

MINUTES  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #74  
MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1997  
WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

I The meeting was called to order by President Craven at 1:30 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Allen, J.  
Bandopadhyay, S.  
Barnhardt, C.  
Boone, R. (L. Duffy)  
Bruder, J.  
Conti, E.  
Cooper, B.  
Corti, L.  
Craven, J.  
Curda, L.  
Finney, B.  
Fitts, A.  
French, J.  
Gatterdam, R.  
Johnson, T.  
Maginnis, T.  
McBeath, G.  
Mortensen, B.  
Nance, K.  
Nielsen, H.  
Perkins, M.  
Robinson, T.  
Ruess, D.  
Schatz, M.  
Weber, J.  
Whalen, M.  
Wilson, B.  
Yarie, J.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Barry, R.  
Gavlak, R.  
Kramer, D.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Croskrey, W.  
Jonaitis, A.  
Kan, J.  
Kelly, M.  
Keating, J.  
Layral, S.  
Martin, W.  
Wadlow, J.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Nuss, S. - President, ASUAF  
Eichholz, M. - Graduate Student  
Long, P. - President, UAFSC  
Alexander, V. - Dean, SFOS  
Tremarello, A - University Registrar (G. Gregory)

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

Hedahl, G. - Dean, CLA

B. The minutes to Meeting #73 (September 15, 1997) were approved with the following corrections: 1) Scott Deal

was present, and 2) under VI. New Business, B. The issues of faculty/union relationship--Ron Gatterdam did not object to the committee, he objected to adding union members to a Faculty Senate committee in order to represent the union.

C. The agenda was approved as distributed via e-mail.

## II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

- A. Motions approved: none
- B. Motions pending: none

## III A. Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow -

A week ago several meetings were held which represented some planning session and exchange of ideas. As Madeline's report indicates the first two days were workshops followed by a session on Friday to reach others and to summarize the ideas presented. The best thing to happen is that we have four pages of good news to share with others. Time was spend on enrollment issues. One of the things that is top priority is enrollment growth. We are pleased with some of the efforts over past 6 months to present ourselves in a different way. These activities seem to be producing good results. The new student, the graduate, and the transfer student numbers are up. Our challenge now will be to retain them and to figure out how to cope with some of the new issues we have as we keep making changes. Advising was busier than ever this summer. Now our challenge is to keep these student. One of the good things we find with transfer students is a high graduation rate.

Another portion of the workshop consisted of budgetary, financial matters. These issues were not always as encouraging as the good news we shared and the enrollment figures. On the one hand we will pay our bills this year. At the same time we were able to keep open a number of sections this fall to serve student that we did not think that we would be able to do six months ago. We were able to provide quite good service to students as they arrived on campus this fall. One of the reasons we were able to do this is because of action by the Board of Regents this summer. By Board action we have to reallocate each year a certain amount of money to our maintenance budget. This year we were able to divert the funds to academic programs. We also looked ahead to FY99. Two things need to be discussed: 1) where will we get the funds if we have a level budget or reduction in the budget for FY99. One major source will be just like this year, it will be the savings from the RIP program. We are facing the possibility of a financial reallocation which is grim,

which we are preparing for and have a plan. We are also working on a parallel plan to work as hard as we can in new and old ways to present a united front to greatly influence Juneau. One of the important things in this effort is to be sure that UAF takes every opportunity to describe some of the very constructive, positive, good things that are going on. Jack Keating gave a report to the Board and some of the Legislators on research at UAF and what it does for the state and education. Last week Keating gave the same presentation to the Chamber.

Wadlow then spoke on the committee chaired by her on the university-wide effort to redesign the system office and find campus and administrative savings. Wadlow will be presenting a report of the committee's preliminary findings to the Board Planning committee at the end of the month. The committee is looking for both cost saving and better service. Whatever the committee recommends, they want it to include better service as well. At the open hearings last week one of the messages that came across in the testimony was the desire for continued good service where it already exists and better service where it is warranted. Specifically, quick response. Another theme that came out was what works best is what we should be doing in performing essential administrative services. Rather than saying everything should be centralized or decentralized, the question is what works best. And for the committee the question also includes, will it work in the Alaska setting. We continue to review and move forward a lean systemwide office and separate the executive and service function. And move the service function to campus-based service centers which would be jointly administered, managed by the campuses.

Jerry McBeath asked a question about the multicultural office: What is the value to UAF? Wadlow indicated that it was pursuant to one of the goals to retain students. The Multicultural Affairs Office is part of the enrollment growth effort. It was proposed by a joint campus and community committee which made it clear that if UAF is to attract and retain people of color and international student that we need to provide more support on campus. It is a major thrust in our retention effort.

Hans Nielsen asked about the consolidated business office. Wadlow indicated that when they make changes in performing essential administrative functions they seek two goals--cost savings and better service. She expects that to be the case in the consolidation of the research business offices. The ultimate goal is to have a research corporation which would serve the needs of the research community in a much better way. That will take much longer to achieve but we are in the process of getting first hand information about recently created research corporations at other universities.

