

## FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral  
 312 Signers' Hall  
 474-7964 fysenat@uaf.edu

For Audioconferencing: Bridge #: 1-800-910-9710  
 Anchorage: 561-9710

A G E N D A  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #76  
 Monday, December 8, 1997  
 1:30 - 3:55 p.m.  
 Wood Center Ballroom

1:30	I	Call to Order - John Craven	5 Min.
		A. Roll Call	
		B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #75 (November 10, 1997)	
		C. Adoption of Agenda	
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
		A. Motions Approved: Amend Article VI of the Constitution	
		B. Motions Pending: none	
1:40	III	A. Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow	10 Min.
		B. Remarks by Provost J. Keating	5 Min.
		C. Guest Speaker - Senator Gary Wilken	15 Min.
2:10	IV	Governance Reports	
		A. ASUAF - S. Nuss	5 Min.
		B. Staff Council - P. Long	5 Min.
		C. President's Report - J. Craven (Attachment 76/1)	10 Min.
		D. President-Elect's Comments - M. Schatz (Attachment 76/2)	10 Min.
2:40	V	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:45		***BREAK***	10 Min.
2:55	VI	New Business	
		A. Motion to approve the Certificate in Microcomputer Support Specialist, submitted by Curriculum Review (Attachment 76/3)	5 Min.
		B. Motion to Approve the AAS in Microcomputer Support Specialist, submitted by Curriculum Review (Attachment 76/4)	5 Min.
		C. Motion on Unit Level Criteria for Development of Distance Education (Attachment 76/5)	5 Min.
		D. Resolution on RIP (Attachment 76/6)	5 Min.
		E. Motion to approve policy concerning UAF faculty and advanced degrees, submitted by Faculty and Scholarly Affairs (Attachment 76/7)	5 Min.
		F. Motion on recommended changes to the draft Board of Regents' Student Affairs Policies and Regulations, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 76/8)	5 Min.
		G. Letter to the Governor, submitted by Legislative and Fiscal Affairs (Handout)	5 Min.

3:30	VII	Committee Reports	15 Min.
	A.	Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath (Attachment 76/9)	
	B.	Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - R. Gavlak	
	C.	Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen (Attachment 76/10)	
	D.	Core Review - J. Brown	
	E.	Curriculum Review - J. French (Attachment 76/11)	
	F.	Developmental Studies - J. Weber (Attachment 76/12)	
	G.	Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley	
	H.	Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - D. Porter	
	I.	Graduate School Advisory Committee - S. Henrichs	
	J.	Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal (Attachment 76/13)	
	K.	Service Committee - K. Nance	
3:45	VIII	Discussion Items	5 Min.
3:50	IX	Members' Comments/Questions	5 Min.
3:55	X	Adjournment	

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/1  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
 DECEMBER 8, 1997

Report by John Craven, Senate President

Welcome to the 76th meeting of UAF's Faculty Senate. It will be our pleasure at this meeting to hear from Senator Gary Wilken, who is beginning his second year in the Alaska Legislature. We also have a full agenda of work, so come prepared with questions for Senator Wilken and our committees submitting motions. Please read them in advance of the meeting.

The Board of Regents held its regular November meeting several weeks ago (November 20-21). The main ingredients of the meeting comprised about seven hours of executive sessions (public not allowed), four hours of public comments, a long hour for the governor and lt. governor to meet in public with the Board, a half hour for the Anchorage mayor to meet in public with the Board, a full morning of productive committee work, a few "5 minute" breaks, and, if you are keeping track, there were a few hours left over for formal consideration of issues by the full board before its scheduled 5:00 p.m. Friday meeting with the State Board of Education. You all received email copies of the "Summary of Actions," so you know what the end results were for all motions. What you did not read was what happened when it considered President Komisar's recommendations on how to proceed with redesign of the system office. These are the recommendations that were distilled from the work of Chancellor Wadlow's committee. The members of the Board were well acquainted with the material, but, after rejecting a series of proposed amendments by Regent Henri, the response to a motion by Regent Ogg (that made sweeping alterations) was to table the entire package until the February meeting! The vote to table was 5 to 4, which is a measure of the Boards lack of cohesiveness. Not long after this, it occurred to the Board that President Komisar was not going to have any instructions for beginning the cost reductions until well into the legislative session. In response, they promptly untabled the main motion, forgot the amendment in doing so, and

passed it. For completeness, the motion as passed reads as follows:

"The Board of Regents receives President Komisar's recommendations regarding the Redesign of the University of Alaska Administrative System and the Creation of Administrative Service Centers: expresses its tremendous thanks to President Komisar for appointing the committee and for the work of Dr. Wadlow, specifically, and her committee for their very fine effort; and directs President Komisar to re-engineer functions and organize the administrative system according to the following seven points:

1. maintain a strong presidency with the ability to concentrate on policy issues but responsible to the Board of Regents for both the executive and service functions;
2. endorse the concept of a President's Council;
3. clearly distinguish between executive and service functions;
4. maintain a university-wide system that avoids unnecessary duplication to the maximum extent possible;
5. assure that re-engineering of functions and organization results in new reductions of executive/administrative costs of at least \$2 million per year for a total of \$10 million over the next four years beginning with FY99;
6. keep operational authority closest to customers; and
7. assure that this be done in a form in which actual savings can be projected and reported."

If I read this correctly, President Komisar can now begin to re-engineer the operations as he desires, subject only to these very general guiding principles. I don't wish to put Chancellor Wadlow on the spot without asking her in advance, but I hope we can gain from her some insight into what may now actually occur.

As my last item concerning the Board of Regents' meeting, you may have read that the meeting with the State Board of Education did not take place, as "they" ran out of time. If you delve more closely you will find that an apparent breakdown occurred in communications and each side thought the other had gone home. From my perspective, the Regents were late in finishing their work, as described above, and did not adjourn until after they were due elsewhere in Anchorage to meet with the State Board of Education. Given the delicate situation with regard to our School of Education, this was no time to be making such huge mistakes in communication. I still have no idea what really happened, but the message was clear at the Regents' meeting; the other side had gone home, rightly or, as it now seems, wrongly.

