, grades, assignments, laboratory experiments, or class-related documents without authorization. Examples of tampering include using a computer or false-written document to change or affect the grade recorded for a student and forging the signature of a University official on a drop/add sheet or other official University record.

Procedures:

If an instructor has reason to believe that a student has engaged in academic misconduct, the following procedures apply:

1) Informal Resolution: The instructor shall personally and privately advise the student there is reason to believe that the student has committed an act that constitutes academic misconduct. The student shall be allowed a reasonable opportunity to respond or explain. This communication may be conducted face-to-face or by phone, email, or other electronic means. This informal resolution might include sanctions agreed upon by the instructor and the student. Among the sanctions listed below, these may include options a, b, or both. In this case, it is recommended that the instructor provide the student with written confirmation of the agreed-upon resolution.

2) Formal Resolution: If the instructor has evidence that the student engaged in academic misconduct and there is no resolution through the informal process and/or the student does not fulfill the agreement made in the informal process, the instructor shall inform the student in writing of the instructor's determination and of any intended sanctions.

In such cases, the instructor shall be limited to imposing one or more of the five sanctions listed below. The instructor shall prepare the Academic Misconduct Notification form and submit a copy to the student, the department chair, dean for the College in which the course is offered, and the Dean of Students.

Academic Sanctions:

These sanctions may be imposed for academic misconduct. They are listed in no specific order, and multiple sanctions may be imposed for a single offense:

- a) Instruct the student to redo the assignment or examination or to complete an alternate or supplemental assignment;
- b) Assign a lower or failing grade on the particular assignment or examination;
- c) Assign a lower or failing grade in the course;
- d) Remove the student from the course;
- e) Report the incident to Student Conduct for review of policy violation

3) Appeal Rights: If the student disagrees with the sanction(s) imposed by the instructor during the semester, the student has the right to appeal that decision to the dean or director of the school in which the course is housed within seven business days of receiving the Academic Misconduct Notification form. A copy of the appeal shall also be submitted to the instructor and the Dean of Students. The dean or director shall issue the finding on the appeal to the student, the instructor, and the Dean of Students within seven business days of receiving the student's appeal documents. The decision of the dean or director of the college housing the academic program is final.

Disciplinary Sanctions:

In cases of egregious or multiple violations, the Dean of Students shall apply the further disciplinary sanctions of reporting the student for violation of the Student Code of Conduct, removing the student from a major program or college, withdrawing from the student a degree or academic credit previously bestowed and/or imposing sanctions for violation of the Student Code of Conduct, which include disciplinary probation and suspension or expulsion from the University.

Academic Misconduct Notification Form - next page

Academic Misconduct Notification Form

The Academic Misconduct Policy at the University of Alaska Fairbanks requires that an instructor complete this form if he/she decides a formal resolution is required. Having completed the form, the instructor should keep the original in his/her files and give a copy to the student, to the department chair, to the appropriate dean, and to the Dean of Students.

1) Name of student: _____

2) Semester when misconduct occurred: Fall / Spring / Summer (circle one) Year: _____

3) Class in which misconduct occurred:

Course Prefix and Number: _____ Course Name: _____

4) Date when the misconduct occurred, or date when the misconduct was discovered by the instructor:

Date: _____

5) A description of the facts surrounding the incident of academic misconduct. Please attach additional pages, if more room is needed.

6) The academic sanctions imposed on the student for this incident. Please see UAF Academic Misconduct Policy for permissible sanctions.

7) Name of instructor:

8) Date: _____

9) Signature: _____

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate, upon recommendation of the Student Academic and Development and Achievement Committee, moves to amend the Admissions policy for how pre-majors are admitted and moved to major status. Students who do not yet meet the requirements for a Bachelor's degree will have pre-major status as General Studies students until they meet the minimum requirements to move to major status in General Studies. At this point students may change major to a department of their choice if they have met that program's requirements.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2017

RATIONALE: This motion amends the current pre-major policy at UAF. This addresses a concern that students were advancing to major status under the current pre-major policy without meeting the minimum requirements. Classifying pre-major students as General Studies students eliminates confusion about who advises them and provides students with consistent access to advisors and support networks. Under the new policy, students will not be admitted to a major until they have met the minimum requirements for that major.

Additions in bold italics and deletions indicated with ~~strike-through~~.