B. Remarks by Provost, Jack Keating -

Jack Keating commented on savings on the research business offices. When he first reviewed this proposal it was to find monetary savings. When he finished reviewing it he realized that the efficiency would be a greater outcome than money saved. We watch very carefully our federal initiatives to the government and so far we are doing very well at the federal level. Our research picture from federal funding looks bright. Most everyone has undergraduates involved in research and scholarly activities. We do not have a good method for collecting details on those situations. Keating will ask the deans and directors at the Provost Council to really carefully monitor the amount of our undergraduates involved in research. It is important when we talk about research to make sure we relate it to our teaching mission. Keating believes that undergraduate teaching is enhanced by our research.

Keating's presentation to the Board of Regents and the Legislature on research is basically Research 101. Keating will give the same presentation to the Senate at the November meeting. It was a good experience because it seems that we have not told our story well enough to the legislature to let them know what we do and how it translates to them.

The Library search is ongoing and Clif Lando is the chair. The applicant pool has been assembled and is twice as large as last year. They will continue taking applications. They hope for a successful search for that position.

Keating announced that he will be reviewing select departments. The campus has been divided into nine academic areas. The review is based on teaching credit hours, number of majors, retention, and so forth. He will be asking some departments to talk about quality.

It is very nice to look at the efforts of departments in hosting a variety of professional organizations on campus. Last Friday we had the acquisition of language community in the state of Alaska, composed mostly of high school teachers, on campus. We don't have a good record of how many of these events happen on campus. So, when you are hosting a group from off-campus, please let the Provost Office know.

All units will be receiving a memo asking what departments are doing that is different and unusual to retain students. We are trying to see what efforts departments, units and individuals are taking to ensure that students are being retained as much as possible. We



seem to have an extensive job pool for our undergraduate students. About 1,000 undergraduates are employed each semester. We don't always do a necessary good job or find a systematic way of relating those jobs to their career or career aspirations in their majors. Ideas on how to hook up jobs to careers of students are most welcome.

Thanks to faculty workload efforts, last year with 30 or more faculty on campus we offered 1,114 sections of instruction last fall. This year we offered 1,113 with less faculty. Keating finds this difference of one, given the size of our faculty, very encouraging because it shows that faculty are being responsive to getting the sections out there to offer the students.

Keating said he would save his comments on the RIP to the later discussion.

Larry Duffy asked about the research corporations. What is the target that is being set for assessment of efficiency. Keating indicated that the target for the business office consolidation was \$200,000. Already the institutions have been assessed that amount. We will try to find that in personnel costs. The target on efficiency for program review has been in terms of instructional dollars. We want to look at the total picture of departments in terms of scholarship, creativity, student retention and so forth to see the total quality image of a particular department. We can't look at all programs nor do we want to, but we will look at some that seem to be inefficient relative to instructional dollars. Larry also asked what the Provost would see as the overhead return from the \$200,000 to show that the consolidation of the business office was successful. Keating indicated that the overhead return was very uneven because different units on campus return different amounts. So no target has been set in terms of overhead return. What they are looking at is efficiencies.

Kara Nance asked for clarification on the students involved in undergraduate research and if it included both funded and unfunded research. Keating would like to know how many students spent at least 10 hours or more a week on research. This includes directed research and unfunded. Also interested in student aides for faculty and that receive credit as well.

C. Guest Speaker - Michael Kelly, President, UA Board of Regents

The Regents' approved an operating budget of \$174 million for the FY99 budget request. This is an increase of about \$7 million over last year and will be submitted in the face of a storm of cuts. The

legislature is only part way through their target of \$250 million in cuts. They have warned us that we will see additional cuts this year. The administration will have an opportunity to make cuts before it goes to the legislature. This, in a time when we are in nominal dollars, receiving state funding equal to what it was a decade ago. That fiscal note occupies a great amount of time. We are in a search for truth while are trying to provide excellent education, research, and service to the state. Kelley graduated many years ago and believes it's the cultural, spiritual, educational, and economic contributions that the university makes to the communities it serves that is valuable. We are faced with the statement of budget cuts and are asked to get more efficient. Our students are being provided with more choices than before. And so we are being held accountable as never before. We are not the only one's facing budget cuts, restructure, and other issues not directly related to our primary mission.

Faculty have to spend time worrying about things that take away from teaching. There is a difference of opinion on the Board. So, the Regents are on a course that involves two tracks. One is to be accountable to the public and be as efficient in our administration and course delivery as possible. At the same time another track involves convincing Alaskans that the university is worthy of more state funding, not less. We increased the ratio between non-state revenue and state funding. The Board believes they have raised the tuition as high as they can. On these two tracks we are trying to convince Juneau that our house is in order and that we are efficient and productive as possible. And at the same time saying this university will become a barren wasteland if you do not turn about with state funding.

Another issue is that we hear a lot of talk about whether the university's mission should go back to three MAUs and deliver the rural mission differently. All feel it is a critical part of the university mission. For an organization that seeks the truth it is a full time job. Many have a university story that is always told with passion. The are all different, so it is hard to come up with the truth about the university. Are we everything to everyone or to a few? Is the Republican majority trying to shut the university down or are they elected and doing the will of the public? Are we working miracles in rural Alaska? Is Fairbanks losing everything to Anchorage or is Anchorage suffering because Fairbanks gets it? What are the truths among these things? It is issues like this that the Regents struggle with to find out what's fact and what's fiction. Another issue is faculty concern about making market wages. Can we continue to run the university without being sensitive to the issue of market pay? It is true in any organization that on the long pull you've got to pay market wages and benefits.