And finally, I want to say what has been on my mind even before the Regents' meeting. It was stimulated by Dean Carla Kirts article in the 7 November 1997 issue of the Cornerstone. In this article, Dean Kirts appears to have accepted the notion that students are consumers, for she says "...is it really worth arguing about?" That notion may be useful at Student Services, but I hope it does not permeate the rest of the campus. Personally, I find the notion abhorrent that an educational institution is delivering a product, education. Let me explain my view. First, the consumer, the state to which we can be personally reduced by modern advertising-driven capitalism, is a human-powered machine that labors to buy those things that are needed and, more importantly, those numerous commodities that are not needed. The simple fact is that most of us are participating, whether we acknowledge it or not.

Now to education, or, more correctly, the continuation of our never-ending attempt to decrease ignorance of the world and people around us. By this I do not mean to imply personal ignorance on our parts, but to emphasize that no matter how hard we try, there is so very much of which we will have no -- not little, but no -- awareness,

try as we will. Education is highly personal. Our improvements are centered around personal initiatives and intellectual achievements; they are not purchased at the grocery store or Student Services. The achievements are gained by hard personal work, mental and physical, in the classroom, within study groups, in the late nights of reading and writing, in our numerous out-of-class experiences, in our homes through distance education courses, in our personal everyday readings and conversations, in our contributions to the community, and in so many more ways. They are gained because of personal effort, only heighten and focused by the persons sometimes honored to be standing in the front of the classrooms. They are everywhere. They are not purchased. They cost money, of course; books, room, and board are limited examples. Free lunches are not prominent in American education. In the end, if I had to have a model, I would start with subsistence rather than consumption.

Business people like to say that "the customer is always right". It isn't true and they know it. They can even hate it, though they patronize the customer anyway for fear of losing business. If students are consumers, and they expect to always be right in an intellectually honest classroom, then something has to give, and if it is the professor in that class, then Dean Kirts is right, I am wrong, and it is time for me to go to work in industry, for universities are dead and mediocrity will rule. The classroom, physical, virtual, or otherwise, is not a place of compromise. It is a place of questioning, doubting, searching and, with a little care, a place of learning from the experience of our forebears and even our elders. It is the beginning of wisdom, matured with time and experience throughout life, long after the consumer product has been trashed or maybe recycled.

No, the student is not a consumer, not in my world, and not in the world of many of my peers in this and other universities. It is a fraudulent concept in education that probably makes sense within the world of an administrator if it provides a simple model with which to view the organization and to address certain questions that need answers. It may help in the day-to-day grind on administrative tasks of which most of us are so totally ignorant, some happily so, but it should never be confused with what happens on the academic side of the house. Many in university administration have academic backgrounds, and some may even agree with me. The hard part is to keep both the administrative and the academic views in clear perspective, especially in the words used to describe what goes on within institutions of higher education.

Yes, Dean Kirts, it is worth arguing about, for it is an issue at the heart of a university. Nothing less. I am happy to report that my comments about "students as consumers" made during a recent KUAC interview have stimulated many to call and thank me; there are others out there that think as I do, and, I think, as do many of you. Let's end this pestilence of "students as consumers" within our university.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/2  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997

Report by Madeline Schatz, President-Elect

I'm not exactly sure how the end of the semester has crept up on us so quickly, but it is definitely here. I hope that all of you have a peaceful and restful semester break and that you come back refreshed.

Business has definitely picked up for the Faculty Senate. There are several issues to be discussed at this meeting which demand serious input from all members. Please read all attachments to this agenda very carefully. We are in a position to have important input into issues which affect us strongly. If you cannot make the meeting, PLEASE send your alternate. It seems to me that attendance at our meetings drops in direct proportion to the fewer number of days until our holiday break.

I wish you all a joyous holiday season. If you're free on Sunday afternoon, December 14, come by the Charles Davis Concert Hall and Great Hall for the annual Fairbanks Symphony auction and Holiday concert. The auction starts at 2:00 p.m. and the concert starts at 4:00 p.m. This is always a great party for all who come. Hope to see you there!

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/3

UAF FACULTY SENATE #76

DECEMBER 8, 1997

SUBMITTED BY CURRICULUM REVIEW

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Certificate program in Microcomputer Support Specialist.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents<sup>1</sup> Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal #28 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers<sup>1</sup> Hall.

\*\*\*\*\*

Executive Summary

Certificate, Microcomputer Support Specialist

33 credits

As computers become indispensable in our daily lives, agencies and businesses are discovering that providing ongoing support for computer users is an absolute necessity. The critical need for well-trained professionals with the requisite technical computer knowledge and people support skills is becoming every more apparent. Thus, the objective of this Certificate program is to provide the essential elements of both technical knowledge and interpersonal skills for a new cadre of microcomputer support specialists who can fill permanent staff positions, like the new State of Alaska Microcomputer/Network Technician I and II, or develop private microcomputer support enterprises throughout Alaska.

As one of the programs approved last year for funding through the President's Reallocation Fund, this program meets the criteria for being collaborative statewide, focused on vocational/technical training, and utilizing alternative modes of delivery. The group of faculty and staff who compose the committee making this project proposal come from all three MAUs. Microcomputer support represents an area of vocational/technical expertise that is increasingly desired and needed within the state but which is not currently satisfied by any University of Alaska program. And, there is a direct relationship between the requirements of the courses and

the expected skills and knowledge the student will need on the job; the program will be competency based, individualized, and available at a distance through a variety of delivery modes.

The program staff developed a questionnaire regarding microcomputer classes that was sent to 1247 people in state government, educational institutions, libraries, military bases, private corporations and businesses including Native corporations: 257 responses were received for a response rate of 21%. About 78% of the respondents indicated there was a need for a program leading to a certificate as a microcomputer support specialist, and 84% said it would be helpful to have a person trained in this area working for their organization; 58% said, if they were in a position to hire staff, they would seek to hire someone with such a certificate. Finally 56% said they themselves would be interested in obtaining a microcomputer specialist certificate.

