ORIGI

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #17 on March 9, 1990:

MOTION PASSED (with 2 nays, 2 abstentions)
==========

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to replace the existing policy on selection of academic unit heads to the proposed policy on election of department chairs as follows:

1. Election of department chairs shall be by a simple majority vote of the vote of all tenure-track faculty and permanent instructors of the respective department.

2. Department chairs shall be elected as representatives of their faculty.

3. Among other agreed upon duties, department chairs will have access to the college-wide budget requests and allocations and will operate as a college-wide budget committee.

****

Follow-up: The Faculty Senate is further charged with forming a committee to determine the role, duties, functions, and compensation of department chairs.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor's Approval

RATIONALE: This new policy will enable representative department chairs to assist their departments in meeting the goals that the faculty have determined to be important and will empower department chairs to act on behalf of their faculty.

Dan Smith 3/19/90

President, UAF Faculty Senate Date

ORIGINAL

Motion on election of department chairs
Faculty Senate Meeting #17
March 19, 1990

APPROVED _____ DATE _____
Chancellor's Office

DISAPPROVED:_____ DATE _____
Chancellor's Office

APPROVED WITH MODIFICATIONS(S) INDICATED _____ DATE _____
Chancellor's Office

Office of the Chancellor
(907) 474-7112

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Fairbanks, Alaska 99775-0500

MEMORANDUM

TO: David Smith, President
Faculty Senate

FROM: Patrick J. O'Rourke, Chancellor
University of Alaska Fairbanks

DATE: April 3, 1990

RE: DEPARTMENT HEADS MOTION--REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

I would like to request an indefinite extension in my taking action on the department head motion which I received in my office on March 20, 1990. According to Article XI, Section 1 of the Faculty Senate constitution, such an extension may be granted upon request by the chancellor and approval by the Administrative Committee of the Faculty Senate.

My reason in doing so is to engage in further exploration and discussion of the issues surrounding department heads/chairs. I found the discussion at the Executive Council of March 28, 1990 to be revealing and useful in my consideration of the action. However, I am also of the belief that, in its current form, I would be doing the University a disservice by taking final action either way. One of the most telling observations that came out of the Executive Council meeting was the fact that we have the *cart before the horse.* This was voiced by a number of people, and it seems clear that we need to scope out the role, duties, and functions of the department heads/chairs and, from that, should follow the means of election/selection.

I would also like to suggest that the senate committee working on this further elaboration work with a few of the deans and current department heads so that a fuller exploration of the issues, desires, and problems might be brought about.

If the Administrative Committee of the Faculty Senate is willing to grant such an extension, I would appreciate knowing of your decision before the April 13, 1990 Faculty Senate meeting. Thank you.

PJO'R/clb

cc: Janice M. Reynolds
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS

Governance Office
Fairbanks, Alaska 99775-0680

MEMORANDUM

TO: Patrick J. O'Rourke, Chancellor
University of Alaska Fairbanks

FROM: David Smith, President
Faculty Senate

DATE: April 9, 1990

SUBJECT: Department Heads Motion -- Request for Extension

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, the Administrative Committee has agreed to grant you an extension to act on the department head motion passed by the Senate on March 9, 1990, until such time that the Senate receives and acts on recommendations from the Task Force on Department Chairs.

cab

ORIGINAL

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #17 on March 9, 1990:

MOTION PASSED (17 ayes, 9 nays)
==========

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to establish the following ~~policy~~ procedure PJOR 4/19/90 to consider requests to censure administrators:

A. An investigation for possible censure of an administrator must be initiated by a petition signed by 25 individuals with faculty rank. – see attached PJOR 4/19/90

B. There shall be an independent investigation by faculty of the case against the person being considered for faculty censure, including votes of no confidence. Once a motion to consider censure has been raised in the Senate, the Senate President, in consultation with the Administrative Committee, shall appoint an ad hoc committee of at least three members of the faculty (members may or may not be senators).