Some of the things the Regents are doing relates to figuring out where do we go from here with the strategic plan. This information is on the Regents' recap. They are looking at some shorter term responses to the budget issues and then a process that will take a year to a year and a half and will involve input from everyone about a strategic direction for the university in view of the current realities. We restructured, did program assessment, and now another program and some are asking when does it end. Looking at the national level it is going on everywhere as well. In industry there is constant change or reassessment or you are left behind. We are on another round of looking at the university and what its future might be. Kelly looks at it as an opportunity to shape the university for the next decade. Not just survive but thrive. He thinks we can bring Alaskans along to the visions of what that university can be.

John Craven asked Kelly to share the philosophical range of the Board of Regents. It would be helpful for Senate members to understand. It is Kelly's sense is that each Regent who votes, whether in the affirmative or negative has the firmest desire to get for the university the funding that it needs. We must stop the drop in state funding, we must turn this around, we must get Alaskans to respond and save the university. There is a two track approach--one side saying there is enough cutting, we need to increase the funding and we have to fight to do that. Most of the Regents believe that. On the other side we have a legislature that is saying we demand accountability, we demand efficiency in what you do, and there are things which need attention in efficiency and productive. There are Regents that are responding along this two track system. Kelly believes that each of the Board of Regent members firmly believe that we have to turn the state funding around. A six-four split in voting does not mean they want to cut, it is more an issue of how to get there.

Sukumar commented on the need to get out and meet with towns and communities. Kelly agreed with the need for more opportunity to give the research show and talk about the rural mission. The discussion that occurs is helpful. Out of the planning process will come a White Paper on the future of the university. This will be the kick off to the community planning effort. That is the time we plan to take that to the public. Kelly believes we need to go out with reasonable options.

Madeline Schatz feels that increased efficiency is necessary. However, we have had assessments, changes, and budget cuts. Every time we are told, yes, we did it the other way and it wasn't enough and now we need to look at this other way. Now we are told to reassess and look at different things. In CLA department heads do

not get paid or get release time to do the work. Most of the work falls on them. That is inefficient. Every time we go through this we are taking people out of classroom situations and taking them away from what they need to be doing and have them do paperwork for which they are not being reimbursed or given any type of pay. The moral is really low because it does not seem to stop. Something has to be done. Things are not even and the Board needs to look at what impact it has on the faculty when we make this decision. Is this assessment the end? Madeline indicated that many faculty members had talked with her about these concerns.

Kelly agreed that the challenge to Regents says that they have enough information, now they need to get on with it, make some decisions and move ahead. The other side says how can you move ahead without input from faculty. It is a balancing act. That is the approach with the committees. Chancellor Wadlow is chairing one committee. That committee has taken the heat for not having enough faculty and other input. At this point the Board wants to get some options generated and then get more input. They will try to be more efficient. As to the fairness of how it is handled on the campus among the different department, that is a management issue at this point.

John French asked about the future of technology development and other intellectual properties. Kelly served on the board and had asked the Board for money to support UATDC. We could not afford it on a continuing basis. Looking at other universities we have the same challenges as other institutions. It may need a partnership with others. Keating indicated that the facilities do exist under the Office of Arctic Research and proposals are being processed. FITC has produced the only successful money making patent from this campus.

#### IV Governance Reports

##### A. ASUAF - S. Nuss

Steve reported on two brief items from the coalition of student leaders and Board of Regents meeting.

The Coalition has agreed to form a committee composed of the student body presidents from the three MAUs. It will also include the president from Mat-Su and Northwest Campus. This committee will be in charge of developing a 10 minute presentation CD ROM to be used to market the university as a whole to the legislature, community organizations, potential students, etc. They are looking at about 100 hours of work to get the CD ROM up and going. This idea

was brought forward from Marie Scholle as way for the students to get involved more on the lobbying side. The focus will be on what the students have done at the university for Alaska, within Alaska.

ASUAF is also looking at the Student Affairs Policies under review by the Board of Regents'. An item that has come up is student pay rate. They are looking at the need for a Student Assistant I and at the pay scale and step increases.

Student elections are going on this week for 10 Senate seats. There is a good pool of candidates running. They are hoping for a good turn around to fill these seats.

Steve indicated that in terms of the university system it is always good to work together, especially between the campuses--UAA, UAF, and UAS. However, there has to be some competition somewhere and he hopes that everyone comes out and support UAF at the Governor's cup Hockey game.

Kara Nance asked how material would be collected for the CD ROM. Steve indicated that each campus would collect material that best represents their campus. Then the committee will get together. They hope to have something by the first of January. Linda Curda indicated that Bethel has a video recruiting film which might have some useful material.

Michael Kelly indicated that the Regents are looking at funding a road show sort of thing. The committee should use Wendy as a resource and let them know what is being used so it do not duplicate what they are doing.

