

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral
312 Signers' Hall
474-7964 FYSENAT

A G E N D A
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #83
Monday, November 16, 1998
1:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Wood Center Ballroom

1:30	I	Call to Order - Madeline Schatz	5 Min.
		A. Roll Call	
		B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #82	
		C. Adoption of Agenda	
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
		A. Motions Approved:	
		1. Motion to delegate the authority to approve petitions.	
		B. Motions Pending:	
		1. Motion prohibiting faculty from receiving a graduate degree from UAF.	
1:40	III	A. Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow	10 Min.
		Questions	5 Min.
		B. Remarks by Provost P. Reichardt	5 Min.
		Questions	5 Min.
		C. Guest Speaker - Ralph Gabrielli	10 Min.
		Questions	5 Min.
2:20	IV	Governance Reports	
		A. ASUAF - J. Richardson	5 Min.
		B. Staff Council - S. Christensen	5 Min.
		C. President-Elect's Report - R. Gatterdam	5 Min.
2:35	V	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:40		***BREAK***	10 Min
2:50	VI	Consent Agenda	
		A. Motion on Unit Criteria for Music, submitted by Ad Hoc Committee of Unit Criteria (Attachment 83/1)	
2:50	VII	New Business	
		A. Motion on Board of Regents Policy & Regulations 09.03--Student Dispute Resolution, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 83/2)	5 Min.
		B. Motion of Diploma size, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 83/3)	10 Min.
3:05	VIII	Committee Reports	20 Min.
		A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath (Attachment 83/4)	
		B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - J. Yarie (Attachment 83/5)	
		C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen (Attachment 83/6)	
		D. Core Review - J. Brown	
		E. Curriculum Review - C. Basham	
		F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber (Attachment 83/7)	
		G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley (Attachment 83/8)	

- H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - D. Porter
- I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - L. Duffy (Attachment 83/9)
- J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal
- K. Service Committee - K. Nance

- 3:25 IX Discussion Items
- A. AQSI (Alaska Quality Schools Initiative) 15 Min.
--strategy for action - presentation by Carol Barnhardt & P. Andre' Layral, President, AASSP & ACSA
- 3:40 X Members' Comments/Questions 5 Min.
- 3:45 XI Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 83/1
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
 NOVEMBER 16, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIT CRITERIA

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for Music.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately
 Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the Music Department. With some minor changes, agreed upon by the department representative, David Stech, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

UNIT CRITERIA

for Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion and Tenure

Department of Music
 University of Alaska Fairbanks

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

These unit criteria are to supplement the University of Alaska Fairbanks Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion and Tenure (hereafter referred to as the "University Policies and Regulations") and to clarify their application to faculty of the UAF Department of Music. These unit criteria are subordinate to the University Policies and Regulations.

INTRODUCTION.

These criteria define for the University Promotion/Tenure Review Committee the kinds of music performance and conducting events that are most appropriately assigned to the categories of Teaching, Research and Service.

With respect to performance or conducting activities done under the category of research, the professional prestige of any performance or conducting event is determined by the visibility of the performance forum and the likelihood that a printed review could result. Also affecting visibility of the event is the level of sophistication of the audience, and the reputation of the forum in the eyes of the music professionals in the same performance discipline.

A review can be a significant part of a performer's professional record; however, the lack of a printed review for any one concert should not be construed as a negative assessment of the work of the artist. The artist has no control whether a reviewer is present or whether a review is ultimately printed.

Each live performance is itself a separate creative act where the professional risk is not reduced by the fact that the same program may have been done previously in another location.

Performers are evaluated and chosen for professional management sponsorship after a screening process that parallels the review process used for printed forums. Vitae and recordings of prior concerts are carefully evaluated by sponsors before contractual terms are agreed upon.

The value of university and public school service in music is fully recognized. In many aspects of music performance, service represents a major part of the professional time commitment, even for faculty with heavy teaching loads. Music faculty participation in such events brings favorable notice to the institution as a whole.

Finally, public performance or exhibition activity was described as the appropriate research product for the discipline. Chancellor Patrick O'Rourke wrote, in a memorandum to the Executive Council in 1985:

"Each faculty member must be involved in some effort to make a valid contribution to the body of knowledge in his/her own discipline. This contribution can be made in a variety of ways: research and publication in learned journals, monograph publications, papers at professional meetings, sculpting, painting, music composition, and other performance media which may be appropriate to the discipline. The medium is not near as important as the effort to make a contribution."

SUGGESTIONS FOR DEPARTMENTAL USE OF THE UNIT CRITERIA

It is recommended the faculty member including music performance or conducting activities as part of their promotion and tenure files classify their creative activities according to the categories defined below. The candidate should describe explicitly which events were refereed, juried, or otherwise screened, and precisely how this process was accomplished.

The Departmental Peer Review Committee and Department Chair should offer its collective opinion as to whether the events listed by the candidate appear in the appropriate categories.

The Unit Criteria document defines how the following

professional activities apply to the discipline of music:

- I. TEACHING
- II. RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY
- III. UNIVERSITY/PUBLIC SERVICE

for the three levels of professional forum:

- a. local and surrounding community
- b. statewide; mostly outside the local community
- c. national or international; mostly outside the state.

MUSIC PERFORMANCE activities defined as part of TEACHING

DEFINITIONS: Performance done as an adjunct to formal course instruction, principally to provide role models for students in the classroom environment.