A great number of students have already inquired about this program, having heard by word of mouth, apparently, of its imminent availability. Extended campus directors, faculty in this area, and others have told us that many potential students are waiting to enroll. Therefore, it is anticipated that a sufficient number of students will enroll in the program. In fact, the opposite problem of having too many students too quickly may materialize.

Because of the nature of this program, there will be a need to examine some academic policies:

1. Faculty workload: it will be necessary to find a way to equate a person's involvement with some number of students in this type of program to the normal credit-hours-taught basis of workload determination.
2. Residence credit: students in this program may take all their courses through a number of different sources including various units of the UA system; in order for a UAF certificate or degree program to be offered on a statewide basis, policies must be adjusted to accept credits earned at any UA campus or previously approved by a UA mentor as resident credit.
3. Credit for prior learning: this program is designed to fit the needs of a wide variety of students with a tremendous diversity of backgrounds; some will be able to demonstrate their competencies in particular subject areas through diagnostic instruments; in quite a few situations, though, credit for prior learning would be more appropriate and could surpass the 25% limit. Consequently, for this program to work as intended, this policy needs to be made more flexible.

Students will be required, at minimum, to complete a 9 credit core to earn the Certificate. If they have prior experience and/or can demonstrate their competencies in the required subject area, all the remaining credits may be waived; however, many will need to take all 33 credits of course work. Courses are being redesigned for distance delivery during the Fall 1997 and Spring 1998 semesters; and equivalencies across all three MAUs have been determined. The Certificate will not be available for matriculation until all approvals have been achieved hopefully by the Fall 1998 semester.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/4  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997  
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULUM REVIEW

MOTION  
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the A.A.S. in  
 Microcomputer Support Specialist.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal #29 on file in the  
 Governance Office, 312 Signers<sup>1</sup> Hall.

\*\*\*\*\*

Executive Summary  
 A.A.S., Microcomputer Support Specialist  
 60 credits

As computers become indispensable in our daily lives, agencies and businesses are discovering that providing ongoing support for computer users is an absolute necessity. The critical need for well-trained professionals with the requisite technical computer knowledge and people support skills is becoming every more apparent. Thus, the objective of this A.A.S. program is to build on the Certificate for Microcomputer Support Specialist and provide additional skill development in the major area as well as associate level general education requirements. For some, this may become a stepping stone to more advanced work in computer science at the baccalaureate level.

As one of the programs approved last year for funding through the President's Reallocation Fund, this program meets the criteria for being collaborative statewide, focused on vocational/technical training, and utilizing alternative modes of delivery. The group of faculty and staff who compose the committee making this project proposal come from all three MAUs. Microcomputer support represents an area of vocational/technical expertise that is increasingly desired and needed within the state but which is not currently satisfied by any University of Alaska program. And, there is a direct relationship between the requirements of the courses and the expected skills and knowledge the student will need on the job; the program will be competency based, individualized, and available at a distance through a variety of delivery modes.

The program staff developed a questionnaire regarding microcomputer classes that was sent to 1247 people in state government, educational institutions, libraries, military bases, private corporations and businesses including Native corporations: 257 responses were received for a response rate of 21%. About 78% of the respondents indicated there was a need for a program leading to a certificate as a microcomputer support specialist, and 84% said it would be helpful to have a person trained in this area working for their organization; 58% said, if they were in a position to hire staff, they would seek to hire someone with such a certificate. Finally 56% said they themselves would be interested in obtaining a microcomputer specialist certificate.

A great number of students have already inquired about this program, having heard by word of mouth, apparently, of its imminent availability. Extended campus directors, faculty in this area, and others have told us that many potential students are waiting to enroll. Therefore, it is anticipated that a sufficient number of students will enroll in the program. In fact, the opposite problem of

having too many students too quickly may materialize.

Because of the nature of this program, there will be a need to examine some academic policies:

1. Faculty workload: it will be necessary to find a way to equate a person's involvement with x number of students in this type of program to the normal credit-hours-taught basis of workload determination.
2. Residence credit: students in this program may take all their courses through a number of different sources including various units of the UA system; in order for a UAF certificate or degree program to be offered on a statewide basis, policies must be adjusted to accept credits earned at any UA campus or previously approved by a UA mentor as resident credit.
3. Credit for prior learning: this program is designed to fit the needs of a wide variety of students with a tremendous diversity of backgrounds; some will be able to demonstrate their competencies in particular subject areas through diagnostic instruments; in quite a few situations, though, credit for prior learning would be more appropriate and could surpass the 25% limit. Consequently, for this program to work as intended, this policy needs to be made more flexible.

The A.A.S. will require general education and computer courses beyond the Certificate to total 60 credits. Courses are currently being redesigned for distance delivery during the Fall 1997 and Spring 1998 semesters; and equivalencies across all three MAUs have been determined. The A.A.S. degree will not be available for matriculation until all approvals have been achieved hopefully by the Fall 1998 semester.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/5  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
 DECEMBER 8, 1997  
 SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

MOTION  
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate encourages individual departments to design their own criteria where appropriate to evaluate the work done towards developing distance education, including the creation of materials for such instruction.

EFFECTIVE:                   Immediately

RATIONALE:           The University of Alaska Fairbanks Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty, Section III.C.1f (Effectiveness in Teaching) specifically states that "Effective teachers . . . regularly develop new courses, workshops and seminars and use a variety of methods of instructional delivery and instructional design." This implicitly states that periodic evaluation of faculty includes distance delivery-based courses as part of teaching evaluation. It is appropriate to develop such criteria at the department level.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/6



UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997  
SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION  
=====

WHEREAS, The University of Alaska Faculty Senate has discussed in depth the consequences of the 1996-97 academic year Retirement Incentive Program; and

WHEREAS, Positions vacated in that RIP were not refilled on a one-to-one basis by the administration; and

WHEREAS, The loss of faculty members to retirement in certain departments caused undue hardship to certain academic programs; and

WHEREAS, College deans were given the power to decide in which way faculty members in their units would have input into the decisions as to which positions were more important to departments than others; and

WHEREAS, Recommendations from the dean's level in colleges were not always followed in replacing faculty positions once these recommendations reached the Provost and Chancellor levels; and