#### B. Staff Council - P. Long

The Staff Council held a face-to-face meeting with rural sites last Wednesday. Chancellor Wadlow gave a report on the all-day workshops which focused on the enhancement of student enrollment and retention and the possibility to meet the budget cuts. Mike Rice gave a report on the latest financial state of UAF. One of the thing he is encouraging is energy awareness and to turn off computers at night.

The Supervisory Training program is in place. The first session presented by Terry Vrabec was on illegal activities on campus. The next session on October 15 will be on the LIFE program. This program came out of recommendations by the Health Issues Committee.

Staff Council has reconfigures their constituents units to correspond with the current college/school structure for ease in communicating with their constituents.

Carolyn Chapman, the Acting Director of Personnel Services, spoke on the JEF process. She clarified how the process was done at UAF. Several questions focused on lab assistants on Fund 2 money. They are term funded and in the past many were kept on board as if they were regular full time employees. They were accumulating leave and the University continued to pay benefits. This was illegal. The University is cracking down on the these rules of hiring.

The Picnic Committee is up and running. The picnic will be earlier in year to include faculty, staff, and students who go off contract in May. Part of the picnic is the raffle which supports the Carolyn Sampson scholarship. This scholarship supports adults going back to school.

Paula has been asked to form a committee on what is wrong with Banner. Steve Smith will be working on this issue and what to do to make Banner more accessible and more workable.

#### C. President's Comments - J. Craven

John Craven's comment are attached to the agenda. John reminded the Senate that his comments on the RIP will be added at the later discussion. The ad hoc committee on governance will include Ron Illingworth, John French, David Porter, Ray Gavlak, and Ron Gatterdam.

The three committees reviewing student affairs policies should be aware of the UAF grade appeals policy.

#### D. President-Elect's Comments - M. Schatz

Madeline had one addition to her written report. Please remember that the constitution says we represent the faculty. That means we need to bring ideas from the faculty and take Senate information back to the faculty. Our responsibility is to keep them informed.

#### V Public Comments/Questions -

##### A. Aldona Jonaitis, Director, UA Museum -



Because of the crisis faced by the Museum it will need to impose admission fees on many of the categories that up to now have not had to pay admission. The reason for the crisis, in addition to the university budget, is the lost of the Westours business. This results in a loss in number of visitors (39%) and admissions fees (27%). This is on top of the loss of the Princess tours. The Museum store revenue stayed relatively even (-9%). Anticipate a reduction in the number of independent visitors. Changes include free admission to 7 and under rather than 12 and under. All school programs visits will cost \$2. This will start in January. UAF faculty and staff is not a large number, but they are looking at either a \$3 or \$5 admission fee. The big question mark is UAF students. Aldona has heard a lot of concern that we should continue not charging students. With all the changes in admission fees this will generate \$23,000 which will help. The Museum will start charging the admission fee to UAF faculty & staff.

Sukumar felt that charging faculty and students was ridiculous. Kara Nance asked about the loss of the tour business. Aldona said that both tour companies have their own theme park and make more money going to them. Last summer only about 30 people took advantage of the Museum tour option. Mike Eichholz asked about the public school charge and if that would hurt. Aldona indicated that students pay for many other activities and she has not heard any complaints. Keating indicated that a substantial portion of the Museum budget is based on revenues as opposed to state funds or tuition. It has taken a big hit from the travel industry. It is unfortunate that this great educational opportunity is denied people. Carol Barnhardt has a big concern about charging our own students. They work in the travel industry in the summer and it is an educational resource used by the school of education students.

## VI New Business

A. Motion to amend the Article VI of the Constitution, submitted by Administrative Committee

\*\*\*FIRST READING\*\*\*

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend Article VI of the Constitution as follows:

(( )) = Deletion  
CAPS = Addition

ARTICLE VI - Relation to the University of Alaska Fairbanks  
((Assembly and the University of Alaska General  
Assembly)) GOVERNANCE COORDINATING COMMITTEE AND  
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SYSTEM GOVERNANCE.

*Sect. 1* THE UAF FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT-ELECT ((Senate members)) shall represent the faculty on the University of Alaska Fairbanks GOVERNANCE COORDINATING COMMITTEE ((Assembly and the University of Alaska General Assembly)).

*Sect. 2* The UAF FACULTY SENATE President, ((and)) President-Elect, AND ONE OTHER DESIGNEE APPOINTED BY THE SENATE PRESIDENT SHALL ((will)) represent the Senate on the University of Alaska FACULTY ALLIANCE ((General Assembly)) and one will serve on the SYSTEM GOVERNANCE COUNCIL ((Executive Committee of the General Assembly)).

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Changes in the structure and name of the UAF Governance Coordinating Committee and to the UA System Governance bodies necessitate a change in the UAF Faculty Senate Constitution to bring it up to date.

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Motion to amend Section 1 (Article III: Membership) of the Bylaws, submitted by the Administrative Committee

This motion cleans up the wording used to define a faculty member in keeping with what is used in other university documents. It does not change who is counted and how we count them. There was no objection and the motion passed.

