

## FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral  
312 Signers' Hall  
474-7964 FYSENAT

For Audioconferencing: Bridge #: 1-800-910-9680  
Anchorage: 561-9680

A G E N D A  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #67  
Monday, November 11, 1996  
1:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.  
Wood Center Ballroom

1:30	I	Call to Order - Don Lynch	5 Min.
		A. Roll Call	
		B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #66	
		C. Adoption of Agenda	
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
		A. Motions Approved:	
		1. Motion to approve the AAS in Apprenticeship Technology.	
		2. Motion to amend the Associate of Arts requirements.	
		B. Motions Pending: none	
1:40	III	Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow & Provost Keating	10 Min.
		Questions	5 Min.
1:55	IV	Guest Speaker - April Crosby Assistant to the President University of Alaska Learning Cooperative	10 Min.
2:05	V	Governance Reports	
		A. ASUAF - C. Wheeler	5 Min.
		B. Staff Council - R. Pierce	5 Min.
		C. President's Report - D. Lynch (Attachment 67/1)	5 Min.
		D. President-Elect's Comments - J. Craven (Attachment 67/2)	5 Min.
2:25	VI	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:30	VII	Old Business	
		A. Motion to continue tabling of the Withdrawal/ No Basis grade issue until the December 9, 1996 face-to-face meeting, (Attachment 67/3), submitted by Curricular Affairs	5 Min.
		*****BREAK*****	5 Min.
2:40	VIII	New Business	
		A. Motion on when basic Core skills courses are accomplished (Attachment 67/4), submitted by Core Review	5 Min.
		B. Motion to eliminated registration signature requirement for continuing Graduate Students (Attachment 67/5), submitted by Graduate Curricular Affairs	5 Min.
		C. Motion to amend Section 3 (ARTICLE V: Committees) E., PERMANENT, 8. of the Bylaws (Attachment 67/6), submitted by Faculty Appeals & Oversight	5 Min.

- |      |     |   |         |
|------|-----|---|---------|
|      | D.  | Resolution to recommend that returning faculty (after sabbatical leave) participate in the Faculty Seminar Series (Attachment 67/7) - R. Seifert  | 5 Min.  |
|      | E.  | Motion to amend Section 3 (ARTICLE V: Committees) A., of the Bylaws (Attachment 67/8), submitted by Administrative Committee  | 5 Min.  |
|      | F.  | Motion to appoint an ad hoc committee to study the structures of faculty governance at universities in which faculty are unionized (Attachment 67/9), submitted by Administrative Committee | 5 Min.  |
| 3:10 | IX  | Committee Reports   | 30 Min. |
|      | A.  | Curricular Affairs - Maynard Perkins<br>(Attachment 67/10)  |         |
|      | B.  | Faculty Affairs - Dave Spell  |         |
|      | C.  | Graduate Curricular Affairs - Mark Tumeo<br>(Attachment 67/11)  |         |
|      | D.  | Scholarly Activities - Ron Barry  |         |
|      | E.  | CNCSHDR - Rudy Krejci   |         |
|      | F.  | Developmental Studies - Ron Illingworth   |         |
|      | G.  | Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Diane Bischak<br>(Attachment 67/12)   |         |
|      | H.  | Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - Rich Seifert (Attachment 67/13)   |         |
|      | I.  | Graduate School Advisory Committee - Peggy Shumaker<br>(Attachment 67/14)   |         |
|      | J.  | Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - Michael Jennings   |         |
|      | K.  | Service Committee - Kara Nance  |         |
|      | L.  | University-Wide Promotion/Tenure - John Keller  |         |
|      | M.  | Core Review - Jin Brown (Attachment 67/15)  |         |
| 3:40 | X   | Discussion Items  | 5 Min.  |
| 3:45 | XI  | Members' Comments/Questions   | 5 Min.  |
| 3:50 | XII | Adjournment   |         |

\*\*\*\*\*  
 ATTACHMENT 67/1  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
 NOVEMBER 11, 1996

PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 11, 1996 - Donald F. Lynch

The Eleventh Hour of the Eleventh Day of the Eleventh Month, Armistice Day, which ended the fighting along the western front in World War I. The story is that machine gunners on both sides fired off a short burst, not hitting anyone, and then stood and saluted their opponents. Let us all hope and pray that such wars are ended, for the Great War was a disaster for everyone, a lesson which had, however, to be repeated and repeated and repeated again in this, our time.

Besides that, my report is the Alliance Meeting report. Let me emphasize a few things:

- assessment of educational effectiveness is upon us;
- we shall be required to deliver courses and programs to the other campuses;
- educational standards at the University level will probably be mandated;
- Faculty Development policies are the key issue coming from the Alliance.

