

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral
 312 Signers' Hall
 474-7964 FYSENAT

A G E N D A
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #75
 Monday, November 10, 1997
 1:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
 Wood Center Ballroom

1:30	I	Call to Order - John Craven	5 Min.
		A. Roll Call	
		B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #74	
		C. Adoption of Agenda	
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
		A. Motions Approved:	
		1. Motion to amend Section 1 (Article III: Membership) of the Bylaws.	
		2. Motion to amend Section 3 (Article V: Committees, Permanent) of the Bylaws.	
		3. Motion to accept the peer review units.	
		B. Motions Pending: none	
1:40	III	A. Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow	10 Min.
		B. Remarks by Provost J. Keating	5 Min.
		C. Research Presentation - J. Keating	30 Min.
2:25	IV	Governance Reports	
		A. ASUAF - S. Nuss	5 Min.
		B. Staff Council - P. Long	5 Min.
		C. President's Report - J. Craven (Attachment 75/1)	5 Min.
		D. President-Elect's Comments - M. Schatz (Attachment 75/2)	5 Min.
2:45	V	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:50		***BREAK***	15 Min
3:05	VI	Old Business	
		A. Motion to amend the Article VI of the Constitution, submitted by Administrative Committee (Attachment 75/3)	5 Min.
3:10	VII	New Business	5 Min.
3:15	VIII	Committee Reports	30 Min.
		A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath (Attachment 75/4)	
		B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - R. Gavlak (Attachment 75/5)	
		C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen (Attachment 75/6)	
		D. Core Review - J. Brown (Attachment 75/7)	
		E. Curriculum Review - J. French	
		F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber (Attachment 75/8)	
		G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - John Kelley (Attachment 75/9)	
		H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - D. Porter	

- I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - S. Henrichs
- J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal
(Attachment 75/10)
- K. Service Committee - K. Nance
- L. University-wide Promotion & Tenure - H. Sankaran
(Attachment 75/11)

- 3:45 IX Discussion Items 15 Min.
- A. Faculty Contribution to the Planning for Recovery
from RIP II: The Sequel to RIP I - J. Craven
- 4:00 X Members' Comments/Questions 5 Min.
- 4:05 XI Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 75/1
UAF FACULTY SENATE #75
NOVEMBER 10, 1997

Report by John Craven, Senate President

Welcome to the 75th meeting of UAF's Faculty Senate. It will be our pleasure at this meeting to hear from UAF Provost John Keating, our guest speaker, who will talk to us about research at UAF; what it is and how it distinguishes us from universities that do not have a strong research component.

The RSO Committee (Redesign of the System Office) chaired by Chancellor Wadlow has now presented its preliminary report to the BOR's Planning and Development Committee (on October 29th). The preliminary report is readily available electronically for anyone who has not already read it. The attachments to the report contain all public comments, some of which are rather candid. I was not able to attend that meeting, so I can't give you a first-person account, but many of us have read stories in the newspaper that suggest the committee is at work implementing revisions suggested by the planning committee. I look forward to Chancellor Wadlow's perspective on the report's reception and the committee's progress in preparing the final draft. The final report will get its second vetting on November 14th, in Anchorage. Meanwhile, public hearings on the report are scheduled for November 4th (6-8 PM) and November 7th (1-3 PM) at locations announced earlier by email.

You all received email copies of the Chancellor's executive summary of the Chancellor's Workshops. Among the 26 cost saving ideas given by members of our administration there are four that should quickly grab our attention: have faculty teach more; change how research units use state general fund money; replace full-time faculty with TAs and adjuncts; and eliminate faculty tenure. I wonder how those same individuals would react if a faculty workshop suggested the following equally well thought out suggestions: those paid on "administrative" accounts work more than 40 hours a week in the same percentages as do faculty; change how administrators use general fund money by being accountable to faculty; replace full-time administrators with part-time administrators and TAs; and eliminate administration 12-month contracts and paid annual leave. Want to bet how soon those would get implemented?

The ad hoc committee on union-governance issues has its required minimum number of members and Senator Ron Gatterdam is acting as convener for the initial meeting, at which I expect the

committee to elect a chair. The ex officio members from each of the two bargaining units are former Senator Ron Illingworth (ACCFT) and Senator John French (United Academics). The senate members are David Porter (chair of Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement), Ray Gavlak (chair of Faculty and Scholarly Affairs), and Senator Ron Gatterdam (Mathematics). The Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee has not yet made a decision.