MOTION PASSED

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend Section 1 (Article III: Membership) of the Bylaws as follows:

(( )) = Deletion  
CAPS = Addition

Section 1 (Article III: Membership)

B. 2. FOR REPRESENTATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY a faculty member ((is)) SHALL BE DEFINED AS one who holds academic rank OR SPECIAL ACADEMIC RANK. (( (Currently includes lecturer, research or senior research associate, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor be they full-time, part-time, or visiting.) ))

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Simplification of wording. Current UAF Faculty Appointment and Reevaluation Policies (Chapter III.1.c.(2)) define Special academic rank as "lecturer, instructor, and titles of academic rank preceded by the terms adjunct, affiliate, visiting, research, or clinical." At present the "special academic rank" faculty are not excluded anywhere in the constitution or bylaws from being counted in the head-count toward representation.

\*\*\*\*\*

C. Motion to amend Section 3 (Article V: Committees, Permanent) of the Bylaws, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 74/5)

Madeline reviewed the changes in the bylaws. Number four puts the representative in a list form to clearly identify each area and delete SSSP program which no longer exists. Number five changes the representative from Faculty Development because there has not been a director for a number of years. Number six clarifies the relationship between the committee and the actual nomination and includes the University Regulations which makes this necessary. Number ten identifies the Core areas and specifies that one member of the committee is from a non-Core area. There were no objections and the motion passed.

MOTION PASSED

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend Section 3 (Article V: Committees, Permanent) of the Bylaws as follows:

(( )) = Deletion  
CAPS = Addition

Section 3 (Article V: Committees)

E PERMANENT

4. The Developmental Studies Committee will include one representative from each of the following units:
  - Northwest Campus
  - Chukchi Campus
  - Kuskokwim Campus
  - Bristol Bay Campus
  - Interior-Aleutians Campus
  - College of Science, Engineering and Mathematics
    - Science Department (Biology, Chemistry, Geology, or Physics)
    - Mathematical Sciences Department
  - College of Liberal Arts
    - English Department
    - ((Student Support Services Program))
    - Cross Cultural Communications Department
  - College of Rural Alaska Developmental Studies Division
  - Rural Student Services
  - Advising Centerand two representatives from the Tanana Valley Campus.
  
5. The Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee will be composed of faculty members and ((the Director of Faculty Development)) A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE OFFICE OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT TO BE SELECTED BY THE PROVOST. This committee will deal with faculty and instructional development and evaluation.
  
6. The Committee to Nominate Commencement Speaker and Honorary Degree Recipients, will nominate commencement speakers and candidates for honorary degrees AS SPECIFIED IN UNIVERSITY REGULATION 10.03.02. THIS COMMITTEE WILL WORK IN CONCERT WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY RELATIONS TO REVIEW THE NOMINEE FILES AND MAKE A FORMAL NOMINATION TO THE CHANCELLOR.
  
10. The Core Review Committee reviews and approves courses submitted by the appropriate school/college curriculum councils for their inclusion in the core curriculum at UAF. The Core Review Committee coordinates and recommends changes to the core curriculum, develops the process for assessment of the core curriculum, regularly reports on assessment of the core curriculum, monitors transfer guidelines for core

courses, acts on petitions for core credit, and evaluates guidelines in light of the total core experience. This committee will also review courses for oral, written, and natural science core classification.

The committee shall be composed of one faculty MEMBER from ((the following)) EACH OF THE core component areas: ((Behavioral)) (SOCIAL Sciences, ((Business/Engineering,)) English, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, and Communication) AND ONE FACULTY MEMBER FROM A NON-CORE COMPONENT AREA. Membership on the committee will include an undergraduate student.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The present bylaws do not accurately reflect the realities of committee membership.

\*\*\*\*\*

D. Motion to accept the peer review units, submitted by Administrative Committee

This motion lists the new organization of the peer review units. There was no objection to the motion. The motion passed.

MOTION PASSED

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to accept the peer review units as indicated below:

#### UAF UNIT PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES

<u>UNIT</u>	<u>NUMBER OF TENURED FACULTY</u>
Alaska Cooperative Extension -- School as a Whole	14
College of Liberal Arts -- Arts & Communication (Art, Communication, J & B, Music, Theatre)	19
English & Humanities (English, Philosophy & Humanities)	13
Language & Cultures (AK Native Studies, Ak Native Lang. Center, AK Native	

Lang. Prog., Cross-Cultural Comm., Anthropology, Linguistics, Foreign Lang. & Lit., Geography)	19
Library Sciences	10
School of Education	8
Social Sciences (History, Justice, Northern Studies, Political Sci., Psychology, Social Work, Sociology)	17
College of Natural Resource Development & Management	
School of Agriculture & Land Res. Mgt.	20
School of Management	14
School of Mineral Engineering	9
College of Sciences, Engineering and Mathematics --	
Biology & Wildlife	19
Chemistry	7
Engineering	16
Geology & Geophysics	11
Mathematical Sciences	13
Physics	13
School of Fisheries & Ocean Sciences --	34
School as a Whole	

EFFECTIVE:       Immediately

RATIONALE:       The Peer Review Units were first approved by the Senate in 1989. With the reorganization, combination, and changes within colleges/schools it is necessary to update the Unit Peer Review Committees.