The idea of looking at a common grading system for all three Campuses reflects one result of these pressures. The faculty alliance has a committee working on this, as is our curricular affairs committee.

We are also being told to increase student retention and so deliver our courses so that students can graduate in four and a half years. This is part of being student friendly. Changes in policies regarding advising, etc., are related to this objective.

I am told that the Banner Program may be able to enforce pre-requisites. Therefore, each department should examine its pre-requisite requirements and be sure they remain valid. Enforcement, without advising, means that a student might be denied permission to enroll without, perhaps, any of us realizing it.

A subcommittee of the Board of Regents Academic Affairs Committee met by teleconference with the State Board of Education Nov. 4th. The purpose was to determine those areas in which the two had sufficient common interests to present a united front. The area highlighted in what I heard was developmental studies. According to President Komisar, preliminary data indicate that about 3,000 students are enrolled in developmental studies, and of these about half are fairly recent high school graduates. The establishment and enforcement of educational standards in the high schools, and subsequently at the University, may help alleviate the circumstance in which Alaskan high school graduates are not able to do college work. One thought is to make the transition from high school to college "seamless."

The minutes from the September 20, 1996, meeting of this group indicate that the state is considering a new system of teacher certification which will involve a two to three year and then a five year evaluation of teachers with the state, not the University, certifying teachers. Sheri has a copy of these minutes.

The Regents will meet in Anchorage November 20, 21 and 22. The Alliance meets November 15th by audio conference.

We are half way through this semester and most committees are to be complimented on their diligence and attentiveness. It is a real and genuine pleasure to work with people like you and an honor to represent you.

\*\*\*\*\*  
ATTACHMENT 67/2  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
NOVEMBER 11, 1996

Report by John Craven, President-Elect and Chair of the Administrative Committee

#### THE OCTOBER 17TH MEETING OF THE FACULTY ALLIANCE

I refer you to Don Lynch's excellent summary. Two items from that meeting are to be pursued by the UAF and UAA Faculty Senates and the UAS Faculty Council. They are as follows:

1. We are attempting to coordinate the meeting dates for the senates and the council so that they can consider and act on issues of importance to the Alliance in plenty of time for a meeting of the

Alliance prior to each meeting of the UA Board of Regents. I have put forward for investigation the following: the Faculty Alliance meet the week before a BOR meeting and the senates and council meet two weeks before a BOR meeting. This is now the subject of discussions between the three members who will lead their senates or council next year: Cable Starlings, UAA; Dennis Russell, UAS; John Craven, UAF. It is clear that UAA and UAF meet the objective with no alteration of their existing or planned meeting dates, and we are awaiting word from UAS. The UAF Administrative Committee will bring the proposed meeting dates forward for your approval at an upcoming meeting.

2. A more ambitious undertaking is to attempt the creation of a uniform definition of letter grades at the three MAUs. It our opinion that we had better do it before the BOR decides to do it and much more as part of their drive for transparency between the three MAUs. Again, the three of us have undertaken an investigation, and the first thing I have proposed is that we review each other's present definitions and policies. I would hope that we can quickly move this to our Curricular Affairs Committee and Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee later this semester, but I am under no illusion that this will be easy.

#### THE UAF ISSUE OF ADVISING

It is understood within the administration that the Faculty Senate is silent on the subject of advising and this is included within the operating principle as the administration's drives to simplify student's life with regard to registration and related issues. I believe that the Senate should not remain silent on this issue.

The Graduate School Advisory Committee and the dean of the Graduate School have discussed a proposal that would affect any graduate student receiving funds from the state or an advisor's grant and/or contract, and this has since been reviewed by and is submitted for your consideration by the Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee. I am impressed with the speed with which the committee structure was able to respond.

I think the Faculty Senate should now proceed to build on Dana' Thomas' work and fully investigate the numerous comments and suggestions of faculty members with regard to the proposed new university policy being formulated at the administrative level. I, for one, do not want students paying no attention to graduation requirements that could have easily been pointed out by an effective advisor, and then appealing to the provost when the Graduation Office states that the student has not fulfilled the graduation requirements. Stated simply; if students really want the advising requirements eased, then ignorance of this University's policies for meeting graduation requirements will not be a defense in an appeal. However, sloppy advising could be, and that is an area we would have to address. This is not a simple issue, and perhaps that is why the Senate has remained silent. I think we can no longer do that, and am delighted with the attention it is being given by the Curricular Affairs Committee.

#### UPDATING COMMITTEES' DUTIES

You will note in our agenda two motions for amendments to the bylaws of the Faculty Senate, both intended by the committees to more clearly define their responsibilities. As author of the motion on duties of the Administrative Committee, I was motivated by the complete lack of specific tasks for this pivotal committee and the

wish that this not be a "free-form" committee that does as it pleases versus working to assure the efficient operation of the Faculty Senate. It should not have to re-invent itself each year.