Several units are now in need of midterm elections to refill a vacated senate seat and several alternates' positions. I have taken the list to the Provost's Council, so your deans should soon be addressing the issue at the college level.

One of my other governance duties is to chair the Faculty Alliance, comprising faculty leaders of UAA, UAF and UAS, and to report to the Board of Regents on work and thoughts of the Alliance. I thought you might like to read some of what I reported at the last meeting of the Faculty Alliance. It goes as follows:

"The president of the Board of Regents, Mr. Mike Kelly, was the guest speaker at last Monday's UAF Faculty Senate meeting. My objective was to provide an opportunity for senate members to hear from the top what is going on at the regents' level, so they could understand that it doesn't differ from what is being said on campus by Chancellor Wadlow and Provost Keating. I encourage you to invite BOR members to your governance meetings, if you are not already doing so. Communications is still the best antidote for rumors, and the deity must know there is a surplus available at the moment. What I want to do is take advantage of something Mike Kelly said during his remarks when discussing change. Note, however, that these are my thoughts as stimulate by his remarks. The essences was that change is nearly routine today in the business world in order to remain competitive, and I took him to imply that this too would be our life for some time to come. It is my position that the nearly continuous series of program reviews, program assessments, and the present series of activities, such as RIP-1, its sequel, RIP-2, "re-invention or re-engineering" of administration, etc. are, in themselves, becoming the creator of an environment within the University that is wholly contrary to the learning environment and is inflicting damage on both morale and the quality of our programs. I do not have a simple solution, but I find it imperative that everyone clearly understand that at some point this has to stop. At some point sanity has to return to the daily lives of all member of this institution or we will dissolve in a sea of meaningless committees, reports, words, actions, reactions, recovery from previous actions, and on and on and on. It truly might be better in the long run to just get the whole thing over with in one outrageous spasm and then pick up the pieces and carefully and methodically put together a new university.

The second point I must make as a faculty member concerns the counterproductive notion that universities are training grounds for future employees. I was not trained to be an employee. I went to a university to continue my education, not to become "educated." What a dead-end word; "educated." We are supposed to be teaching people to THINK for themselves so that they can more easily grasp the essence of the world around them and to more quickly make the connections between the seemingly disparate parts of our world and beyond. If I want to learn some specific and relatively narrow task, the training courses exist, here or somewhere. There is nothing wrong with that; its part of our mission. But our primary mission, the mission that makes us unique in this state, and unique like any institution of higher learning, is to teach people to really THINK for themselves. If we let the language of the business world become the daily fare of this University, then we are lost; we are cogs in a

training machine; we do not need tenure; we only need to stand in front of students, TV cameras, or microphones and point to widget A that is to be placed in gismo B. Connect the dots and be "trained." Some in the business world seem bent on dumping the expense of training for their particular needs and want us to do it. Hell no! We want people to leave here as more broadly intelligent, thinking people who also can pick up quickly the needs of employers, as you should expect. We have enough trouble with the sometimes disappointing results of K-12 and the lunacy of making it K-14. We need to be different. Students entering the University need to know that the rules are now different from home and high school, and that they are responsible for their own lives and they need to pay attention or hit the road. If they don't learn this in the four years they will be defenseless in the hard knocks of the business world."

ATTACHMENT 75/2
UAF FACULTY SENATE #75
NOVEMBER 10, 1997

President-Elect's Comments - Madeline Schatz

Last week the Faculty Alliance met in Anchorage, at President Komisar's invitation, with, President Komisar, Provost Keating, Roberta Morgan (filling in for the UAA provost), 'Nanne Myers, Pat Ivey and Patty Kastelic. All representatives of the Alliance from all three MAU's were in attendance and a very educational and prolific discussion ensued. Topics covered were 1) a general discussion of the state of the university from our point of view, 2) RIP-2 and long-term planning, 3) faculty development, and 4) strategic planning. John Craven presided over the meeting which lasted from 9:30 a.m. to approximately 3:30 p.m. The following is my report to you on the information I carried away from this encounter.

