

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral
 312 Signers' Hall
 474-7964 FYSENAT

A G E N D A
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #85
 Monday, February 8, 1999
 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 #83 & #84	
		C. Adoption of Agenda	
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
		A. Motions Approved:	
		1. Motion to require the inclusion of a description of the student learning outcomes assessment process for new programs and revision of major program changes.	
		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 - Joe Kan, Dean, SOEd.	10 Min.
		Questions	10 Min.
2:25	IV	Governance Reports	
		A. ASUAF - J. Richardson	5 Min.
		B. Staff Council - B. Frey	5 Min.
		C. President's Report - M. Schatz	5 Min.
2:40	V	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:45		***BREAK***	10 Min
2:55	VI	New Business	
		A. Motion to approve the 2000-01 Academic Calendar (Attachment 85/1), submitted by Curricular Affairs	5 Min.
		B. Motion to approve the MFA degree program in Art (Attachment 85/2), submitted by Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs	5 Min.
		C. Motion on post-baccalaureate programs (Attachment 85/3), submitted by Graduate School Advisory Committee	5 Min.
		D. Nominations of faculty members for the Usibelli Awards Committee	5 Min.
3:15	VII	Committee Reports	30 Min.
		A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath (Attachment 85/4)	
		B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - J. Yarie	
		C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen (Attachment 85/5)	
		D. Core Review - J. Brown (Attachment 85/6)	

- E. Curriculum Review - C. Basham (Attachment 85/7)
- F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber (Attachment 85/8)
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley
(Attachment 85/9)
- H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -
D. Porter (Attachment 85/10)
- I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - L. Duffy
(Attachment 85/11)
- J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal
(Attachment 85/12)
- K. Service Committee - K. Nance
- L. Ad Hoc Committees - (Attachment 85/13 & 85/14)

3:45	VIII	Discussion Items	5 Min.
3:50	IX	Members' Comments/Questions	5 Min.
3:55	X	Adjournment	

ATTACHMENT 85/1
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
 FEBRUARY 8, 1999
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the 2000-2001 Academic Calendar as presented by the Registrar prepared in accordance with Senate policy and Board of Regents' policies and forward it to the Governance Coordinating Committee for action.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Curricular Affairs reviewed two drafts of the 2000-01 academic calendar and forwards the following calendar to the full Senate. This calendar meets Senate policy requiring a study day prior to finals.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS - Fairbanks Campus
 ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2000-2001

Classes begin after Labor Day for Fall Semester and
 after Civil Rights Day for Spring Semester.

FALL SEMESTER-2000

Registration for the 2000 fall semester begins	Mon., Apr. 3, 2000
Fee payment begins	Wed., July 5
Application for admission deadline for fall semester	Tues., Aug. 1
Orientation for new students	Sun.-Wed., Sept. 3-6
Labor Day (no registration or fee payment)	Mon., Sept. 4
Residence halls open, 9 am	Mon., Sept. 4
Financial aid disbursement begins	Tues., Sept. 5
First day of instruction	Thurs., Sept 7
Late registration begins	Thurs., Sept 7
Late registration and fee payment end	Fri., Sept. 15
Last day for 100% refund of tuition and materials fees	Fri., Sept. 15
Last day for student-initiated and faculty-initiated drops	

(course does not appear on academic record)	Fri., Sept. 22
Last day for 50% refund of tuition (only)	Fri., Sept. 22
Low grade reports for freshmen due not later than	Fri., Oct. 13
Last day to apply for 2000 fall graduation	Fri., Oct. 16
Last day for student-initiated and faculty-initiated withdrawals (W grade given for course)	Fri., Nov. 3
Registration and fee payment for the 2001 spring semester begin	Mon., Nov. 13
Thanksgiving holidays (no classes)	Thurs.-Sun., Nov. 22-26
Last day of instruction	Fri., Dec. 15
Final examinations	Mon.-Thurs., Dec. 18-21
Residence halls close, noon	Fri., Dec. 22
Grades due to the Registrar's Office	Fri., Dec. 22
Campus closed	5 p.m., Fri., Dec. 22, 2000 - 8 a.m., Wed., Jan 3, 2001