LOCAL: Local solo and ensemble events done as part of studio teaching, master classes, student recitals, or non-solo participation with credit-producing university music ensembles.

Method for Evaluation: This activity should be evaluated by use of the Learning Assessment System (LAS).

STATEWIDE: Similar activities done as part of formal course instruction delivered at other units of the University.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

NATIONAL: Similar activities done as part of formal teaching done at institutions beyond the state or done at institutions outside the U.S.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

Statewide and national teaching activities should not be confused with workshop-type performance activities described in Public and University Service.

MUSIC PERFORMANCE activities defined as part of RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

DEFINITION: Formal concerts given clearly independently of formal instruction or service activities. Shall include performance of music created through electronic music synthesis.

LOCAL: Faculty solo recitals, chamber music, and solo concerto events where the visibility of the event is limited to the local

community.

Method for Evaluation: Based upon opinions expressed by music faculty, or by members of the Performing/Fine Arts/JP Promotion & Tenure Review Committee.

STATEWIDE: Similar events where the visibility of the events extends beyond the community but appears limited to the confines of the state

Method for Evaluation: Faculty who do much performing should be expected to have received some printed press reviews for some of the concerts. Unsolicited written comments may also be used to substantiate the impact and success of the performance.

NATIONAL: Similar events given mostly at nationally or internationally recognized forums. A forum located in the state such as the Fairbanks Summer Arts Festival, the Anchorage Festival, or the Sitka Festival may be included in this category if the professional visibility of the individual is judged to go beyond the State. Also includes faculty participation at an internationally-known music ensemble or at a nationally-visible professional forum. Includes sound recordings commercially and distributed beyond the State.

Method for Evaluation: Faculty engaged in such activities Are expected to have accumulated reviews for some of the events, if they appeared as a soloist. For evaluation of nationally-released sound recordings, the existence of printed reviews would reflect significance of the product in the professional world.

In the absence of published reviews, the Department Chair or the Department Peer Review Committee could (at their discretion) solicit opinions from knowledgeable persons who attended out-of-town performances. Faculty members desiring to engage local peers should discuss specifics with the Department Head well in advance of the concert event.

The principal determinant for measuring the impact placement of an event is the scope of professional visibility achieved.

Special recognition will be given to those performances which

- 1) expose the performer to critical public evaluation by professional peers, or
- 2) major statewide events in which the performer was selected from a national or international pool of performers, or
- 3) where the performer placed well in a formal competition, or in a similar juried evaluation process.

MUSIC PERFORMING
activities defined as part of PUBLIC AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE

DEFINITION: defined as that done in a non-solo capacity to support departmental ensembles, or done as part of University public relations events. Performance done to benefit an extra-

university host or sponsor, especially where the host or sponsor is principally involved with activities other than sponsorship of the performance arts.

LOCAL: Performances given at a municipal event, given to benefit of a host or sponsor such as service organization, church, public school or private business. Also includes performances with municipal non-profit performance groups (e.g. municipal band, light opera theatre, youth orchestra) or other activities done as part of public relations events held locally.

Method for Evaluation: Since such activities are done to benefit the sponsor or host directly, no printed review should be expected. Evaluation can be based upon the opinion of faculty peers who attended the event. There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

STATEWIDE: Similar performances given out of town. Also includes performances with departmental-sponsored music ensembles on tour in the state; performing at music clinics at state regional music festivals by invitation, or performing done at public schools, for purposes of recruitment. Local events may be included in this category if the event drew an audience which is statewide.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. The importance of the event could be assessed according to the professional prestige of the sponsor or the host. There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

NATIONAL or INTERNATIONAL: Similar events done outside of the state. A local or statewide event may be included in this category if the event drew an audience which was national or international in scope.

Method for Evaluation: There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself. The importance of the event could be assessed according to the professional prestige of the sponsor or the host.

MUSIC CONDUCTING activities defined as part of TEACHING

DEFINITION: Conducting done by the instructor as part of required day-to-day preparation of credit-bearing music ensemble courses.

LOCAL: Conducting activities as defined above, including department-sponsored performance.

Method for Evaluation: Through use of the Learning Assessment System (LAS).

STATEWIDE: Similar activities done as part of formal credit-bearing course instruction delivered University wide.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

NATIONAL or INTERNATIONAL: Similar activities done as part of formal credit-bearing course instruction done at institutions beyond the state or done internationally.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

MUSIC CONDUCTING

activities defined as part of RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

DEFINITION: Formal concerts given independently of formal instruction and independent of service activities, except where noted below.

LOCAL: Conducting of non-credit producing department-sponsored music ensembles given locally. Conducting of faculty chamber recitals given locally would be considered part of this category.

Method for Evaluation: Based primarily upon opinions by music unit faculty who attended the performance. Printed reviews would not normally be expected. The provision to allow occasional credit-producing events into the category is NOT to be misunderstood to mean that any successful course-related performance may be automatically included in this category. The assertion by the candidate that the "exceptionally favorable" test was met would need to be supported by Departmental Peer Review and Chair evaluations.

STATEWIDE: Similar events where the visibility extends beyond the community (e.g., if televised to the general public, or if noted in out-of-town press).