\*\*\*\*\*

## VII Committee Reports

### A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath

The following minutes were distributed at the meeting as a handout.

Minutes of Curricular Affairs Committee Meeting, October 7, 1997

In attendance were all members of the committee except A. Fitts, A. Tremarello, W. Martin, and the student representative. The meeting began at 3:45 p.m., and members discussed four issues.



1. Request of Early Child Development to change the course equivalents when a student has a national Child Development Associate (CDA) credential. Patty Meritt, Early Childhood Department Coordinator, presented this request to the committee. During discussion, committee members noted that this request did not follow senate procedures, and moved to recommit (to the academic council of the College for Rural Alaska). This motion failed (5-2). Further discussion led to the motion "The Curricular Affairs Committee approves the request from the Early Childhood Department contingent on its approval by relevant curricular councils." This motion passed by the vote 5-2. (Following the meeting, the chair has learned that there is a senate procedure for the handling of such cases, a procedure established in 1992. The procedure requires the cognizant dean to present the request to the faculty senate; the curricular review committee considers such requests; those adopted unanimously are approved at that level. Sheri Layral will re-route this request, following the procedure.)

2. Proposal to change graduation with honors requirements. Ann Tremarello submitted draft language to deal with complaints about the current policy (involving the use of credits attempted at other institutions in the computation for honors that were not accepted in transfer to UAF, that were not applicable to a student's UAF degree and/or that were earned years ago).

Members of the committee discussed the proposed changes. Some thought the current requirement was sufficiently liberal; others saw no need for a change; still others objected to the piecemeal nature of the proposed change. The committee took no action on the proposal.

3. Revisions to Board of Regents' Student Affairs Policies. No committee member had conducted a detailed investigation of the difference between the proposed student affairs policies and current UAF policies. In general discussion, committee members pointed to several flaws in the policies, for example: a) new language does not make clear that only faculty members can assign grades other than the "W"; b) student rights are well protected, but faculty rights are not; and c) grade appeal committees appear to have limited choices.

Two committee members--Ron Gatterdam and Sukumar Bandopadhyay--agreed to review the recommended policy changes carefully and make recommendations to the committee.

4. Course-level definitions. The committee reviewed the "draft statements for catalogs based on BOR regulations and most comprehensive statements in UAA, UAF, and UAS catalogs." Most committee members were of the opinion that the language of the

draft was overly vague and general. Some members thought the draft represented an improvement in that it does mention the need for prerequisites for upper-division courses. Several members pointed out that language on credit compressibility needed to be added. A final observation, reached unanimously by the committee, was that special/reserved numbers should be made consistent across the three MAUs.

The committee finished its business at 4:47 p.m. and adjourned. If there is pressing business for the committee to handle, it will meet on October 28th; in the absence of such business, the committee will not meet until a date in November.

Submitted by J. McBeath.

#### B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - R. Gavlak

The following minutes were distributed at the meeting as a handout.

Minutes for Faculty and Scholarly Affairs Committee Meeting,  
9/22/97

Present: Gavlak, White, Nielsen, Cooper, Craven, Porter, Henrichs

- 1) John Craven is setting up an ad hoc committee on relations between the Faculty Senate and United Academics. He needs members; anyone interested (whether they are already on the Faculty-Scholarly Affairs committee or not) should let him know.
- 2) We returned to the issue of whether current UAF faculty members should be able to receive a Ph.D. from UAF. Ray and Sheri searched for existing regulations on the subject and could find none. It was suggested that we search other institutions' policies and ask colleagues about precedents at other institutions.

All agreed that this was a situation to be avoided on both ethical and pragmatic grounds. However, there was some discussion over how absolute a prohibition of such degrees should be. Does the particular situation need to be taken into account?

Also, should faculty members who have already been hired, with the understanding that they could pursue a degree here, be grandfathered in?

Members will come to the next meeting with a rough statement ready to be shaped into its final form.

3) Meeting times for the semester have been changed, to Wednesdays at 4 PM. The remaining meeting dates will be 10/22 and 11/19.

Submitted by Burns Cooper

C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen

Formal action of the committee was to elect Michael Whalen as chair. Issues under discussion include graduation walk-through and the three credit registration requirement in the semester of graduation.

D. Core Review - J. Brown

The following minutes were distributed at the meeting as a handout.

Minutes, Core Review Committee Meeting, October 8, 1997

Attending: Renee Manfredi, Doug Schamel, Dan White, Judy Shepherd, Sue McHenry, Tara Maginnis, Dennis Stephens, Gordon Hedahl, Basil Coutant, Jin Brown, and guest Robert Arundale.

Agenda Item #1 was to vote on a form for the reporting of CORE assessment. It had been suggested that the Committee use an adjusted version of the Eastern New Mexico form that has been used by other areas of UAF. It was amended by putting the mission statement at the top of the page (rather than as a column item), and by adding a final column to allow reporting on how assessment findings have been used in regard to curriculum. The motion to adopt was made by Doug Schamel, seconded by Basil Coutant and voted in favor. The Chair is to provide a working draft at the next meeting.

