

## FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral  
312 Signers' Hall  
474-7964 FYSENAT

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

A G E N D A  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #78  
Monday, March 9, 1998  
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 #77	
		C. Adoption of Agenda	
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
		A. Motions Approved:	
		1. Motion regarding UAF Academic Calendar	
		2. Motion to approve the Certificate program in Microcomputer Support Specialist.	
		3. Motion to approve the A.A.S. in Microcomputer Support Specialist.	
		4. Motion to approve a policy statement on Stacked Courses.	
		5. Motion to modify the date of Freshman Low Grade notification.	
		6. Motion to approve the Ph.D. program in Marine Biology.	
		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 Speakers: Paul Reichardt & Ralph Gabrielli - Overview of President Komisar's Committees on Resource Allocation & the Extended Sites	10 Min.
2:05	IV	Governance Reports	
		A. ASUAF - S. Nuss	5 Min.
		B. Staff Council - P. Long	5 Min.
		C. President's Report - J. Craven (Attachment 78/1)	10 Min.
		D. President-Elect's Comments - M. Schatz (Handout)	10 Min.
2:35	V	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:40		***BREAK***	10 Min
2:50	VI	New Business	
		A. Motion prohibiting faculty from receiving a Ph.D. degree from UAF, submitted by Faculty & Scholarly Affairs (Attachment 78/2)	5 Min.
		B. Motion to amend the probation policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attach. 78/3)	5 Min.
		C. Motion to amend the academic disqualification policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 78/4)	5 Min.

- |      |      |   |         |
|------|------|---|---------|
|      | D.   | Motion to adopt an interim promotion and tenure process for ACCFT faculty, submitted by Faculty & Scholarly Affairs (Attachment 78/5) | 5 Min.  |
|      | E.   | Nominations for President-Elect   | 5 Min.  |
| 3:15 | VII  | Committee Reports   | 30 Min. |
|      | A.   | Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath<br>(Attachment 78/6)  |         |
|      | B.   | Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - R. Gavlak<br>(Attachment 78/7)  |         |
|      | C.   | Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen<br>(Attachment 78/8)   |         |
|      | D.   | Core Review - J. Brown (Attachment 78/9)  |         |
|      | E.   | Curriculum Review - J. French   |         |
|      | F.   | Developmental Studies - J. Weber (Attachment 78/10)   |         |
|      | G.   | Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley<br>(Attachment 78/11)   |         |
|      | H.   | Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -<br>D. Porter  |         |
|      | I.   | Graduate School Advisory Committee - S. Henrichs<br>(Attachment 78/12)  |         |
|      | J.   | Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal<br>(Attachment 78/13)  |         |
|      | K.   | Service Committee - K. Nance  |         |
| 3:45 | VIII | Discussion Items  |         |
|      | A.   | Board of Regents/Legislative meeting<br>(Attachment 78/14)  | 5 Min.  |
| 3:50 | IX   | Members' Comments/Questions   | 5 Min.  |
| 3:55 | X    | Adjournment   |         |

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 78/1  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #78  
 MARCH 9, 1998

Report by John Craven, Senate President

Welcome to the 78th meeting of UAF's Faculty Senate. It will be our pleasure at this meeting to hear from members of two of President Komisar's committees addressing critical issues of the University; Executive Dean Ralph Gabrielli, a member of the committee addressing the extended campuses, and Dean Paul Reichardt, the senior UAF member of the committee charged with creation of a resource allocation model for the main campuses. The former committee has submitted its report to President Komisar, while the latter committee is still deeply imbedded in the numbers and what they mean or don't mean.

Nominations for president elect of the UAF Faculty Senate are open as of this meeting and will close during Meeting #79, prior to balloting. We look forward to nominations today as part of new business. Each senator wishing to be considered for the office is asked to submit a personal statement to the Governance Office by March 27, 1998. There are no length requirements, and they are generally not long. However, it is your opportunity to make your case in as much detail as you wish, and if length were held against the candidate I would not have become your president. The request for a personal statement does not preclude nominations at the April meeting, but a candidate is then asked to consider bringing 40 copies of his or her personal statement to that meeting and give one to the

Governance Office in advance so it can be FAXED to the rural sites in time for the meeting. After nominations are closed in that meeting, I will give each candidate an opportunity to make a few remarks to the Senate and time will then be provided for senators to question the candidates. If the Senate wishes, we can then ask the candidates to leave the room and have any further discussion, as per the wishes of the Senate. In my years on the Senate I have only seen this done once, and I believe you should be provided with that opportunity. Candidates will rejoin us at the conclusion of this discussion and balloting will begin. Senators at the rural sites will have been provided ballots before the meeting and will be asked to vote and immediately forward their ballots by FAX to the Governance Office. Ballot counting will take place during a break in the meeting and the results announced when we are reconvened.