C. This committee shall be charged to thoroughly investigate any and all reasons for considering the action, and shall report within (30) days its findings and recommended action. The recommended action can include remediation.

D. Upon acceptance of the ad hoc committee's report, the Faculty Senate will act upon the committee's recommendation.

E. Any motion and consequent vote shall be by secret ballot. The vote of no confidence shall be by simple majority. The vote will be followed by a communication of the action to the Chancellor's Office, or in the case where the Chancellor is involved, to the University of Alaska President, for consideration and response. The appropriate administrator(s) ~~shall~~ MAY communicate their response to the Senate within 30 days. PJOR 4/19/90

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor's Approval

RATIONALE: On occasion, the Faculty Senate needs to address the issue of administrators who have lost the confidence of faculty. However, the Senate has no policy which can provide a fair, deliberate, and responsible procedure for considering these cases. This motion proposes such a procedure.

David R. Smith Mar 22, 1990
President, UAF Faculty Senate Date

APPROVED: _____ DATE _____
Chancellor's Office

DISAPPROVED: _____ DATE _____
Chancellor's Office

APPROVED WITH MODIFICATIONS(S) INDICATED Patrick J. O'Rourke DATE 4/19/90
Chancellor's Office

approved as a procedure and in the spirit of the attached memorandum to Prof. Smith dated 4/19/90
PJOR

Office of the Chancellor
(907) 474-7112

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS

Fairbanks, Alaska 99775-0500

MEMORANDUM

TO: David Smith, President
Faculty Senate

FROM: Patrick J. O'Rourke, Chancellor
University of Alaska Fairbanks

DATE: April 20, 1990

RE: CENSURE PROCEDURE

I have approved, with the modifications contained in the motion and in this memorandum, the action of the senate regarding a procedure for censure. However, I did find the motion troubling. Let me explain.

The senate has the right to take action at any time regarding any individual within the University including members of the administration. Attempting to regulate how and when such an action might occur is something that I believe is not in the best interests of the University or the senate. Many different issues can be involved including the severity of an action or the chronic nature of such actions. The senate action came to me as a policy item, yet it seems inappropriate as a policy. It also seems inappropriate as part of the senate's constitution and by-laws. Thus, I have modified the action to reflect that it is a senate procedure for it is a means by which the senate will conduct its business.

I am further concerned that the action is out of context. An investigation for possible censure is a very serious action and is one that should be utilized only as a last resort. Yet, I find nothing in the senate action to indicate that other means of problem resolution have been explored. There are other ways of correcting inappropriate actions within the institution, and I would hope that all who are part of the academy would utilize these means.

Let me address the specific items contained within the action. With regard to Section A, there is nothing in the senate action which indicates the substance of charges for which a petition may be initiated. Because 25 faculty members might disagree with a particular action, is this sufficient enough cause to initiate such a petitioning? If such is the case, chaos will reign because many actions taken throughout the institution will be controversial in nature. A petition and investigation can be as damaging to an individual as a censure vote.

Regarding Section B, this mandates an independent investigation once the signature petition is received. Neither the senate president nor the administrative committee appear to be given any latitude, rather, they "shall appoint" an investigating committee. The institution would be better served if the senate president and the administrative committee had the latitude to determine whether or not the charges being alleged (if any) are serious enough to warrant further investigation.

Under Section D, the senate is mandated to act on the committee's report, yet the committee might be of such a nature that no further action is required. Additionally, the procedure does not mandate that the individual being charged has a right to appear either before the committee or the senate to answer the charges. Additionally, there is no requirement that the investigations and deliberations shall be kept confidential. The senate may be bordering on legal liabilities depending on how they carry out their actions.

Under Section E, it assumes that the only form of censure is by a vote of no confidence. Censure could and should take other forms than just a "no confidence vote." Yet, the implication is otherwise. Again in this section is the same issue whereby the administrator is asked to communicate after the action rather than before it. Further, if the action of the senate is against censure, why then should there be any further communication of this throughout the institution?