Agenda Item #2 Approval of letter to departments and faculty regarding assessment of the "O" and "W" requirement of the CORE. The Chair provided a working draft of the letter. Professor Arundale commented on procedure for the assessment plan for this aspect of the CORE. Several suggestions were made for amending the letter. The Chair was to rewrite the Draft, with help by Professor Arundale and submit the letter to members of the Committee via E-mail. An October date for a campus-wide meeting in regard to assessment procedures for the "O" and "W" aspect of CORE requirements is to be announced after approval of the letter. The meeting is to be scheduled at the Tuesday, 1:00 p. m. open time, the date being still undecided. (Note: After the Wednesday meeting English Department Head Eric Heyne was reached in regard to his Department's comments

on the procedure for assessment and the letter Draft. He gave approval of the assessment procedure and was put on the E-mail list for the Draft of the letter).

Agenda Item #3 Petitions to the CORE. No petitions were submitted during this period. It was commented that perhaps our work over the last two years in trying to reduce petitions to the CORE was bearing some fruits. Sue McHenry believed, however, that the reduction will soon be forgotten as pre-enrollment begins.

Agenda Item #4 Other Business. The Chair introduced the possibility that the Committee might have to adjust or create University policy in regard to courses bearing "W" designation and offered by correspondence but not offered as an on-campus course with the "W" designation. The Committee does not yet have enough information to act, but the Chair is seeking clarification on the matter.

Business completed and meeting adjourned.

#### E Curriculum Review - J. French

The committee will meet to review three trial courses.

#### F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber

The following minutes were distributed at the meeting as a handout.

Minutes of The Developmental Studies Meeting, September 23. 1997

In attendance: Charlotte Basham, Richard Clausen, Cindy Hardy, Ron Illingworth, Rose Kairaiuak, Wanda Martin, Joe Mason, Greg Owens, Ron Palcic, Jane Weber, Ruth Lister

The Developmental Studies committee agreed to work on the following issues during the 1997-98 academic year:

Tracking and documenting DEVE, DEVM, and DEVS students through 100-level courses,

Linking outcomes assessment for DEVE and DEVM with English and math department assessments,

Strengthening the working relationship with the academic and vocational departments to smooth students' transition into core classes taught by these departments.

The committee also discussed the following:

A resolution supporting the continuance of the rural campuses, stressing their importance for developmental education,

Student placement into developmental, academic, and vocational courses by renorming the ASSET test and by getting ACT's COMPASS test fully on line,

Support for underprepared students through required placement into study skills courses for students taking two developmental courses,

Tutorial support for students, given the loss of SSSP funding--perhaps through increased funding to the Math Lab and Writing Center,

The question of whether to establish a developmental science class,

The question of whether, and to what extent, we want to implement placement testing for students entering developmental classes.

A subcommittee composed of Jane Weber, Cindy Hardy, Greg Owens, and Wanda Martin formed to decide what information is needed to track students from DEV classes as they proceed into their core requirements in math and English. This committee will request this information from the SIS system before it goes off line at the end of October and the information is lost.

#### G Faculty Appeals & Oversight - B. Alexander

Barbara Alexander resigned from the committee and the Senate. Included here are the draft minutes of the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee meeting, October 7.

The second meeting of the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee met without a quorum on October 7, 1997 in Wood Center conference room A. T. Cooney, F. Dyen, J. Kelley, J. Ruppert, and F. Sorensen were present for the teleconference. Sheri Layral from the Governance Office was also present.

A major order of business remaining from the first meeting was the election or appointment of a committee chairperson. There were no volunteers from the members present. We were informed that Barbara Alexander had resigned and that Meriam Karlsson did not want to be considered. Both had prior experience on the committee. The committee suggested that the entire membership be polled to (1) ascertain their intent to serve and (2) willingness to

serve as chair or co-chair. Ted Cooney indicates his willingness to assist the committee if the chair or co-chair is someone who was on the committee last year.

Much of the remaining meeting time was spent seeking clarification of the committees mission and responsibilities. Past committees formed subcommittee task groups. Based on the current understanding of the committees tasks it concluded without dissent the following operational strategy:

1. Grievance Council--One member will be needed for service on this council. The selection is usually done in the spring. The selectee will serve two years. No action is anticipated during the fall semester.

2. Grievance Hearing Panel Pool--The committee recommended that all members of this committee be candidates for selection.

3. Grade Appeals--The committee recommended that all members of this committee be candidates for selection.

4. Academic Administrator, Evaluation, Oversight--This committee shall oversee the process of evaluation of academic administrators to ensure that the procedures set by the university are followed. Deferred the decision on who to place on that sub-committee until closer to the evaluation process in order to excuse anyone who's unit administrator is being evaluated.

5. Collective Bargaining--The committee will (may) need a member to serve on an ad hoc committee. Collective bargaining discussions are going on at the present time and it is unclear what the future responsibilities of the Appeals and Oversight Committee will be.

6. Faculty Ethics--This task has been dealt with and resolved through Faculty Senate action last year. It should be removed as a task item.

Discussion centered on the ideal size of the committee which appeared to be eight. It is difficult to find a convenient time for all to meet if the group is much larger. The committee discussed how many representatives were needed from newly merged schools/colleges, and that because of the merger, we might end up with fewer rather than more members.

