

## FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral  
312 Signers' Hall  
474-7964 FYSENAT

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

A G E N D A  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #84  
Monday, December 7, 1998  
1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.  
Wood Center Ballroom

- |      |     |   |         |
|------|-----|---|---------|
| 1:30 | I   | Call to Order - Ron Gatterdam   | 5 Min.  |
|      |     | A. Roll Call  |         |
|      |     | B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #83   |         |
|      |     | C. Adoption of Agenda   |         |
| 1:35 | II  | Status of Chancellor's Office Actions   | 5 Min.  |
|      |     | A. Motions Approved:  |         |
|      |     | 1. Motion to approved Unit Criteria for Music.  |         |
|      |     | B. Motions Pending:   |         |
|      |     | 1. Motion prohibiting faculty from receiving a graduate degree from UAF.  |         |
| 1:40 | III | A. Remarks by Provost P. Reichardt  | 5 Min.  |
|      |     | Questions   | 5 Min.  |
|      |     | B. Guest Speaker - Dana Thomas  | 15 Min. |
| 2:05 | IV  | Governance Reports  |         |
|      |     | A. ASUAF - J. Richardson  | 5 Min.  |
|      |     | B. Staff Council - B. Frey  | 5 Min.  |
|      |     | C. President-Elect's Report - R. Gatterdam  | 10 Min. |
| 2:25 | V   | Public Comments/Questions   | 5 Min.  |
| 2:30 |     | ***BREAK***   | 10 Min. |
| 2:40 | VI  | New Business  |         |
|      |     | A. Motion to amend the Academic Course and Degree Procedures Manual to requires the inclusion of a description of the student learning outcomes assessment process for new programs and revision for major program changes, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 84/1) | 5 Min.  |
|      |     | B. Motion to establish a Departmental Honors Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 84/2)  | 5 Min.  |
|      |     | C. Motion on Common Grading Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Handout)   | 5 Min.  |
|      |     | D. Motion on Course Level Definitions, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Handout)  | 5 Min.  |
|      |     | E. Resolution on qualifications of new Board of Regent members, submitted by Legislative & Fiscal Affairs (Handout)   | 5 Min.  |
| 3:05 | VII | Committee Reports   | 20 Min. |
|      |     | A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath (Attachment 84/3)  |         |
|      |     | B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - J. Yarie   |         |
|      |     | C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen (Attachment 84/4)   |         |

- D. Core Review - J. Brown (Attachment 84/5)
- E. Curriculum Review - C. Basham
- F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber (Attachment 84/6)
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley  
(Attachment 84/7)
- H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -  
D. Porter
- I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - L. Duffy  
(Attachment 84/8)
- J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal (Attachment 84/9)
- K. Service Committee - K. Nance
- L. Ad Hoc Committees

3:25 VIII Informational Item  
A. Results of Evaluation Committee elections  
(Attachment 84/10)

3:25 IX Members' Comments/Questions 5 Min.

3:30 X Adjournment

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 84/1  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #84  
DECEMBER 7, 1998  
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the New Degree Program Request (Format 3) and Major Program Change (Format 5) in the Academic Course and Degree Procedures Manual to include a full description of the student learning outcomes assessment process for new programs and revision for major program changes.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Development and implementation of student learning outcomes assessment programs are professional teaching duty and is also a requirement of our institutional accreditation. This motion brings us into compliance with accreditation standards.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 84/2  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #84  
DECEMBER 7, 1998  
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to establish a Departmental Honors policy. Criteria for award of departmental undergraduate honors include:

1. An overall GPA of 3.0 and 3.5 in the student's major
2. Evidence of exceptional academic achievement in one or more of the following areas:
  - a. completion of significant research under guidance

- of university faculty member;
- b. completion of a specific cluster of advanced courses with a GPA of 3.5 or higher;
- c. completion of a senior thesis with distinction;
- d. score at or above the 85th percentile on specialty GRE test or other "standard" test;
- e. completion of an outstanding portfolio of student work.

Departments wishing to award this honors designation will submit a plan to the curricular affairs committee, indicating the specific evidence of exceptional academic achievement the department requires. Departments with approved plans are responsible for notifying the registrar's office of their honorees one month before graduation. Names of students receiving departmental honors will be listed with other student honorees in the commencement program, and the designation will appear on students' transcripts.

