

MINUTES

UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #218

Monday, November 07, 2016 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)	QUICK, Kate (18)
AGGARWAL, Srijan (18)	REMBER, Rob (17)
AGUILAR-ISLAS, Ana (18)	TILBURY, Jennifer (17)
ANAHITA, Sine (18)	TOPKOK, Sean (18)
ARNDT, Kathy (17)	TUTTLE, Siri (17)
BACSUJLAKY, Mara (18)	WILDFEUER, Sandra (18)
BARNES, Bill (18)	ZHANG, Mingchu (18)
BENOWITZ, Jeff (18)	
BOLTON, Bob (18) – Jessie Robertson	Members absent:
BRET-HARTE, Donie (17)	CROSKREY, Wendy (18)
CARROLL, Jennie (17) – Andy Anger	HUNT, Steve (18)
COLLINS, Eric (17)	ICKERT-BOND, Stefanie (18)
CUNDIFF, Nicole (17)	LUNN, Lisa (17)
DIERENFIELD, Candi (17)	MEYER, Franz (17)
FALLEN, Chris (18)	PETERSON, Rorik (17)
FARMER, Daryl (17)	
GIFFORD, Valerie (17)	Others Present:
HAMPTON, Don (17)	Dana Thomas, Susan Henrichs
HARDY, Sarah (17) – Melissa Good via Zoom	FAC Chair: Andreas Anger
HARNEY, Eileen (17)	RAC Chair: Jamie Clark
HARRIS, Norm (17) – via Zoom	Mark Herrmann, SOM Dean
HIRSCH, Alex (18)	Chris Coffman, Mike Earnest, Dani Sheppard
LAWLOR, Orion (17)	Nate Bauer; Colby Freel; Carol Gering
LILJEDAHN, Anna (18)	Casey Byrne; Joy Morrison; Abel Bult-Ito
MAIER, Jak (17)	Ginny Kinne; Colleen Angaiak;
MAKAREVICH, Roman (18)	Karina Gonzales; Donna Anger
MATWEYOU, Julie (18) – via Zoom	Tara Smith – UAA FS, Faculty Alliance
MAXWELL, David (18)	Maren Haavig – UAS FS, Faculty Alliance
MAY, Jeff (18)	
NEWBERRY, Rainer (17)	

B. Approval of [Minutes for Meeting #217](#) (linked)

The minutes for Meeting #217 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions approved: None submitted

B. Motions pending: None

III A. President's Remarks - Orion Lawlor

President Lawlor reported that Faculty Alliance has taken the UAF Faculty Senate resolution on Strategic Pathways and added citations and detailed suggestions to it.

He also noted that President Johnsen responded to the UAF resolution in a way that gave him the impression they'll see some change in how things are set up for the next round. They'll definitely keep an eye on that. While SP has serious problems, he believes the process can be made better. If they can come up with a better process to help make the really hard decisions the university must make, he thinks the President would listen. They're faced with complex and long-lasting decisions, and extremely important and hard to make decisions, as well. One of the big challenges is to figure out how we can make rational decisions about what the university should look like, reallocate our increasingly scarce resources, and how we make a university that's actually going to be vibrant and growing ten years from now.

B. President-Elect's Remarks - Chris Fallen

President-Elect Fallen briefly noted that a cancelled flight had delayed the Phase II Strategic Pathways meeting he was scheduled to attend.

He reminded everyone of the importance of voting in the elections tomorrow, sharing some creative strategies for helping get out the vote. He mentioned some of the issues affecting the University of Alaska right now, noting that they originate out of the Alaska State Senate and House. This makes it especially important to look at the candidates' records of support of the university and vote.

IV A. Interim Chancellor's Remarks - Dana Thomas

Chancellor Thomas reiterated Orion and Chris's comments to get out and vote.

He shared about the special budget meeting that was held by the Board of Regents. They looked at a handful of different budget scenarios. The budget they tentatively support is one based on a model with three key elements. The first element involves attempting to reach a state and national goal of reaching 65% of the state population with a postsecondary credential by 2025. The second element is to reach the national average for tuition. And, the third is by FY25, to move to 1.3x state support per student FTE, decreasing from about 2.0x the national

average (the .3 is to address cost of living for Alaska). Backtracking from 2025 to present, given our current enrollment, to achieve these elements would require a budget of \$341 million. We were allocated \$325 million this year. So, how useful this model will be remains to be seen, along with whether or not the Board of Regents will support it.