State of the University

Two of the three faculty members from UAS felt that the public had a positive perception of the UA system. They felt that the students were generally pleased but that the faculty members were concerned about the direction of the university. The program changes were seen by them as good, deep, systemic changes that needed to be done. The third representative from UAS, however, felt that the overall faculty and public perception of the university system was that we are in a downward spiral and that we needed to refocus our efforts to create an image of a vibrant and viable university.

UAA also believed that the public is slowly becoming aware of the positive role of the university system in their lives. They felt, however, that not enough was being done to bridge the gap between the really diverse interests and environments of the three MAU's. A suggestion was made to form a coalition to seek out the similarities between the campuses in order to avoid devastation of any one unit. It was stated that the effect of the budget cuts has been to demoralize the faculty and students. The focus on long range planning and the RIP must be emphasized.

Your UAF contingent (Craven, Schatz and Nance) spoke to the need for communication across all lines. It is imperative that everyone understands what is going on. We discussed with the administrators the inherent isolation in the university structure and asked for ways in which this segregation could be modified. They spoke of their belief in the collegial control of the university and the difficulty in

achieving that process. We seem to have a total lack of trust across the barriers brought about by rumor mongering and poor media understanding. President Komisar expressed his confidence in the quality of the university system stating that our relationship to the community is the most important aspect in retention and recruitment. It is clear that most members of the Alaskan community do not understand the structure of the UA system (including the governor!). Recent surveys have showed that there are three main moods held by the public in relation to higher education: 1) they believe that higher education is essential to the success of Alaskans, 2) they believe that the cost of higher education will rise even more, and 3) they do not expect their own income to rise in the near future.

RIP-2 and long term planning

Some faculty members pointed it out that the spirit of the RIP has changed. It was never, according to them, planned as solely a management tool but rather a cooperative program between the university and faculty. It is important, therefore, that management and faculty get together and plan the outcome. Most of the faculty members in attendance expressed a desire for involvement in the process of how decisions will be made on replacements for RIP positions. A request was made for some sort of a systemwide checklist, which would be across the board and fairly structured for all campuses. The faculty, we believe, should be involved in creating the criteria for this checklist. The mission of each MAU should be considered when preparing the list.

We were told that RIP administrative positions would not have to be filled and that RIP positions would definitely not be reallocated across MAU's.

In essence we were able to communicate our desire to be active in the decision-making process at the UA. We, as a faculty, MUST be involved in assessing the impact of the RIP on our programs.

Faculty Development

The initial steering committee for the creation of a Faculty Development program (distance delivery and teaching pedagogy) was finalized. Members from UAF are D. Thomas, K. Nance and M. Perkins. Three members from UAA and two members from UAS (at their request) were also announced.

There was a very long discussion on the pros and cons of the "virtual university" and the need for distance delivery to be controlled by system academic directors and faculty. The whole process needs to be analyzed and directed toward a meaningful experience with a definite end. A Board of Regents policy on distance delivery is expected in 1998.

Intellectual property rights were mentioned, but, as this is an item under negotiation at this time, no decisions were made.

Strategic Planning

We discussed the short-term and the long-range strategic planning issues. Short-term topics include the three committees formed by the President to look at the cost-saving possibilities of 1) centralization of administrative functions, 2) re-organization of extended campuses, and 3) the re-allocation of our present resources.

The long-range issue is to create a statement on what Alaska is

going to be in the future and what the UA's function is going to be in it. The "white paper" will address these issues and the issue of the unique demographics of the state of Alaska. With our lower college-going rate and our higher percentage of students attending college out of state we must find ways to better serve Alaskans.

Faculty and governance will be asked to come up with a strategic plan for our future in cooperation with community focus groups. It is obvious that if we are to survive we must have predictability in our financing. Perhaps focus groups could give us ideas in that area.

I left the retreat with the feeling that all of us were in agreement regarding the fact that the academic programs should be the central focus of our mission. We must communicate across administrative/faculty lines, across MAU's, and with the Legislature to get this point across. Our CONSTRUCTIVE response to the suggestions made in the "white paper" will be essential to the creation of a communicative process, which works for all of us.

ATTACHMENT 75/3
UAF FACULTY SENATE #75
NOVEMBER 10, 1997
SUBMITTED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

SECOND 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.