WHEREAS, The RIP program unduly impacts departments with a majority of senior faculty; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That faculty members be selected from each of the departments affected by faculty who have exercised the RIP option, serve as an advisory board to the dean at the college review level and Provost and Chancellor in making final decisions regarding RIP replacements.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/7  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997  
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY AND SCHOLARLY AFFAIRS

MOTION  
=====

No tenure-track faculty member of the University of Alaska Fairbanks may receive a graduate degree from the University of Alaska Fairbanks.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Chancellor's Approval

RATIONALE: A possible conflict of interest is inherent in this situation. Since degrees are granted by the faculty, it appears unethical for the faculty to grant degrees to themselves. This motion is to ensure equity and eliminate the possibility or appearance of bias.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/8  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997  
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION  
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate has reviewed the draft Board of Regents' Policy and Regulations 09.01.00, 09.03.00, 09.04.00, and 09.05.00, at the request of the Faculty Alliance, and recommends that Regulation 09.03.00 rejected as written and makes no suggestions with regard to the other draft regulations and policies.

EFFECTIVE:       Immediately

RATIONALE:       The basis for the draft language submitted to the Board of Regents was the existing and functioning UAF rules, which were specifically designed to guarantee completion of the procedure in ONE semester with only one meeting of a review committee, and to keep it as simple as possible. The draft procedures do not guarantee completion in one semester, provide for as many as three review committee meetings, and turn it into a student-unfriendly procedure that will dissuade many from seeking corrections of what may have truly been arbitrary and capricious grading. The present UAF rules were written in response to a request by the Provost (UAF Chief Academic Officer) to get this issue out of his office. The draft reverses this by replacing the dean with the "Chief Academic Officer", hence putting it back in his office and the other MAUs' chief academic officers; it is regressive. The draft review does not protect faculty rights to due process. The draft rules violate the fundamental axiom of academe that degrees are awarded by faculty in that it violates the corollary that only faculty award grades that count toward degrees. Based on experience by several faculty members, having two students on the committee rather than another faculty member is probably detrimental to the student's chance of a successful appeal. There are basic structural problems with the draft. For example, in Section B, "Resolution of Disputes Regarding Academic Decisions or Actions", the first sentence is general, and states that section is not limited to assignment of final course grades. The second sentence limits this entire section to assignment of the final grade. It can't be both and the material that follows is designed to address the question of final grades, but with confusing language related to the other issues. There are other serious structural problems.

The UAF Faculty Senate's Curricular Affairs Committee has spent many hours on this review and has concluded there are too many issues involved for a simple markup of the draft. The UAF Faculty Senate offers to meet with the drafting committee to make clear the areas of concern and to aid in the creation of regulations that will truly aid as opposed to hinder students.

\*\*\*\*\*

MOTION  
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate has reviewed the draft Board of Regents Policies and Regulations 09.01.00, 09.03.00, 09.04.00, and 09.05.00 at the request of the Faculty Alliance and moves to recommend the

following changes to the draft Board of Regents Policy and Regulations 09.03.01.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: In response to the Board of Regents' request for examination and updating of Regents' Policy and University Regulation, a policy revision work group has prepared draft language and submitted it to governance bodies. The Curriculum Affairs Committee examined the draft at two meetings and focused on changes to Chapter III (Student Dispute Resolution). The committee believes the draft pays insufficient attention to the fact that assignment of grades is a faculty responsibility; and that instructors have procedural rights that are invoked when they are charged with unfairness. The committee recommends changes to the draft, which are largely in accord with the UAF Grade Appeals Policy.

\*\*\*\*\*

[[ ]] = Deletions  
CAPS = Additions

Part IX  
Student Affairs  
Chapter III  
Student Dispute Resolution

General Statement: Student Dispute Resolution R09.03.01

[Reserved]

General Procedures for Dispute Resolution R09.03.02

#### INTRODUCTION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA IS COMMITTED TO THE IDEAL OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND SO RECOGNIZES THAT THE ASSIGNMENT OF GRADES IS A FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY. THEREFORE, THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION SHALL NOT INFLUENCE OR AFFECT AN ASSIGNED GRADE OR THE REVIEW OF AN ASSIGNED GRADE.

#### A. Resolution of Disputes Regarding Student Employment Decisions or Actions

Issues related to student employment will be reviewed in accordance with the grievance procedure specified in Regents' Policy and University Regulation on human resources, except where specifically modified by Regents' Policy and University Regulation on employment of students.

#### B. Resolution of Disputes Regarding Academic Decisions or Actions

Examples of academic actions or decisions subject to this regulation include, but are not limited to: assignment of final course grades, denial of admission to an academic program, and academic dismissal. Only the final grade received in a course is subject to review under this section.

#### 1. Definitions Applicable to Academic Disputes

a. Academic Leader

The term "academic leader" is used to denote the administrative head of the academic unit offering the course or program from which the academic decision or action arose. The term is adopted to refer to the person with immediate administrative authority for the program, generally but not always, at a level below that of dean or director.

b. Academic Unit

The term "academic unit" generally refers to a department or other group with responsibility for academic decisions within a school, college, institute, or center. The term may refer to a school, college, institute or center in instances when a smaller unit is either of insufficient size for a given purpose or non-existent.

c. Arbitrary and Capricious Grading

Arbitrary and capricious grading means the assignment of a final course grade on a basis other than performance in the course; the use of standards different from those applied to other students in the same course; or substantial, unreasonable and/or unannounced departure from the course instructor's previously articulated standards or criteria. (See also "grading error.")

d. Chief Academic Officer

The chief academic officer is the individual responsible for the administration of the academic program of the MAU.

e. Class Day

As used in the schedule for review of academic decisions, a class day is any day of scheduled instruction, excluding Saturday and Sunday, included on the academic calendar in effect at the time of a review. Final examination periods are counted as class days.

f. Dean/Director

The dean/director is the administrative head of the college or school offering the course or program from which the academic decision or action arises. For students at extended campuses the director of the campus may substitute for the dean/director of the unit offering the course or program.

g. Final Grade

The final grade is the letter grade assigned for a course upon its completion. A grade of I (Incomplete) is considered a temporary grade up to one year following assignment, during which time it is not subject to review. After standing for one year an Incomplete grade may be challenged by the student.

h. Grading Error

A grading error is a mathematical miscalculation of a final grade or an inaccurate recording of the final grade. (See also "arbitrary and capricious grading").

i. Next Regular Semester

The next regular semester is the fall or spring semester following that in which the disputed academic decision was made. For example, it would be the fall semester for a final grade issued for a course completed during the previous spring semester or summer session. The spring semester is the next regular semester for an academic decision made during the previous fall semester.

j. Review Committee

A review committee is an ad hoc committee appointed by the [[chief academic officer]] DEAN or designee to formally review a contested academic decision or action.