This brings me to the Scholarly Affairs Committee. Some of you may recall the recommendation of a earlier chair of that committee that it be abolished as it had nothing to do. I find it remarkable that a tripartite faculty (teaching, research and service) would have active committees for teaching and service, but not for research and other scholarly affairs outside the classroom. I believe that this committee has an important role to play as part of this organization, and hope that we can discuss and create a greatly improved description for the work of this committee with regard to our scholarly activities. There are several other committees that require the senates attention, but we must pace ourselves.

#### ACCOUNTING

You may wonder why this is included in my report, but it will affect how you write proposals for federal money in the future (see, this belongs in the Scholarly Affairs Committee), and your deans and directors have already seen a long presentation. The Administrative Committee is of the opinion that a senate meeting is not an appropriate venue for such a presentation. However, it is another example how the promise of less interference is actually more when it comes to the presence of the Federal Government in your research life. The following paragraph has been supplied to me by Renee Webb-Otis from the statewide offices. If you need additional information, please see your dean or director, who is now presumably fully aware of all this. A full presentation could be prepared for the Faculty Senate if it so wished.

Re: Federal Cost Accounting Standards

The University is currently subject to new Federal Cost Accounting Standards with which we need to comply to prevent potential loss of federal funds. A critical element of compliance is a pervasive knowledge of the regulations and their meaning to the university. I would appreciate an opportunity to make a short presentation to the Faculty Senate. Standard 501 requires consistency between how costs are categorized in the proposal, the accounting system, and the reporting. Our accounting system is fairly rigid so its critical that proposals be consistent with the accounting system, and faculty are the key to this compliance. Standard 502 requires internal consistency between units, including units which receive no federal funds. A survey of accounting practices at UAF has revealed significant inconsistencies and we anticipate compliance will impact the English department, for example, just as much as the Geophysical Institute. Faculty understanding of the regulations is the cornerstone of our ability to comply. I look forward to hearing from you. I can be reached at 474-6496 or SNRW@orca.alaska.edu.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/3  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
 NOVEMBER 11, 1996  
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION  
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to continue the tabling of the Withdrawal/No Basis grade issue until the December 9, 1996 face-to-face meeting.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The Curricular Affairs (CA) and the Developmental Studies (DS) Committees have a sub-committee tasked with developing a compromise motion. This sub-committee is meeting by audioconference and will report back to CA and DS from which a motion will be sent to the Faculty Senate.

The December 9, 1996, Senate meeting is face-to-face allowing for full participation of all Senators.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/4  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
NOVEMBER 11, 1996  
SUBMITTED BY CORE REVIEW

MOTION  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Core Review Committee's recommendation on when basic Core skills courses shall be accomplished.

Beginning Fall 1997 all incoming students are required to successfully accomplish English 111X and Communication 131X (or 141X) prior to enrollment in oral intensive (<sup>3</sup>O<sup>2</sup>) or written intensive (<sup>3</sup>W<sup>2</sup>) courses.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 1997

RATIONALE: Having spent a week with Jim Ratcliff discussing the University's mandate for Effectiveness Evaluation, we have identified an obvious flaw in the way the University has enacted the CORE curriculum. For whatever historical reasons the current lack of an imposed time frame for accomplishing CORE skills has come about, if the University is serious about current efforts to do a curriculum-enhancing assessment and to improve the retention of a greater percentage of incoming students, it is time to change the expectation of when basic CORE skills courses shall be accomplished.

As the requirements stand, no student is required to complete basic skills courses at any specific point before graduation. This situation is antithetical to any sense of what those courses are intended to accomplish. If, as stated, we intend to give our students the tools with which to be competitive, both in classes at the University and life experience beyond, the most primary skills of writing, speaking, and working with diverse groups must be a part of the educational experience as close to the student's entry into the educational process as we can accommodate. How can we expect to encourage content education of students who are preoccupied with a lack of or deficit in basic student skills? And how can students participate in experiences

that encourage retention if a lack of basic skills robs them of the satisfaction that learning successes engenders? IT IS THE POSITION OF THE CORE REVIEW COMMITTEE THAT ENGLISH IIIX AND COMMUNICATION 131X (OR 141X) SHOULD BE ACCOMPLISHED, AS A REQUIREMENT, IN THE STUDENT'S FIRST YEAR OF CLASSES. In recognizing that such a shift in requirements, while it is in line with practices at many other state universities, might be a hardship to this University, we believe that we must require basic skills courses to be completed before the end of the sophomore year. Both Communication and English serve over 100% of demand by the end of enrollment. Given the anecdotal experience of teaching faculty in regard to the current policy vacuum, we submit this motion.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/5  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
 NOVEMBER 11, 1996  
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MOTION  
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to eliminate the requirement for an advisor's signature on a registration form for all continuing graduate students

Furthermore, it will become policy of the University of Alaska Fairbanks starting in Fiscal Year 1998 that all graduate research assistantships, teaching assistantships, fellowship and tuition scholarship stipend letters contain the following language:

tuition paid as part of graduate assistantships, fellowships, or tuition scholarships covers only courses approved by the student's Advisory Committee.