Applying for Admission: Bachelor's Degree Programs

Pre-Major ([Pre-major status when applying for admission, UAF catalog](#))

Students who have not met the minimum requirements for admission to a baccalaureate degree program will be admitted to pre-major status ~~within the department of their choice~~ **as General Studies students.**

Students will be changed to **General Studies** major status when they are in good standing and have completed 14 credits at the 100 level or above with a C (2.0) ~~average~~ or higher; 9 of the 14 credits must satisfy ~~baccalaureate core~~ **general education** requirements. **At that point, they may change major into the department of their choice, provided they have met that program's admission standards.**

General Studies

Pre-Major ([Pre-major in General Studies, UAF catalog](#))

Students admitted in pre-major standing have not met the admission requirements for bachelor's degrees but are intending to major in a bachelor's degree. ~~As a bachelor's-intended student, you~~ **Pre-majors** will ~~generally work~~ meet with advisors in the Academic Advising Center, Rural Student Services or a community campus **to work toward admission into their desired major.** ~~, but it is helpful to also contact the department of your intended major. Because~~

~~not all requirements for immediate admittance to a bachelor's degree will have been met, pre-major students will work with an academic advisor to determine the best selection of courses to pursue. Students who are in good standing and have completed 14 credits at the 100 level or above (9 credits must satisfy baccalaureate general education requirements) with a C grade average (2.0) or **higher** better, of which 9 credits must satisfy baccalaureate general education requirements, will be changed to major status **as General Studies students**. The vice provost will notify students of their change of status and inform the registrar. Pre-major students do not use the change of major form to move from pre-major to major status in General Studies, but may use the form to change from pre-major status in one program to another program **from General Studies to their desired major once they have been accepted as baccalaureate students**. Academic assistance and actions are processed the same as for general studies students.~~

History:

FY02 Motion to add a "pre-major" admission status to the baccalaureate degree. [Meeting #109](#)

FY07 Motion to revise how pre-majors move to major status. [Meeting #143](#)

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions (other than assignment of grades), as shown below.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2017

RATIONALE: The Appeal for Academic Decisions Policy was last revised in 2012. The current revisions clarify the informal and formal appeals processes and timelines, and brings the policy in line with Board of Regents' Policy (Chapter 09.03 - Student Dispute Resolution).

Additions in bold italics and deletions indicated with ~~strike through~~.

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 are a faculty responsibility. Therefore, the University administration shall not unduly influence or affect the review of academic decisions that are a faculty responsibility. The following procedures are designed to provide a means for students to seek review of academic decisions alleged to be arbitrary and capricious. These academic decisions may involve non-admission to or dismissal from any UAF program that were made by a department or program through the department chair, or involve pass/fail decisions by a committee of faculty on non-course examinations (such as qualifying, comprehensive or thesis examinations) or satisfactory/unsatisfactory evaluations on student reviews (such as the annual review of graduate student performance). 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, **as defined in university regulations (R09.03.024)**. Final examination periods are counted as class days.

B. The term "academic leader" is used to denote the administrative head of the academic department offering the course or program from which the academic decision or action arose.

~~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 division coordinator or program chair if the faculty member is in the College of Rural Alaska).~~

C. "Committee of Faculty" for the purposes of this policy denotes the group of faculty who rendered the initial decision being appealed. Such groups may include, but are not limited to: graduate examination committees, graduate advisory committees, and thesis defense committees.

D. 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.

E. 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 decision made during** ~~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.

F. For the purpose of this procedure, "arbitrary and capricious" means:

An academic decision that is based on something other than academic performance or that represents a substantial, unreasonable and unannounced departure from previously articulated standards.

III. Procedures

A. Informal Procedures

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

- 1. Review the UAF Appeal of Academic Decisions other than grades form. [The form is available through the Office of the Provost.]**
- 2. 4-** Notification must be received by the Provost **academic leader** within ~~30~~ **15** class days

after the beginning of the next regular semester.

3. ***The academic leader notifies the dean that an action has commenced. The dean invites all relevant parties that an informal review has begun.***
4. ***If the student wishes to appeal an academic decision, the student should work with their committee chair, department chair, associate dean, and dean as necessary to resolve the academic decision. The dean makes the final decision and provides a report to the student and to the affected parties within 10 class days.***
5. ~~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 ***academic leader*** ~~Provost~~, after review of supporting documentation provided by the student, ***may recommend to the appeals committee that the deadlines be adjusted accordingly.*** ~~may adjust the deadlines accordingly.~~ ***At the discretion of the academic leader,*** ~~A~~ ***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.***
6. ***If the student wishes to appeal the decision of the academic leader, the student can file a formal appeal with the Office of the Provost.*** ~~3.~~ ~~In cases where the decision was rendered by a committee of faculty (such as those dealing with graduate examinations and evaluations), the provost will request the appropriate committee to conduct an informal review of its decision. The committee of faculty will determine whether its original decision should be overturned or changed in any way. The committee of faculty will submit its recommendation to the provost through the department chair and dean/director within 10 days.~~
4. ~~In all other matters, the Provost will request the appropriate department chair to conduct an informal review of the decision. The Department chair will determine whether the original decision should be overturned or changed in any way. The department chair will submit his/her recommendation to the provost through the dean/director within 10 days. In the event that the department chair is directly involved, the provost can ask the dean/director to conduct an informal review and submit his/her recommendations directly to him.~~
5. ~~The Provost will consult with the student on the committee of faculty's or department chair's recommendation. If the student does not find that recommendation acceptable, he/she may request the Provost to conduct a formal review.~~