3. Procedure for Resolving Disputes Regarding Academic Decisions or Actions

a. Informal Resolution Procedures

Before taking formal steps to challenge an academic decision or action, a student must attempt informal resolution of the issue by notifying the appropriate faculty member(s) prior to the twentieth (20th) class day of the next regular semester. If the appropriate faculty member(s) is no longer an employee of the university or is otherwise unavailable, the student must bring the matter to the attention of the academic leader who will attempt to contact the faculty member(s).

A response to a request for informal resolution must be made within five (5) class days of notification of the appropriate faculty member(s). If a final grade change is required, the instructor must initiate within five (5) class days the process provided in MAU rules and procedures to change a final grade.

If the response to informal efforts at resolution is unsatisfactory, the student may initiate a formal review.

b. Formal Review Procedures for Disputes Regarding Grading Errors in Assignment of Final Grade

(1) A student initiating a formal review of an alleged grading error must provide the course instructor with a signed, written request for formal review of the final grade, with a copy to the academic leader and the dean/director. The request must be filed prior to the thirtieth (30th) class day of the next regular

semester.

(2) [[If the course instructor cannot be contacted promptly, the academic leader will undertake the review and so notify the student in writing.]]

IF THE INSTRUCTOR IS NO LONGER AN EMPLOYEE OF THE UNIVERSITY OR IS OTHERWISE UNAVAILABLE, THE STUDENT MUST BRING THE MATTER TO THE ATTENTION OF THE ACADEMIC LEADER WHO WILL MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO CONTACT THE INSTRUCTOR.

A. IF THE INSTRUCTOR CANNOT BE CONTACTED BUT COURSE RECORDS ARE AVAILABLE, THE ACADEMIC LEADER MAY CORRECT A GRADING ERROR THROUGH THE REGULAR CHANGE OF GRADE PROCESS ON BEHALF OF THE INSTRUCTOR.

B. IF THE INSTRUCTOR CAN NOT BE CONTACTED AND COURSE RECORDS ARE EITHER UNAVAILABLE OR INDECISIVE, THE STUDENT MAY REQUEST A REVIEW FOLLOWING THE PROCEDURE OUTLINED BELOW.

C. IF THE INSTRUCTOR CAN BE CONTACTED AND ELECTS TO PARTICIPATE, THEN A CONSTRUCTIVE PARTICIPATION IS TO BE WELCOMED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE. THE PROCEDURES OF PARAGRAPH III.A.5.A. OR PARAGRAPH III.A.5.B. WILL BE INSTITUTED IF THE INSTRUCTOR WITHDRAWS FROM PARTICIPATION.

(3) Within ten (10) class days of receipt of the written request, the instructor or the academic leader will notify the student in writing of the decision concerning the final grade and, if a change is required, process the change of final grade according to MAU rules and procedures.

(4) If the student does not receive a response or receives a negative response, from the course instructor or the academic leader by the required deadline, the student has five (5) days to submit the written request for review to the dean/director. The dean/director must rule on the final grade and notify the student of the decision within 10 class days.

(5) In the review of final grades on the basis of grading error, the dean or the director has the authority to issue the final decision of the university.

c. Formal Review Procedures for Disputes Regarding Academic Decisions or Actions Other Than for Allegation of Grading Error.

(1) In order to contest an issue other than an allegation of grading error, the student must file a written request for review with the [[chief academic officer]] DEAN or designee prior to the thirtieth (30th) class day of the next regular semester. The [[chief academic officer]] DEAN or designee will provide a copy of the request to the faculty member(s) or previous decision maker(s) involved in the disputed academic decision or action. The request must include:

- (a) the name, student identification number, current address, permanent address, current phone number, and permanent phone number of the student;
- (b) the course number, title and instructor relevant to the final grade in question or the academic decision or action under dispute and the names of the responsible faculty member(s);
- (c) a description of the previous actions taken by the student in attempting to resolve the issue (with attached documentation, letters, written responses, etc.);
- (d) an explanation of why the student believes the assigned final grade was arbitrary and capricious or an explanation of why the academic action or decision is under dispute;
- (e) the remedy sought;
- (f) a request for an open hearing, if so desired;
- (g) any other supporting documentation deemed relevant and appropriate (e.g. graded assignments, references); and
- (h) the student's signature and the date.

(2) Upon receipt of the written request for review by the student, the [[chief academic officer]] DEAN or designee will appoint a review committee composed of the following:

- (a) two faculty members from the academic unit in which the course or program was offered (other than previous decision makers involved in the issue), preferably tenured or tenure-track;
- (b) one tenured or tenure-track faculty members outside the academic unit in which the course was offered;
- (c) [[two students;]]

AT THE OPTION OF THE STUDENT WHOSE

GRADE IS BEING REVIEWED, THE FIFTH MEMBER TO BE APPOINTED BY THE DEAN WILL BE A STUDENT OR ANOTHER TENURE TRACK FACULTY MEMBER OUTSIDE THE COLLEGE OR SCHOOL IN WHICH THE COURSE WAS OFFERED. IF THE FIFTH MEMBER IS A FACULTY MEMBER, THIS MEMBER WILL BE SELECTED FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE UAF FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE IF ONE IS AVAILABLE and,

(d) a nonvoting facilitator/moderator to conduct the proceedings.