EFFECTIVE: 1999-2000 academic year

RATIONALE: UAF lacks a system for recognizing outstanding graduates in their fields of study, which this proposal would establish. Also, departmental honors will be an incentive spurring student achievement in UAF's disciplines and programs.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 84/3  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #84  
 DECEMBER 7, 1998  
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Minutes: Curricular Affairs Committee, November 24, 1998

Present: J. McBeath, Chair; H. Bader, Secretary; C. Barnhardt; C. Basham; A. Fitts; R. Illingworth

Ex-Officio: A. Tremarello  
 Non-Voting Members: G. Gregory; W. Martin; E. Murphy  
 Student Member: K. Klasen

NOT present: M. Perkins; J. Reynolds

Presentations:

Outcome Assessment Briefing & Update - D. Thomas

Business:

1. Student Organizations and Recognition Policy  
 Report on the registration and recognition of student organizations by the University. Criteria for organization compliance with University rights and responsibilities.

Discussion:

This issue is outside the scope of the subject matter authority for the CA committee. However, the committee recognizes that there is currently no formal structure within the Faculty Senate to address such student activity issues.

Action:

The committee voted to return the request back to Administrative Affairs and recommend a special task force be

established within the Senate to address such student oriented issues.

## 2. Departmental Honors

The committee addressed a request to implement independent Departmental Honors to be bestowed to students at graduation by academic departments for particularly accomplished students.

### Discussion:

The committee discussion focussed upon the need to maintain high standards and continuity for such honors. There was broad support for the concept and the belief that such a system would recognize excellence in a manner not now addressed by the current system.

### Action:

The committee approved a process for departmental requests for honors. The process is a three step approach: (1) minimum GPA within UAF and the academic department; (2) requirement of extra work requirements in addition to those required for the degree, such as, but not limited to, faculty supervised research projects, senior thesis, and additional course work; (3) all such honors proposals must receive final approval from the CA committee. The committee forwarded a request for input and review from the campus honors program before making a final recommendation to the senate. Honors would be listed upon the diploma after confirmation of completion. Program is proposed to begin conferring honors for Fall 1999. Submissions must be made by Departments no later than April 15, 1999.

Next Meeting: January 26, 1999. 10:00 a.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 84/4

UAF FACULTY SENATE #84

DECEMBER 7, 1998

SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

### Report of the GPCA Committee Meeting

Nov. 11 1998, Chancellors Conference Room

Present: Michael Whalen - Chair, Vikas Sonwalker, Clif Lando, Harikumar Sankaran, Joe Kan, Gayle Gregory, Dennis Stephens, Larry Duffy (GSAC), Dennis Schall (visitor Dept. of Ed.)

### New Business

A. Division of labor for review of graduate course/program changes.

B. Discussion of changes in MAT program - Joe Kan

Changes necessitates adding 4 new courses and dropping 3 courses. Only 9 credits of undergraduate course work permitted. Seven year cutoff for MAT -- clock starts when student applies for MAT program. Most universities appear to be phasing out B.Ed. programs and moving towards MATs. This change should therefore not adversely effect our competitiveness with other universities.

Action on MAT program will be taken once the program change paperwork has been reviewed.

## C. GSAC Recommended Motions - Larry Duffy

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.

GRE and GMAT are becoming less accessible. Minimum admissions requirement - GPA of 3.0. Individual departments would still be permitted to have more stringent requirements for admission.

Question concerning admittance of student with less than a 3.0 GPA who hasn't taken GRE. Possible ways to deal with issue is to permit admittance based on appeal or petition to graduate school or permit conditional admittance for one semester.

GREs should probably be offered on UAF campus. Joe Kan agreed to look into this possibility.

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.

Grads shouldn't be prevented from transferring more than 9 credits within UA system. This would bring grad policy in line with undergrad.

Question was raised as to whether minimum grade for transfer should be a "C" or "B". Consensus was that a "B" was more appropriate at the grad level.

Departments could have other standards that permit exclusion of some credit transfers.

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.

Recommended that projects should not be archived across the board. Should permit individual programs to determine whether archiving is a degree requirement.

Action on all three GSAC recommendations deferred until course/program changes are dealt with.