Method for Evaluation: Faculty do much conducting would be expected to have received some printed reviews for some of the concerts. Letters of appreciation, or other unsolicited written comments recognizing the merit of the performances, could also be used to substantiate the impact and success of the performance.

NATIONAL: Similar events given mostly at nationally or internationally recognized forums. May include local performance if visibility is judged to extend to beyond the state. Also includes faculty conducting appearances with a national, or internationally, known music ensemble or at nationally, or internationally, visible concert forums. Sound recordings commercially marketed and distributed beyond the State would also be included in this category.

Method for Evaluation: The significance of such participation would derive from the visibility or prestige of the ensemble. For evaluation of nationally-released sound recordings, the existence of printed reviews, would reflect the significance of the product in the professional world.

In the absence of published reviews, the Department Chair or the Departmental Peer Review Committee could (at their discretion), solicit opinions from knowledgeable persons who attended out-of-town performances. Such evaluations, if available, can supplement the candidate's professional file. Faculty members desiring to

implement this evaluation tool should suggest the possibility of the music executive well in advance of the concert advance. The lack of external peer evaluations should not reflect negatively on the record of the faculty candidate

The principal determinant for categorizing conducting events described above is the scope of the professional visibility achieved by the performance, and to a lesser degree, where the performance actually took place.

Special recognition should be given to those performances which

- 1) exposed the conductor to critical public evaluation by professional peers,
- 2) major statewide events in which the conductor was elected from a national or international pool of conductors, or
- 3) where the conductor placed well in a formal competition or in a similar juried evaluation process.

MUSIC CONDUCTING

activities defined as part of UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE

DEFINITION: to benefit an extra-university host or sponsor, especially where the host or sponsor is principally involved with activities other than sponsorship of the performing arts.

LOCAL: Performances given at a municipal event sponsored by a service organization, church, public school, or private business. Also includes conducting municipal band, light opera theater, youth orchestra, conducting of departmental ensembles for public school music ensembles (including those out-of-town groups which were hosted locally).

Method for Evaluation: There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

STATEWIDE FORUM: Similar performances given out-of-town. Also includes conducting of department-sponsored music ensemble on tour of the state. Also includes conducting of music clinics at state region festivals by invitation and other clinics done around the state.

Method for Evaluation: There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

NATIONAL or INTERNATIONAL: Similar events done where professional visibility of the conductor extends beyond the confines of the state or local region. May include being a clinician at a nationally-recognized event held locally, if sponsors of the event have a previously established record of selecting clinicians from a national pool.

Method for Evaluation: The importance of the event could be assessed according to the professional prestige of the sponsor or the host. There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION DOCUMENT
SUMMARY OF UNIT CRITERIA DESIGNATIONS AND
PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS

I. Teaching	A. Local and surrounding community
II. Research	B. Statewide; mostly outside the local community
III. University and Public Service	C. National or International, mostly outside of the state.

PROFESSIONAL VISIBILITY EXPECTED FOR
PROMOTION TO DIFFERENT ACADEMIC RANKS

Lecturer (non-tenure)	IA
Instructor (non-tenure)	IA
Instructor (tenure)	IA, IIA, IIB, IIIA
Assistant Professor (tenure)	IA, IIA, IIB, IIIA
Associate Professor (tenure)	IA, IIA, IIB, IIC, IIIA, IIIB
Professor (tenure)	IA, IIA, IIB, IIC, IIIA, IIIB

Criteria for tenure are assumed to be the same as those used for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Candidates for promotion are expected to have a record of recent professional activities beyond the professional record used to achieve promotion to previous rank.

ATTACHMENT 83/2
UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
NOVEMBER 16, 1998
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the proposed Regents' Policy and University Regulation 09.03.00--Student Dispute Resolution as submitted by the Board of Regents to the Faculty Alliance be accepted.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The Curricular Affairs Committee discussed the revised draft policies and regulations on Student Dispute Resolution, forwarded to the Faculty Senate for review and moves to forward them to the full Senate,

with its recommendation that they be accepted.

Date: 12 October, 1998

To: Pat Ivey, Executive Officer, for distribution to
Systemwide Governance Organizations

From: 'Nanne Myers, Assistant Vice President for
Academic Affairs, for the Policy Revision Work Group

Subj: Re-draft of Regents' Policy/University Regulation
09.03.01--Student Dispute Resolution

Last spring, as a result of the dissatisfaction expressed in this policy and regulation by the Faculty Alliance and the Coalition of Student Leaders, the drafting team met with representatives of the Faculty Alliance. It was agreed that the team would revise the policy and regulation to reflect the AAUP guidelines for review of assignment of final grades. The resulting drafts are herewith forwarded for your consideration, with apologies that they were not available at the beginning of the semester. Editing reflects changes from the first draft forwarded for review by governance.

The changes to the policy are summarized below.

- 09.03.02.A The word "generally" is inserted to indicate that an informal resolution is not a necessary first step in the initiation of a review.
- 09.03.02.B.2 This section has been substantively changed to make a policy statement that only faculty may authorize a change in grade.
- 09.03.02.B.3 This paragraph is rewritten but not substantively changed

The regulation has been revised to address reviews of final grade assignments as distinct from all other reviews of academic decisions, and reflect student concerns regarding eligibility for services while a review is in progress.