B. Formal Procedures ~~The formal review will be conducted as follows.~~

1. This formal review is initiated by the student through a ~~signed, written~~ request **in writing** to the **Office of the Provost**.
 - a. The student's request for formal review **must be submitted using the formal Academic Decisions Other Than Assignment of Grades Appeals form** ~~may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and available~~ **in person or electronically** 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 **informal** ~~formal~~ review of the decision., ~~and that the university's administration including the college dean/director can not influence or affect the outcome of the formal review.~~
 - c. The request for a formal review must be received no later than **5 class** ~~40~~ days after the student has learned the outcome of the informal review. ~~(HIA4).~~
 - d. The student will work with the Office of the Provost on collecting appropriate documentation to support their appeal and must submit this documentation with the appeal.
 - 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 ~~5-member~~ review committee will be appointed **by the Provost and the Faculty Senate president** as follows:
 - a. The Provost shall appoint one non-voting ~~tenure-track~~ faculty member **holding academic rank, who is represented through the current applicable collective bargaining agreements**, from the academic unit in which the decision was made. This individual shall serve in an advisory role. This faculty member shall not be the individual(s) against whom the appeal is directed.
 - b. Two ~~tenure-track~~ faculty members **holding academic rank, who are represented through the current applicable collective bargaining agreements**, from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the decision was made shall be appointed. One of these members shall be appointed by the Provost. The other person shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President and shall be a member of the Faculty Senate (including alternate members), if available.
 - c. One ~~tenure-track~~ faculty member **holding academic rank, who is represented**

through the current applicable collective bargaining agreements, from outside the college or school in which the decision was made. This person shall be a member of the Faculty Senate (including alternate members). The Senate member shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President.

- d. The fifth member to be appointed by the Provost will be a non-voting student representative.
 - e. **In the case of an appeal from a graduate student, a representative appointed by the Graduate School shall serve on the committee in a non-voting capacity.**
 - f. The **facilitator, appointed by the Provost**, ~~campus judicial officer or his/her designee~~ shall serve as a non-voting **committee member** ~~facilitator~~ for appeals hearings. This individual shall serve in an advisory role to help preserve consistent hearing protocol and records- **and insure that appeal policies and procedures are followed.**
3. The committee must schedule a mutually agreeable date, time and location for the appeal hearing within 10 ~~class working~~ days of receipt of the student's formal request. **If the request for appeal is received any time other than during a regular semester, then the hearing must be scheduled on or before the 10th class day of the next regular semester.**
- 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. To be considered by the committee, all written materials shall be submitted to the **Office of the Provost along with the formal appeal form** ~~hearing facilitator~~ no later than **2 class days** ~~48 hours~~ before the **day start** of the scheduled appeals hearing. To give all interested parties a chance to submit written materials, at least three ~~class business~~ days shall elapse between the time the meeting is announced and the start of the meeting. New written materials presented after the **2 class day** ~~48-hour~~ deadline or presented during the meeting will only be considered by agreement of all voting committee members. These procedures related to written materials also apply to all subsequent meetings.
 - c. Throughout the proceedings, the committee will encourage a mutually agreeable

resolution.

- d. 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:
 - i. The student has not provided sufficient reason in support of the allegation that the academic decision was arbitrary and capricious.
 - ii. This is not the first properly prepared request for appeal.
 - iii. The request was not made within the policy deadlines.
 - e. In the event that the committee votes to dismiss the request, a written notice of dismissal must be forwarded to the student, ~~instructor,~~ **academic leader** ~~department chair,~~ dean/director and provost within five **class** 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 written response from the **academic leader** ~~program department chair~~ to the student's allegation.
 - b. A second meeting scheduled to meet within 10 **class** days of the decision to review the request.
 - i. The student and the **academic leader** ~~department chair~~ or a representative of the program will be invited to attend the meeting.
 - ii. The meeting will be closed to outside participation, and ~~either~~ **neither** the student ~~or nor the instructor or~~ **appropriate academic representative** ~~department chair~~ may be accompanied by an advocate ~~or representative~~. Other matters of format will be announced in advance.
 - iii. The proceedings will be ~~tape~~ recorded and the **recordings** ~~tapes~~ will be stored with the **Office of the Provost** ~~campus Judicial Officer~~.
 - iv. The meeting must be informal, non-confrontational and fact-finding, where both the student and **appropriate academic representative** ~~instructor or department chair~~ may provide additional relevant and useful information and **clarify** ~~can provide clarification of facts for~~ **any** 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:

- i. direct the **academic leader** ~~program instructor or department chair~~ to reconsider the decision,
 - ii. 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, **academic leader** ~~instructor, program/department chair~~, dean and Provost within five **class** 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.