Last year, this Senate revised UAF requirements for the MA and MS degrees, the recommendations were accepted by Chancellor Wadlow and they are now UAF rules due to take effect in the Fall semester. These changes are not well known due to a resistance on the part of the Graduate School dean to properly inform the faculty of the changes. Preparation of the new UAF Catalog required that this information be included, and, as part of the preparation for insertion, the Registrar's office issued a letter outlining the new requirements. It is only with the distribution of that letter that numerous faculty members and departments are either finding out that the changes were made and/or are finally forced to take them seriously. Either way, students could be impacted and it is necessary that this issue be fully discussed. It was the Graduate and Professional Curricular Affairs Committee (Mark Tumeo, chair) that carried out that work last year, work that included significant interaction with faculty and departments - this was not a rush job, but a carefully considered effort by faculty trying to bring to a UAF MA or MS degree some greater degree of uniformity of requirements. This work was initiated by a letter from the dean of the Graduate School.

There is today a case of collective amnesia surrounding this issue, ranging from at least one member of the committee to faculty members who knew what was being considered but paid no attention, until now. And then there is the dean who intends to fix it after I am gone. I did not start this and I did not create it, but it is my task to seek acknowledgment of the established rules of the Senate and UAF. If there are shortcomings, then they should be corrected, and we have established methods for doing it. However, I do not recommend that this Senate continue to live up to its reputation in some circles as a group that does things one year and undoes them the next. Either this Senate does its work carefully from the outset and improves the academic environment or it doesn't. If the latter, then to my mind the provost, the chancellor and the Board of Regents have every right to question its dedication to shared governance. This body should pass motions that have every expectation of lasting for years, not months, and have the conviction to stand by them, improving them as needed. My bottom line is that the Senate is not just some debating society to be ignored by the rest of the faculty except when it is convenient for gaining credit for the service part of our tripartite obligation.

I urge the Senate to think creatively. For example, why is it just a MS degree? Why doesn't the diploma state MS with Thesis, MS with Project, MS in Course, or some such things (if we don't already), so that we publicly announce a difference? I don't know the answer; I am just asking the question. Secondly, take note that the definitions presently on the books provide significant latitude in what constitutes a thesis or a project. This should be explored further, for it seems to me that it simultaneously provides the

latitude individual departments need, a partial solution to the difficulties, and the potential for loopholes.

And lastly, Chancellor Wadlow will host a round-table discussion on March 10th to discuss what faculty, staff and students learned while in Juneau for the Board of Regents' meeting and some "quality time" with legislators. This is prudent. The chancellor has initiated the RIP-2 replacement effort with assumptions meant to give us hope. However, there is Hope and there is hope, and it is necessary that we know the difference; which is prudent planning and which is without foundation. I, for one, got some mixed messages in Juneau. I worry when my own senator considers us one more agency looking for money and the Speaker of the House says the Board of Regents has to learn to live with what it has. With regard to the "quality time" issue, an hour of pizza and beer with Rep. Con Bunde is not to be missed if you want a civics lesson (real politics) from someone who was once a highly regarded university professor (knows things we might not admit in public).

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 78/2

UAF FACULTY SENATE #78

MARCH 9, 1998

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY & SCHOLARLY AFFAIRS

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to prohibit tenured faculty, tenure track faculty, and research faculty hired after this motion becomes effective, or not currently enrolled in a Ph.D. program, from receiving a Ph.D. degree from UAF.

EFFECTIVE: July 1, 1998

RATIONALE: It is ethically questionable for faculty to confer Ph.D. degrees upon themselves. Included are tenured, tenure track, and research faculty. Though research faculty are not tenured, they are equivalent to regular faculty in other ways: they are full-time, they are presumed to have Ph.D.'s or the equivalent before starting the job, and most importantly, they supervise graduate students and sometimes teach as affiliates to academic departments. Thus they are involved in the degree-granting process.

The motion is not intended to restrict faculty professional development derived from enrolling in courses to enhance one's performance in one's own field.

Tenured, tenure track, and research faculty already in degree programs by the effective date of the motion, are grandfathered. For questionable cases, the affected individual should process his/her appeal through the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee of the UAF Faculty Senate.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 78/3

UAF FACULTY SENATE #78

MARCH 9, 1998

SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

## MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the following new policy on academic probation which replaces the existing policy passed by the Fairbanks Academic Council on October 14, 1987.

\*\*\*\*\*

## PROBATION

An undergraduate degree status or full-time special student whose semester or cumulative GPA is less than 2.0 will be on probation until that situation changes. Probation reviews are done after both fall and spring semesters.