The budget is set to be approved at the November meeting. Once approved, it will go to the governor, and he will release his budget in December. He reminded everyone that the initial guidance from the governor's office in late August noted a 5-10 % reduction across the system. They're expecting that from the governor's office, but where it will fall exactly within that range is yet to be determined.

Eric C. asked for clarification about reaching the goal to increase enrollment by making it more expensive to go to school. Chancellor Thomas responded that there is some evidence that it doesn't negatively impact, but it depends upon the area. The local evidence is that both the Schools of Management and Engineering got super tuition, and their enrollments have grown. But, this wouldn't work for all program areas, of course.

With regard to Strategic Pathways, the Board will be acting on some issues relative to Phase I, the biggest one being the recommendation for a single School of Education across the system lead by UAF. Some pushback is expected. Also interesting to see will be the reaction to the very organized effort to save skiing.

SP Phase II is underway and options will be released on or near December 9. Public comment will then be opened, and faculty are encouraged to respond.

Phase III starts in January. One of the Phase III elements concerns discussions of the scope of the academic programs (arts and humanities, social sciences, physical and natural sciences, and mine training). Early discussion indicates there will be an emphasis on whether or not there should be graduate programs at multiple institutions in these programs. There is less or no mention of baccalaureate programs in these areas. They're letting that playing out, currently. He and the Provost will be looking for names of faculty to serve on Phase III teams.

Sine A. asked who the constituents of the early conversations were. Chancellor Thomas responded that the conversations have been with VP Dan White. They have been asking him about the intended scope of the upcoming discussions, which has bearing on what names they put forward for the teams.

Jamie C. asked about the School of Education consolidation report: What would adding more faculty from UAA and UAS to UAF do to our budget? Chancellor Thomas responded that along with the budget issue was whether or not UAF would accept the tenure of the additional faculty. Jamie asked about the student credit hours (SCH) and tuition revenue. Chancellor Thomas said the nursing model would be followed, where all the faculty are considered UAA faculty and that is where the SCH and tuition go. The plan still requires approved by the BOR, and then institutional and specialized accreditation issues would have to be addressed. The target implementation date would be fall of 2018.

The Chancellor commented on the forum that was held recently on ideas for generating revenue. The focus was on recruitment and retention. Also discussed were ways to grow

research. There were 57 different submissions of ideas. The next step is for working groups to go through the ideas and identify those with the greatest cost benefit. It's very challenging with the budget they currently have, but looking at revenue growth is very important in dealing with the reduction approach being pursued by state government.

Chancellor Thomas announced that VC Mike Sfraga has taken a position with the prestigious Woodrow Wilson Center. An interim will be named soon; and a national search will be done to fill the vacancy.

Jeff B., in regard to the topic of generating revenue, asked faculty in the room to raise their hands if they led a successful external funding grant. Sixteen plus hands were hands raised. He noted there is a lot of revenue generating potential represented in the room, especially if there is investment in them.

B. Provost's Remarks - Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs, noting that program review is on the agenda, remarked that she hopes faculty know that she wants an open process, as well as for the reasons, justification and necessity for these decisions to be understood by the university community. When we get to the process of program review, it's important to consider whether that process is sufficient to that end. Does it give an opportunity for all of the relevant information to be known and considered? Adding to the process must take into consideration whether doing so is helpful and makes it possible to arrive at better decisions. But, adding processes and modifications can also be done to the point that it is not effective for decision-making. She's open to changes, and does not want faculty to feel disenfranchised in that process. But, the process must allow program review to be expeditiously carried out within a reasonable time frame, as well as allow for the difficult decisions to be made in the current budget situation. The university needs to change and adapt over time, and the processes in place need to allow for that to occur.

C. Senate Members' Questions / Comments

Sine A. asked how PAIR data quality can be improved. Provost Henrichs responded that departments should let PAIR know as soon as incorrect data is received. Banner is a challenging database, but questioning the data and working with PAIR can help the issues be addressed effectively.