SPRING SEMESTER-2001

Application for admission deadline for spring semester 2000	Wed., Dec. 1,
Residence halls open, 9 a.m.	Mon., Jan. 15
Alaska Civil Rights Day (registration and fee payment continue)	Mon., Jan. 15
Orientation for new students	Tues.-Wed., Jan. 16-17, 2001
Financial aid disbursement begins	Tues., Jan. 16
First day of instruction	Thurs., Jan. 18
Late registration begins	Thurs., Jan. 18
Late registration and fee payment end	Fri., Jan. 26
Last day for 100% refund of tuition and material fees	Fri., Jan. 26
Last day for student-initiated and faculty-initiated drops (course does not appear on academic record)	Fri., Feb. 2
Last day for 50% refund of tuition (only)	Fri., Feb. 2
Last day to apply for 2001 spring graduation	Tues., Feb. 15
Low grade reports for freshmen due not later than	Fri., Feb. 23
Spring recess	Mon.-Sun., Mar. 12-18
Last day for student-initiated and faculty-initiated withdrawals (W grade given for course)	Fri., Mar. 23
Registration for the 2001 fall semester begin	Mon., Apr. 9
All Campus Day (no classes)	Fri., Apr. 27
Last day of instruction	Fri., May 4
Final examinations	Mon.-Thurs., May 7-10
Residence halls close, noon	Sun., May 13
Commencement	Sun., May 13
Grades due to the Registrar's Office	Wed., May 16
Fee Payment for the 2001 fall semester begins	Mon., July 2

ATTACHMENT 85/2
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
 FEBRUARY 8, 1999
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the new MFA degree program in Art and forward it to the Chancellor and Board of Regents.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

RATIONALE: See new course requests #2-7 and full program proposal #8 on file in the Governance Office,

312 Signers' Hall.

Executive Summary
MFA Degree Program in Art

Civilizations throughout history have all held one thing in common, that is the rich tapestry of art. The visual arts are fundamental to the human experience. We therefore propose the establishment of a Master of Fine Arts degree program in the visual arts. This program will serve students in the areas of ceramics, compute art, drawing, native arts, painting, printmaking and sculpture in their quest for professional excellence. At present, Alaska is the only state in the country not offering the M.F.A. degree and it marks the highest level of professionalism in the field. The inclusion of this degree program means that this University would be one of only two schools nationally to offer a degree program with a concentration in Native Arts beyond the Associate level.

MFA Program Description:

The MFA in visual art is the terminal degree in the field. It customarily requires 60 graduate credit hours. Students take between 9 and 15 credits per semester. Two thirds of their classes must be in studio art. The graduate career culminates in a solo gallery exhibition of a substantial body of original work. An oral examination must be passed prior to advancement to candidacy. The work must be consistent and thematically coherent and must adhere to the highest professional standards. A written thesis is required which documents and discusses ideas and execution of the exhibition.

The MFA Program will:

Produce well-trained and competent artists to be qualified in various state and federal arts organization, galleries, museums, colleges and universities.

Supply the necessary background for students to participate in state, national and international art competitions and exhibitions. This participation is extremely important to the professional careers in the visual arts.

Enhance the University of Alaska's interests by producing highly trained, knowledgeable, and competent visual artists for the benefit of the people of Alaska.

The University will evaluate the MFA Program by the following criteria:

Number and quality of enrolled graduate students.

Number and quality of positions in the art field achieved by graduates of the program.

The Art Department will evaluate the MFA Program by the following criteria:

Quality and quantity of artwork produced by students enrolled in the program.

Maturity of artistic development achieved by its students while enrolled in the program and the continued achievements of graduates of the program.

Relationship of the MFA Program to the Purpose of the University:

The MFA program will substantially enhance the scope and

richness of the University experience for the entire University community. It will enhance and enrich the artistic life of the entire state. The unique Native Art component of the program will encourage enrollment, retention and graduation of Native students. The TA's associated with the program will provide for more and more varied course offerings, bringing art and an appreciation of art to a wider audience. An important consequence of this program will be the general betterment of the artistic environment of the community.

Resource Impact:

A. Budget: Presently we are supporting 5 graduate students in the Interdisciplinary Graduate program. The graduate students are teaching several classes that would not be offered without the help of the graduate TA's. There should be release time for the Graduate Advisory (Chair of the student's committee) which should not be confused with the Chair of the Graduates who also receives release time for the mentoring of teaching and oversight of the program and this could be covered with additional TA's. The TA's have greatly benefited our program in difficult financial times. As such, resource impacts are fairly small.

B. Facilities/space needs: In projecting the resource impact of a MFA program, it must be noted that present staffing and physical facilities are inadequate for our existing program, and will need to be upgraded in the near future in order to meet existing and anticipated demands. We currently do not have enough studio space to avoid scheduling conflicts for our ongoing courses. We turn away enough students each term to fill numerous sections of beginning courses. Noting that upgrading the existing program to a level defensible for our anticipated 1999 undergraduate program would simultaneously cover our graduate program and summarize the additional resource requests. In addition, providing the graduates with studio space that is adequately ventilated by deferred maintenance, we would be able to sufficiently start the program. With this in mind and by limiting enrollment to 5 at the onset, we could start the program without adding any new faculty.