EFFECTIVE: May 10, 1998

RATIONALE: Current policy and practice provide for three levels of review for probation: for students on good standing whose semester or cumulative GPAs are less than 2.0; for students placed on probation at admission whose semester or cumulative GPA are less than 2.0; and for readmitted students continued on probation whose semester or cumulative GPAs are less than 2.0. This proposal simplifies the probation action, reducing three distinctions to one.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 78/4

UAF FACULTY SENATE #78

MARCH 9, 1998

SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

## MOTION:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approved the following new policy on Academic Disqualification which replaces the existing policy passed by the Fairbanks Academic Council on November 20, 1978.

\*\*\*\*\*

## ACADEMIC DISQUALIFICATION

Undergraduate students on probation whose semester and cumulative GPAs are less than 2.0 at the end of the spring semester may be disqualified from degree status. Disqualified students may continue their enrollment at UAF only as non-degree students, limited to enrolling in nine credits per semester, until reinstated into an academic program.

EFFECTIVE: May 10, 1998

RATIONALE: Current UAF practice is to review students for academic disqualification at the end of both fall and spring semesters. Disqualifying students after the fall semester imposes undue hardships on those who have already returned to campus in the expectation that they will be able to continue in their degree programs. Moreover, because eligibility determinations

for financial aid and athletic participation are made only at the end of the academic year, some students may be academically disqualified while remaining eligible for financial aid and athletic participation. The new policy language will make the academic disqualification time line consistent with that used for determining financial aid and athletic participation eligibility.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 78/5

UAF FACULTY SENATE #78

MARCH 9, 1998

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY & SCHOLARLY AFFAIRS

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt an interim promotion and tenure process for ACCFT faculty associated with the UAF MAU. The specific steps (mirroring existing UAF policy & regulations) shall be:

1. Submission of materials by the faculty member.
2. Review of material by the campus director.
3. Review by a peer review committee.
4. Review by the CRA Executive Dean.
5. Review by the University-wide Promotion & Tenure Committee.
6. Review by the Chancellor's Office.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: For the last several years ACCFT faculty at UAF have utilized a Regional Review Process for promotion and tenure decisions which was modeled on the system in place at UAA. This process involved forwarding P&T packages to UAA for review by their University-wide P&T committee. This committee was augmented by representatives from UAF (ACCFT members). This UAA committee made recommendations for or against P&T and sent their recommendations to the UAF Chancellor.

The most recent ACCFT collective bargaining agreement states in item 5.4.B. that "The University and the Union agree that evaluation policies in which decisions are made within MAUs are desirable. New policies which reflect this goal will be generated through the normal governance structure and will be patterned on the current Regional Review Process (RRP). These policies will become effective when approved by the University and the Union. No changes will be made in UAA policy."

ACCFT faculty at UAF established an ad hoc P&T policy and procedures development committee. This committee developed Standards and Indices (Unit Criteria) which have been approved by CRA faculty and forwarded to the CRA Executive Dean, approved, and forwarded to the UAF Provost office in accordance with UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty.

Changes in the procedures from RRP to local review include establishment of a peer review committee within CRA, inclusion of the CRA Dean within the review process, and inclusion of the UAF University-wide P&T committee in the review process.

However, given the establishment of a new bargaining unit at UAF (United Academics), and given that UAF ACCFT faculty have existed under UAA policy for faculty appointment and evaluation for several years, we recommend that an interim process be approved to accommodate those UAF ACCFT faculty who wish to stand this year. Subsequently, the entire UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty will require revision to include UAF ACCFT faculty as well as the new United Academics contract language. This is a longer process but one which should be initiated soon.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 78/6  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #78  
 MARCH 9, 1998  
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Minutes of Curricular Affairs meeting, 2/23/98

Attending the meeting were members: Carol Barnhardt, Ron Gatterdam, Jerry McBeath, Maynard Perkins (audio), Jane Weber, Ann Tremarello, Gayle Gregory, Wanda Martin, and Paul Reichardt. Also in attendance were Larry Duffy, Gerry Mohatt, and Jim Stricks. The meeting began at 3:05 p.m. and covered five topics.

#### 1. RESERVE NUMBER REQUEST

The committee reviewed a request to institute a reserved number for courses that provided continuing education units. Larry Duffy mentioned that some students had requested continuing education credits for a molecular biology course funded by NSF; Gerry Mohatt mentioned that some students in psychology, social work, and counseling courses needed CEUs for certification purposes. Both thought a special reserve number would meet the needs of these students. Ann Tremarello indicated that the -91 number is already used by several courses and not available as a reserve number.

Committee members discussed whether the 500-number series could be used for CEUs, or another unappropriated series (e.g., 700, 800, 900). The consensus of the committee was that the current system was sufficiently flexible to accommodate needs of those seeking CEUs.