## D. Establishment of Graduate Faculty at UAF - Joe Kan

Most universities have a graduate faculty designation. Need to determine criteria to decide which faculty are considered graduate and which are not. Could have a probationary period prior to awarding graduate faculty status.

E. Next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, November 24, 1998, 2:00 - 3:30 p.m., Chancellor's Conference Room, 330 Signers

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 84/5  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #84  
DECEMBER 7, 1998  
SUBMITTED BY CORE REVIEW

Activities of the Core Review Committee, Fall 1998 - Jin Brown,  
Chair

The Core Review Committee has met every two weeks of the semester. The primary matter on our table has been the organization and continuation of assessment matters. We have selected the courses designated "Oral Intensive" and "Written Intensive" that are to be evaluated this semester. Those faculty teaching selected courses were notified at the first of the semester to gather data for evaluation. Evaluation materials are to be submitted to Governance at the end of the semester. Our assessment timetable calls for Spring, 1999 Reports from several areas of the Perspectives on the Human Condition that have not yet submitted reports and which will then report again in Spring 2000 in order to return to our two-year rotation for reporting assessment (Foreign Languages; Political Science and Economics sharing the 100X political economy course; Sociology sharing the 100X cultures course). Also in Spring 1999 we anticipate first reports from Mathematics, from the Natural Sciences, and from the College of Rural Alaska in regard to courses offered in the Core.

The Committee has acted on petitions to the Core curriculum. Again, the overall number of petitions continues to be very low and manageable. The continuing largest number of requests for exemption are addressed to the "breadth/depth" selection of the Natural Sciences.

The Committee has approved nine new courses to bear the "O" (oral intensive) designation, two new courses to be "W" courses, and one to be both "O" and "W." The Committee is concerned that these numbers are considerably lower than most semesters. Noting current research regarding the significance of writing and speaking across the curriculum to graduating students seeking employment, to entry level employees in virtually any organizational setting, and to career mobility in virtually any setting, the Committee intends to renew efforts across the University to encourage programs and departments to initiate and maintain these important efforts. We feel that it is of great importance that the baccalaureate experience of our students includes as much speaking and writing experience as possible. Further, we believe that students who graduate from UAF should understand the expectations of their chosen professions in regard to these necessary skills.

The Committee has acted on various other academic matters such as courses dropping or changing the "O" and/or "W" requirements of courses.

In cooperation with Professor Dana Thomas and the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation Team, the Committee is sending two members to assessment meetings during this school year. Tom Riccio has a conference scheduled immediately in Atlanta, David Bantz will attend a session in San Antonio in April.

The Chair of Core Review has just returned from a disciplinary conference in New York where his focus was on assessment sessions and short courses.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 84/6

UAF FACULTY SENATE #84

DECEMBER 7, 1998

SUBMITTED BY DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

Minutes of The Developmental Studies Committee  
November 12, 1998, Wood Center Conference Room A

Attending: Rich Carr, Jerah Chadwick, Richard Clausen, George Guthridge, Cindy Hardy, Marjie Illingworth, Ruth Lister, Wanda Martin, Joe Mason, Greg Owens, Kay Thomas, Lisa Thomas, Jane Weber.

Visiting: Delena Norris-Tull and Kelly Dickerson

Old Business:

Rural Alaska Science and Math Network:

Delena Norris-Tull and Kelly Dickerson attended by teleconference to bring us up to date on this project, a grant to CRA through the office of Naval Research to develop distance-delivered instruction to Alaska Native and rural students to prepare them for college level math and science courses. These courses will help rural students who attend high schools that are not equipped to offer anything beyond a middle school general science class, and prepare more rural students to enter math and science-related careers. The grant--\$1.9 million over five years--will be used to develop these courses and to hire math and science faculty for the remote sites. Delena and Kelly are holding meetings with rural math and science faculty, have a meeting scheduled with Anchorage faculty and have already met with Mark Oswood in Fairbanks.

In addition to the Developmental Science course, they will be developing another core science course, possibly an interdisciplinary science course for rural campuses. They are spending this year in planning and hope to have courses ready for fall semester.