C. Credit hour production: Department credit production will increase because of the increased lower division offerings staffed by TA's. For example, if we increase the number of MFA students by 3 and offer them TA's, we can increase the number of classes by 9 per year. The impact of the MFA program on department workload results in a decrease of 6 classes and the net gain is 3.

ATTACHMENT 85/3
UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
FEBRUARY 8, 1999
SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves that post-baccalaureate teacher licensure programs be subject to graduate policy and regulations and that students in the licensure programs be considered graduate students.

Effective: Immediately
Upon Chancellor Approval

Rationale: The post-baccalaureate teacher

licensure programs are graduate-level programs. UAF Graduate School Admission Standards apply to the post-baccalaureate licensure programs. Students in the post-baccalaureate certification programs are counted as UAF graduate students. This policy brings UAF into compliance with National Graduate Student Policy

ATTACHMENT 85/4
UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
FEBRUARY 8, 1999

Minutes, Curricular Affairs Committee, 1/26/99

The meeting began at 9:45 a.m. in Wood Center B with all committee members, except Harry Bader and Janice Reynolds, in attendance or on-line. The agenda covered four items: departmental honors, 2000-01 academic year calendar, effective date for curricular actions, and course/instructor approvals.

1. DEPARTMENTAL HONORS. Roy Bird and Kara Nance, representing the Honors Council, presented a two-page memorandum on the previous motion to establish a departmental honors policy. The gist of their concern was that the proposal would duplicate what the honors council does and that it introduced quality control issues. Roy mentioned that before John Whitehead departed from the directorship of the honors program, he developed an "honors thesis scholar option." This option would allow a student with a high GPA (3.5) to receive an "Honors Thesis Scholar" designation for completion of a senior honors thesis in addition to 12 credits of honors' work. One student has already taken advantage of this option.

Committee members questioned whether this proposal had received the blessing of any curricular council at UAF, the number of students to which it might apply, whether it would apply to part-time as well as to full-time students, whether rural students would have access to it. The consensus of the committee was that the "honors thesis scholar option" was a change to curricular policy, and that it should be reviewed in full by the Curricular Affairs Committee at its next meeting. Upon approval, the committee would recommend favorable consideration by the Senate.

The sense of the committee was that honors thesis option satisfied some concerns addressed by the committee when it began considering departmental honors, and that the departmental honors discussion should be postponed until the effects of the thesis option could be ascertained.

2. 2000-01 ACADEMIC YEAR CALENDAR. Ann Tremarello presented two versions of this calendar, explaining the differences between them. The committee unanimously recommended that the senate adopt version one (with the second semester beginning after Alaska Civil Rights day), including two corrections (fee payment beginning on July 5th, and Final exams from Monday through Thursday, May 7-10th).

3. CLARIFICATION OF EFFECTIVE DATE/CURRICULAR ACTION. Charlie Basham introduced this issue, based on her experience in Curricular Review this year. The course and degree manual (p. 7, item 12) specifies that "item become effective when it is included in the next UAF catalog" but the publication date of the catalog has varied in recent years. Also, development of a spring review cycle creates the possibility that curricular changes will be adopted that

will not appear until 1 1/2 years later.

Some committee members recommended that minor changes (new course proposals, revisions of existing courses, etc.) become effective at the start of the next academic year, but that major (program) changes not become effective until their publication in the catalog. Other committee members thought all changes, major and minor, should become effective at the start of the next academic year after their adoption.

In the absence of consensus, the committee declined to take action on this item, but agreed to reconsider the issue if presented with a request to change a specific policy.

4. COURSE/INSTRUCTOR APPROVALS. Alex Fitts presented the report of the Task Force on Course/Instructor Approvals. The committee met twice toward the end of the fall semester. It considered the existing situation concerning approvals, and made five suggestions concerning the approvals process. Committee discussion focused on suggestion 4, specifically whether the committee should recommend a procedure to facilitate resolution of conflict, but no proposed procedure emerged.

Committee members thanked Alex and her task force for its work, and recommended that copies be distributed to the senate. The committee referred the matter of whether the course/instructor approval issue has been sufficiently resolved to the administrative committee.

5. NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, February 16, 9:45 a.m.

The committee adjourned at 11:15 a.m.; submitted by Jerry McBeath.