EFFECTIVE: July 1, 1997

RATIONALE: The signature requirement was originally instituted to ensure that 1) graduate students get advising and work closely with their advisor and committee in course selection; and 2) the university and/or grants which pay tuition are not paying for courses that are not reasonably related to the progress of the student. However, it was the consensus of the Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee that the requirement to obtain an advisor's signatures for registration did not meet either of these goals, and could be construed as paternalistic towards graduate students. However, removal of the signature requirement leaves concern about oversight of the classes being taken by those graduate students receiving research or teaching assistantships, fellowships or tuition scholarships.

After further discussion of the role of faculty advisors and the necessity for advisors to play a pro-active role in reaching out to students to track class enrollment, progress and performance, and discussion on the necessity for the University to be clear about what courses a student can take when the UAF or a research grant is paying for tuition, the motion above was

unanimously approved by members of GCAC.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/6  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
 NOVEMBER 11, 1996  
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend Section 3 (ARTICLE V: Committees) E., PERMANENT, 8. of the Bylaws as follows:

(( )) = deletion

CAPS = addition

The Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee shall be composed of two tenured faculty members, elected from each college/school and confirmed by the Faculty Senate, who shall serve for a two year term. Members' terms will be staggered to provide continuity. ((This committee will function as an appeal body for issues of faculty prerogative, oversee evaluation of academic administrators, and make recommendations to the Provost or Chancellor.))

A promotion/tenure appeals subcommittee composed of five tenured faculty will hear all promotion and/or tenure reconsideration requests and report its findings to the Chancellor according to University of Alaska Fairbanks Regulations, Section IV,B,4. THE SUBCOMMITTEE WILL BE SELECTED BY THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND WILL NOT INCLUDE FACULTY FROM THE UNITS IN WHICH THE REQUESTS FOR RECONSIDERATION ORIGINATED. NO TWO FACULTY FROM THE SAME UNIT, AS CURRENTLY ELECTED TO THE COMMITTEE, WILL BE SELECTED FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE.

Committee members shall constitute a hearing panel pool to serve as needed on grievance hearing panels, AS SPECIFIED IN REGENTS' POLICY 04.08.08.VI.A.

Committee members shall oversee the process of evaluation of academic administrators.

A NON-RETENTION APPEALS SUBCOMMITTEE COMPOSED OF FIVE TENURED FACULTY WILL HEAR ALL NON-RETENTION RECONSIDERATION REQUESTS AND REPORT ITS FINDINGS TO THE CHANCELLOR. THIS SUBCOMMITTEE WILL CONDUCT BUSINESS IN THE SAME FASHION AS THE PROMOTION/TENURE RECONSIDERATION SUBCOMMITTEE, I.E., WILL REVIEW THE AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS AND MAKE A DETERMINATION ON WHETHER OR NOT APPROPRIATE POLICY AND DUE PROCESS WAS FOLLOWED.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS SHALL REVIEW ISSUES DEALING WITH FACULTY PREROGATIVE AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY CHANGES TO THE FACULTY SENATE.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: This motion clarifies the charge of the committee as currently stated in the Bylaws. It also adds a non-retention appeals subcommittee to hear non-retention reconsideration requests. This will provide an avenue for appeals by non-retained faculty



similar to that provided by the promotion/tenure appeals subcommittee for faculty who are denied tenure or promotion.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/7  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
NOVEMBER 11, 1996  
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT

RESOLUTION  
=====

WHEREAS, current UA Board of Regents policy calls for faculty returning from a sabbatical leave to submit a written report; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Development, Improvement, and Assessment Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate recommends that an oral report to the faculty of the university, one in the series of Faculty Seminars sponsored jointly by the Faculty Senate, Provost's Office, and the Academic Unit in which the faculty member holds their appointment, be a new requirement of the returning sabbatical leave faculty member; and

WHEREAS, this fosters intellectual exchange within UAF academic community, reinforces the legitimacy of sabbatical leaves to reinvigorate faculty, and provides opportunities to share UAF's research and scholarly traditions and experiences with the broader constituencies of UAF and the community statewide;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate recommends the adoption of a procedure to expand the obligations of faculty returning from sabbatical to require participation in the Faculty Seminar Series.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/8  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
NOVEMBER 11, 1996  
SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