#### 2. REQUEST TO AMEND INCOMPLETE POLICY

Jim Stricks reported the experience of independent learning faculty after the Senate eliminated the "NB" grade in 1996. He sought an amendment of the policy to allow faculty to give students a permanent "I" grade, without the need to complete paperwork indicating how students could complete remaining course work.

Committee members pointed out that for independent learning courses taught over the course of a year, instructors could initiate a withdrawal of students up to the 7th month. The consensus of the committee was that the Senate policy on incompletes was workable for independent learning faculty.

### 3. ACADEMIC DISQUALIFICATIONS

The committee heard a report from the subcommittee composed of Ann Tremarello, Wanda Martin, and Paul Reichardt. The subcommittee recommended a simplification of the academic disqualification process, as indicated on a chart prepared by the committee. For students whose semester GPA was less than 2.0 or whose cumulative GPA was less than 2.0, academic probation would be required, with notification each semester. For students on probation with a semester GPA of less than 2.0 and a cumulative GPA of less than 2.0, academic disqualification would be required. However, this action would be taken only at the end of the spring semester. The subcommittee spelled out four statements of rationale for this policy change.

The committee discussed the subcommittee report. Ron Gatterdam moved and Carol Barnhardt seconded a motion instructing the committee chair to draft appropriate policy language embodying the subcommittee report and forward it to the Faculty Senate for consideration at the March meeting. This motion passed unanimously.

### 4. PETITION PROCESS

The committee discussed Jin Brown's memo on the petition process, and perceived problems in it. Several committee members reported that petitions are logged in at deans' offices, and this has introduced some accountability in the process. Also, banner has a check-off item for petitions. Some committee members believed that students were able to work within the current process, notwithstanding its cumbersome nature. Ron Gatterdam pointed out that because it is the Faculty Senate that approves curricula and degree requirements, only the Senate can approve exceptions; he recommended that the Senate pass a motion clarifying its authority over the petition process. The chair appointed a subcommittee of Ron Gatterdam, Gayle Gregory, and Paul Reichardt to make recommendation by the next committee meeting in March.

### 5. OTHER BUSINESS

At the February Senate meeting, the committee received a charge to define what a course syllabus was. The chair presented a preliminary definition. Committee members proposed adding to the list of elements: the grading system used in the course (pass/fail, letter grade), consequences of honor code violations, and withdrawal deadlines. The revised definition will be discussed at the next meeting.

### SYLLABUS

A syllabus is "a statement of outline of the subjects covered by a course of teaching; a program of study." (OED, Shorter, 1993) At UAF, the syllabus an instructor gives students typically contains:

- a statement of the course objectives
- a list of required textbooks or other course materials
- the criteria (e.g., participation, examinations, papers, reports) on the basis of which students' grades are determined
- an outline of topics covered in the course and calendar list of out-of-class assignments to help students prepare themselves for class
- instructor's contact information (name, office location, telephone extension, e-mail address, office hours)

The committee adjourned at 4:20 p.m. It will meet next on Monday, March 23, at 3:00 p.m. in Wood Center room B.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 78/7  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #78  
 MARCH 9, 1998  
 SUBMITTED FACULTY AND SCHOLARLY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Faculty and Scholarly Affairs Committee  
 Minutes, Meeting 2/18/98

Present: Rich Boone, Burns Cooper, Keith Criddle, Ray Gavlak, Ron Illingworth

1. The committee completed discussion of the motion on faculty receiving graduate degrees from UAF. The main remaining issue was the appeals process. Keith Criddle and Ron Illingworth pointed out that this issue would also be subject to union grievance procedures. There was general agreement that it is the faculty's job, not administration's, to decide these issues; we agreed to change the motion so that appeal would go not to the dean or director but to the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee. Ray Gavlak also suggested an effective date of July 1998 (to give affected faculty a little notice); there were no objections.

2. Ron Illingworth presented proposed new interim guidelines for the tenure/promotion procedure for ACCFT faculty. He first gave us some history on the issue, and an explanation of why and how ACCFT procedures have been different from those for other faculty at UAF and UAS. In the last contract negotiations these procedures were found to be awkward, and a committee to rewrite them was formed, chaired by Ron Illingworth. He explained that there are still some long term issues to resolve, including the definition of "special academic rank," the required degrees for vocational faculty, and how to deal with bipartite contracts. However, an interim procedure is needed because someone is currently standing for promotion. The committee discussed the proposal briefly and agreed that it looked well thought out. Given the negative consequences of having no procedure in place this spring, we agreed unanimously to send it on to the Administrative Committee for approval. It will be identified as an interim process, pending the new contract and more deliberation by the ACCFT members on the unresolved issues.