The review of final grade assignment results in a process by which a faculty committee may change a grade given by an instructor. It is important to note, as the AAUP guidelines point out, that institutions receiving federal funds are legally obligated to provide procedures by which students might successfully challenge grades that they believe may have been tainted by race or sex discrimination. A copy of the AAUP statement is attached.

On the advice of the Systemwide Academic Council, procedures for resolving other academic disputes are left to definition by MAU rules and procedures. The chancellor or designee is specified as the person to make the final decision, since in some cases, e.g., for decisions regarding graduate studies at UAS, the chief academic officer may make the decision which is subsequently challenged.

Section 09.03.02.E has been revised in response to a recommendation from the Coalition of Students Governments that eligibility for services not be affected while a dispute is in progress. Unfortunately, this is not always possible or desirable.

The drafting team requests the Faculty Alliance and the Coalition of Student Leaders to consider completing final recommendations on the policy in time for its presentation to the board in November. Because the regulation is approved not by the board, but by the president, more time could, and probably should, be taken for consideration of final recommendations regarding the regulation.

This request is made out of respect for Academic and Student Affairs Chair Sharon Gagnon, who was primarily instrumental in calling for and expediting the sorely needed revisions to policy regarding academic matters and student affairs. Regent Gagnon's term is coming to an end, and the November meeting is most likely to be her last. It would be fitting to accomplish as much revision as possible before she leaves.

(The following policy draft is the equivalent of the hard copy with the footer "For Governance Review, second reading; Disp Res Pol 10.13gov.doc)

DRAFT

POLICY 09.03.00

PART IX

STUDENT AFFAIRS

CHAPTER III

Student Dispute Resolution

General Statement: Student Dispute Resolution P09.03.01

The University of Alaska will provide fair, consistent, and expeditious procedures for students to contest actions or decisions which adversely affect them. These procedures will be published in student catalogs or handbooks. Students may direct a complaint to the MAU senior student services officer, the chief academic officer, the chief administrative services officer, or designee. This official will initiate action to resolve the complaint or will inform the student of the appropriate procedure, if any, for review of the action or decision in dispute.

Actions or decisions of the Board of Regents or the substance of Regents Policy, University Regulation, and MAU rules and procedures are not subject to review pursuant to the provisions of this policy.

General Procedures For Dispute Resolution P09.03.02

A. Informal Resolution Procedures

Unless specified to the contrary, the first step for a student to challenge a university action or decision will GENERALLY be to seek an informal resolution with the person responsible for the decision or action, or with the person's immediate supervisor.

B. Formal Review Procedures

If the matter [is not] CAN NOT BE resolved informally, a

student may submit a written statement to initiate one of the following formal review procedures. A request for formal dispute resolution may not be filed under more than one procedure, or more than once on an issue. Each procedure will include at least one level of review prior to the final decision, and will provide due process appropriate to the issue.

1. Review of student employment decisions or actions

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

2. Review of academic decisions or actions

Challenges to academic decisions or actions of the faculty or academic administration will be reviewed in accordance with the procedures set forth in the accompanying regulation and in MAU rules and procedures. [Review of the assignment of grades will start with the faculty member assigning the grade, unless this person is unavailable within the review schedule provided in the regulation.] Appropriate issues for this procedure include such things as alleged arbitrary or capricious dismissal from or denial of admission to an academic program based upon academic considerations, or assignment of final grades. ONLY THE COURSE INSTRUCTOR OR A REVIEW BODY COMPOSED OF FACULTY MAY AUTHORIZE A CHANGE IN THE ASSIGNMENT OF A FINAL GRADE.

3. Review of university judicial decisions or disciplinary SANCTIONS [actions]

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING TWO PARAGRAPHS ARE NEW WORDING

Procedures by which students may challenge decisions resulting from university judicial procedures and/or the imposition of sanctions for violation of the Student Code of Conduct are set forth in University Regulation 09.02.04 - Student Rights and Responsibilities, sections G - K.

The Code, examples of violations of the Code (which include cheating, plagiarism, and disruption of the living or learning environment), university judicial procedures, and disciplinary sanctions are set forth in Regents' Policy and University Regulation 09.02.00 - Student Rights and Responsibilities, and MAU rules and procedures.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH WAS PROPOSED FOR DELETION

[Challenges of university judicial decisions or disciplinary sanctions related to behavioral or academic misconduct will be reviewed in accordance with procedures set forth in University Regulation on student rights and responsibilities and in MAU rules and procedures. Appropriate issues for this procedure include such things as allegations of cheating, plagiarism, disruption of the living or learning environment, or other violations of the Student Code of

Conduct.

4. Review of administrative decisions or actions

Chancellors will be responsible for providing and promulgating MAU rules and procedures which provide a mechanism for students to challenge certain administrative decisions or actions not otherwise covered in this policy. Not all administrative decisions and actions will be subject to challenge.

C. Final decision

At the end of the review proceedings the university will issue a written decision, identified as the "final decision," after which point the matter under dispute will not be reviewed further by the university. Notification of the final decision will be made in accordance with Regents' Policy on student rights and responsibilities regarding seeking further redress in the court system to university decisions and actions. (See also Regents' Policy 09.02.08 - Student Rights and Responsibilities: Final University Decision.)

Confidentiality

P09.03.03

Access to files pertaining to student disputes will be governed by state and federal laws and regulations, Regents' Policy, University Regulation, and MAU rules and procedures and may vary with the issue under review and the review process.