MOTION  
=====

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

(( )) = deletion  
CAPS = addition

A. An Administrative Committee will be composed of the chairpersons of all standing and permanent Senate committees, AND THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY SHALL BE AN EX OFFICIO, NON-VOTING MEMBER. SPECIFIC DUTIES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE IN ITS OBLIGATION TO FULLY PREPARE THE AGENDA AND MATERIALS FOR EFFICIENT OPERATION OF THE SENATE ARE:

- 1. RECEIVE REPORTS FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, THE PROVOST, AND, AS DEEMED TIMELY, OTHER INDIVIDUALS, ON ISSUES OF CURRENT AND FUTURE IMPORTANCE TO THE

SENATE;

2. ACCEPT AND REVIEW THE MOTIONS OF STANDING AND PERMANENT COMMITTEES, AND FROM MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE;
3. MAKE CERTAIN THAT THE MOTIONS ARE READY FOR SENATE ACTION TO THE MAXIMUM DEGREE POSSIBLE, AND IF NOT, REFER THEM BACK FOR FURTHER WORK AND/OR DIRECT THEM TO OTHER RELEVANT COMMITTEES THAT MAY NOT HAVE CONSIDERED THE MOTIONS;
4. MOVE THE MOTIONS TO THE SENATE'S AGENDA;
5. REVIEW AND APPROVE OTHER ITEMS OF THE SENATE'S AGENDA, AS DEEMED NECESSARY;
6. REVIEW REPORTS OF ALL COMMITTEE WORK IN PROGRESS; AND
7. DISCUSS OTHER ISSUES, THAT MAY OR SHOULD LEAD TO LATER COMMITTEE AND SENATE ACTIONS.

IN ADDITION,

8. WITHIN THE SCOPE OF AUTHORITY GRANTED BY THE SENATE AT THE LAST MEETING OF THE SPRING SEMESTER, THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE WILL REPRESENT THE SENATE FROM THE CLOSE OF THE LAST SENATE MEETING IN THE SPRING UNTIL THE OPENING OF THE FIRST SENATE MEETING OF THE FALL SEMESTER; AND
9. AT THE FIRST MEETING IN THE FALL SEMESTER MAKE A REPORT OF ALL ACTIONS CARRIED OUT IN THE NAME OF THE SENATE SINCE THE LAST MEETING IN THE SPRING SEMESTER.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The duties and obligations of the Administrative Committee are not clearly defined in the Constitution and Bylaws, and can vary from year to year based on the experiences and desires of individuals chairing the committee.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/9  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
 NOVEMBER 11, 1996  
 SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

MOTION  
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to appoint an ad hoc committee to study the relationship and/or structures of faculty governance at universities in which the faculty are unionized, and to report back to the Senate in a timely manner. Members will be:

Chair, Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement  
 Committee  
 Chair, Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee  
 Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Significant interest has been expressed for a senate study of these issues, and one committee has already formed a subcommittee. A coordinated effort is required. Greater understanding of these relationships can aid the Senate in its preparations for the new environment. Three individual committee chairs have agreed to serve on such a committee.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/10

UAF FACULTY SENATE #67

NOVEMBER 11, 1996

SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Curricular Affairs Committee Report - Maynard Perkins, Chair

Minutes of Curricular Affairs Meeting, October 25, 1996  
Prepared by Carol Barnhardt

Members Present: Carol Barnhardt, Joan Braddock (Acting Chair),  
John Creed, Jerry McBeath, Jane Weber, Terry McFadden.  
Others Present: Don Lynch

Don Lynch provided a brief review of last week's meeting of the Faculty Alliance with President Komisar. He focused on the complexity of issues related to coordination among the three MAUs, and he will provide a full written report.

Agenda Items:

1. Review of Elizabeth Liwanag-Po's AAS equivalency for BT degree.

Action: Tabled until group can get additional information from Wanda Martin.

2. Change of Wording in Catalog for Dept. of Foreign Languages & Literature.

Action: Motion to accept wording in the catalog as requested by Foreign Language Department was approved unanimously.

3. No Basis Grade Discussion

Discussion regarding several possible alternatives to the NB grade were discussed (elimination of several current grades, coordination with other MAUs, etc.). Committee recognized that issue could not be resolved here.

Action: Motion to form a subcommittee formed to work with Developmental Committee to make recommendations regarding NB grade approved unanimously. Volunteers for the subcommittee are: Maynard Perkins, John Creed and Jane Weber.

4. Discussion of Advisor's Signature Requirement

Discussion regarding the Chancellor's newly-established policy of elimination of the required advisor's signature for continuing students at UAF was discussed. There was disagreement within the

group about the policy itself (implications and consequences for students, effect on retention rates, accuracy of catalog to inform students, etc.) and about the process through which this policy became effective (i.e., whose responsibility is it to make decisions regarding policy?).