These courses could serve as a model for a Developmental Science course here in Fairbanks. Ruth expressed interest in this especially for the needs of the pre-nursing program at TVC. Delena invited Ruth to send interested faculty and will notify her of audioconferences, so they can sit in. Currently those developing the math curriculum are meeting every other week for a half-hour teleconference. The science course will be developed the same way, later in the year.

Class Sizes:

Marjie reported for Ron on the information he's gathered on this topic.

Ron looked at a Ph.D. dissertation in Communication by Mahla Strohmeyer, in which she looked at student comfort in the classroom, using class size as one of her variables. She reported that 23% of the students in her study reported that large classes decreased their comfort in the classroom. This finding crossed ethnic and age groups. Those who preferred large classes preferred them because they could sleep in class, skip class, or not participate!

A survey of e-mail responses from a broad spectrum of colleges indicates that the most common class size for DEVE is 16-20 students. Ron reported that those with higher class sizes expressed concern about having larger classes. He reported, too that the NADE standard for these classes is 18 students, with no more than 40% part-time faculty of the total faculty teaching Developmental classes.

Currently, DEVE classes cap at 25 and DEVM classes cap at 30. George reported that the cap on his distance delivery classes has raised to 25 in the last two years and that this has become so time-consuming that students don't get the help they need. Other concerns expressed include the assumption, with higher class caps, that students will drop anyway and bring the class down to a manageable level, an assumption which works against goals of retention and student success. Richard asked if there was any way we could track this using BANNER, but Wanda reported that the people who could help us do this are too busy right now with other projects. Our only option is to continue tracking by hand. George suggested that we look for information from other universities. Ron will follow up on this, says Marjie.

#### Outcomes Assessment:

Jane reminded us that the remainder of this year should be spent working on Outcomes Assessment. We developed a preliminary plan last May and have been working on tracking. Greg will have all the Fall '94 DEVE and DEVM students tracked to this semester. Ruth reminded us that the deadline for the final plan in January 15.

Jane will get copies of the May plan for us to review at the next meeting. Marjie will bring copies of NADE outcomes assessment forms. Wanda expressed a concern that we develop a form so that everyone collects information consistently.

#### Influx of DEV students in 2002:

Ruth reported that President Hamilton is looking at this. It is to our advantage to say what we intend to do to address the needs of these students. Kay reported that in Wisconsin a similar high school exit test resulted in 30% of students taking the test seeking community resources to help them pass the test in Math.

#### DEVS 189:

The approval for this course number was sent to the Senate Office, which referred it back to us for final approval. We did.

#### New Business:

##### Mandatory Placement:

Marjie has been working with the UAF Retention Committee. They have been discussing mandatory testing and placement for students below the ACT/SAT cutoff. They would like to see this committee come out with a position on this.

Discussion of this included concern that BANNER can't check for prerequisites for a year and a half. It's important that students not face more bureaucratic roadblocks and that, if mandatory testing is in place, that students without it be caught in advising. Ruth suggested that there are two issues: mandatory testing and mandatory placement. Wanda suggested that if placement test scores were included on BANNER, that there be a way to keep the system flexible for individual advising. Marjie reminded us of the idea of a Developmental Semester, where students enter as part of a developmental peer group.

The next committee meeting will be Dec. 10, 2-3:30 p.m., Wood Center, Conference Room A. We will address Outcomes Assessment.

\*\*\*\*\*  
ATTACHMENT 84/7



UAF FACULTY SENATE #84  
DECEMBER 7, 1998  
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT

REPORT OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE FACULTY APPEALS AND  
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

PRESENT: Godwin Chukwu, Fred Dyen, Ray Gavlak, John Kelley  
(Chair), Tara Maginnis, Pham Quang, Richard Stolzberg, George  
Guthridge

ABSENT: Kristy Long, James Ruppert, David Verbyla, SOEd (Not yet  
appointed)

VISITOR: Michael Pippenger, United Academics

The committee met on Wednesday, November 18, 1998 in the  
Chancellor's conference room from 1 to 2pm.

1. The minutes of the third meeting of the Appeals and  
Oversight Committee were approved. George Guthridge was  
welcomed to the committee.

2. Tara Maginnis was elected Co-Chair of the Appeals and  
Oversight committee. The purpose of the Co-Chair is to preserve  
continuity of committee memory and procedures and serve as  
chair during the absence of the existing chairperson. The Co-chair  
will succeed as chairperson of the committee.