ATTACHMENT 75/4
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #75
 NOVEMBER 10, 1997
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF THE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING, OCTOBER
 28, 1997

The CAC met at 3:45 p.m. in Wood Center A. In attendance were all members of the committee except Ann Tremarello and Wanda Martin. The committee addressed the following five topics.

1. COURSE-LEVEL DEFINITIONS

The committee reviewed, for the second time, the "draft statements for catalogs based on BOR regulations and most comprehensive statements in UAA, UAF, and UAS catalogs." The committee recommended to the Senate the following response to the Alliance:

- a. Make the language of the statements less vague and general
- b. add a statement on credit compressibility
- c. make special/reserved numbers consistent across the three

MAUs

d. add, in the policy language, a statement expressing the need to have prerequisites for upper-division courses.

These recommendations were put in the form of a motion, which passed unanimously.

2. REVISIONS TO BOARD OF REGENTS' STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICIES

The committee accepted the report prepared by a subcommittee (composed of Ron Gatterdam and Sukumar Bandopadhyay), which had examined the draft BOR policy in detail and compared it to the UAF grade appeals policy. Discussion of committee members reflected the subcommittee's general observations that the BOR draft document was poorly written and organized (the section designation, particularly, was ill-crafted and incorrect), and that the tone of the draft document was anti-faculty and appeared contemptuous of the academic process.

The committee discussed the specific recommendations of the subcommittee; it accepted most and amended some. Members adopted unanimously the following committee resolution:

- a. [UAF] I, An introduction should be added to [BOR]. In particular, the paragraph asserting the unique authority of the instructor to assign a grade should be added.
- b. [BOR] B3b(3) should be replaced by [UAF] IIIA5. The only circumstance under which a department head (dean/director) can make a grade correction is if the instructor is unavailable and class records are available.
- c. In [BOR] B3c(2) CEO should be replaced by Dean.
- d. [BOR] B3c(2)(c) should be replaced by [UAF] IIIB4d.
- e. [BOR] B3c(4)(b) should be replaced by [UAF] IIIB5c 2).
- f. [UAF] IIIB5c.4) should be appended to [BOR] B3c(4).
- g. The final paragraph of [BOR] B3c(4) should be replaced by [UAF] IIIB5d). The action of the committee should be final and not subject to review.
- h. [BOR] B3c(6) does not provide due process for the instructor of the class. In particular, the meeting should be closed unless both the student and instructor request that it be open. Also, the instructor should be permitted an advisor.
- i. [BOR] B3c(7) should be revised as follows: "The committee

will deliberate in private and will forward its written findings, conclusions, and recommendations to the Dean within five (5) class days of the meeting. The committee is not authorized to award a grade. A copy of the committee's findings, conclusions, and recommendations must be sent to the student and instructor.

j. [BOR] B3c(8) should be eliminated and replaced with: "The recommendation of the committee is final."

k. In [BOR] B3d CEO should be replaced by Dean.

l. The BOR policy 09.01.00 should make specific reference to policy 09.01.00 (P09.01.09 in draft) and incorporate the section "Prohibitions on Reprisal and Retaliation."

3. ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR 1998-99

The committee reviewed the action of the governance coordinating committee, which has recommended that MLK day be made up by adding a Monday class day to the end of the semester, which would push final exams back one day. The concern of the committee was that this recommendation contravenes action the Senate took at its 20th meeting (September 17, 1990), specifying that there should be one day between the end of instruction and the start of the final exam period.

Student representative Steve Nuss (who chaired the governance coordinating committee) explained that for this particular year, a weekend would separate the close of instruction and start of exams. The committee engaged in general discussion, the gist of which was that the process we have undergone to find a "make up day" for the civil rights holiday is nonsensical. The committee decided to take no action on this issue.

4. PROPOSED EXPANSION OF THE AHEAD PROGRAM

John Craven presented additional information on the AHEAD program, and the suggestion that it become known as the "Middle College" option for high school students at UAF. Questions concerned who might be eligible for this program (HS juniors as well as seniors?), whether it would be available for students outside the Fairbanks school district, who would pay for it, and what the program components contained. The Senate will hear a presentation on AHEAD's expansion in December, and the committee deferred action until it received more details.