ATTACHMENT 85/5
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
 FEBRUARY 8, 1999
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Report of the GPCA Committee Meeting
 Nov. 24 1998, Chancellors Conference Room

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

Agenda

1. Course and program changes
2. Graduate Petition motion
3. Other issues?
4. Next meeting

1. Course and Program Changes Approved

Drop Course - ANTH 620

Drop Course - COMM 685

New Course - COMM 600

New Course - COMM 611

Program Change - MA Professional Communication: Drop following courses and add new courses to requirements

Drop - ENGL 687, 689

New Course - ENGL 661

New Course - JB 661, 698

Drop Course - BIOL 601

New Course - CS 602

New Course - ME 608

New Course - ME 608

Program Change - MS Electrical Engineering: Change requirements, require 5 ME core courses, eliminate math requirement, electives not restricted to 600 level

Change Course - NRM 672: Change title, credits, description, stack with NRM 472

New Course - ACCT 656

Program Change - MS Resource and Applied Economics: Delete ECON 670 as required, reduce credits

New Course - GE 620

Program Change - MS Geological Engineering: Change requirement of Research/Project to 6 credits, reduce electives to 20 credits

Change Course - PETE 666: Change title, change description, change frequency of offering

Program Change - MS Petroleum Engineering: Reorganize required and elective courses, change project credit from 3 to 6 and total credits to 36.

Change Course - ED 614: Change description and prerequisites

Change Course - ED 657: Change description and prerequisites

Change Course - ED 666: Change credits, description and prerequisites

Change Course - ED 667: Change credits, description and prerequisites

Drop Course - ED 632

Drop Course - ED 634

Drop Course - ED 644

Program Change - MAT - Secondary MAT split into 2 parts: post-baccalaureate teacher certification

Stacked/Cross Listed Courses Approved

ANTH 422/625

ANTH 423/623

HIST 482/NORS 682

NRM 472/672

2. Graduate Petition motion

Deferred until Ron Gatterdam can address committee

3. Next Meeting scheduled for Dec. 15, 2:00-3:30

Report of the GPCA Committee Meeting

Dec. 15 1998, Chancellors Conference Room

Present: Michael Whalen - Chair, Harikumar Sankaran, Clif Lando, Renee Manfredi, Joe Kan, Gayle Gregory, Dennis Stephens, Wendy Croskrey (visitor - Art), Ray Barnhardt (visitor - ED)

Agenda

1. Course and Program Changes including:

Remaining course changes

MFA Program

Cross Cultural Studies Program

2. Motions based on GSAC Recommendations

3. Next meeting

1. Course and Program Changes Approved

Major Program Change - Ed.S. changed to MA in Cross Cultural Studies

Change courses - ED 603, 610, 611, 613, 690

New Courses - CCS 601, 602, 608, 612

Change Course - HIST 475: Change description, stack with NORS 675

New Program - MFA - Masters of Fine Arts - Passed and forwarded
to Senate for approval

New Courses - ART 661, 663, 673, 690, 692, 699

2. GSAC Motions

Three motions from GSAC were originally considered by the committee (see minutes of 11/10/98). The motion dealing with GREs and other standardized tests was withdrawn due to action of Graduate School to facilitate these tests being given on campus. The motion dealing with Master's Degree projects was deferred until all Master's Degree requirements are reviewed. The third motion was adopted and forwarded to the Senate for action.

Motion:

Graduate credit is transferable within the UA system and from any other accredited institution for courses where the student has received a grade of B or better. For use in a specific graduate program, the student's graduate committee must approve the transfer credit and it must be clearly indicated in the Graduate Study Plan and the Advancement to Candidacy Form.

Effective: Immediately

Rationale: Graduate students are currently prevented from transferring more than 9 credits within the UA system and from other accredited institutions. This motion would change university policy to permit such transfers. This would bring graduate policy in line with undergraduate policy. Individual departments could have other standards that permit exclusion of some credit transfers.

3. Next meeting scheduled for Feb. 2, 1999

ATTACHMENT 85/6

UAF FACULTY SENATE #85

FEBRUARY 8, 1999

SUBMITTED BY CORE REVIEW COMMITTEE

CORE Review has had its first meeting of the new year. We had a quorum, but several members were out of town.

We agreed on an agenda for the Spring as follows:

*Assessment

Natural Sciences

Mathematics

Late Reports from Political Economy, Foreign Languages,
Sociology

"O" and "W" courses chosen for spring

Consider longterm assessment costs

1999 Assessment Report

*Language in the Perspectives on the Human Condition

*Support for "O" and "W" courses from Communication and English
Departments

*Areas of the CORE in which more courses may be welcomed

*The usual business of acting on petitions and tracking requests

Jin Brown, Chair
CORE Review Committee

ATTACHMENT 85/7
UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
FEBRUARY 8, 1999

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT - Charlotte Basham, Chair

The Curriculum Review Committee met Friday, Jan. 22 and approved the following:

- 1) BIOL 485 New course (it was unclear why it was put in as trial course when the number was for a new course.)
- 2) French 103, 203; German 103, 203; Russian 103, 203; Spanish 103, 203. (These requests were held over from last semester. They had been held with questions about duplication in the catalog. Larry Kaplan, head of the Foreign Languages and Literatures Department, presented a proposal which included deleting the conflicting courses. That paperwork will need to go through CLA Academic Council, but we approved these new courses with the understanding that those deletions would be approved.)