3. Mike Pippenger presented a brief review of his  
association with the committee and review of his memorandum  
outlining how the committee can best work with United  
Academics on Appeals Boards. The committee was asked to  
review the previously distributed memorandum, make suggested  
changes if any and approve or disapprove. The committee voted to  
approve the suggested arrangement for selection of faculty for  
service on Appeal Boards.

The Faculty Appeals/Oversight committee will act as a pool  
to be drawn upon to act as the United Academics representatives  
to the Appeal Board. The Chair of the Faculty Appeals and  
Oversight Committee will act as the convener of the Board  
picking from the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee  
members of the United Academics Bargaining Unit who will serve  
on the particular Appeals Board. The Chair or designee of the  
Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee will serve as Chair of a  
particular Appeals Board. The committee approved the intent of  
the memorandum. Mike Pippenger will present this management  
plan to the United Academics governing body for approval. Upon  
receipt of approval the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee  
will present a motion to the Faculty Senate.

4. The committee was made aware through the governance  
office that the Faculty Senate was concerned about plans and  
procedures for review of the Chancellor. We were advised that a  
presentation would be made to the committee. Since no  
presentation was made we entered into preliminary discussions.

The Faculty Senate passed a motion (Meeting 23, December  
17,1990) regarding procedure for the evaluation of the Chancellor.  
The procedure is codified in Board of Regents' policy. The Senate  
urged the Regents and President to consult with faculty as a  
crucial part of this evaluation. The committee suggests that the  
Administrative Committee of the Senate suggest that the Senate

President contact the University President and President of the Board of Regents to suggest that a decision be as to where an evaluation of the chancellor be centered (1) In the Senate, (2) through the Appeals and Oversight Committee or (3) an Ad Hoc committee established by the Senate.

5. A set of documents relating to past reviews of UAF administrators including lists of previous administrative reviews was circulated to the committee prior to this meeting. The committee was only able to engage in a preliminary discussion before adjournment. A suggestion was made that the committee make a motion to the Senate to identify criteria concerning which Deans and Directors should be evaluated. A subcommittee was established to discuss evaluate past practices and make recommendations.

6. Next meeting: December 2, 1 to 2pm, Chancellors Conference Room.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 84/8  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #84  
 DECEMBER 7, 1998  
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Graduate School Advisory Committee - Larry Duffy, Chair

The GSAC met on November 30 and discussed the following issues:

1. Increase in minimum salary rates for graduate students. It was agreed that the minimum should not be increased at this time. Several members believed it would not have a major impact on recruiting and may cause problems for researchers funding graduate student off grants. It was recommended that the graduate school commission a survey by discipline to determine how UAF compares nationally.
2. A minor revision to the Graduate Student Annual Report form was recommended. A goals statement for the upcoming year would be recommended.
3. The committee recommends that centralization of the graduate student admissions process occur under the graduate school dean. A full time check should be dedicated to graduate student admissions in the Admissions Office or the staff should be increased in the graduate school.
4. The committee discussed the pros and cons of having a graduate faculty listing. This was viewed as a way to honor and encourage faculty who mentor students who graduate.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 84/9  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #84  
 DECEMBER 7, 1998  
 SUBMITTED BY LEGISLATIVE & FISCAL AFFAIRS

The Legislative and Fiscal Affairs Committee had its most recent meetings on November 18 and December 2. On the agenda were the following items.

1. The Administrative Committee requested that the LFA committee produce a document/resolution to send to Governor Knowles regarding criteria for consideration when appointing individuals to the Board of Regents. This document will be presented under New Business at the December 7 Senate meeting.
2. Inquiries into what colleges do with monies that come from lab/course fees. A report is enclosed.

Preliminary planning for activities in the coming semester. We feel that there will be much to do in the area of communicating with legislators in Juneau, especially considering the current climate of plummeting oil prices.