3. We began discussion of how credit should be assigned for various types of teaching and supervision. We came to no conclusions, and agreed that we need more information. As a preliminary step, we identified several issues:

- How to assign credit for thesis/dissertation supervision. The division of labor, and division of credit, is different in different cases.
- How to handle courses that are co-taught.
- How to assign credit for labs or sections taught by TAs.
- How to deal with distance delivery (especially Web-based D.D.)

submitted by Burns Cooper

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 78/8  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #78  
 MARCH 9, 1998  
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

The GPCAC met on 2/26/98

Two major issues were discussed.

- I. New Master's Degree Requirements
- II. Master's Degree in the Ph.D. Program

I. New Master's Degree Requirements

A. Nonresearch thesis requirements.

Discussion initially dealt with the MAT degree which has different requirements from MS/MA requirements. The MAT was not addressed by the new Master's requirements. MAT p. 35 of catalog requires 36 credits, would be helpful if it specified maximum of 6 credits in research.

Motion proposed by Clif Lando: New regulations for Master's Degree programs do not apply to MAT program. The MAT description of program requirements must be amended to include Sections A - E of the new Master's degree requirements.

Rationale: MAT does not fall under any of the 3 categories defined in the Faculty Senate motion from meeting #71. There seems to be no problem with MAT requirements as they now exist.

Motion seconded by Allen. Motion passed.

B. Requirement for thesis or project for MS or MA degrees: Should a coursework only category of MS and MA degree be erected?

Guest Speakers: John Olsen and Peter Olssen - Physics

Pointed out that a course work based physics MS is a required degree program for many students who go on to work at the National Weather Service and other industry or government positions. Such programs are also commonly offered at many other institutions. The new Master's degree requirements eliminated this category of degree.

Lando: Motion to announce a meeting of the GPAC with specific agenda item regarding discussion of thesis requirement for Master's Degree.

Motion seconded by Allen. Motion passed.

II. Master's Degree in the Ph.D. Program

Initial discussion of this topic resulted in the conclusion that this issue cannot be resolved until the above issues concerning the new Master's degree requirements are dealt with. This topic will also be addressed along with the new Master's requirements at an upcoming meeting.

submitted by Michael Whalen/Jim Allen

\*\*\*\*\*  
 ATTACHMENT 78/9  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #78  
 MARCH 9, 1998  
 SUBMITTED BY CORE REVIEW

The CORE Curriculum Review Committee has, in its last two meetings, met with the areas of the CORE which have not yet finalized plans for outcomes assessment. On February 4th, Dean Reichardt met to discuss plans for assessing the Natural Sciences area of the CORE Curriculum. The Dean has a committee which has

been working on an assessment plan for several months. The projection is that there will be a Natural Sciences assessment plan within the time frame set by CORE Review. Professor Lando of the Mathematics Department also met with this Committee on the 4th. He informed us that plans are being made to assess the CORE Mathematics area, with 131X decided, 107X in process, and the Calculus area not yet begun.

On February 18th, the Committee met with Dean Gabrielli, Pete Penny of TVC, and Jim Stricks of Distance Delivery. Because the Committee was late in understanding that the College of Rural Alaska's CORE offerings would need to be assessed, and assessed uniformly with other UAF CORE offerings, CRA has come into the process when much work has already been accomplished. The CORE Curriculum Review Committee has asked that UAF Campus faculty work closely with CRA faculty to determine that any assessment plans that have been prepared will be workable for CRA's unique mission and delivery circumstances. Where adjustments need to be made for CRA input we will work together to revise existing plans. In meeting with the CRA Dean and faculty, however, the Committee has found no reason to believe that the outcomes assessment process for the CORE Curriculum will be unable to continue to meet its timetable.

Jin Brown  
CORE Curriculum Review Committee

\*\*\*\*\*  
ATTACHMENT 78/10  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #78  
MARCH 9, 1998  
SUBMITTED BY DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

Minutes of the  
DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES COMMITTEE  
February 24, 1998

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

Developmental Science Class: Mark reported that, while he has no time now to work further on this project, he has been involved in writing a grant to Howard Hughes to install a virtual Biology lab in The Bunnell building. This will involve a shell through which an instructor can construct classes or lectures on video, computer, websites, etc. This will also allow for the possibility of placement tests, which would help determine the need for a DEV Science class, at least in the biological sciences.

Marjorie reported that the DEV Science class planned for the Downtown Center will not happen till Spring '99, since there has not been enough time to develop a course and get in on the schedule for Fall. We agreed to let this be on the back burner for now-but we won't forget it!

Emerging Scholars Program: Cindy suggested that we write a President's Special Projects grant to either bring someone up to help design this or to help with getting this idea going. We have time for this and all agreed that this is a good idea. No committee has been formed for this yet, though.