The university cannot guarantee confidentiality but will make a reasonable effort to preserve the legitimate privacy interests of the persons involved. In order to preserve the legitimate privacy interests of the persons involved, all participants in the proceedings will be expected to maintain confidentiality.

The person in charge of the review procedure may release information if appropriate permission from the parties is provided or if other applicable legal requirements are met.

Access to Formal Review Proceedings

P09.03.04

Student dispute resolution proceedings will normally be closed. Requests for an open proceeding must be made by a party prior to the start of the proceeding. Such requests will be granted to the extent allowed by law unless the person in charge of the proceeding determines that all or part of a proceeding should be closed based upon considerations of fairness, justice, and other relevant factors. A party may choose an advisor to be present at all times during the proceedings.

The person in charge of the proceeding may direct that witnesses, but not the parties or their advisors, be excluded from the proceedings except during their testimony. The deliberations of the hearing panel or officer will be closed to the public and the parties.

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

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] GRADES ASSIGNED PRIOR TO THE FINAL GRADE RECEIVED IN A COURSE ARE NOT [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, AS DEFINED IN MAU RULES AND PROCEDURES. [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.")

The following terms is no longer used in this section
[d. Chief Academic Officer

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

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. Faculty Review Committee

A FACULTY REVIEW COMMITTEE IS AN AD HOC COMMITTEE COMPOSED SOLELY OF FACULTY APPOINTED BY THE DEAN/DIRECTOR TO FORMALLY REVIEW A CONTESTED FINAL GRADE ASSIGNMENT.

g. Final Grade

Note: The following, recognized as under dispute, should probably wait for modification until after the Faculty Alliance agrees upon grading standards.

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 or designee to formally review a contested academic decision or action.]

(PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING IS ALMOST COMPLETELY REVISED. I HAVE PROVIDED ONLY THE NEW TEXT. --'Anne Myers)

2. Procedure for Resolving Disputes Regarding FINAL GRADE ASSIGNMENT [Academic Decisions or Actions]

Students may challenge a final grade assignment on the basis of alleged grading error or arbitrary and capricious grading.

Because grades can affect such things as a student's eligibility for continued financial aid, MAU rules and procedures must advise students to learn their final grades and initiate a review, where appropriate, as soon as possible. MAU rules and procedures must also stipulate other provisions which may be needed to expedite these reviews in the manner outlined in regulation below. While it is preferable that reviews are initiated in the same semester as the assignment of the grade, the time schedule outlined below will stipulate maximum time periods within which to complete stages of the review.

a. Informal [Resolution] Procedures

- (1) [Before taking formal steps to challenge an academic decision or action, a student must] Where possible, students will be expected to first request an [attempt] informal resolution of the [issue] final grade assignment with the course instructor or academic leader. The process must be initiated prior to the fifteenth [twentieth] class day of the next regular semester. The instructor or academic leader must respond to the request within five class days of receipt.
- (2) If the instructor's decision is to change the [a] final grade, the instructor must immediately initiate [within five (5) class days] the process in accordance with [provided in] MAU rules and procedures. [to change a final grade.] If the instructor does not change the grade and the student's concerns remain unresolved, the student may, in accordance with MAU rules and procedures, notify the academic leader of

the academic unit responsible for the course. Within five class days of such notification, the academic leader must either effect resolution of the issue with the instructor or inform the student of the process for formally appealing the final grade assignment.

- (3) If the course instructor is no longer an employee of the university or is otherwise unavailable, the student must notify the academic leader prior to the fifteenth class day of the next regular semester. Within five class days of notification by the student, the academic leader must either effect resolution of the issue through contact with the course instructor or inform the student of the process for formally appealing the final grade assignment.

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

- (1) A student formally appealing a final grade assignment must provide the dean/director a signed, written request for a formal review, indicating the basis for requesting a change of grade. The request must be filed prior to the twentieth class day of the next regular semester or within five class days of receipt of notification of the process by the academic leader.

[A student initiating a formal review of an alleged grading error must provide the course instructor with a signed, written request for a 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 class day of the next regular semester.]

- (2) In accordance with MAU rules and procedures, the dean/director will convene a faculty review committee and forward to it the written request for formal review from the student. The committee must initiate proceedings within ten class days of receipt of the student's request.
- (3) The faculty review committee may dismiss the request without a hearing or, in accordance with MAU rules and procedures, conduct a formal hearing and consider information provided by the student, the instructor, and others as it sees fit. If the faculty review committee initially concludes the grade should be changed, the review committee will request the course instructor to change the grade. If the instructor refuses, the review committee will provide an opportunity for consideration of the

instructor's explanations.

- (4) The faculty review committee proceedings will result in the preparation of written findings and conclusions. Conclusions will result in one of the following.
 - (a) The request for a grade change is denied.
 - (b) The request for a grade change is upheld; the review committee requests the course instructor to change the grade; and the course instructor changes the grade in accordance with MAU rules and procedures.
 - (c) The request for a grade change is upheld; the course instructor is either unavailable to change the grade or refuses to, and the review committee authorizes the dean/director to initiate the process specified by MAU rules and procedures to change the grade to that specified by the review committee .
- (5) The decision of the faculty review committee constitutes the final decision of the university, and will be provided in writing to the student, the course instructor, and the dean/director.
- (6) Except in the event of extenuating circumstances, disputes concerning final grades must be completed by the end of the next regular semester following the assignment of the grade.