Eric C. asked about the recent Title IX investigation which has seemed to cause a lack of confidence in administrative support for addressing Title IX issues. The Chancellor responded that he can't speak to the current case specifically. But, what he can say is that there are a number of things they have done to try and improve the process. The vacant EEO / Title IX director position has been posted and they have some good applicants, and hope to hire someone soon. Upon hire, that person will hire an additional investigator. They've brought in a UAA person to do report writing. UAA and UAS have requested a prevention educator, and the President has recommended UAF create such a position as well. On the investigation side, a local attorney has agreed to come on board if other cases arise. He's also reached out to the UAA vice chancellor of student affairs with the request to examine the UAF Title IX processes from beginning to end, and speak with complainants and respondents about their experiences with our process. He's also asking him for recommendations for improvement and an

examination of our organizational structure in that realm. He's happy to hear other suggestions, noting that ASUAF is also reaching out, which Colby Freel will describe.

The Provost was asked to speak more specifically about what might constitute a good decision when it comes to special program review, and if it's possible to arrive at a good decision after special program review that excludes disbanding academic departments and losing faculty positions. She remarked that the best decision very much depends upon the circumstances. One of the fundamental circumstances is how much the budget is reduced; another is student demand for a program, and so on. It's hard to make a blanket statement about what the best decision is in all cases.

V Public Comment

Professor Abel Bult-Ito commented on an alternative plan to Strategic Pathways, called A New Vision for the University of Alaska. The plan's main theme is to greatly reduce statewide administration, and reduce administrators and middle management by 5% over three years. The savings would be reinvested in teaching, research and service. He shared revenue projections if the plan were followed. Spreadsheets with a cost/benefit analysis to back up the plan are posted online (see link below). He offered to present his plan at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

<https://sites.google.com/a/alaska.edu/a-new-vision-for-the-university-of-alaska/>

Sara Rodewald, program manager for the Healthyroads wellness program, introduced James Martin, a student from University Relations. James M. is helping to get the information out about Healthyroads to the UAF campus. He gave an overview of the steps to get the health cost rebate of \$600 per individual and provided a brochure.

VI Governance Reports

A. Research Report - VC Hinzman

A report was not available.

B. Staff Council - Faye Gallant – Nate Bauer stood in for Faye today.

Nate reported on the Staff Council meeting held today, noting that their elections are currently active through tomorrow. In December they will have a special election for the vice president as Nate will step up as President when Faye goes on maternity leave.

He is seeking staff nominations for Phase III Strategic Pathways. He also mentioned they are seeking faculty participation in nominating staff for the Staff Make Students Count Award and the Chancellor's Cornerstone award.

C. ASUAF - Colby Freel

Colby mentioned survey results of a recent student poll which indicated over 75% of student respondents would be in financial distress if tuition were raised by 10%. Since then, of course, the situation has changed with the Board of Regents supporting only a 5% tuition increase at

their meeting. By means of a survey in the future, he wants to see what students would think about another planned tuition increase over several years.

They have found students would support a 'college 101' type of course that included the required alcohol and campus safety trainings. They propose that this course would replace the mandatory Haven training. There will be a forthcoming resolution that asks for the course to be created. In the interim, they would like to see the "incentive" piece changed from a \$150 fee to a registration hold or other nonmonetary penalty. They would also like the Haven survey to be removed from the training itself; and they want to see the governance mechanism to be engaged in making changes. The students were blindsided by the Haven implementation and there was no UAF student input.

He described his recent communication to ASUAF membership regarding Title IX matters. They are soliciting testimony and feedback from students on the Title IX reporting process. They are forming a commission that includes faculty. The purpose of the commission is not to determine guilt or innocence; but to assess UAF performance and effectiveness with its policies from a systemic viewpoint.

Orion asked Colby if he is looking for faculty volunteers. Colby responded that he's open to suggestions and has approached faculty already. The final decision will be made by Colby and ASUAF.