We also discussed the question of when an approved course becomes effective. In our current procedures (p.7 of the Faculty Senate Academic Course and Degree Procedures Manual), an item becomes effective when it is included in the next UAF catalog. Since we now have two dates for approving courses, the courses approved in the spring would not by these rules become effective for more than a year. A possible rewording might be "an item becomes effective the next academic year." We wondered what the rationale had been for the rule in the first place and why an item doesn't become "effective" with the Provost's signature. It was suggested that changing this wording would eliminate the need for many petitions.

This will be taken to Curricular Affairs for further discussion.

ATTACHMENT 85/8
UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
FEBRUARY 8, 1999
SUBMITTED BY DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

Minutes of The Developmental Studies Committee
December 10, 1998, Wood Center Conference Room A

Attending: Rich Carr, Jerah Chadwick, George Guthridge, Cindy Hardy, Wanda Martin, Joe Mason, Greg Owens, Kay Thomas, Lisa Thomas, Jane Weber.

Old Business:

The December meeting was dedicated to a discussion of outcomes assessment for developmental classes.

Jane and Cindy reported on their meeting with Dana Thomas on outcomes assessment for developmental programs. Dana liked both our plan for assessment and that we had begun tracking previous semesters. He informed us that we were not subject to the January 15 deadline, since we fall under the category of Student Information. He suggested that we write a proposal to the statewide office to write a program into BANNER that will track developmental students so that we can automatically get data at the end of each semester. Jane and Cindy will write the proposal and Dana will add his signature to it. He also suggested that if we find out that programming BANNER will take too much time, we can write a President's Special Projects grant to hire a programmer to do this.

The committee discussed the format Dana suggested, creating a grid to evaluate student outcomes. We discussed the advantages and difficulties of this method of assessment, including, on the positive side, that we can identify what skills students are generally learning, and, on the negative side, that charting these criteria will be an added burden on teachers, especially lecturers. We agreed to continue discussing this and to bring a report to the May meeting, when the committee meets face to face.

The committee continued in a wide-ranging discussion of student success, particularly in the DEVM/Math track. Topics touched on and reserved for future discussion and action included: class size, mandatory placement, and retention.

The next meeting will be Tuesday, January 26, 1999 at 2:15pm.

Minutes of The Developmental Studies Committee
January 26, 1999, Wood Center Conference Room B

Attending Rich Carr, Jerah Chadwick, Cindy Hardy, Marjie Illingworth, Ron Illingworth, Ruth Lister, Joe Mason, Greg Owens, Kay Thomas, Lisa Thomas, Jane Weber.

Old Business:

Tracking:

Gregg presented the results of the tracking data for DEVE and DEVM classes, showing the percentages of students who were successful and continued to succeed as they passed through developmental classes and on into the traditional math and English sequences. Now we need to track the data for Spring 94. Ron pointed out that our data does not include students on rural campuses, since these courses are often numbered differently than those on main campus. Jane requested that this data be gotten to Greg, who can put it together and include it in our Outcomes Assessment report in May.

Discussion continued, touching on ways in which this information can be helpful and available to instructors and advisors, whether or not there is similar tracking information available nationally, and the relationship between DEVM and Math 107 and 131.

Outcomes Assessment:

For Outcomes Assessment we still need to tabulate the Spring 94 data and address the questions on DEVS that were outlined at our May 98 meeting. Marjie mentioned that Joanne Klumb is keeping stats on DEVS 105, the Reading Skills class. We discussed the value of reading to math and science success, and why students do not sign up for this course more often. Ruth suggested incorporating these

skills as a unit in DEVM and DEVE classes.

Jane and Cindy will write up a proposal to Statewide to request that BANNER begin tracking DEVE/M students so that we can access statistical data more easily-rather than hand counting! Since BANNER may be backlogged with requests, we will also approach the President's Special Projects fund for funds to hire a programmer to do this for us.

This led to discussion of advising, mandatory placement, creating self-paced DEV classes and a "Developmental year," and a comparison of the later success of DEV students with those who do not need DEV classes.

High School End-of-Program testing:

Ruth reminded us that this is in the works and will start in 2001. There is discussion going on at the highest level about this and its impact on DEV classes. We need to connect with this process and have input. Ruth suggested inviting someone from the school district to meet with us. Marjie reported that she is already getting calls from parents asking for alternatives for their children.

Upcoming meetings:

Next meeting with Dan Apple: Monday, March 1, 3-5pm.

May 4-10, CRA face-to-face meeting with Dan Apple. (Finals week for UAF faculty).