Given the reservations I have expressed, you might ask why I signed the senate action. Despite the fact that I believe it is a flawed procedure, it is the right of the senate to establish any procedure it wishes in order to bring action against an individual in the institution that it feels it has cause to take such action against. My personal belief is that you do not have a carefully thought-out, working procedure in this action and that the senate would be better served by rescinding its action and giving far more careful thought and consideration to the entire issue. However, that is my opinion, and I endorse the senate's right to conduct its business as it sees fit.

PJO'R/clb
Attachment

cc: Executive Council

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #17 on March 9, 1990:

MOTION PASSED (unanimous approval)
==========

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to conduct a faculty referendum to provide an advisory vote on the Core Curriculum Proposal. On March 22, 1990, the UAF Faculty Senate will distribute to permanent UAF faculty the Core Curriculum Proposal, along with the following advisory ballot. Completed ballots must be returned to the UAF Faculty Senate office by 5:00 p.m., Friday, March 30, 1990. Ballots may be returned by mail, FAX, or VAX. The Faculty Senate will vote on the Core Curriculum Proposal in its April 13, 1990, meeting. (see attached for copy of ballot)

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: While current Senate procedure does not call for an advisory vote of the entire faculty on the Core Curriculum Proposal, response to the proposal at the level of schools and colleges and in the senate-sponsored convocation makes it obvious that there is strong faculty sentiment in favor of an advisory vote.

David B. Sapp 3/22/90

President, UAF Faculty Senate Date

ADVISORY BALLOT ON CORE CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Please answer each of the following seven questions:

1. Do you favor implementation of the Mathematics Literacy section of the Core Curriculum Proposal?
   ===== yes =====no

2. Do you favor implementation of the Communication Literacy section of the Core Curriculum Proposal?
   ===== yes ===== no

3. Do you favor implementation of the Library and Information Literacy section of the Core Curriculum Proposal?
   ===== yes ===== no

4. Do you favor implementation of the Computer Literacy section of the Core Curriculum Proposal? ===== yes ===== no

5. Do you favor implementation of the Natural Sciences section of the Core Curriculum Proposal? ===== yes ===== no

6. Do you favor implementation of the Perspectives on the Human Condition section of the Core Curriculum Proposal?
   ===== yes ===== no

7. Overall, do you favor the Core Curriculum Proposal over the current general degree requirements? ===== yes ===== no

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #17 on March 9, 1990:

MOTION PASSED (unanimous approval)
==========

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to endorse the following motion presented by the participants of the General Assembly Governance Retreat, February 14, 1990:

> "We adopt, in principle, the concept of a council of presidents and suggest that it replace the General Assembly as it exists today. The council of presidents would improve the representation of the different constituent groups, while resulting in a more efficient form of governance. This structure will allow direct access for student, staff and faculty to the President and the Board of Regents on concerns that are unique to those groups, and will provide an avenue for joint consideration of issues that affect all constituent groups. This statewide organization would in no way dictate how governance is organized at the local campuses."

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: As an outcome of the systemwide governance retreat, the faculty, staff, and student presidents have requested that each local constituent body at the three universities consider this motion which would begin a process to change the statewide governance structure.

David M. Smith 3-22-90

President, UAF Faculty Senate Date

ORIGINAL

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #17 on March 9, 1990:

MOTION PASSED (unanimous approval)
==========

A UAF undergraduate minor shall consist of at least 15 hours of coursework to be designated by each discipline or department offering a minor. Such designation shall specify whether courses used to fulfill minor degree requirements may be used at the same time to fill major or general distribution requirements.

EFFECTIVE: September 1991; earlier, by petition

RATIONALE: Since UAF began offering bachelor of science majors the option of obtaining a minor, there has been some confusion as to the content and requirements of minors among different academic disciplines. Implementation of this motion would eliminate confusion and give academic disciplines the freedom as well as the obligation to determine minor degree requirements.