With regard to the motion on the attendance policy, Colby remarked that it's unrealistic to expect that students know all of their absences at the start of the semester. Ken A. pointed out that the motion concerns scheduled absences from classes for events known in advance (e.g., athletic competitions, music performances). The policy is not binding for unknown UA-related events. Colby said he's sat on student appeals committee, and still feels there's a piece is missing in the policy.

Colby announced a perks program for Polar Express card holders.

Chancellor Thomas mentioned the Haven training implementation at UAA and UAS (which is only mandatory for student employees at those campuses). What should be noted is that any changes involve a system level conversation for UAF. He also mentioned why not delaying the training is important.

Mara B. commented about Administrative Committee having been blindsided about the mandatory Haven training last spring, as well. They had been opposed to the fee and were concerned about the training. They were told the student body supported it; but she's glad to see that's not the case. She supported the comments about the intrusiveness of the survey.

Colby clarified that a resolution had been passed by the Coalition of Students which supported a low or no-cost safety training course (not Haven, specifically). However no UAF student reps were able to vote on it at the time. He reiterated that the resolution spoke to a course and not the specific Haven training.

Chancellor Thomas, who wasn't at UAF when this was enacted, had the understanding that UAF students wanted the training to be mandatory. He can follow back up on that for clarity.

Ken A. asked for clarification about Colby thinks is still missing from the attendance policy motion, especially since Faculty Senate is voting on the motion today. Colby noted there are no allowances for absences that come up after the start of the semester that are related to university-sanctioned events (i.e., the Strategic Pathways meeting he has been invited to attend by President Johnsen). Colby is personally facing a dock in his grade for the absence. It's a very difficult position to be put in as a student. Eileen H. responded that they don't want to penalize students like him and she hoped his faculty member would work with him. She noted the motion is addressing policy about known sanctioned events, and prevent actions against them. Colby wondered if there's room for adding to the policy for situations like he is currently facing.

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

<http://unitedacademics.net/update-1122016-and-supporting-documents/>

Chris C. shared some specifics on the continuing contract negotiations and noted that updates are being sent out to the membership. She reported on hosting two UAF events as Org VP.

The Representative Assembly met in Anchorage on October 15. She read aloud the resolution passed by the assembly at that meeting concerning the Strategic Pathways process.

Whereas the central mission of the University of Alaska is to advance and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, and public service emphasizing the north and its diverse peoples; and

Whereas the cost of administrative overhead at statewide is disproportionately high; and

Whereas Strategic Pathways to date has not been directed by any cost benefit analyses in its recommendations;

Therefore be it resolved that United Academics AAUP AFT Local 4996 calls upon the University of Alaska and the Board of Regents not to proceed with Strategic Pathways and to reduce administrative costs at statewide to preserve the university's core academic mission at all of our universities.*

Sine A. asked if there had been any response to the resolution, yet. Chris said she had not received any response, and was not aware of any other UNAC staff or faculty having received a response.

E. Athletics - Dani Sheppard

Dani reported the request for an NCAA waiver addressing Strategic Pathways recommendations was currently in process. She's had a couple of specific requests for information. Responding to those, she reported that UAF is a Division II institution within the

NCAA, and as such, has some scholarships. There are 136 athletes of which 65% are receiving financial aid in the form of partial scholarships. There are no athletes on full scholarships here at UAF. Only about 20% of them get over 80% of their costs covered (typically seniors). They have 10 sports currently, of which eight are Division II. They have one Division I sport (rifle, an open division sport). They represent five different sport conferences. She also reported that it is an NCAA mandate that student athletes cannot miss class for practice sessions; only for competitions.

Chancellor Thomas commented that many sport scholarships are privately funded endowed. Dani commented that each of the students on the rifle team have privately endowed scholarships.

Jeff B. asked if there have been any new initiatives for fund-raising in the intercollegiate athletics world at UAF since SP Phase I came out. Dani said yes, and they are looking at marketing ideas and new initiatives at every staff meeting. Chancellor Thomas also added that UAF is in the 85th percentile for fundraising relative to other Division II institutions.

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

Tara Smith, chair of Faculty Alliance, was present in person and commented on recent UAA Faculty Senate action (passage of a resolution similar to the one passed by FA). She noted that both UAA and UAS passed motions in opposition to the consolidation of the schools and colleges of Education. The announcement of the consolidation plan came after the public testimony period for the upcoming Board of Regents meeting. She would be happy to hear from UAF Faculty Senate and UAF faculty before she gives her BOR report on Thursday morning.