NOTE: The next section of the previous draft has been deleted; see the former draft for its contents. All bases for disputing a final grade assignment are now addressed by one procedure, outlined above. Disputes regarding other academic decisions or actions are to be addressed primarily by MAU rules and procedures, as outlined below.

3. [Formal Review Procedures for Dispute Regarding Academic Decisions or Actions Other Than for Allegation of Grading Error.]

Review Procedures for Disputes Regarding Academic Decisions or Actions Other Than Assignment of Final Grade

MAU rules and procedures will provide for informal and/or formal procedures for students to challenge academic decisions or actions other than assignment of a final grade. At least one level of review prior to the final decision and due process appropriate to the issue must be provided. The chancellor or designee will make the university's final decision on the matter and provide a written statement to the student and other concerned parties as appropriate.

C. Resolution of Disputes [Challenges] Regarding University
Judicial Decisions or Disciplinary Sanctions

Disputes regarding university judicial decisions or resulting disciplinary sanctions will be reviewed according to procedures set forth in University Regulation on student rights and responsibilities.

D. Resolution of Disputes Regarding [Procedures 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 students eligibility for financial aid, housing, or other UNIVERSITY service, THE STUDENT WILL BE INFORMED OF THE STEPS TO BE TAKEN WHICH MAY [and is responsible for initiating the appropriate review process to] maintain or reinstate the affected service. THE STUDENT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR INITIATING ANY NECESSARY ACTIONS OR PROCEDURES.

Confidentiality

R09.03.03

[RESERVED]

Access to Formal Review Proceedings R09.03.04

[RESERVED]

ATTACHMENT 83/3

UAF FACULTY SENATE #83

NOVEMBER 16, 1998

SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves that diplomas be issued in two sizes: a 6" by 9" diploma for recipients of certificates and associate degrees, and an 8" by 11" diploma for recipients of baccalaureate and graduate degrees.

EFFECTIVE: Spring, 1999

RATIONALE: The UAF tradition has been to issue diplomas in two sizes, with certificate and associate degree diplomas smaller than those for baccalaureate and graduate degrees. When UAF began printing its own diplomas, the software then in use produced diplomas of one size only. Now, software allows differentiation in the size of diplomas, and it is possible to return to the

tradition of issuing diplomas in two sizes.

ATTACHMENT 83/4
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
 NOVEMBER 16, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Notes on Curricular Affairs meeting, 10/27/98 - J. McBeath, Chair

At our meeting today, we took action on a motion, agreed to a registrar's proposal on commencement announcements, and reacted to the latest version of the student dispute resolution policy. We also formed two sub-committees and had general discussion on several issues. I list here the items that members of the administrative committee may be interested in; Harry Bader is committee secretary and he will forward minutes by the end of the week.

1. Motion on diploma size

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves that diplomas be issued in two sizes: a 6" by 9" diploma for recipients of certificates and associate degrees, and an 8 1/2" by 11" diploma for recipients of baccalaureate and graduate degrees.

EFFECTIVE: Spring 1999

RATIONALE: The UAF tradition has been to issue diplomas in two sizes, with certificate and associate degree diplomas smaller than those for baccalaureate and graduate degrees. When UAF began printing its own diplomas, the software then in use produced diplomas of one size only. Now, software allows differentiation in the size of diplomas, and it is possible to return to the tradition of issuing diplomas in two sizes.

(The committee discussed amending the proposal to have one diploma for undergraduate degrees and another for graduate degrees; the amendment failed to pass. The registrar said it was possible to create diplomas in only two sizes. The main motion passed by a 5-4 vote of the committee, and is forwarded to the administrative committee to be placed on the November senate agenda.)

2. Course/instructor approvals

Two members of the committee--Alex Fitts and Harry Bader--will work with two CRA representatives to consider policy changes in the area of consistency of course and instructor approvals. They will report to the CAC at its January meeting.

3. Departmental honors

Two members of the committee--Ann Tremarello and Carol Barnhardt--will form the subcommittee to investigate whether UAF needs a policy on departmental honors. They will report to the committee at its next meeting in November.

4. Student dispute resolution

Committee members had reviewed the results of the policy

revision work group on Policy/Regulation 09.03.01--Student Dispute Resolution. No member of the committee objected to this revision, and generally members believed the committee's concerns had been addressed. However, the chair believes the issue should be discussed at the administrative committee meeting.

5. Certification of degree requirements and honors

Ann Tremarello proposed a change in the timing of degree requirements' and honors' certification--that it occur after (and not as at present, before) the commencement. She also proposed that language similar to the following appear at the bottom of each page of the commencement program: "Certificates, degrees and honors for May degree candidates will be awarded after final grades have been received and verification of completion of requirements has been completed."

The committee agreed unanimously with Ann's proposal. The chair believes that this item falls within the purview of administrative discretion and does not require full Faculty Senate action.

I have classes Monday from 1:00 to 3:20 p.m., and will join the administrative committee meeting afterwards. Best regards, Jerry.