-----

MEMO TO: Faculty Senate, Legislative and Fiscal Affairs  
Committee  
FROM: Scott Deal, Chair, LFA

This semester a department chair in CLA made inquiries about the appropriation of course/lab fees to respective departments. The question was, do all of the course/lab fees go back to the department where the fee originated, or is a portion skimmed off the top to help finance a particular college's general fund? Or, are the course fee dollars used to replace budget appropriations to the respective departments? In a legislative and fiscal affairs committee meeting, we decided to investigate the issue, inquiring at two colleges; CLA and CSEM. John Craven made inquiries at CSEM, and I did the same at CLA. The response appears to be the same, which is that all funds are handled in a reasonable manner, but each unit must pay close attention to the details at all times. Of particular importance is the situation in which a department prepares materials for a course that is then under enrolled. The department has spent the money, but may not fully recover its cost, and in addition is then required to make up the loss from other of its accounts. Hence, great care must be taken in selection of the amount to be charged for the course/lab fee. Additionally, in the event of a windfall of dollars, each unit is responsible to request that additional amount. It will not automatically be transferred to the unit, but must be requested. We found no evidence of requests that had been denied. If the money is not requested it simply goes into the college general fund. Very clear explanations of how the system works were kindly provided by Irene Downes, Administrative Assistant in the Physics Department, and Judy Brainerd, Fiscal Officer, CLA. Their accounts follow:

Irene Downes:

"Every year each department submits a continuation budget to their respective fiscal officer. In our case, that is Joan Roderick, Executive Officer for CSEM. In our continuation budget, we state how much money we need to operate for personnel dollars as well as non-personal funds (commodities and services,) and we also project how much money we are likely to bring in for lab fees. In our case, we projected \$8,000 for the entire FY99. When we receive our budget award at the beginning of the fiscal year, the lab fee projection is listed as a liability or negative amount. As we received lab fees from enrollments, the negative amount is reduced by the amount of income. If we receive more income than we projected, than the surplus is given to the department for our use. For example, if we project \$8,000 and we actually receive \$10,000, then I submit a budget revision to have the \$2,000

transferred into our account for spending (usually into commodities). Please note, that if the budget revision is not requested, then the surplus does not go to the respective department. The down side of this scenario is if we receive less than the projected amount in lab fees then we realize a budget shortfall. For example, if our projection is \$8,000 and we receive only \$7,000, then we essentially take a \$1,000 cut in our budget. I guess you could look at this process as sort of a quota system. Just one last comment: the projection for lab fees must be consistent with previous years or the fiscal officer will make an adjustment in the submitted continuation budget. In other words, there is no cheating allowed by saying that you will only receive \$2,000 in lab fees when you know you will actually receive \$10,000. The lab fee is not a vessel for making money for the department by any stretch of the imagination! I hope this helps with your report, and if you need additional information or more clarification, please don't hesitate to ask."

Judy Brainerd:

"When a department has a lab fee charged for a particular course, the lab fee goes back to the departmental account under the student lab/materials fee account code 9159 (as revenue). Once the department has reached the budgeted amount for lab fees, they can request approval from the Dean to allow them to spend the additional fees. In the past, the CLA Dean has always approved this request. If the department does not reach the budgeted amount for lab/materials fees, they must then decrease their departmental spending by that amount. I do watch the department lab/materials fees, and remind departments to either request approval or decrease departmental spending, depending upon what the lab/materials fees amount is compared to the budgeted amount. If the department does not request approval to spend the excess lab/materials fees, the excess does not automatically go back to their department to spend. If you need additional information or clarification please let me know."

Information provided by Provost Reichardt, Vice Chancellor Williams, and Betty Hoch, Director of Financial Services, is given below for completeness of the record.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Deal  
Chair, Legislative and Fiscal Affairs Committee

-----  
Memo to Provost Reichardt on November 4, 1998

Paul,

The Faculty Senate's Legislative and Fiscal Affairs Committee has done its best in the political ring and now wants to play in the money department for a while. We have been asked to look at how the money collected as fees for classes is handled by the university, in particular its distribution back to the department in which a course is taught. You would be the local expert on CSEM's history, so I am coming to you to ask how that issue was handled when you were running the shop. Unfortunately, Gordon jumped ship, so someone on the committee will have to do extra research for CLA. Do you have any knowledge of their policy and/or the policies in other colleges or schools? Of particular interest is if this money (which appears as income to the university, if my memory from the rat force is correct) is returned independent of

all other budget activity with a department. Is there a penalty for going good work by folding it into the overall budget process?