Outcomes Assessment: Marjorie handed out a description of the research she is conducting for TVC. She will look at three groups of AA and AAS students in their first, third and exit semesters to determine the effects of taking DEV classes on their overall success as students. She suggested that this research could be used as a model for outcomes assessment of DEV programs. Jane reported that the plan is to have an outcomes assessment process in place, and that using this model will make that process easy. She will pass on a copy of Majorie's memo to the rural sites. Greg, who has been working on tracking, reported that Brigitte Mayes has told him that Banner will not be of any use to us in tracking student cohorts until late this semester or early next semester. Since Marjorie is working with Dan Lord on statistics for her project, Greg will pass his request on to Dan, too, to see if he can "cook it up."

Ron reported that he and Marjorie will be going to the NADE (National Association of Developmental Educators) conference next week and will check to see if there are presentations on Outcomes assessment.

Other Business: Ron reported that the DEVS 200 class has gone to the CRA dean and will come to us for approval soon. Sheri will know the timeline. Marjorie suggested that, if we are crunched for time, we can approve this by e-mail, then Jane can sign off on it.

The next meeting will be March 31, 1:15-2:30 PM. The following meeting will be on April 21, same time.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 78/11

UAF FACULTY SENATE #78

MARCH 9, 1998

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

Report of the sixth meeting of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Meeting, John Kelley, Chair

PRESENT: John Kelley, Ted Cooney, Godwin Chukwu, David Verbyla, Roy Bird, Fred Dyen and Don Lynch

ABSENT: Greg Goering, Meriam Karlsson (travel), James Ruppert, Richard Seifert (travel), Fred Sorenson (travel), Richard Stolzberg (travel), Barbara Wilson (travel)

#### 1. MEETING OVERVIEW

The meeting convened at 11:30 with an overview of accomplish-ments since the last meeting and introduction of Dr. Donald Lynch.

#### 2. RELATIONSHIP OF FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEE TO THE NEW (United Academics) UNION.

In an earlier communication with the committee chair, Dr. Lynch indicated that if the union agreement with the university was ratified and if it was eventually approved by the Board of Regents and the Legislature then certain functions of this committee may be eliminated or modified. We also have another union, ACCFT, at the university which represents faculty and has similar but not identical rules affecting its members. Members of our committee, FA&O, are members of committees in their respective unions.

Dr. Lynch emphasized that we do have a Memorandum of

Understanding, MOU, and that article 7 deals with resolution of disputes. It provides for a committee for grievances and complaints.

At issue is "Are there procedural violations?" The grievant owns the grievance, not United Academics. If the grievant wishes UAc can assist; otherwise it will just observe to see that procedures are followed. A grievance is not just restricted to tenure/promotion matters.

Section 7.3 of the union-university agreement--Complaints, involves academic decisions. It is vague. Dr. Lynch speculated that there may be many complaints regarding workload unit assignments. A complaint of this nature would go to an appeals board. Our committee is not mentioned presumably since it is unique to the UAF. Dr. Lynch felt that our committee might be selected to participate in complaint resolution since it is already constituted. He felt that our committee would still provide oversight as to whether a tenure/promotion procedure is violated.

A question arises as to how closely the grievance procedure complements the ACCFT. For example, UAc ( Dept heads are union), ACCFT(Dept heads not union).

Dr. Lynch felt that our committee should get involved in providing oversight for Professional Ethics. He called to our attention the Ethics Policy passed by the Faculty Senate (#72), May 12, 1997. Our committee agreed to make this an agenda item at a future meeting. The chair of this committee will contact the chair of the Faculty Affairs committee.

Dr. Lynch concluded in summary that this committee should not make any changes now but continue to follow events leading to transition to union activities and continue to provide oversight services.

### 3. PROVOST REVIEW OVERSIGHT

A letter was sent to the Chancellor advising that preparations should be underway for the review of the Provost. The Appeals and Oversight Committee was available to provide oversight services for the review process.

### 4. MEMBERSHIP

Membership is being resolved. Two members from each unit will be elected to serve on this committee. Sheri notified the units. We will gain two representatives from the School of Education. Election materials have been sent out and are due to the governance office by March 27 with confirmation on May 4.

### 5. NEW BUSINESS

Next Meeting: March 12, 1998, 11:45 to 12:45 pm.

\*\*\*\*\*  
 ATTACHMENT 78/12  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #78  
 MARCH 9, 1998  
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes, Graduate School Advisory Committee Meeting, 2/18/98

Attending: Dempsey (representing Graduate School), Henrichs,

Herrmann, Kane, Mason, Smith, Sweeney, Watkins.