ATTACHMENT 83/5

UAF FACULTY SENATE #83

NOVEMBER 16, 1998

SUBMITTED BY FACULTY & SCHOLARLY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Report of the October 26, 1998 meeting of the Faculty and Scholarly Affairs Committee

Present: S. Bandopadhyay, S. Grigg, B. Luick, B. Mortensen, J. Olson and J. Yarie

Meeting Overview

1. Dr. Godwin Chukwu was present to make a presentation on the role of Department Head's in the University. With the development of the union contract the exact role of a Department Head is no longer as straight forward as it was in the past. At this point in time it needs to be decided if the committee should address this issue in the future.

2. We started a discussion of the changes that need to be made to the Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies (FAEP) and the Regulation for the Evaluation of Faculty (REF). We have decided to start with the first three chapters in both sections. Within the FAEP document we will start with the following chapters: Construction and Application, Definitions and Appointment of Faculty. Within the REF document we will start with the Purview, Initial Appointment of Faculty and Periodic Evaluation of Faculty.

3. We will place future discussion of the Faculty Handbook on the shelf for the time being.

4. Finally Dr. Pippenger was present to give a presentation on evaluation policies. Dr. Pippenger presented a short discussion on the development of a disciplinary committee for the faculty.

ATTACHMENT 83/6
UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
NOVEMBER 16, 1998
SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Report of the GPCA Committee Meeting
Oct. 22 1998, Chancellors Conference Room

Present: Michael Whalen - Chair, Renee Manfredi, Vikas Sonwalker,
Clif Lando, Joe Kan, Gayle Gregory, Dennis Stephens, Dennis Schall
(visitor Dept. of Ed.)

New Business

A. Joe Kan presented a plan to restructure the MAT in Education.
This consisted of three separate programs including:

- 1) Post-Baccalaureate Teach Licensure Program
- 2) MAT Degree for Licensed Teachers with BA/BS degrees
- 3) MAT Degree for Licensed Teachers with Bed degrees.

Dr. Kan explained the reasoning behind the program changes which
included separating the licensure procedure from the MAT
requirements and changing MAT degree requirements for previously
licensed teachers.

The plan was presented to the committee for its review and input
and will be presented for formal approval at an upcoming meeting.

B. The committee reviewed and approved a Trial Course request for
NRM 494/694 Nutrient Cycling and Soil Fertility. This represents a
broadening of a previously existing course (NRM 472/672) and thus
requires a new course number. Additional requirements for graduate
credit include discussion leadership, an annotated bibliography, and
a synthesis paper.

C. Next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, November 10, 1998, 2:00 -
3:30 p.m., Chancellor's Conference Room, 330 Signers.

ATTACHMENT 83/7
UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
NOVEMBER 16, 1998
SUBMITTED BY THE DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES COMMITTEE

Minutes of The Developmental Studies Committee
October 15, 1998, Wood Center Conference Room A

Attending: Rich Carr, Jerah Chadwick, George Guthridge, Cindy Hardy,
Margie Illingworth, Wanda Martin, Greg Owens, Jane Weber.

Old Business:

Number for DEVS 193, Academic Intervention:

Margie indicated that, after our discussion of the numbering of this
class last spring, she felt comfortable with a 100-level designator.
She requested, however, that the number be at the upper end to
distinguish it from other DEVS offerings. The committee agreed to
DEVS 189 as the designator for this class. Jane has the paperwork
for this change and will file it.

Developmental Science course:

Late last spring, the Department of Defense asked CRA to submit a grant to develop a Developmental Science prototype course for delivery to the rural areas. Mike Suffrage, a grantwriter, and rural campus faculty developed this grant and it is now proceeding. Delena Norris-Tull heads the grant, and this year she will be working on course development so that the class can be on the books for fall. The class will be interdisciplinary, developing math and science skills that students need for the 105/106 Chemistry and Biology series. While this course is intended for rural areas with a significant minority population (Interior Aleutians, Sitka, Bethel, Nome, and other CRA campuses), once developed, it could be used at TVC and on the main campus. Delena has an office on campus through CRA, with Kelly Dickerson for administrative support. In addition, two full-time science and one math faculty and seven part-time faculty will be hired under the grant. Marjie is working with the grant, bringing her background in using Video Supported Instruction (VSI) and other innovative methods to this project. She had invited Delena to phone into the meeting, but Delena was unable to attend.

The committee expressed some concern that this has been done in reverse order—that the development of this course and grant should have come through committee first. However, since CRA was given the opportunity to apply with a short turnaround time, we will meet with Delena and go on with the process from this point. Jane and Cindy will meet with her when she gets back to town.

Tracking and Outcomes Assessment:

Wanda reported that we need people to work on pulling Fall '94 data together and that we may want to look at Spring '95, as well, to put together baseline data. Once the baseline is collected and analyzed, we can go forward with tracking our current students, comparing new data with the baseline. This will help us identify what we want as outcomes for our students. The questions we are addressing this year are:

Does a student who succeeds with a C or better in DEVM and who takes the next level math class succeed (C or better) in that next level math class?

Does a student who succeeds with a C or better in DEVE and who takes the next level English class succeed (C or better) in that next level English class?

Do students on academic probation who take DEVS 193 (189) and pass achieve a semester GPA of 2.0 or better during the same semester, and do they maintain a semester GPA of 2.0 or better in the following semester?