Dave McSmith 3-12-90
President, UAF Faculty Senate Date

APPROVED: Pat O'Rourke DATE 4/19/90
Chancellor's Office

DISAPPROVED: _____ DATE _____
Chancellor's Office

APPROVED WITH MODIFICATIONS(S) INDICATED _____ DATE _____
Chancellor's Office

Office of the Chancellor
(907) 474-7112

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS

Fairbanks, Alaska 99775-0500

MEMORANDUM

TO: Janice Reynolds
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Academic Deans

FROM: Patrick J. O'Rourke, Chancellor
University of Alaska Fairbanks

DATE: April 20, 1990

RE: UNDERGRADUATE MINORS

Attached you will find a copy of an action passed by the Faculty Senate, and signed by me on April 19, 1990, which establishes that undergraduate minors shall consist of at least 15 hours of coursework to be designated by each discipline or department offering such a minor. It is possible that some of your minor fields of study may not comply with this action. Please review the requirements for each of your minor fields and indicate to Vice Chancellor Reynolds, by May 20, 1990, which minor fields of study are not in compliance. Over the course of the next academic year, you will need to take appropriate action in order for these minors to come into compliance with the new policy.

PJO'R/clb
Attachment

cc: David Smith, President
Faculty Senate

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #17 on March 9, 1990:

MOTION PASSED (unanimous approval)
==========

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to establish a Task Force on Lecturers and Research Associates/Assistants, with the membership and charge indicated below.

MEMBERSHIP
==========

Jean Anderson
Lecturer - Assistant Professor
College of Liberal Arts

Wendy Esmailka
Director, Interior Campus
College of Rural Alaska

DeAnne Hallsten
Associate Professor
School of Career and Continuing Education

Stephen Jewett
Research Associate
School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences

Lola Oliver
Laboratory Supervisor
School of Agriculture and Land Resources Management

Nag Rao
Professor
College of Rural Alaska

David Spell
Assistant Professor
School of Engineering

CHARGE
=======

The Task Force on Lecturers and Research Associates/Assistants is charged with addressing the following issues and forwarding recommendations to the Senate at its April 1990 meeting:

1. How much teaching is being undertaken by temporary part-time faculty? How high a percentage is it in certain colleges and disciplines?

2. How much research is being undertaken by research associates and assistants? How high a percentage is it in certain colleges and disciplines?

3. How are these persons selected and how are they integrated (if at all) into the department structure?

4. How are these persons remunerated and what other benefits (if any) do they derive from University affiliation?

5. How much turnover do we have in these positions and what implications does this have for academic integrity at UAF?

6. How can the Faculty Senate and/or Staff Council better represent the temporary part-time faculty and the research associates/assistants?

7. What policies involving the part-time faculty and staff in research and teaching positions at the University should be considered by the Faculty Senate?

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

David M. Smith 3-22-90

President, UAF Faculty Senate Date

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #17 on March 9, 1990:

MOTION PASSED (with 1 nay)
==========

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to refer to the Faculty Affairs Committee the motion regarding separating the EEO function from the hiring authority and instructs the committee to address the spirit of the original motion and recommend action at a future Senate meeting.

Dan M. Smith 3-11-90

President, UAF Faculty Senate Date

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #17 on March 9, 1990:

MOTION PASSED
==========

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to refer to the Task Force on Lecturers and Research Associates/Assistants for further consideration the motion to amend bylaws regarding Senate representation of research associate/ assistants. The task force will present its recommendation on the motion at the next Senate meeting.

Dave M. Smith 3-22-90

President, UAF Faculty Senate Date

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #17 on March 9, 1990:

MOTION PASSED (unanimous approval)
==========

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to reaffirm its position that if the statewide governance structure is not changed, the Senate will disassociate itself from the General Assembly.

Dave M. Smith 3-22-90

President, UAF Faculty Senate Date