Next Meeting--Sheri will contact the present members to ascertain a convenient time for all to meet AND URGE ALL ELECTED



MEMBERS TO COMMIT TO ATTENDING MEETING OR STATE WHY THEY CAN'T.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -  
D. Porter

David Porter indicated the committee held two meetings and reviewed the agenda suggested to them from the last Senate meeting. They are in the process of formulating a resolution for the creation of a permanent committee to oversee the faculty seminar series. They have also discussed at some length the creation of a faculty development policy and a faculty handbook. And in particular the consideration related to distance delivery and preparation of courses and how they are considered in the tenure and promotion process.

The other set issue has to do with the overlap of what the bargaining unions are doing and to what extent the Senate should get involved. We should probably look at some elements in the faculty development and assessment process, particularly as they relate to instruction. These seem to be changing significantly and we need to focus on faculty accountability in these areas. The committee meets every other Tuesday at 11:30.

I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - S. Hendricks

No report was available.

J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal

A report was attached to the agenda. The committee is actively recruiting members.

K. Service Committee - K. Nance

Kara indicated that the committee had nothing to report.

IX Discussion Items

A. Faculty Contribution to the Planning for Recovery from RIP II: The Sequel to RIP I - J. Craven

John asked Keating to review the mechanics of the RIP I recovery program. Keating considered this a timely discussion because we do have concerns from last year. Including the fact that more people took the RIP than anticipated. This year the time to sign up for the RIP is earlier. The RIP program passed under the appeal of the chancellors as a needed management tool. This translates into making various budget projections based on three scenarios. We have to wait to see how the budgets come in to understand how to use it as a management tool. The policies for the RIP this year are identical to last year. This includes age, service, and cost savings. Everyone eligible will receive a letter. Last year 82 faculty and staff took the RIP from UAF. This included about 42 faculty. More took the RIP than thought and it was very random. Some units had eight people take it and other units had none. The question comes back with how much money for the RIP. It was decided that we would need 60% of the savings to pay this current years' bill. That is what happened and there will be no more assessment to fund this years' budget. Then 40% was given back to the organizations units, including staff, where it came from. For the academic side a memo was sent to deans and directors on how to prioritize requests for the RIP funds. Looked at innovative ways to utilize funds including job sharing, interdisciplinary, and split funding. At the end of that request for proposals he received \$2.5 million of requests. The 40% returned was \$1.4 million. Keating then prioritized the list in two ways. First, down to the 40% from RIP and then continued on to a second list if we received funds from a release of deferred maintenance. The Board gave a one year release only. Half the funds were given to the President's office and half to the campuses for academic programs only. This year we are living on borrowed money. The amount of money for next year is unknown. It will depend on the union contract, tuition, and legislative funding.

If we get a \$7 million increase we are in good shape and we can give back all RIP positions. If we are given a flat budget then we will have to find money elsewhere, again from reserves. Keating is certain that the giving back of appointments will not happen at the same level. The assumption again is to define this as a management tool. We look now at faculty as to best exercise that tool. It is clearly contingent on the budget.

Jerry McBeath stated that this was a very bad actuarial tool. He also asked how many more RIP opportunities will be coming. Keating said the state approved the program for three years. State agencies must approve it each year. The Regents were very hesitant to grant it the first year. This year the Chancellors' supported it as a management tool.

John indicated that the procedure last year was that each unit that took a RIP was offered the chance to compete for the positions. Keating indicated that it was not done at the department level but the college and institute level. They did not have to request the same position, in fact, they encouraged the unit to come back with alternate requests.

Kara Nance asked about the lecturer funds and replacement of staff in the Math department. Keating stated that the staff position for Math was in the second tier. John Craven said that the procedure at UAF was much clearer than at UAA.

Larry Duffy asked if there was any conversation with UAA on duplication of programs or services. Keating said that was a good suggestion but at the time they were all involved in our own campuses. They did warn each other about their own qualities and limitations but not in terms of sharing faculty. They try to look at it, especially in engineering.

Larry also asked about pay raises. Keating indicated that if we go on with the pay raises this year it will be very difficult to fund. If there is a union contract it is up to the legislature to fund pay raises as opposed to the units to find it. Larry said there were units in his area who can't make pay raises unless there is an elimination of programs.

The Senate will assist in dissemination of information to the faculty. Keating is also looking for ideas. John French encouraged everyone to be involved in the discussions. Larry Duffy indicated that the process might include a process for appeal. Keating would prefer any appeals process be done at the college level as the dean is the representative to Keating.

The Senate will include this topic as a discussion item for the next meeting.

#### X Members' Comments/Questions

a. Jerry McBeath made an announcement about the student legislative internship program and stated the deadline for application is October 22.

b. Larry Duffy commented that money spent on transportation by administrators to attend the meetings could be used by others. It could be better spent on undergraduate students. Keating said that his committee does meet by audioconference. Some of committee meetings are important to us and are critical to attend.

c. Tom Robinson stated that he was always interested in faculty and staff participation on the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee.

## XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Tapes of this Faculty Senate meeting are in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall if anyone wishes to listen to the complete tapes.

Submitted by Sheri Layral, Faculty Senate Secretary.