Action: Curricular Affairs wants to see a copy of the Chancellor's original statement before making any response. Request that this statement be available to committee members before the next meeting.

5. Proposal from CORE Review Committee to change university requirements for Fall 1997. "The Committee proposes that beginning Fall 1997 incoming students be required to successfully accomplish English 111X and Communication 131X (or 141X) prior to enrollment in Oral Intensive ("O") or Written Intensive ("W") courses."

Discussion revolved around advantages and disadvantages of implementing this policy (e.g., Would the acceptance of this proposal require that additional instructors be hired for English 111X and Communication courses? Could this requirement be determined instead by individual departments?). There was confusion about the policy as presented because the proposal itself states only that the courses be taken prior to enrollment in Oral or Written intensive courses, but the discussion of the problem states that these courses "should be accomplished as a requirement in the student's first year of classes."

Action: A motion to accept the proposal, as presented, was defeated unanimously.

6. Proposal from CORE Review Committee to change the prerequisite requirements for the 300 level values and choice courses (PHIL 322X, PS 300X, and COMM 300X).

Discussion revolved around the following issues:

1. There has been no discussion of this proposal with the Political Science Department.
2. This course was designed as <sup>3</sup>a capstone course<sup>2</sup> (because CORE courses are integrated vertically) and therefore should be taken after completion of the other CORE courses.
3. There should be some type of agreement about the prerequisites among the two (and in the future, three) departments offering this course.

Action:

-Motion to accept proposal, as presented, was defeated unanimously.

-Recommendation was made that Sheri be asked to set up a meeting between representatives from the Departments of Philosophy, Political Science, and Communication so that a discussion can occur at this level before there is additional discussion of the CORE Review Committee's recommendation.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/11

UAF FACULTY SENATE #67

NOVEMBER 11, 1996

SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee Report - Mark Tumeo, Chair

Minutes of the October 28 Meeting of the Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee

Members Present: James Beget, Mark Tumeo, Peter Schweitzer, John Kelly, Kara Nance, ex-officio John Craven, ex-officio Joe Kan, ex-officio Dennis Stephens (alt: Tamara Lincoln), ex-officio Gayle Gregory, ex-officio Marcus Ortelee

Members Absent: NONE

The meeting was called to order at 12:10 p.m. in the Chancellor's Conf. Room

Item 1: First order of business was a discussion of the idea of eliminating the requirement of an advisor's signature for class registration for continuing graduate students. The discussion first focused on what the original purpose of the signature was and what the goal was in eliminating the signature requirement.

In summary, the signature requirement was seen as an attempt to ensure that 1) graduate students get advising and work closely with their advisor and committee in course selection; and 2) the university and/or grants which pay tuition are not paying for courses that are not reasonably related to the progress of the student. However, it was the consensus of the committee that the requirement for signatures for registration did not meet either of these goals, and could be construed as paternalistic towards graduate students. However, removal of the signature requirement leaves concern about oversight of the classes being taken by those graduate students receiving research or teaching assistantships, fellowships or tuition scholarships.

After further discussion of the role of faculty advisors and the necessity for advisors to play a pro-active role in reaching out to students to track class enrollment, progress and performance, and discussion on the necessity for the University to be clear about what courses a student can take when the UAF or a research grant is paying for tuition, the following motion was made by John Kelly and seconded by Kara Nance:

\*\*\*\* Motion \*\*\*\*

That the requirement for an advisor's signature on a registration form be eliminated for all continuing graduate students, effective Fall, 1997.

Furthermore, it will become policy of the University of Alaska Fairbanks that all graduate research assistantships, teaching assistantships, fellowship and tuition scholarship stipend letters contain the following language:

tuition paid as part of graduate assistantships, fellowships, or tuition scholarships covers only courses approved by the student's Advisory Committee.

The motion passed without objection.

Item 2: The committee then returned to it's ongoing discussion of thesis vs. projects as part of the Master's program. Each committee member reported on the information gathered from their respective units since the last meeting. Marcus Ortelee (ex-officio Graduate Student representative) had compiled many of the project and non-project degree requirements listed in the 1996-97 catalogue. He

agreed to provide a complete summary by the next meeting. In general, there is no consistency or quality control with respect to what constitutes a project versus a thesis, what is required for a M.S. or M.A. in a non-thesis track, oral defense requirements, or publication requirements.

The committee discussed various concerns vis-a-vis variable program quality leading to the same degree, the pros and cons of a professional "Master's" Degree versus a more academic "Master's of Science" Degree, and the special requirements of professional schools such as Business and Engineering.