Jeff B. commented that the BOR will still take written testimony up to the meeting time. Chris F. mentioned the evening social with the Regents, also.

G. Senate Members' Questions / Comments

There were no further questions or comments. The break occurred at this point in the meeting (approximately 2:10 PM).

BREAK

VII New Business:

A. [Resolution in Support of Allowing Candidates for Promotion, Tenure, or Comprehensive Review to Opt for Open Meetings](#), submitted by the Administrative Committee

Orion commented on the lateness of bringing this resolution before the Faculty Senate this semester, but noted it had been passed by the Senate each year for many years. With no objections, the resolution was passed unanimously.

B. [Motion to modify the Attendance Policy](#), submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Anna L. commented about student participation in undergraduate research, with opportunities to give presentations at planned events. Should this be added to the list of examples?

Sine A. and Chris F. commented about the purpose and rationale of the wording in the current policy change, which is meant to specifically address the change of the semester start date (and the fact that classes no longer start on a Thursday).

Ken A. noted that nothing in the policy addresses the department side of notifying the students of planned absences by their first day of classes so they can then notify their instructors in a timely manner. He wanted to see this addressed by a friendly amendment to the motion.

Adding “research opportunities” to the list of examples was approved by majority vote with two objections. The suggested amendment to address the department notification to students was not seconded, and therefore not considered for a vote.

The motion modifying the attendance policy was passed with one objection.

C. [Motion to have F698 non-thesis course grades automatically be changed from “deferred” to “pass” upon successful completion](#), submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

Donie B. described the “housekeeping” purpose of the motion which would allow for more timely processing of Pass / Fail grading of non-thesis projects. GAAC regards this as a non-controversial matter. Letter-graded non-thesis projects are not affected by this motion.

With no objections, the motion was unanimously passed.

VIII Discussion Items

A. [Draft Revisions for Academic Program Review Policy](#), submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Eileen H. described the changes in the current version from CAC, Faculty Affairs and Administrative Committees. These have occurred since the last discussion at the October Faculty Senate meeting.

Provost Henrichs clarified the language under item #3, noting that the final decision is that of the Chancellor and Core Cabinet, and not a unilateral decision of the Provost.

Nicole C. commented that she has been on program review for three years, and special program review for two years. She suggested that the FS president or president-elect join the program review committee rather than come in solo (and late) in the process and thereby delay the extensively time-consuming process. This would help keep the already thorough process efficient and timely. She noted the committee makes recommendations, not decisions. She and her colleagues on the program review committee feel the faculty voice is heard in the process. Orion responded that he would be excited about not having to respond to each recommendation and not sitting on the committee.

Jennifer T. asked if the draft document pertains to regular program review or special program review. She also asked about the proposed committee selection process being undertaken by the Faculty Senate and if that would be done in conjunction with the deans and directors.

Orion noted the difficulty he already has of seeking names and volunteers for other various committees and functions.

Provost Henrichs commented that the deans have the authority to assign faculty workload to these kinds of tasks and should be involved in the process. She suggested that one way to address both the deans' role and Faculty Senate in the process is for the provost to develop the committee in consultation with the deans, and have the final list reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate.

Sine A. commented that Dean Paul Layer, ex officio member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, has noted that the majority of program reviews go smoothly. But, she also noted that with Strategic Pathways there is more uncertainty. She wondered if having two processes would help, so that if a program were identified as being threatened early in the regular process, that would move it to a special program review committee that involved more faculty from the program and had more time for deliberations.

Nicole C. responded concerning special vs. regular program reviews and the hours devoted by the committee to review programs. She described the committee's process, emphasizing the care taken to perform thorough reviews and write the final reports.

Alex H. expressed his appreciation for the time and care taken by faculty on the program review committee, but noted that despite the methodical nature of the work they are doing, it's still possible that some relevant information can be excluded because individuals do not necessarily have the expertise in a given program to perform the review as thoroughly as possible. It would be useful to have another process that incorporated the program faculty and their expertise, so there would be more adequate opportunity to explain what is being reviewed.