5. LISTING OF PREREQUISITES IN THE CATALOG

Sukumar questioned the listing of prerequisites in the catalog, specifically those departmental listings of "junior/senior standing AND permission of the instructor." In his view, this was an obstacle to entry for students registering in the summer, who could not locate an instructor. Some committee members thought this was a departmental issue and there might be more effective ways to address it than through committee or senate action. The committee awaits a need statement from the provost as to the impact of this issue.

The chair announced the next committee meeting for early December, probably December 2nd, unless pressing curricular business necessitates a meeting in November.

The committee adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Submitted by Jerry McBeath.

ATTACHMENT 75/5

UAF FACULTY SENATE #75
 NOVEMBER 10, 1997
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY & SCHOLARLY AFFAIRS

Minutes of Faculty and Scholarly Affairs committee meeting,
 10/22/97

Present: R. Boone, B. Cooper, K Criddle, R. Gavlak (chair), T. Johnson,
 B. Mortensen, B. White

The meeting was again devoted to discussion of a possible motion on tenure-track faculty working on degrees from UAF at the same time they are employed here. Draft language for a motion was discussed and revised, but a few of the issues discussed could not be resolved immediately. Remaining issues include: whether accumulating credit for courses should be allowed (and if so, who should approve it); how the policy should apply to faculty with non-Ph.D terminal degrees (such as the MBA or MFA); whether a policy is needed for anyone besides tenure-track faculty; how or whether to deal with faculty with joint appointments at two campuses of the UA system; and a few other details. More research and more discussion will follow.

Next meeting: 11/19/97, 4 PM.

Submitted by B. Cooper
 R. Gavlak, Chair

ATTACHMENT 75/6
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #75
 NOVEMBER 10, 1997
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Minutes of the Graduate and Professional Curricular Affairs
 Committee, Oct. 27, 1997

The GPCAC met from 1:00 to 3:00 pm in the Chancellor's Conference Room, Signer's Hall on Oct. 27, 1997. In attendance were: Michael Whalen, Jim Allen, Elena Conti, Mike Eichholz, Joe Kan, Dennis Stephens, John Craven, Gayle Gregory.

1. ELECTION OF COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Jim Allen was elected secretary of the committee.

2. TRAIL COURSE REQUESTS

ART 494/694, Northern Studies 694

Discussion ensued concerning the stacking of courses and the additional requirements for the graduate portion of staced courses. While several committee members felt that the simple requirement of an extra paper for graduate credit was inadequate they agreed that this meets the written requirements for a stacked course. The additional requirements, however, were not outlined under the ART 494/694 proposal and the committee's approval depends on the proper paper work being submitted.

Approved pending paper work changes concerning stacking or ART 494/694

MPR 694
 Approved

3. BOR STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICIES

John Craven provided some background information concerning the draft policies including a summary of the findings of the subcommittee of the Curricular Affairs Committee which reviewed the policies in detail. After discussion the committee voted to defer to the more detailed analysis of the above committee.

4. MS DEGREES GRANTED DURING PHD PROGRAMS

The committee spent considerable time discussing the merits of granting an MS to students pursuing the PhD. The consensus was that clarification of the current policy was necessary and that the proposed policy probably needs to be more specific concerning the use of MS degree materials toward the PhD. Given that the GSAC is also reviewing this topic in detail the committee voted to defer further discussion pending the GSAC's findings.

5. COURSE LEVEL DEFINITIONS

The committee considered only 500 and 600 level courses.

600-699: Graduate level courses.

The committee voted to accept the draft statement with minor corrections. The revised definition would read:

These courses are for post-baccalaureate study towards advanced degrees with the approval of the student's Graduate Study Committee. A few well qualified undergraduates may be admitted to graduate courses with appropriate approval in the department in which the course is being offered. With prior approval they may be used to meet graduation requirements for baccalaureate degrees but a student may not apply a course to both a baccalaureate and a graduate degree.

500-599: Professional Development Courses

The committee voted to accept the draft statement for 500 level course descriptions.