The [[chief academic officer]] DEAN or designee will provide the student issuing the request for review two (2) class days within which to challenge the committee's composition on the basis that a member cannot render an objective recommendation. A student's failure to respond within this period constitutes waiver of the right to challenge the review process on the basis of alleged lack of objectivity.

(3) The review committee must meet within ten (10) class days of receipt of the student's request.

(4) The review committee may dismiss the request for review if:

(a) the request is a repeat of a previously submitted academic dispute which already received a final decision;

(b) [[the actions of the course instructor may have constituted a grading error]]  
THE ACTIONS OF THE INSTRUCTOR DO NOT CONSTITUTE ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS GRADING, AS DEFINED HEREIN; or

(c) the request was not made within the applicable time period; OR

(D) THE STUDENT HAS NOT TAKEN PRIOR ACTION TO RESOLVE THE GRADE CONFLICT WITH THE INSTRUCTOR.

[[If a majority of the review committee votes to dismiss the request, a written recommendation for dismissal must be forwarded to chief academic officer or designee within five (5) class days of the decision, stating the reasons for the recommendation. The chief academic officer or designee must accept, reject, or take other appropriate action within ten (10) class days of receipt of the recommendation, and must notify the student and the previous decision makers(s) of the decision, with copy to the review committee.]]



IN THE EVENT THAT THE COMMITTEE VOTES TO DISMISS THE REQUEST, A WRITTEN NOTICE OF DISMISSAL MUST BE FORWARDED TO THE STUDENT, INSTRUCTOR, DEPARTMENT HEAD AND DEAN WITHIN FIVE DAYS OF THE DECISION, AND WILL STATE CLEARLY THE REASONING FOR THE DISMISSAL OF THE REQUEST.

(5) If the student's request for review is not dismissed, the committee will request a formal response from the previous decision maker(s) to the student's request for review. The response will be due to the review committee within five (5) class days. The previous decision maker(s) and the student will be notified in writing of the time and place of the hearing, which must occur within 15 class days of the decision to conduct a hearing. The student and the previous decision maker(s) will be invited to attend.

(6) The meeting will be closed unless otherwise requested by BOTH THE INSTRUCTOR AND the student prior to the start of the proceeding. A request for an open meeting will be granted to the extent allowed by law unless the facilitator/moderator of the review committee determines that all or part of the proceeding should be closed based upon considerations of fairness, justice, and other relevant factors. The INSTRUCTOR AND student may choose an advisor to be present at all times during the proceedings. However, the advisor may not speak or ask questions on the student's OR INSTRUCTOR'S behalf except on limited occasions at the discretion and request of the facilitator/moderator.

(7) The committee will deliberate in private and will forward its written findings, conclusions, and recommendations to the [[chief academic officer]] DEAN or designee within five (5) class days of the meeting.

A. THE COMMITTEE IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO AWARD A GRADE (LETTER OR PASS/FAIL) OR TAKE ANY ACTION WITH REGARD TO THE INSTRUCTOR.

B. ACTIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE CAN TAKE IF IT ACCEPTS THE STUDENT'S ALLEGATION OF ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS GRADING MUST BE DIRECTED TOWARDS A FAIR AND JUST RESOLUTION, AND MAY INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, THE FOLLOWING:

1) DIRECT THE INSTRUCTOR TO GRADE AGAIN THE STUDENT'S WORK UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD,

2) DIRECT THE INSTRUCTOR TO ADMINISTER A NEW FINAL

EXAMINATION AND/OR PAPER IN  
THE COURSE,

3) DIRECT A CHANGE OF THE  
STUDENT'S REGISTRATION STATUS  
(I.E., WITHDRAWN, AUDIT,  
DROPPED) IN THE COURSE.

A copy of the committee's findings, conclusions, and recommendations must be sent to the student, THE INSTRUCTOR, and the previous decision maker(s), who, if they wish, have five (5) class days within which to provide the [[chief academic officer]] DEAN or designee written comments on the review committee's findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

(8) The [[chief academic officer]] DEAN or designee must provide a decision in writing to the student, THE INSTRUCTOR, and the previous decision maker(s), with a copy to the review committee, within ten (10) working days of receipt of the committee's recommendation. This decision is the final decision of the university.

d. At any step in the processes described above, the [[chief academic officer]] DEAN or designee may grant an extension to the timelines in these regulations.

C. Procedure for Resolving Challenges of University Judicial Decisions or Disciplinary Actions

[Reserved: under construction, will be brought forward with policy and regulation on student rights and responsibilities, which are still under construction.]

D. Procedure for Challenges to Administrative Decisions or Actions

[Reserved]

E. Eligibility for Services Pending Final Decision in the Review Process

During the review of an action or decision by the university, the action or decision being contested will remain in effect until the dispute is resolved. Should an academic action or decision affect the student's eligibility for financial aid, housing, or other service, the student is responsible for initiating the appropriate review process to maintain or reinstate the affected service.

Confidentiality R09.03.03

[Reserved]

Access to Formal Review Proceedings R09.03.04

[Reserved]

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/9  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
 DECEMBER 8, 1997  
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF THE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, 12/2/97

The Curricular Affairs Committee met at 3:45 p.m. in Wood Center

A. All members of the committee except John French and Paul Reichardt were in attendance. John Craven also attended the meeting. The committee discussed the three items on its agenda:

1. Review of motion on course level definitions

The committee reviewed the entire text of the motion and made several recommendations, by section.

UPPER DIVISION COURSES

The committee recommended that the third sentence (Freshman and sophomore students are required to obtain special permission to take any upper division courses.) be deleted. In the opinion of the committee, this language is unduly restrictive of student choice, as currently UAF lower-division students do take upper division courses without "special" permission.

300-399: Junior-level courses.

The committee recommended that the phrase marked for deletion (also be applied to graduation requirements for some master's degrees with prior approval of the student's Graduate Study Committee) be retained. This should be reinstated in the text and transformed into a sentence: "They may also be applied to graduation requirements...." The reasoning of the committee was that under current UAF policy, graduate students are allowed to apply a junior-level course to degree requirements, with the approval of their committee.

400-499: Senior-level courses.