Next committee meeting: Thurs., March 4, 1-2, p.m.

ATTACHMENT 85/9
UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
FEBRUARY 8, 1999

REPORT OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE FACULTY APPEALS AND
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE - John Kelley, Chair

PRESENT: John Kelley, Ray Gavlak, Tara Maginnis, David Verbyla,
Pham Quang

ABSENT: Godwin Chukwu, Fred Dyen, Don Kramer, Kristy Long, James
Ruppert, Richard Stolzberg, George Guthridge

VISITOR: Michael Pippenger

The committee met on Tuesday, January 19, 1999 in the Chancellor's
conference room from 4-5pm.

1. The minutes of the fifth meeting of the Appeals and Oversight meeting were approved.
2. Dr. Don Kramer (MAP, Anchorage) was appointed as the second faculty representative (SFOS) to the committee.
3. Dr. Michael Pippenger, representing United Academics union participated in the meeting to review a draft motion to amend section 3E (Article 5) on Permanent committees. The purpose of this amendment is to define the Faculty Appeals and Oversight committee role in relation to section 7.34 (The Appeals Board) of

the United Academics union contract with the university (January 1998). Acceptable language was drafted with the assistance of Sheri Layral to define the new role of the committee. However, Dr. Pippenger pointed out that the new language may not be in harmony with the ACCFT union contract. Further action on this part of the draft amendment was deferred until resolution of the problem.

A section to the draft amendment was added to reflect participation of the Appeals and Oversight committee in the grade appeals process.

4. Deliberations during meeting #5 resolved a list of administrators recommended for review and the projected date of their review. The position of the Dean of the Graduate School was discussed. The committee was divided on which category this position fell. This agenda item will be discussed further at the next meeting.

5. Evaluation of the UAF Chancellor was discussed at the December meeting of the committee. The committee sought the advice of the UA President through the Senate President for direction on the topic of evaluation of the Chancellor. There was no response. A message was sent to the Senate President for response.

6. Old Business - None

7. New Business - None

8. Next Meeting: Because of the low attendance at this meeting the committee will be contacted to determine a favorable time(s) to meet during the spring semester.

ATTACHMENT 85/10
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
 FEBRUARY 8, 1999
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT

Report of the Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement
 Prepared by David O. Porter, Chairman

Members: Channon P Price, Dennis G Schall, Daniel M White, David O Porter, Scott L Huang, Roxie R Dinstel, Linda R Curda, David A Bantz, James M Collins

In its last two meetings, the Faculty Development and Improvement Committee has discussed and analyzed responses by faculty to a questionnaire circulated in the Spring 1998.

Major findings are:

1. Faculty with tri-partite contracts are experiencing relatively high levels of uncertainty as they approach decisions relative to promotion and tenure. Levels of faculty concern were highest about how much research and what types of research are required. Some units and departments reported much higher levels than others.

2. Three "clusters" of resource to support faculty development emerged as responses were analyzed.

a. Funds for research-related activities. These items had by far the highest number of mentions. The numbers of first and second rankings on these items was very high.

b. Mentorship for junior faculty and pre-tenure review procedures. Rankings and mentions of these items were second

relative to items associated with research support. We inferred, as a Committee, that the mentorship and pre-tenure reviews were viewed by most faculty responding as a possible help in understanding what research would be required.

c. Instructional Support. These items include assistance in learning technologies to support instruction. Support these resources was stronger among faculty with bi-partite contracts. Faculty with tri-partite contracts are interested in developing instruction skills but clearly do not perceive the same anxiety about meeting and/or exceeding expectations in teaching. This is true even though most faculty responded that teaching is given equal or more weight by their peers and administrators in decisions on tenure and promotion.

Committee members believe a memoranda conveying the above summary, with the same attachments, should be forwarded to the Provost by the Faculty Senate.

ATTACHMENT 85/11
UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
FEBRUARY 8, 1999

GRADUATE SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT - Larry Duffy,
Chair

The committee met on Jan 25, 1999.

1. Dr. Duffy reported to the committee on a recent meeting of the MAT Subcommittee of Science Curriculum. He reported that for secondary teachers, the idea of stacking basic junior/senior science courses was discussed. It was proposed that these could be offered as regular schedule courses or in 1 credit unit form. These courses should be scheduled at night or weekend during the academic year. They must be available during the summer.

Graduate education credit would be given for students who develop a lesson plan, which could be utilized in these high school courses. A series of education courses titled "Modern Techniques in _____" was proposed. Courses over the Internet were also suggested for graduate MAT credit.

2. Mike Mills discussed the TOEFL exam. Housing was also discussed. A housing official will be invited to the next meeting.