Michael Whalen, Chair

ATTACHMENT 75/7

UAF FACULTY SENATE #75

NOVEMBER 10, 1997

SUBMITTED BY CORE REVIEW

CORE Review Committee Minutes, Meeting 22 October, 1997

Members present: Jin Brown, Basil Coutant, Judy Shepherd, Tara Maginnis, Renee Manfredi, Dan White Ex Officio present: Gorden Hedahl, Dennis Stephens, Sue McHenry

Agenda Item 1: Committee voted all in favor of going forward with our "O" and "W" assessment plan. A letter to be sent from the Committee through Governance to departments, and to faculty through departments, who offer "O" or "W" courses stating the plan for outcomes assessment of the "O" and "W" aspects of the CORE Curriculum. A date is set for an open meeting for all concerned. (4 November, 1:00-2:00)

Agenda Item 2: A letter from the Committee to the Registrar was revised and is to be sent immediately asking that banner be set to

deny admission into an upper division "O" or "W" course to any students attempting to register without prerequisites All members voted for.

Agenda Item 3: CORE Curriculum Review will request Department Heads of departments presenting courses in the CORE Perspectives on the Human Condition (or their representatives) to attend the next meeting (5 November) to inform the Committee on plans for their outcomes assessment procedures.

Agenda Item 4: The Committee was given a revision of the Eastern New Mexico report form (for reporting outcomes assessment data). We will vote on November 5th on our own form (it was previously decided that we would use a revised version of the ENM form).

Agenda Item 5: The Committee voted all in favor to accept the adjudication decisions of the Chair on the 5 petitions before the committee this meeting. It was noted that the number of petitions to the CORE is considerably down from this point last year. It is hoped that the efforts of this Committee to "send signals" around the University that petitions must be submitted with adequate documentation is having an effect.

The Committee has asked the Chair to invite Dean Paul Reichardt to visit the Committee to discuss the Breadth/Depth requirement for CORE Natural Sciences. The Chair was asked, further, to review the pattern of the CORE decision-making process last year in regard to petitions to the Breadth/Depth requirement.

Jin Brown, Chair

ATTACHMENT 75/8
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #75
 NOVEMBER 10, 1997
 SUBMITTED BY DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES MEETING, October 28, 1997

In attendance: Charlotte Basham, Susan Blalock, Kay Brekke, Richard Clausen, Cindy Hardy, Ron Illingworth, Rose Kairaiuak, Wanda Martin, Joe Mason, Mark Oswood, Greg Owens, Ron Palcic, Jane Weber

The Developmental Studies committee discussed the following items:

Tracking DEV students' progress through academic and vocational classes. Wanda, Jane, Cindy, and Greg met October 2 to determine criteria to request information from the SIS system before it goes off line. They reported that they had received information from Ann Tremarello on students who had taken DEVM classes and all 100-level math classes and students who had taken DEVE and English 111. This data will not reflect the situation of those students at rural sites who take ABUS and TTCH classes instead of DEVE classes. Wanda will try to run ACT, SAT, and ASSET scores for the past six semesters, the semesters for which we have other data. Since SIS will go off line, correlation of data will have to be done by hand. This group will continue to meet and will report on its findings.

Outcomes Assessment. Jane and Ron received an email message

from Dana Thomas requesting that we discuss and make plans to implement an Outcomes Assessment for DEV classes. There was some discussion as to the nature of the assessment and the extent of assessment requested. The committee decided to appoint a subcommittee to determine what has been done at other locations both within UAF and at other colleges and universities, and to develop a method of assessment appropriate to DEV classes. A subcommittee of Wanda, Cindy, Ron, Jane, Greg, Joe, and Kay will meet November 5, at 3:30 PM in one of the Wood Center conference rooms. Dana Thomas will be invited to speak at our next meeting to answer questions about the Outcomes Assessment process.

Resolution on the continuance of the rural campuses. Though there was expression of support for this idea, it wasn't clear that a resolution of this sort is the role of this committee. It was decided to put this item on hold.

Renorming ASSET and COMPASS for placement of DEV students. This has been on hold since Marcele Skelton left TVC. Ron agreed to get data from the rural sites and from TVC so that we can begin work on this again.

Required placement of A.A. students into study skills classes. There was some discussion about the scope and nature of these classes. Mark asked whether this would be limited to A.A. students or would apply to all entering freshmen. Ron stated that applying it to A.A. students would be more workable, since they are advised through TVC. A subcommittee was appointed to look into this further, including looking at what is being done at other schools. The subcommittee members are Rose, Ron, and Mark.

Developmental Science class. There was brief discussion of this, but due to time constraints this discussion was postponed to a later meeting.