Jennifer T. responded to his comment, noting the review committees rely heavily on the faculty report written by the program. They are given the same PAIR data that the committee receives, and the report is their opportunity to explain their program. The committee is open to taking questions from the program faculty, as well, during their meetings.

Eileen H. asked Nicole to speak to her comment about the process being prolonged by including the Faculty Senate president. Nicole responded that currently their final reports go to the Provost who takes them to the Chancellor's Cabinet. The review committee can't predict how long a particular review might take. Adding the step of including the Faculty Senate president adds weeks of delay in getting the information to the Provost and Chancellor's Cabinet.

Orion noted that, on paper, it looks like the administrative review with the deans takes place after the faculty review committee, and before Chancellor's Cabinet. He asked how long that step typically takes. The Provost said the administrative committee of deans (and CRCD directors) normally works more quickly than the faculty committee, usually taking about one month. Orion commented that Faculty Senate envisioned the president looking at the reports at

the same time as the committee of deans and directors. He commented that while he doesn't necessarily want additional responsibilities, that Faculty Senate currently only sees the very end result of the process, and that doesn't seem appropriate.

Sine spoke to the need for an additional process that could address programs that are threatened but which could possibly be salvaged through restructuring or collaborating with another department. The problem of program survival is going to increase as the budget crisis worsens. The process for programs that are not in trouble could be streamlined, and a more deliberative process created for programs in trouble.

Jennifer T. expressed her agreement with Sine's comments about having two distinct processes. She also made the suggestion that the Faculty Senate president review a summary of the committee's work rather than the longer reports, which would help shorten the time added to the process.

Orion reiterated that he envisioned looking at the information during the same time period as the administrative committee of deans and directors, but he would be looking for indications of programs being suspended or eliminated in order to bring the conversation to the Faculty Senate in a timelier manner. His hope is that most of the work being done for the budget would be in the realm of creative reorganization rather than lopping off programs. Amputation is a very effective way to lose weight, but it's not an effective way to make yourself healthier.

Nicole C. commented that the current review process already incorporates the newly added bullet point in purple typeface (**Modify program through consolidation with another program or other significant re-organization**). As they go through their reviews, the committee already inherently adds in these ideas of things that the departments and programs can do to help the programs survive every single time it's evaluated.

Jennifer T. added that if a different process were added for special programs, these recommendations could look different than they do for regular programs, as the stakes are much higher for special programs.

Jak M. commented that since they already are doing these things, it's not bad to write them down and add them to the process. It gives them voice to ensure that it continues to happen in that manner.

Eric C. asked about the Chancellor's role in the process and whether he has to follow the faculty recommendations or not. Provost Henrichs responded that, provided the Chancellor signed the motion agreeing to the revised program review process, it would then constitute an agreement in the shared governance process between administration and the Faculty Senate and they would proceed in that way in the future. She feels the Chancellor's signature on a motion would be contingent upon the process being practical and something that can be reasonably implemented.

The Provost added that UAF administration only controls the process for UAF in the shared governance manner, while the Board of Regents have broader authority over the system as established in the Alaska Constitution. This means the BOR could decide to exercise their authority to have a program review process of their own design and act upon it. They've not

chosen to do that in the past, but it's not inconceivable that they could do so. Another layer that has not been mentioned is that if there is a major change to a university that alters its mission, core themes and objectives, they need to apply to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) to make those changes before they can be enacted. The NWCCU decides what constitutes a substantive change. An example of such a change would be if the Board decided to end three of the seven schools and colleges. Other scales of change would be decided by the NWCCU.

Orion noted the Google Doc will be open for comments.

Jeff M. asked for clarification from the members of the program review committee who were present about the additions to the process potentially bogging it down. Nicole C. responded that, through today's discussion it's been made clear that if the senate president's review coincided with the time frame of the deans and directors review, it would not slow down the process, but would add additional relevant insight. She noted that this particular process is for regular program review, not special academic program review which has a different process.

B. [President Johnsen's Response to the Resolution on Strategic Pathways](#)
(Memorandum linked)

Orion commented about the President's response to the Faculty Senate's resolution on Strategic Pathways. He felt it was an indication that the President heard what they said and would like them to keep talking to him.