Thanks, John

-----  
Date: Thu, 05 Nov 1998 21:01:38 -0600  
To: "John D. Craven"  
From: Paul Reichardt  
Subject: Re: Course and lab fees

John:  
As far as I know all these course fees are dumped into departmental accounts, irrespective of the rest of the department's budget. In CSEM I assume this always happened because I never got a complaint that any anticipated \$ was missing. To my knowledge, this is the way it works for all depts. at UAF. However, the skeptic would ask, "How would a dept know if a few bucks got skimmed off?" I suspect that Frank Williams could give you an answer from the admin services/ budget perspective.....

Paul

-----  
Frank,

An earlier note to Paul Reichardt and his reply are below. What can you contribute, both from experience as a dean and in your present job? Thanks for you help.

John

-----  
Frank Williams replied to the quiry:

Date: Sun, 8 Nov 1998 06:02:40 -0900  
To: "John D. Craven"  
From: "Frank L. Williams"  
Subject: Re: lab fees and the like  
Cc: Betty Hoch ,  
fnpbr@uaf.edu

John,  
I don't know of cases where the fees don't go back to the department. In fact, when different engineering department faculty taught the core engineering courses like ES 101, the windfall fees did go to the department of record. Having said that, I do not know about every place else. It would seem pretty odd for the college or school to rip off the fees since they are justified on the basis of specific costs for the course - laboratory supplies, etc. By copy of this, I am asking Betty Hoch to work with Tim Bauer to help prepare a short description of what Adm Services believes happens with the fees. Of course if we know of any "special" circumstances we will bring them to your attention. To know what each dean does, I am afraid you'd have to contact them directly.

Frank

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 84/10  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #84  
 DECEMBER 7, 1998

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Below are the result of the recent election for the Promotion/  
 Tenure Review Committe and the Pre- and Post-tenure Evaluation  
 Committees.

UAF FACULTY SENATE  
 ELECTION BALLOT

PROMOTION/TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The following faculty have been nominated for the Promotion/Tenure  
 Review Committee. Please vote for seven (7) candidates.

- Ron Barry, Assoc. Professor (CSEM, Mathematical Science)
- Claudette Bradley-Kawagley, Assoc. Professor (School of Ed.)
- Peter Cornwall, Assoc. Professor (CLA, Social Sciences)
- Vidyadhar Kamath, Professor (CNRDM/SME)
- Jonah Lee, Professor (CSEM, Engineering)
- Jenifer McBeath, Professor (CNRDM/SALRM)
- Sathy Naidu, Professor (SFOS)
- David Porter, Professor (CNRDM/SOM)
- W. Roger Powers, Professor (CLA, Languages & Culture)
- James Ruppert, Professor (CLA, English & Humanities)
- William Schneider, Professor (CLA, Library)
- Gerald Shields, Professor (CSEM, Biology/Wildlife)
- Todd Sherman, Assoc. Professor (CLA, Arts & Communication)
- Sheryl Stanek, Assoc. Professor (ACE)
- Richard Stolzberg, Professor (CSEM, Chemistry)

PRE- AND POST-TENURE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The following faculty have been nominated for the Pre- and Post-  
 Tenure Evaluation Committee. Please vote for seven (7) candidates.

- Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Professor (CNRDM/SME)
- Roy Bird, Professor (CLA, English & Humanities)
- Don Carling, Professor (CNRDM/SALRM)
- Deben Das, Professor (CSEM, Engineering)
- Sven Ebbesson, Professor (SFOS)
- Perry Gilmore, Assoc. Professor (School of Education)
- Thomas Jahns, Assoc. Professor (ACE)
- John Keller, Professor (CSEM, Chemistry)
- Margaret Lee, Assoc. Professor (CLA, Languages & Culture)
- John Lehman, Professor (CNRDM/SOM)
- Tamara Lincoln, Assoc. Professor (CLA, Library)
- Janice Reynolds, Professor (CLA, Social Sciences)
- Mitch Roth, Professor (CSEM, Mathematical Science)

Return to: UAF Faculty Senate, 312 Signers' Hall, Fairbanks,  
 AK 99775 Ballots must be received by 3:00 p.m., November  
 30, 1998.