Tutorial support for former SSSP students through the Writing Center and Math Lab. Jane and Susan are working on this and will report at a later meeting.

The next meeting of the Developmental Studies Committee will be November 18, 12:45-1:45 in Wood Center Conference Room A.

Jane Weber, Co-Chair

ATTACHMENT 75/9

UAF FACULTY SENATE #75

NOVEMBER 10, 1997

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

Minutes, Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee meeting, October 28, 1997

Present: T. Cooney, F. Dyen, M. Karlsson, J. Kelley, J. Ruppert, F. Sorensen, R. Stolzberg, B. Wilson

Absent: G. Chukwu, G. Goering, (D. Verbyla contacted S. Layral regarding class conflict)

The committee met (third meeting) on Tuesday, October 28, 1977 in the Chancellor's conference room. The first order of business was the election of a chairperson. This task has been

deferred since the committee first met and Barbara Alexander announced her resignation as chairperson and member of the committee. John Kelley agreed to serve as a co-chair since he was inexperienced with the work of the committee. This task was resolved with John Kelley agreeing to serve as chairperson and the experienced members of the committee (Stolzberg and Karlsson) agreeing to serve as advisors. The chair of this committee is expected to participate in the UAF Faculty Senate Administrative Committee meetings.

Representation on the committee needs to be resolved. There are three vacant positions: CNRDM/SOM, CSEM and ACE. The latter is vacant due to the death of the faculty member. Fred Sorensen agreed to expedite a replacement. Dean P. Reichardt anticipates appointing a member for CSEM. The CNRDM/SOM position needs further clarification as to how or whether or not it will be filled.

No action is needed during this semester for selection of members on the Grievance Council. Dan Walsh will serve until April 1998 and Jonah Lee will serve until April 1999.

The committee agreed that all members will be candidates for selection for the Grievance Hearing Panel Pool.

The committee agreed that all members will be candidates for selection for Grade Appeals. It was unresolved how this selection will work. Stolzberg and Karlsson were previous to this meeting selected for a CSEM undergraduate grade appeal. J. Ruppert is involved in a grade appeal action and J. Kelley was requested by e-mail from Dean Hedahl (CLA) to serve on a grade appeals action. This committee needs to discuss an effective procedure to keep track of grade appeals.

Committee members asked if there was a report written (M. Tumeo?) last March regarding Academic Administrator Evaluation and Oversight.

The committee agreed to table the discussion on representation on the ad hoc Committee on Governance/Union Relations. It may be appropriate for this committee to address the question to the President of the Senate.

The committee agreed that the Faculty Ethics task be removed as a task item as it has been resolved through Faculty Senate action last year.

Committee members expressed concern that there will be enough members to carry on the business of the committee. All elected members are urged to commit to attending, state why the can't, or find a replacement.

The committee agreed that we should meet one more time this semester, possibly in early December. A Tuesday from 1 to 2 p.m. will be scheduled unless it conflicts with other member schedules.

John Kelley, Chair

ATTACHMENT 75/10
UAF FACULTY SENATE #75
NOVEMBER 10, 1997
SUBMITTED BY LEGISLATIVE & FISCAL AFFAIRS

Legislative & Fiscal Affairs Committee, Minutes, 20 October 1997

Convened by Dr. W. Scott Deal

Present: Dr. W. Scott Deal (Chair), Professor Daniel Cole-McCullough (Secretary), Dr. Fredric Husby, Representative Tom Brice

Absent: Dr. Eduard Zilberkant, Rovanna Martin, Wendy Redman

Discussion with introductions. Representative Brice expressed his support for the University as a whole and presented an overview of the operations of the Legislature. He suggested four areas in the budget process to be aware of. All of which have impact on the University of Alaska System.

Dr. Deal and Professor Cole-McCullough presented Representative Brice with more than 350 signatures of voting citizens demanding the reinstatement of a reasonable budget for the University. Representative Brice was impressed and suggested that more signatures be received by the public and sent with the letter constructed by Dr. Deal to the Governor. He felt that the University had taken more cuts than it could afford and restated his support for the University System.

Dr. Husby and Representative Brice dialoged about agricultural concerns and the impact on farmers by the University. They both gave suggestions for gaining support for pressure on the legislators that continue to support budget cuts and ways of informing/educating those legislators to the destruction they are causing.