IX Public Comments

Tom Langdon, customer support services manager for OIT, spoke about the consolidation of the Blackboard system across the UA system. Over 6000 courses are now contained in that single instance of BB. Enrollments will be processed into that single instance of the BB system, which will be demanding of the system and their tech resources. He invited any questions or comments.

X Members' Comments/Questions/Announcements
A. General Comments / Announcements

Nicole C. shared some feedback from the School of Management's Business Administration faculty. They think that Faculty180 is very arduous and would like Faculty Senate to consider ways of making it more effective.

B. Committee Chair / Convener Comments
(An active link is added if minutes are submitted.)

Standing Committees:

1. Administrative Committee - Chris Fallen ([Minutes for 09/30/2016](#) linked)
2. Curricular Affairs Committee - Jennie Carroll ([Minutes for 09/19/2016](#) and [Minutes for 10/03/2016](#) linked)
3. Faculty Affairs Committee - Andy Anger ([Minutes for 09/07/2016](#) linked)
4. Unit Criteria Committee - Mara Bacsujlaky ([Meeting Notes for 10/20/16](#) linked)

Permanent Committees:

5. Committee on the Status of Women - Ellen Lopez, Diana DiStefano
6. Core Review Committee - Andy Seitz ([Minutes for 09/12/2016](#) 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 09/19/2016](#) linked)
10. Information Technology Committee - Siri Tuttle
11. Research Advisory Committee - Jamie Clark, Gordon Williams ([Minutes for 09/16/2016](#) linked)
12. Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee - Sandra Wildfeuer, Jennifer Tilbury
13. Faculty Administrator Review Committee (No Group A reviews in 2016-17)

XI Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00 PM.

Background:

The following resolution was first passed at Faculty Senate Meeting #146 in November 2007, and was endorsed by a letter distributed to the UAF faculty in Fall 2008. Since then the Provost has annually provided this resolution to all Faculty Review Committees. The Faculty Senate reaffirmed this resolution at Meeting #176 in September 2011, Meeting #184 in September 2012, Meeting #192 in September 2013, Meeting #200 in September 2014, and Meeting #208 in September 2015. For academic year 2016-2017, the Administrative Committee submits an updated resolution to the Faculty Senate Meeting #218 on November 7, 2016.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the members of Faculty Committees are called upon under the concept of shared governance to provide professional review of other faculty candidates undergoing Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Review (Pre and Post-tenure),

WHEREAS the faculty portion of the review process must be fair and reasonable in order to maintain the reputation of the University, and the integrity of the academic process,

WHEREAS open and transparent Committee deliberations facilitate fair and reasonable review,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly requests that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an “open” meeting, and that “mandatory closed” meetings be avoided, including during the 2016-17 review cycle.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty Committee meetings are “open” at the request of a candidate and are consistent with all other relevant UAF rules and procedures.
2. Open meetings provide strong incentives for fair and reasonable review, including the oversight of the candidate.
3. The Committee can query a candidate for clarification of the file, which will greatly reduce the number of false assumptions and errors during deliberation.
4. Open meetings are educational—candidates who opt to attend their review have the opportunity to learn about academic traditions and practices.
5. Attendance can reduce candidates' anxiety, and make them feel like a part of the process.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to revise the catalog statement on attendance as indicated below:

Attendance

UAF is committed to student success and academic integrity. UAF faculty expect that students are committed to academic achievement. You are expected to adhere to the class attendance policies set by your instructors.

General Absences: If you miss class, you are responsible for conferring with your instructor as soon as possible concerning your absence, and to discuss the possibilities for arranging alternative learning opportunities. Note that some departments drop students who miss the first day of class and who fail to obtain their instructor's prior approval for the absence.

UAF-Sanctioned Absences: If you are scheduled to miss class for an academic requirement or to represent UAF in an official capacity (e.g., NCAA athletic competition, music performance), you must notify your instructor in writing ~~by the first Wednesday of~~ **within the first five days classes are in session in** the semester in which the absences will occur. The notification should list all scheduled absences and bear the signature of a UAF school official.