~~G. The entire process must be completed by the end of the semester in which the decision first took effect.~~

Record of Changes to the Appeals of Academic Decisions Other Than Assignment of Grades Policy:

The following is a complete copy of the Academic Appeals Policy as passed by the UAF Faculty Senate at its Meeting #96 (Sept. 25, 2000) and amended at its Meeting #101 (April 2, 2001), Meeting #109 (May 6, 2002), Meeting #123 (May 3, 2004), Meeting #157 (March 2, 2009), and Meeting #183 (May 7, 2012).

- Policy at Section III, Procedures, subsection B, Item 2, was revised at [Meeting #183 \(May 7, 2012\)](#).
- Deadlines were revised at [Meeting #157 \(March 2, 2009\)](#).

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the approved updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regents Policy and UA Regulations (10.06) which it passed at Meeting #219 on December 5, 2016. The more recent amendment of March 15, 2017 is indicated in bold, italicized text (below).

Effective: Spring 2017

Rationale: The existing process was modified at Meeting #181 (March 5, 2012) to accommodate a five year review cycle. The revisions approved at Meeting #219 are intended to ensure faculty input, and clarify the role of the Faculty Senate in program eliminations. The Program Review Template as well as the BOR Policy for 10.06 have also changed since the last Faculty Senate motion in 2012, and current versions are included. The most recent amendment proposed here in red text concerns the process at step 2.

Additions: ***bold italics***

Deletions: ~~strikethrough~~

The program review process shall be completed as follows:

1. An initial review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit-provided brief narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere in 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; current PDF posted with motion). A single Faculty Program Review Committee shall be comprised of one faculty representative from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus *one representative from CRCD and one representative from CTC. The Faculty Program Review Committee shall be nominated by the Provost in consultation with the deans and directors, and, once formed, the list of committee members shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate for comment, and finalized by the Chancellor. The Faculty Program Review Committee shall review the materials and make one of 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 shall provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review. A summary of the recommendation shall be shared with the program under review and the Faculty Senate President, who may request a copy of the full narrative. The Faculty Senate President, in consultation with members of the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee, then has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks. The program under review also has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks.

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and four administrative representatives from CRCD shall review the recommendations of the Faculty Program Review Committee, may request additional information from the program, and shall state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation. ***A summary of the recommendation shall be shared with the program under review and the Faculty Senate President, who may request a copy of the full narrative. The Faculty Senate President, in consultation with members of the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee, then has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks. The program under review also has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks.***

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

- a) Program continuation is confirmed.
- 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 shall 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. 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 Chancellor's Cabinet's recommendation. If the Faculty Senate disagrees, it shall provide an alternate recommendation by the end of the semester in which the Chancellor's Cabinet's recommendation is made.

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

Copies of the following are attached to hard-copy printed motion:

Link to [current Instructional Program Review Template](#)

Link to [BOR Policy and UA Regulation 10.06](#)

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate agrees to the discontinuation of the Cooperative Extension Research program.

Effective: On Board of Regents approval

Rationale:

Cooperative Extension Service (CES) faculty, after an in-depth internal review starting in September 2015, identified the Extension Research program for special program review during the spring 2016 review cycle. During the special program review process, the faculty review committee, administrative review committee, and chancellor's cabinet approved the discontinuation; as did the statewide academic council, vice president for academic affairs & research, and academic and student affairs subcommittee of the board of regents. The [discontinuation summary and financial analysis are attached](#).

Because Cooperative Extension is a service unit, it does not offer degrees, so traditional teaching programs do not exist. Like the rest of CES, the Extension Research program does not offer degrees, and so does not appear in the catalog. Historically, the position of "Extension Specialist" has a tripartite appointment, including a research workload component, so during the internal review the Extension Research program was defined to consist of all Extension Specialists: this discontinuation would apply to all Extension Specialists, and only Extension Specialists. Tenured and tenure-track positions would still exist at CES as bipartite "Extension Agent" positions.

The ongoing budget cuts mean CES, like the rest of UAF, has extremely hard decisions to make. Many cooperative extension faculty were deeply involved in the reorganization process, which was both extensive and difficult, and included detailed financial and impact analysis. Some of the tenure-track faculty whose positions will be discontinued with this change, still support it for the good of the unit. Regardless of this discontinuation, the budget cuts mean tenure-track positions will certainly be lost, but this discontinuation allows the unit itself to make those hard choices for the good of the unit and its service to Alaskans.