The committee recommended the retention of the phrase marked deletion: (and may be applicable to some associates degrees). The committee also found this proposal to be unusually restrictive. Under current UAF policy, students may use senior-level courses to meet associate degree requirements.

500-599: Professional development courses.

The committee recommended the deletion of the third sentence-- "They are not applicable to any grading system." In the opinion of the committee, this statement is unnecessary. The committee also recommended changes to the fifth sentence, as follows: (The) NO 500-level (special topics and independent study) courses shall (not) apply toward any UNIVERSITY degree.....The argument for this change was to improve clarity.

These recommendations were moved as amendments to the motion, and the motion to amend passed unanimously. The committee also believed that the issue of compressibility in 500-level courses needed to be addressed. John Craven remarked that he would send the issue to the graduate and professional affairs committee for resolution.

2. Review of motion on recommended changes to the draft Board of Regents Student Affairs Policies and Regulations.

For the third time, the committee reviewed these draft policy statements. After several attempts to remove contradictions, improve linkages, and clarify and simplify procedures, the committee found it could not remedy the basic flaws in the document. The committee then voted, unanimously, to approve John Craven's substitute motion, as follows:

MOTION  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate has reviewed the draft Board of Regents' Policy and Regulations 09.01.00, 09.03.00, 09.04.00, and 09.05.00, at the request of the Faculty Alliance, and recommends that Regulation 09.03.00 rejected as written and makes no suggestions with regard to the other draft regulations and policies.

3. Review of draft common grading policy

Committee members noted several errors in the proposed common policy, and opined that it requires further, detailed examination. The chair appointed a sub-committee composed of Ann Tremarello and Alexandra Fitts to review the policy and prepare recommendations for the next CAC meeting.

4. Agenda for the next meeting

Discussion produced three agenda items for the next CAC meeting (in late January or early February, 1998):

A. Whether "D" grades, currently disallowed in the major, should also be disallowed in the minor.

B. Whether core curriculum courses can be counted toward major and minor requirements.

C. The timeline for issuing freshman low-grade reports.

The committee adjourned at 4:55 p.m. Submitted by J. McBeath.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/10  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997  
SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

UAF Faculty Senate  
Graduate and Professional Curricular Affairs Committee  
Meeting Notes  
November 19, 1997

Present: Allen, Finney, Lando, Whalen (Chair), Dean Kan (Ex-Officio), Craven (Ex-Officio), Stephens (Ex-Officio), Gregory (Ex-Officio)

Chair Whalen called meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

I. File Review Assignment.

Divided responsibility for review of proposals into five categories. Person responsible will study the file, report back to the committee at the next meeting, and make recommendations.

Responsibilities were as follows:

Allen	Education
Lando	Undergraduate/Graduate Listings & Physics
Conti	Ph.D. Marine Biology & Fisheries
Finney	Biology & Wildlife Biology
Whalen	Anthropology, Art, Accounting, Business
Administration,	Information Systems

Gregory: Gave the concerns that Sheri Layral summarized as a handout for the committee.

Gregory: Raised questions regarding graduate courses in ART, a department which has no graduate degree. These courses are offered for interdisciplinary degrees. Can graduate courses be offered in a program without a graduate degree?

Examples of this practice exist on campus: There are STAT courses offered at the graduate level without a graduate program.

Kan: Noted this is a standard procedure to building a graduate program.

Whalen: There is no policy against this.

Kan: Most universities allow this.

## II. Final Semester registration

Craven: Work in motion for policy on registration for last semester in Graduate School. Idea is to write a clear situation of exception without appeal or waiver.

Current Rule: Graduate student must be registered for 3 credits during semester of graduation.

Kan: Why not use 1 credit?

Craven: Motion in Development:

"When a graduate student has COMPLETED all requirements for receipt of a graduate degree, including all thesis or project submissions to the Graduate School, the Library and academic department, AND has completed all formal applications for the degree and paid all fees, AND has completed all obligations to his or her advisor with regard to that degree, that graduate student is then released from the above requirements."

Rationale. Present UAF policy specifies the following:  
That a graduate student must be registered in the semester of graduation. This is an established requirement in the catalog, but the origin is not presently established. It appears to be a policy of great age.

The Fairbanks Academic Council policy effective in the fall of 1985 (approved by the chancellor on May 30, 1984) requires that all graduate students must register for a minimum of 3 credits or extended registration each semester (excluding summer session) in which he/she is actively working towards a degree.

This motion releases the student from the condition that "a graduate student must be registered in the semester of graduation," once the student is no longer placing any demands for services on the faculty and administration of UAF.

The motion in development must in addition address:

Need statement on extended registration.  
What else has changed?  
What does BOR say about this issue?

Additional Comments.

The effect of these two policies appears to be unambiguous, and there is nothing suggested that would provide for the application for a waiver to this policy. It does not mean that the administration can't waive payment of fees or pay the fee for the student. It just means that the student must be registered at UAF in the manner specified elsewhere, independently of the student's physical location and status of any thesis work.

Please send comments on this motion in development to John Craven. Spirit of this is that the student should be done and drawing no resources from the University.

Whalen : Will read over this proposal and act on it next meeting.

3. Proposal for changes to commencement ceremony policy, proposed by graduate student concerns. Students wish to walk through commencement before all formal processes related to thesis or dissertation are completed.

Graduate student representative was not in attendance.

Whalen summarized issue:

Goal of graduate students is to allow students who have defended their thesis to walk through ceremony.

Gayle: Objections to name appearing in commencement book, as this is an official document. Name could appear next year in book, but book is used to determine who graduated each year. She does not feel abstract for dissertation should appear either.

Craven: Board of Regents certify the graduation afterwards.

Gayle: People come to campus and look at these commencement books from the 1940's as an official record.

Stephens: Also, the commencement book is archived in the library as an official document.

Kan: We have tried this on Ph.D. students, and it did not work. People have not fulfilled their responsibilities. At one point, it was Chancellor approved, now deferred to Kan. Concern regarding Board of Regents questioning this.

Craven: Regents policy is clear against this.

Lando: I would like to see policy completely prohibiting this.

Kan: Rule should be simple. If truly a unique situation, then there can be an exception. Things may have gotten lenient.