Submitted by Professor Daniel Cole-McCullough, Secretary

ATTACHMENT 75/11
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #75
 NOVEMBER 10, 1997
 SUBMITTED BY UNIVERSITY-WIDE PROMOTION & TENURE

Minutes, Promotion and Tenure Committee Meetings

October 10, 1997

Participants present: Harikumar Sankaran (chair), V. Kamath, Meriam Karlsson, Sheryl Stanek, Arvid Welfen, Perry Gilmore, Marvin Falk, Erich Follmann, John Gimbel, and Kes Woodward.

Participants absent: Deben Das and Brian Paust.

Guest: Ron Illingworth

Issue 1 : Consideration of distance education criteria in promotion and tenure review.

The university-wide committee unanimously encourages individual departments to design their own criteria to evaluate work done towards developing distance education. For example, peer review of teaching is a method the department can use. The UAF regulation on faculty appointment and evaluation policies (page 3) indicates that the periodic evaluation of faculty includes distance delivery based courses as part of teaching evaluation. The committee felt that it would be appropriate to develop such criteria at the department

level.

Issue 2: Define the promotion and tenure process for faculty under ACCFT.

The following processes refer to the sequence of evaluative steps taken during the evaluation of a faculty's file.

Past process: Faculty
Director
UAA Promotion and
Tenure Committee augmented by UAF
UAF Chancellor.

Proposed process: Faculty
Director
Unit-peer review
Dean
UAF Promotion and Tenure Committee
UAF Chancellor

a) The proposed process was a consensus view of the committee. Ron Illingworth was concerned that the majority of the members in the university-wide committee does not have a work-load agreement that is similar to the faculty coming up from CRA. In response, the committee recommended that CRA set up a unit-peer evaluation step. b) Unlike the past, the Dean of CRA will perform an evaluative role as all the files are from UAF. c) The UAF Promotion and Tenure Committee, with no change in membership, will evaluate the files. d) The files would go to the Chancellor's office next. The Chancellor decides to obtain input from the Provost, if needed.

Ron Illingworth wanted to discuss the proposal with the ACCFT board. No vote was taken at this time. A meeting was scheduled for October 24, 1997.

Promotion and Tenure Committee Meeting, October 24, 1997

Participants present: Erich Follmann, John Gimbel, Harikumar Sankaran, Gang Chen, Meriam Karlsson, Sheryl Stanek, Arvid Welfen, Deben Das and Kes Woodward.

Participants absent: Perry Gilmore and Brian Paust.

Guest: Ron Illingworth

Proposed process: Faculty
Director
Unit-peer review
Dean
UAF Promotion and Tenure Committee
Provost
UAF Chancellor

Ron Illingworth accepted the proposal with some concerns: a) In case there is a disagreement at the unit level, Ron wanted the flexibility to allow a faculty from CRA with a similar work-load to represent the candidate at the University-wide committee. The committee pointed out that the chair of the unit peer review committee can designate an appropriate person to present the candidate's file to the University-wide committee. b) Page 19 of the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies contains the Appendix that details the role of the Provost in the evaluative process. Based on what is written, the committee felt that it is not

clear whether the candidate has the opportunity to respond to the Provost's comments. Hence, we used the guidelines for Promotion and Tenure sent out by the Provost on September 5, 1997 to all candidates as the steps to be taken between the University-wide level and the Chancellor. Hence, the files would be forwarded to the Provost and the candidate will be allowed to respond to the Provost's comments.

The committee felt that the regulation in the "blue book" must clarify whether or not the file is forwarded to the Provost after the University-wide committee has made its recommendations. In its present form it is not clear.

All participants unanimously voted in favor of the proposal with the conditions in (a) and (b).

Ron had the following notes to the above process. They were discussed and approved by consensus (without a vote). i) Faculty appointment and evaluation is made on the basis of workload, ie., tripartite academic, bipartite academic, or bipartite vocational. ii) Candidates shall have an opportunity to review the recommendations made at each level and may submit comments regarding negative recommendations. The committee pointed out that the candidate can respond even if he or she has received positive recommendations. iii) Candidates may add information, such as acceptance of a manuscript or grant proposal, at any time during the review process. iv) After the Chancellor's decision, any disagreement will be handled under Article 4 --Grievance Procedure.