While no conclusion was reached, it was the consensus of the Committee that this is a very important topic and that we should continue to attempt to develop clear policy guidelines, or perhaps a policy statement. The Committee Chair (Mark Tumeo) agreed to draw up sample policy language to focus the next meetings discussion.

The next meeting of the Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee will be on Monday, November 18 at noon to 1 p.m., in the Chancellor's Conference Room, 3rd Floor, Signer's Hall.

Meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/12

UAF FACULTY SENATE #67

NOVEMBER 11, 1996

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee Report - Diane Bischak,  
Chair

Minutes of the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee, October 17,  
1996

The meeting was called to order at 11:32 AM.

Members present: Alexander, Goering, Ogunsola, Karlsson, Lee,  
Wilson, Stolzberg, Walsh, Bischak, Tumeo, Vandre.

Old business:

1. Confirmation of chair. Nine members responded by e-mail that they would like Diane Bischak to continue as chair of the committee. She also voted in favor, so by majority vote she is confirmed as chair for the year 1996-1997.

2. Subcommittee assignments and charges. A list of subcommittee assignments was distributed by e-mail and at the meeting. Grievance Council members, hearing panel pool members, grade appeals pool members, and members of the subcommittee on exclusive reconsideration for tenure and promotion will be called on as necessary to serve in those capacities. A copy of the Grade Appeals Policy as amended by the Faculty Senate last year was distributed by e-mail to clarify the charge of the grade appeals pool.

The chair instructed the three other subcommittees on their duties in preparation for the committee's next meeting. Specifically, Oversight of Administrator Evaluations (chair: Ken Krieg) should interview the heads of last year's evaluation committees; Collective Bargaining Input (chair: Barbara Alexander) should begin

to examine the current procedures as given in Regents' Policy, University Regulations, and other policy documents for tenure, promotion, and nonretention of faculty, as well as the grievance procedure for faculty; Faculty Ethics (chair: Meriam Karlsson) should determine if a Faculty Senate ethics policy is necessary and, if so, draft one.

There was discussion on why a faculty ethics policy had been brought into consideration at this time, what should go into such a policy, and the relationship between any new policy and the aspects of faculty ethics that are currently mentioned in policy, such as plagiarism, consensual amorous relations with students, and disclosure of outside consulting activities.

3. Mark Tumeo reported on the activities of the 1995-1996 Promotion/Tenure Appeals Subcommittee (referred to above as the subcommittee on exclusive reconsideration for tenure and promotion). The subcommittee was asked to review three reconsideration requests for denial of tenure and promotion. The subcommittee voted 1-4 against one individual's request for reconsideration. The subcommittee voted unanimously in favor of reconsideration for two other individuals. Subsequently, the Chancellor reconsidered both cases, granting tenure in one case and denying it in the other.

4. A motion to clarify and modify the charge of the committee that had been postponed from the previous year's committee was moved, seconded, and approved. It will be brought forward to the next Administrative Committee meeting.

New business:

There was no new business. The meeting adjourned at 12:01 PM.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/13

UAF FACULTY SENATE #67

NOVEMBER 11, 1996

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT

Report for Faculty Senate Committees on Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement and Scholarly Activities

Minutes, October 28th 1996

First we discussed the concept of a Faculty Seminar. It was moved to propose to the Administrative Committee, adoption as a procedure to expand the obligations of faculty returning from sabbatical to encourage them very strongly to participate in the faculty seminar series. The motion was unanimous. The motion was made by Linda Curda, seconded by Tom Robinson to present this to the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee. Tentative wording of the motion: Current UAF procedures call for faculty returning from a sabbatical leave to submit a written report. The Faculty Development, Improvement, and Assessment Committee recommends that an oral report to the Faculty of the University, one in the series of Faculty Seminars sponsored jointly by the Faculty Senate and the Academic Unit in which the faculty member holds their appointment, be a new requirement of the returning sabbatical leave faculty member. (That is the motion.) The rationale: this fosters intellectual exchange within UAF academic community, reinforces the legitimacy of sabbatical leaves to reinvigorate faculty, and provides opportunities to share UAF's research and scholarly traditions and experiences

with the broader constituencies of UAF and the community statewide.

Next, we discussed at length the building of a Faculty Development policy, one of the major charges for our committee this year. Dean David Porter discussed one of the problems he sees in the utilization of existing data on faculty performance and student opinions of instructors, that it is not well used now even though the data is collected at the point of entry into the University system. Very few faculty and administrators are able to take full advantage of these systems now. It would behoove any faculty development initiative process to include this type of skills development to be able to use the existing data resources well. Porter pointed out that our University represents an investment over its life of nearly one billion dollars and that the level of performance, achievement, and public impact of this investment is enormous and quite undersold. We need to use the evaluation and assessment data that we have of our teaching and student experiences to its best advantage to make it clear to the public that this billion dollar investment is an extremely wise one which should be continued into perpetuity.