3. The following motion was discussed and sent forward to the Administrative Committee:

Motion: The post-baccalaureate teacher certification programs are graduate-level programs subject to the UAF Graduate Policy and Regulation. UAF Graduate School Admission Standards apply to the post-baccalaureate certification programs. Students in the post-baccalaureate certification programs are counted as UAF graduate students.

Justification: This policy brings UAF into compliance with National Graduate Student Policy.

ATTACHMENT 85/12
UAF FACULTY SENATE #85

FEBRUARY 8, 1999
SUBMITTED BY LEGISLATIVE & FISCAL AFFAIRS

The Legislative & Fiscal Affairs committee had its first meeting of the new year on Jan 20th. In attendance were Scott Deal, chair, Peter Schweitzer, and Gerry McBeath. The topic of discussion was formulating a plan of activities for the coming semester geared toward communicating with the State Legislature in Juneau regarding budget appropriations to the University of Alaska. The current plan of action shall be for individual committee members to make trips to Juneau, and encourage others to do so. According to Michael Jennings (UAA), United Academics has funds that would enable union members to make trips to visit with their legislators to talk about the university budget. Last year the members of the legislature took note of the high degree of support for the University due to the large number of letters, emails, and visits they received.

Respectfully submitted,
Scott Deal

ATTACHMENT 85/13
UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
FEBRUARY 8, 1999

TASK FORCE ON COURSE/INSTRUCTOR APPROVAL - Alex Fitts, Chair

The Task Force on Course/Instructor Approval met on 11/13 and 12/2. We have been charged with assessing the process of course and instructor approval of CRA offerings by the Fairbanks departments. Issues that have been raised include the possibility of establishing a regular time-line for re-approval of instructors and syllabi, the qualifications that instructors must have at each campus, what impact program assessment will have, and the ability and/or responsibility of the Fairbanks department to oversee rural instructors. We determined that the present situation is:

1. The relevant Senate regulations are eleven years old and are very general, asserting little more than "discipline" control and oversight of courses taught in CRA, both of instructors and course content.
2. Current practice is for rural campuses to submit instructors and syllabi for approval the first time a course is taught by a particular instructor. Many "disciplines" (or departments on the Fairbanks Campus) have provided CRA with guidelines for minimal qualifications to teach at various levels (100, 200, and so on). It is the Fairbanks departments' responsibility to supply and update such guidelines as they see fit.
3. Policies on renewal of instructor vary by campus; for instance, the Interior-Aleutians campus has a five-year expiration policy, after which an instructor must be re-approved to teach a given class.
4. No formal method currently exists for renewing approval on a regular basis, for overseeing syllabi every semester, or for enforcing changes in course content or instructor qualifications based on new accreditation requirements or other changed conditions in the discipline.
5. CRA is open to review that involves negotiation and cooperation between the departments and faculty from the different campuses.

Communication and cooperation between the departments should, of course, be mutual.

6. No procedures currently exist for adjudicating disputes on course content or instructor qualifications. CRA acknowledges that Fairbanks departments have the final say, but the issue can be tricky, potentially involving academic freedom, especially when the dispute is between permanent faculty members. Some CRA campuses, for example, create and offer courses not taught at the Fairbanks campus, where there may be no one with the specific knowledge necessary to oversee the course.

Suggestions:

1. If each Fairbanks department that has rural campus offerings submits guidelines for minimal qualifications to teach at various levels (100, 200, and so on), the issue of differing qualifications between campuses will be moot. Any new instructor will need to meet these qualifications and be approved by the Fairbanks department. At times, there may be no one qualified for the position. In those situations, a cooperative decision will need to be made whether to accept other qualifications or to not offer the class. It is the Fairbanks departments' responsibility to supply and update such guidelines as they see fit. It is also the responsibility of the Fairbanks department to respond in a timely manner to requests for instructor and course approvals.

2. If a syllabus is submitted to and approved by the Fairbanks department each time a new course is offered, or each time a significant change is made in a course's content or philosophy, the Fairbanks department will have oversight over content. We see no reason to review faculty and courses on a regular basis if no changes are being made.

3. In cases of disagreement, direct communication would seem to be the best path to resolution. A phone call first to the faculty member in question and then to the campus director may be all that is necessary.

4. In situations in which a faculty member is resistant to the wishes of the Fairbanks department, there should be some established procedure for resolution of the conflict in order to carry out the desires of the discipline (which consists of the Fairbanks department together with full-time CRA faculty who teach in that subject area).

5. Fairbanks departments need to include full-time off-campus faculty (such as CRA faculty) in decision making regarding these courses and other curriculum changes that will affect them. When evaluating course materials and instructor qualifications, the method of delivery and student population need to be considered.