Lando: Situation now is if thesis is completed, the student can walk through graduation.

Kan: Will research this and report back on current policy and issues next meeting.

#### IV. New Issues

Craven: Bylaws of this committee state ex-office committee members cannot vote.

Clarified the wording for UA system descriptors for graduate courses, approved last meeting.

Whalen: Regents draft of Student Affairs Policy has been deferred to the Curricular Affairs Committee.

Gayle: Oral exams, Copyright Policy should receive these as possible agenda item.

Craven: M.S. as part of Ph.D. will come to this committee as an item for review.

Faculty and Scholarly Affairs reviewing on faculty member getting a Ph.D. at this University.

#### V. Next meeting

Next meeting scheduled for December 3, and Maria Reyes will be invited regarding the Ed course submissions.

Meeting adjourned at 2:19 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/11  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
 DECEMBER 8, 1997  
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULUM REVIEW

Curriculum Review Committee  
 Summary of meeting November 13, 1997  
 11:30 -13:00, Wood Center, Conf. Rm. B

Members Present: Charlotte Basham, Ron Illingworth, Patricia Holloway, Gang Chen, Ted Cooney, Robert Logan, Gayle Gregory, John French

Members Absent: Dan White

Actions: The committee approved the "Change in the credits to be awarded for the CDA credential" as submitted by Patty Meritt with the additional request to revise the advisors manual to include both the TVC and rural site alternatives.

Future scheduling: Committee member doing primary review in parentheses.

November 18: Actions submitted by CRA (#25-33) (Holloway)  
 Actions submitted by SALRM (#53-60) (Illingworth)

November 25: Actions submitted by CLA (#1-24) (Logan & Chen)

December 2: Actions submitted by CSEM (#34-52) (Basham & Illingworth)

December 4: Actions submitted by SOM (#61-82) (French & White?)  
 Actions submitted by SME (#83) (Cooney)  
 Graduate courses requiring review (Cooney)

All meetings are at 11:30-13:00 in Wood Center, Conference Room B.

Summary prepared by John French

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/12  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997  
SUBMITTED BY DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

Minutes of the  
DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES COMMITTEE  
November 18, 1997

Present: Charlotte Basham, Susan Blalock, Richard Clausen, Cindy Hardy, Ron Illingworth, Kay Thomas (for Rose Kairaiuak), Joe Mason, Greg Owens, Mark Oswood, Ron Palcic, and Jane Weber

The committee met for the full hour with Dana Thomas to discuss outcomes assessment. Dana stated that outcomes assessment, as required for accreditation, has three parts:

Setting curriculum outcome goals,  
Determining whether students meet these outcome goals, and  
Reviewing the curriculum in light of these findings.

On our campus, four areas are being assessed:

Student information (which includes data used in advising such as SAT, ACT, and ASSET scores),  
The core curriculum,  
Certificate and degree programs, and  
Out-of-class learning (such as internships, study groups, and math and English labs).

Members of the committee asked the following questions:

Why is Developmental Studies being assessed? Where does it fall in the four areas being assessed?

Dana said that the accreditation process requires that any curriculum have underlying outcomes associated with it. The outcomes assessment process asks that we state our goals and collect information to assess how we meet those goals. DEVS may fall into its own area, though it's certainly linked to the core.

We have different class sequences on the Fairbanks campus and at the rural campuses. Do we need two types of assessment for these classes? Should we do a comparison?

Dana replied that the accreditation process looks at standards across classes. The outcomes assessment process should be the same for each class, no matter when or how the class is offered. He went on to stress that what's being assessed is student learning outcomes, not individual classes or courses.

Developmental classes do more than teach remedial English and math. They teach the learning process. How do we measure outcomes when we teach things such as these that are hard to measure?

Dana suggested that this should be an ongoing topic of discussion as we develop and refine our outcomes process.

Could we, as a result of this process, make changes in the curriculum, such as changing course numbers to reflect the differences in DEV courses at the different campuses?

Dana stressed that assessment is an ongoing process. As a



result of the assessment process, we should make changes in curriculum as needed. This process will allow us to make good decisions about the curriculum.

Why is DEV being asked to do this now?

Dana noted that DEV courses came up at the beginning of the process, two years ago, but it wasn't clear then that DEV was one of the target areas that had to be part of the accreditation process. Now, it's clear that DEV has to be part of that process.

Can we get real information on attrition and success such as SAT, ACT, and other assessments from Banner?

Dana informed us that the Instructional Working Group has set up a Banner web site and that he has requested that any faculty or staff be given a user ID for access to Banner through the web site. This is in the works.

We thanked Dana for an informative presentation. We will be addressing these questions again! Mark Oswood requested that the Developmental Science curriculum be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

The next meeting of the Developmental Studies Committee will be Tuesday, December 9, 12:45-1:45 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/13  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997  
SUBMITTED BY LEGISLATIVE & FISCAL AFFAIRS

Legislative and Fiscal Affairs Committee  
Minutes  
17 November 1997  
Conference Room A, Wood Center

Convened by Dr. Scott Deal

Present: Dr. Scott Deal  
Dr. Eduard Zilberkant  
Daniel Cole-McCullough  
Dr. John Craven  
Marie Scholle  
Wendy Redman

Absent: Rovanna Martin

Called to Order at 1:15 p.m.

Minutes of 20 October approved as amended.

Legislative Bill report tabled until next meeting

Next Meeting 1 December 1997

Dr. Deal presented a report on the Governors Press Conference. The Governor has recommended \$167.8 million for next years budget. Last years was \$164.3 million. the Board of Regents has asked for \$174 million.

Dr. Deal offered a first look at a draft of a letter/proposal that would eventually be sent by the Faculty Senate to the Governor.

Discussion followed with the result being Dr. Deal would craft a reconstructed letter and resubmit it to the committee.

Marie Scholle gave an update report on the efforts of staff in gaining signatures from the public. Dr. Deal mentioned he had submitted about 400 signatures gathered from music concerts.

Discussion followed on the best way for this committee to energize its efforts.

Adjourned 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Daniel Cole-McCullough, Secretary.