Another item that came up concerning faculty development is, the question of any past record of such policy within the Faculty Senate archives or within the Office of Faculty Development which had been an extant office during the 1980s at UAF. Does that office have a policy on faculty development issues? In building the actual point by point menu of faculty development issues, we need to include in a policy, the Chair submits the following as points for discussion only, not as any final foci of discussion:

1. sabbatical leaves;
2. professional meetings and presentations at those meeting;
3. teaching skills and pedagogical development;
4. technological skills development, distance delivery course development, and new electronic communications technology and skills;
5. professional growth, promotion, and tenure mentoring and team building concepts among faculty members and across disciplines; and
6. assessment issues concerning faculty development, documentation of teaching performance and faculty contributions.

Submitted by Chair, Rich Seifert, 29th October 1996

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/14  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
 NOVEMBER 11, 1996  
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Graduate School Advisory Committee Report - Peggy Shumaker, Chair

The Graduate School Advisory Committee met on Oct. 25, 1996, from 1-3, in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

1. We scheduled a meeting to review proposed changes to all graduate school fellowship and scholarship criteria and procedures. Notices have been sent to all deans and directors asking for faculty input. Responses have been gathered by the graduate school staff and forwarded to the chairs of the appropriate selection committees.

2. We discussed further the policies regarding interdisciplinary



Ph.D. candidates. At the next regular meeting, Dr. Kan will provide copies of all current policies. Of particular interest is establishing departmental review prior to admission for these students. We also wish to put into writing policies governing appointment of advisory committees. All proposed changes will be passed to the Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

3. Dr. Kan distributed a draft of new routing procedures for graduate admissions. Everyone agreed that the crucial issue now is making sure applications receive prompt and thorough attention, and that the process does not bog down.

4. GSAC received a memo from Dr. Phyllis Morrow in Anthropology regarding graduate students doing field work who are being required to pay back student loans. Dr. Kan came up with short-term solutions for the current situation, but we are looking for ways we can work with the loan agencies to take care of future cases. (This stems from our no longer having extended registration.)

5. We will discuss TA training campus-wide at our next meeting.

6. We will also begin a discussion of university-wide TOEFL requirements at the next meeting.

Our next regular meeting is scheduled for Nov. 15, from 1-3 in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 67/15  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #67  
 NOVEMBER 11, 1996  
 SUBMITTED BY CORE REVIEW

Report of CORE Review meeting 30 October 1996, Jin Brown, Chair

Agenda Item #1: Petitions to the CORE (31 petitions).  
 All 31 petitions to be passed on as marked (no changes).

Agenda Item #2: Petition procedure for students based on documented disabilities.  
 Motion for procedure for petitioning CORE courses based on student disabilities was passed as written. Send to Curricular Affairs.

Agenda Item #3: Letters to departments sharing CORE course responsibility (call for joint action).  
 Conferred with Committee on wording. Made changes on advisement. Don suggests that copies be put on E-mail to all Senators and copy forwarded to Provost for his Provost Council meeting.

Agenda Item #4: Updates on pilot assessment processes: English, Communication, Library Science.  
 Updated Committee on assessment process. Meeting attended by Rheba? from Library Science. Dennis Stephens is the new head, but was out of town.

Agenda Item #5: Response to motions sent to Curricular Affairs  
 Meeting was attended by Professor McBeath to explain why Curricular Affairs held up out motions from previous meeting.

Motion #1 was to require Engl. 111X and Comm 131X or 141X prior to

enrollment in "O" and "W" courses.

Professor McBeath said the CA Committee held up this motion based on the outdated understanding that space was limited in the lower courses and that students could not get access in a timely manner. He was informed by both myself, as member of Comm faculty, coordinator of the CORE courses in Comm., and advisor in the Advisement Center that his info was WAY old. That assessment was supported by Wanda Martin who was in attendance.

The Committee agreed that we would add the appropriate information (i.e., that both Communication and English serve over 100% of demand by the end of enrollment) and send the motion back to CA. Don suggested that we could send it immediately to Administrative Affairs. If he thinks that should be our course, the Committee concurs.

Motion #2 was to level the requirements for the CORE ethics and value courses from whatever departments they are offered.

Professor McBeath suggested that the course is a "capstone" course for the Perspectives on the Human Condition and should require lower level PHC coursework.

The Committee offered Professor McBeath a copy of the original CORE curriculum document in hopes he could refer us to such "capstone" intent. He could not. The Committee agreed to convene the Heads of the three departments and attempt a mutual resolution of pre-reqs for the course.