According to Wanda, we still do not have access to information or assistance from the Office of Institutional Research, since they are still learning how to get the information they need to address the Chancellor's priorities. We need to decide what information we will need on a regular basis--such as test scores--to help us identify high-risk students. We can gather class lists, however, so that we can begin tracking our students and comparing current information with the baseline data.

Jane and Cindy will look into the possibility of a student worker to help with data entry as we proceed with this project.

Class Sizes:

Ron contacted Jane about reopening discussion of class size in Developmental classes. With all the transitions at upper levels of the university, this may be a good time to reopen this discussion again, especially as it relates to student retention and success. Wanda reported that Shirley Holloway informed the Regents of a new diploma test for High School students. Those who do not pass will receive a certificate and will be turning to us for preparation to retake the test. This will impact our class sizes. We agreed that this is an important--even an ethical--issue for our program, since we now take in more students than we can work with, expecting some to drop or otherwise disappear. Wanda suggested that we need a well-documented proposal and recommendation addressing these issues and that this could be submitted a number of places (President, BOR, Deans and Directors, etc). Marjie volunteered Ron to pull this information together and to write a proposal to bring to the next meeting.

Next meeting: November 12, 2pm

Please add the following information to the minutes re the CRA DOD grant. I was unable to attend the last meeting as I was teaching a class.

As chair of the CRA Developmental Studies Division, I was contacted by Mike Sfraga on a short timeline for the development of this grant. I provided Mike with info for his use in the grant development. The grant specifically applied to rural areas only, eliminating the urban UAF campus and thus was applicable only to CRA. I did back brief the Faculty Senate Developmental Studies Committee last year about this grant but at that time we had only limited information and no contacts other than Mike.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald D. Illingworth

ATTACHMENT 83/8
UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
NOVEMBER 16, 1998
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Report of the third meeting of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee - J. Kelley, Chair

PRESENT: Kristy Long, Pham Quang, Ray Gavlak, Godwin Chukwu, Jim Ruppert, Fred Dyen, John Kelley, Chair

ABSENT: Tara Maginnis, Richard Stolzberg, David Verbyla
SFOS (1) vacant, CRA (1) vacant, SOEd (2) Not yet appointed

The committee met on Friday, October 30, 1998 in the Chancellor's conference room from 1 to 2 p.m.

1. Two members of the committee have a conflict with the present meeting schedule. The committee agreed to change the schedule of the next meeting to Wednesday, November 18 from 1-2 p.m. to accommodate these members. The committee will decide on a new schedule for the spring semester.

2. Review of Administrators: John Kelley met with Provost Paul Reichardt and his assistant Gina Bailey on October 13 to discuss the subject of review of administrators. This meeting was in response to the request of the Appeals and Oversight committee last month to solicit information on former procedures. The original motion was reviewed as well as the 1992 and 1996 processes. A list of Administrator Evaluations starting with the 1991-92 process was obtained. Dr. Ralph Gabrielli is the only administrator scheduled for review in 1998-99.

The committee was concerned that other administrators at the UAF were not considered. Ray Gavlak suggested that we acquire a current list of administrators. This list will be provided for the next meeting. Fred Dyen emphasized that it is the responsibility of this committee to establish the list and cycle of review. It will be necessary to review the original motion as passed by the senate.

The committee felt (motion passed) that coordination of the review effort should be coordinated through the Governance Office. The chairperson will discuss this with Sheri Layral.

Fred Dyen suggested that this committee discuss any changes needed for the evaluation process, provide a suggested timeline for evaluation and identify the Deans and directors who should be evaluated. This information should be presented to the Administrative Committee of the senate.

3. Grade Appeals: G. Chukwu and R. Stolzberg are participating in a grade appeal (CSEM). Other committee members are participating on grade appeals cases in CLA: F. Dyen (2) and J. Ruppert (1).

The committee suggested that Dr. Foley be contacted to report on any changes in policy resulting from past committee action.

4. Old business/New business: Fred Dyen followed up on last month's concerns about effectiveness of the grade appeals process. He suggested that Dr. Foley develop a grade appeal check list (form) to be given to the student. Follow-up is desired to find out if a draft form is available.

5. Mike Pippenger arrived after the meeting had been adjourned. He presented a draft of a memo regarding the United Academics Appeals Board and its relationship to the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee. This memo will be discussed at our next meeting.

6. Next meeting: November 18, 1998

ATTACHMENT 83/9
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #83
 NOVEMBER 16, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

GRADUATE SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE - L.K. Duffy, Chair

The Graduate School Advisory Committee met on October 19 and discussed 3 motions which will be submitted to Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs Committee. They are:

1. For admission to UAF graduate programs, applicants must have an undergraduate GPA of 3.0. If below a 3.0, applicants must submit

the scores from a GMAT or GRE before being admitted.

2. Graduate credit is transferable within the UA system for courses where the student has received a grade of C or better. For use in a specific graduate course, the student's graduate committee must approve and the transfer credit be clearly indicated in the graduate study plan. Residency requirements for UAF graduate programs are 15 credits.

3. Master degree programs will declare at the departmental level:
1) whether a research project is required for a non-thesis M.S. programs, and 2) if a project is required, whether it will be archived at the UAF library.

The Committee also reviewed suggestions for the use of the \$200,000 increased FY99 allotment to the Graduate School. Most ideas were seen as useful if they were initiated on a continuing basis. Since the funding is for one year only, the committee recommended improving the computer infrastructure for graduate students.