ATTACHMENT 85/14
UAF FACULTY SENATE #85
FEBRUARY 8, 1999
SUBMITTED BY AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIT CRITERIA

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee On Unit Criteria - David Porter,
Chair

The Ad Hoc Committee on Unit Criteria met at 10:30 am, Jan 27,

1999, in Wood Center A. Alexandra Fitts (Curricular Affairs), Debbie McLean (Service) and David Porter (Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement) were present. Michael Whalen (Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs) and John Olson (Faculty & Scholarly Affairs) were absent. Ron Illingworth, as a representative and faculty member in the ACCFT, attended the meeting. He was an active and integral participant in preparing the materials considered.

David Porter agreed to serve as chair for consideration of the Standards & Indices that were adopted by the ACCFT faculty of the College of Rural Alaska (CRA) and forwarded to the Faculty Senate for review by the Ad Hoc Committee, the Administrative Committee and the Faculty Senate at large. The Ad Hoc Committee reviewed a copy of the Standards and Indices as reviewed and approved by the ACCFT faculty.

Our committee examined the processes through which these standards and indices were prepared and reviewed its central substantive content. Professor Illingworth provided expert testimony as needed to supplement the written document.

Our report on these issues follows:

1. What processes were followed in drafting and adopting these Standards & Indices?

ACCFT requested the formation of a CRA committee that included representatives of all UAF campuses where ACCFT faculty were employed. A primary task was to adapt former ACCFT Standards and Indices for application

- a. to UAF, rather than ACCFT faculty UA-wide, and
- b. to contracts adopted since the last version of the Standards and Indices had been adopted.

A draft was prepared by the Local Committee. This draft document was sent to all UAF faculty in the ACCFT with instructions that comments and suggestions would be considered for about 30 days. The Local Committee considered comments received and incorporated any given comments or not based on a majority vote within their committee. A Final Draft--the same version that was reviewed by the Ad Hoc Committee--was mailed to all ACCFT faculty members for review and acceptance. Forty-three (or 44) of 47 ACCFT faculty unanimously approved the Standards and Indices as amended.

The Ad Hoc Committee found these procedures to be fair and equitable to all members of the affected unit. All members had effective access to the deliberations if they had substantive contributions to make.

2. The Committee asked Professor Illingworth to briefly review items that had been more or less controversial. He identified three items.

- a. Most (96%) ACCFT faculty have bi-partite contracts with the UAF -- instruction and service. For those who have tri-partite contracts, standards and indices were added that unambiguously included creative activities as well as research.
- b. It was debated whether ACCFT criteria should apply to all faculty in the College of Rural Alaska as a unit. It was decided in the negative because many CRA faculty belong to United Academics, not ACCFT.
- c. Backgrounds of members for the evaluation of specific faculty members should be consistent and weighted to reflect the workload assignments of the person under review. That is, if a

faculty member has a workload agreements that average 75% instruction and 25% community and university service, instructional peers and community and service peers should be selected for committee membership at a ratio of roughly 3 to 1.

The Ad Hoc Committee determined these issues had been resolved in a manner that is consistent with UAF and Faculty Senate policies.

3. Has the draft of Standards and Indices presented to the Ad Hoc Committee and Faculty Senate been carefully edited? Has it been reviewed by University and Union counsel?

Professor Illingworth reported that the present draft was reviewed by University and Union professionals and counsel. The draft has been edited in its entirety three times by a group of four faculty. A final edit is anticipated. Members of the AD Hoc Committee did not review the Standards & Indices for typographical errors and internal inconsistencies. They did not find such problems in their reviews of the content.

4. Since most ACCFT faculty have Bi-Partite contracts, are the Standards and Indices for evaluating instruction and service adequate to bear the full weight of evaluation?

Instruction and service may be intrinsically more difficult to evaluate objectively than research and therefore a more difficult task to achieve. The ACCFT faculty and its leadership have produced a comprehensive and credible document for purposes of guiding fair and effective evaluations.

ACCFT faculty sponsored a workshop series in an effort to assist faculty in identifying, learning and reporting their instructional and services activities. Task forces wrote up suggestions on activities a faculty member may consider to compile an exemplary record to support retention, promotion and tenure. These efforts have explicitly worked at a continuous improvement of the standards/indices to achieve high quality teaching and service.

Based on a review of the text of the Standards and Indices, supplemented by commentary from Professor Illingworth, the Ad Hoc Committee found the Standards and Indices as submitted adequate to these purposes.

5. An issue not covered in the ACCFT Standards and Indices relates to procedures and standards to be considered when a faculty member requests moving from a tri-partite contract to a bi-partite contract, or the reverse. Present policy leaves as a possibility the manipulation of bi-partite or tri-partite status by administrator applying improper fields as part or an evaluation or by a faculty member wanting to exclude a field in which they may not have a strong record.