1. The GRE requirement for applicants was discussed. Some departments think that the UAF-wide requirement is an impediment to recruiting, since some prospective students (e.g., those in Russia) cannot take the exam without hardship. Others think the requirement is not useful because there are no admissions standards based on the exam scores and little correlation with subsequent student performance. However, some departments find the scores useful in evaluating applicants, and others believe that eliminating the requirement may lead to a perception of diminished quality of the graduate program.

Therefore, it was decided that no change in the requirement should be made at this time. However, GSAC and the Graduate School should work to ensure that waivers can be granted in exceptional cases, upon recommendation of the department, and that such cases can be processed by Admissions and Records in a timely fashion.

2. The UAF-wide requirement for a Master's comprehensive exam. The committee discussed several examples of variation in the manner in which this requirement was carried out. Some departments have a free-standing exam administered about 1 year after the student arrives, others have the comprehensive exam simultaneously with the thesis defense. The Physics Department, and perhaps others, believe that the comprehensive is unnecessary within their program because passing the required courses demonstrates an equivalent degree of knowledge.

However, the committee as a whole did not recommend changing the requirement at this time. Of particular note was input from the student representative (Sweeney), who said that students she had consulted generally found the comprehensive a valuable part of their education.

3. The Graduate School Representative (Dempsey) was asked by the chair (Henrichs) about the reason the Graduate Resource Fellowship was not offered this year. She did not know, but will find out and provide an explanation.

4. The April meeting is scheduled for April 8 at the usual time.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 78/13

UAF FACULTY SENATE #78

MARCH 9, 1998

SUBMITTED BY LEGISLATIVE & FISCAL AFFAIRS

REPORT: LEGISLATIVE AND FISCAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The committee is currently working on several tasks as outlined below:

1. Contacting State Legislators: Allies of the University inform us that public comment on the budget and our needs has been minimal, so we are working the problem at several different levels. We have identified the legislative members that will ultimately have the most influence concerning the state budget for the University, and have split the list of names between committee members in an effort to keep in consistent communications with them. We sent a letter (enclosed in report) to the UAF faculty and staff with appropriate names and email addresses urging them to do the same. Our current plan is to supplement the University Relations Office's bulletin with our own going to Faculty Senate members once every two weeks, and two or three letters to the entire faculty over the

course of the next few months. Finally, two members of the committee, Eduard Zilberkant and Scott Deal, will be making a trip to Juneau to give a recital (both are from the music department) and visit with legislators.

2. Letters to the Editor: Each committee member will write a letter to the editor of the Daily News Miner between now and April. We are sending them in one at a time in an effort to have a steady stream of correspondence coming from our committee.

3. University Fiscal Affairs. Committee member John Craven has raised the issue of the need for the Faculty Senate to get a better grasp on the fiscal dealings of UAF. To accomplish this we are currently seeking a faculty member with expertise in economics to assist us in information gathering and interpretation.

News Update on House Bill 302, the "Fair Share Bill": This bill went before the HESS committee (Health, Education, and Social Services) on Thursday, February 12, and was soundly defeated. Wendy Redman gave a presentation to the committee on behalf of the university, speaking against the bill. Representative Con Bunde, who initially introduced the bill, indicated that he had hoped many UAA faculty would be present to speak in favor of the bill, but this was not the case.

Electronic mail to UAF Faculty from the Legislative and Fiscal Affairs Committee, dated February 12, 1998:

To: UAF Faculty and Staff

From: Faculty Senate Legislative and Fiscal Affairs Committee

RE: Legislative concerns

All of us have been hearing much about the actions of the legislature in Juneau, and our need to respond via phone messages, letters, and email. The Governance Council, ASUAF, Faculty Alliance, Faculty Senate, and Office of University Relations, to name a few, have worked hard to be a voice and encourage others to become informed and speak out. The message we are getting from Juneau is that they are not hearing from constituents about the University and its concerns. Now is the time to act, and we can be a large voice if all speak as citizens. To get weekly, up to date information, see the U of A Government Relations Homepage (<http://info.alaska.edu/ua/swlegis>).

Contacting legislators is as fast and easy as a 3 minute phone call. Of course, a thoughtfully written letter or lengthy chat on the phone is better, but the Public Opinion Message Line (452-4448) will get a message to any and as many legislators as you request. You can send as many messages as there are issues you wish to speak on. Email is also effective, but many people have mentioned they don't know the email addresses of the legislators. The internet address for legislators is:

Senator\_first name\_last name\_@legis.state.ak.us or  
Representative\_first name\_last name\_@legis.state.ak.us

House Bill 302, the "Fair Share Bill", which would distribute dollars based on enrollment, is in the House Committee on Health, Education, and Social Services (HESS) today, February 12. This obviously is a bad bill for the university at large, but particularly for UAF, because of the research taking place here, which do not generate high

enrollment figures. The committee members are:

Senate:

Gary Wilken Loren Leman, Lyda Green, Johnny Ellis, Sheila Peterson,  
Committee Aide: (907) 465-3762

House:

Con Bunde (Introduced the bill), Joe Green, Fred Dyson, Brian Porter,  
Al Vezey, J. Allen Kemplen, Tom Brice, Lynne Smith, Committee Aide:  
(907) 465-3759

The University Budget is the biggest issue of concern, and the work on that will come from the Finance Committee. Legislators need to hear that further cuts cannot be managed, but instead we need an increase. The Deferred Maintenance Task Force came out with a proposal very favorable to the University (188 million for repair, 304 million shared between schools and the University for replacement over 6 years). Juneau needs to hear that it is a good plan. Finally, if the United Academics contract is ratified by the Union and University, we need to push funding for salary increases. Listed below are the members of the Finance Committee and Sub Committee for the University.

Senate:

Drew Pearce, Co-Chair, Bert Sharp, Co-Chair, Dave Donley, Sean Parnell, Randy Phillips, John Torgerson, Al Adams, Ben Brown,  
Committee Aide, (907) 465-3710

House:

Mark Hanley, Co-Chair, Gene Therriault, Co-Chair, Eldon Mulder,  
Vice-Chair, Gary Davis, Richard Foster, Pete Kelly, Vic Kohring,  
Terry Martin, John Davies, Ben Grussendorf, Carl Moses, Mike Tibbles,  
Committee Aide, (907) 465-4797

Members of the University Subcommittee:

Al Adams, Eldon Mulder, Gary Wilken, Tim Kelly, Con Bunde, Jeanette James, John Davies, Eric Croft.

Respectfully Submitted,

Scott Deal, Chair, Legislative and Fiscal Affairs Committee

\*\*\*\*\*  
ATTACHMENT 78/14  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #78  
MARCH 9, 1998

Date: Mon, 23 Feb 1998 23:02 -0900  
From: Representative John Davies

To: Schatz Madeline F  
Subject: Re: HELP!

Madeline,

RE the PF: as of Dec 31, 97 the PF folks estimate that there will be 982 million dollars in the earnings reserve at the end of FY98. This is after distributing 848 M\$ in dividends and putting 447 M\$ into the corpus of the fund to inflation proof it. If we were to use 10 M\$ per year from the earnings reserve, it would reduce all of our PF dividends by about 50 cents the first year and a slightly increasing amount each year there after. The total would grow most years but it would grow very slightly slower than otherwise. In five years, eg

the dividend might be 1497 instead of 1500.

Your plan is good, Tom and I will discuss it tomorrow and get back to you.

John

---

Subject: HELP!

From: ffmfs@aurora.alaska.edu (Schatz Madeline F) at CC2MHS1

Date: 2/22/98 10:29 AM

Tom,

It was good to see the two of you and talk with you in Juneau the other day. I heartened, as always, by the sense of commitment you have to the university and its constituents.

I am committed to creating a grass roots movement here in Fairbanks to show our desire to tap the Permanent Fund surplus for the monies needed for higher education in the state. I know that there is very little desire in the legislature to help the university, to "bite off their noses to spite their faces," and I feel so powerless in the face of this dilemma. I want as a last ditch effort to mobilize the community and university in a fight to tap these monies.

What I need from you are the exact figures and facts. How much money is in the fund? What effect does the removal of funds from this surplus have on us, the community? What was the original purpose of the creation of this fund? Whose district do I hit the hardest? etc. I think I know the answer to these questions, but I don't want to act until I am sure that I have the facts straight.

What I plan to do is:

1. Inform the public of the fact that the 20th Legislature does not intend to fully fund the university.

2. Ask Deans of the university schools to SPECIFICALLY indicate how that is going to affect their schools.

3. Ask Department heads to SPECIFICALLY indicate how that is going to affect their departments (for instance, in the Music Department non-replacement of Bruno DiCecco's RIP position means no cellist for the department, which means no low strings teacher for the department, which means no cello students, which means no cellists for the Fairbanks Symphony/Arctic Chamber Orchestra or for the chamber music ensembles in the department, which means no symphony and no chamber music program, which means no accreditation from NASM, which also means the lack of community cellists to fill community needs for cellists, which means no Fairbanks Light Opera or Youth Symphony or Junior Orchestra or Fine Arts Camp, etc...) I'm sure every department has its horror stories like this.

4. Approach my numerous friends in the media to ask them to help disseminate this information to our area.

5. Send copies of all of these press releases to our senators and representatives.

6. Ask the public to respond with letters and letters to the editor.

Have I missed anything? Do you have further suggestions? Please let me know how I may be of help in other areas.

Thanks,

Madeline Schatz