Instructors are encouraged to make reasonable accommodations for students who miss class to participate in these official, UAF-recognized activities. However, it is your responsibility to follow up the notification of absence by discussing alternative learning opportunities with your instructors before the end of the drop/add period (typically the second Friday of the semester). Doing so will allow you to drop the class and to add another if, after a good faith effort, you and your instructor cannot arrange for comparable learning opportunities that would enable you to be successful in the class.

Effective: Spring 2017

Rationale: Due to schedule alignment across the UA system, UAF classes now start on a Monday instead of a Thursday, giving students just two class days to notify their instructors instead of the previous five class days. This revision will ensure that students have the full five days to notify their instructors of their participation in official, UAF-recognized activities.

Motion from GAAC concerning F698 course grading.

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to authorize the Office of the Registrar to automatically change all pass/fail project credits (F698) on a student's record that are graded "DF" (Deferred) to the grade of "P" (Pass) once the project has been fully approved and accepted by the Graduate School. The responsibility for changing the "DF" grade for **letter-graded** F698 project credits will continue to be the responsibility of the instructor of record.

Effective: Fall 2017

Rationale:

The DF (Deferred) grade indicates that the course requirements may extend beyond the end of one semester; e.g., thesis, project, research courses, internships, etc. A final grade and credit will be withheld without penalty until the course requirements are met within an approved time. Currently, the Registrar's Office changes all F699 (thesis) DF grades to "P" (Pass) after the thesis has been fully approved and accepted by the Graduate School. However, project credits (F698) must be changed from DF to P by a "Change of Grade" form signed by the instructor. It is often difficult to get the instructor to submit a Change of Grade form in a timely manner, and this potentially can hold up a student receiving their diploma. It would be more efficient if the Registrar's Office could change F698 project credits that are graded DF to P once the project has been fully approved and accepted by the Graduate School.

Twenty-six departments were contacted regarding their input on changing the requirement from having an instructor change the DF grade to P to having the Office of the Registrar make the change after receiving confirmation from the Graduate School that the project has been approved and accepted. Of the 18 departments that responded to the survey, only one department (the Art Department) would like to continue offering letter grades every semester for their project students. Departments that offer letter grades for F698 are not included in this motion and their instructors will continue to be responsible for submitting grades every semester. The Office of the Registrar would prefer that all F698 credits be offered by P/F. If departments want to offer a project option with a letter grade they could offer this as a separate course with a different number (i.e., Computer Science uses CS 690 and CS 691 as Seminar/Project credits.)

SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO PROGRAM REVIEW - FOR DISCUSSION (ADDITIONS IN BOLD ITALICS; DELETIONS CROSSED OUT.)

Background: Given the potential for program elimination during the ongoing budget crisis, and the need for establishing a clear process, a meeting took place with Vice-Provost Alex Fitts, Provost Susan Henrichs, and the chairs of several Faculty Senate committees. At this meeting revised language that clarifies the role of the Faculty Senate in program deletions was discussed. The proposed revised program review process (below) is a result of that meeting and subsequent changes proposed by FAC and endorsed by CAC with additional CAC changes.

The ~~new~~ program review process will be completed as follows:

1. An initial ~~brief~~ review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit provided ~~two-page brief~~ narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the existence of similar programs elsewhere at 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; attached). A single Faculty Program Review Committee comprised of one ~~tenured~~ faculty representative **selected by the Faculty Senate** from each college and school (not including CRCD) plus ~~five CRCD representatives~~ **one representative from CRCD and one representative from CTC** will review the materials and make 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** will provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review. **The recommendation shall be shared with the Faculty Senate President who has the option to respond within two weeks.**

2. An Administrative Program Review Committee comprised of the Deans of Colleges and Schools and four administrative representatives from CRCD will review the recommendations of the **Faculty** Program Review Committee, may request additional information ~~from about~~ the program, and will state their collective agreement or disagreement with the Committee's recommendation.

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

- a) Program continuation is confirmed ~~until the next review cycle.~~
- 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 will 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. ~~Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action. However, w~~ 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 Provost's recommendation. If the Faculty Senate disagrees, it will provide an alternate recommendation.**

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