

## FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral  
312 Signers' Hall  
474-7964 FYSENAT

For Audioconferencing: Bridge #: 1-877-751-8040

(Passcode: 523297)

Fairbanks: 474-8050

(Chair's Passcode: 628337)

## A G E N D A

## UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #88

Monday, September 27, 1999

1:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Wood Center Ballroom

1:30	I	Call to Order - Ron Gatterdam	5 Min.
	A.	Roll Call	
	B.	Approval of Minutes to Meeting #88	
	C.	Adoption of Agenda	
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
	A.	Motions Approved:	
	1.	Motion to approve the establishment of a new degree, the Bachelor of Arts and Sciences.	
	2.	Motion on testing procedure for language credit for the Core.	
	3.	Motion to amend the minimum requirements for the Master's degrees.	
	4.	Motion to amend the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies & Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty.	
	5.	Motion to recommend list of administrators for evaluation.	
	6.	Motion on Chancellor Evaluation Process.	
	B.	Motions Disapproved:	
	1.	Motion to recommend the Board of Regents change it policy 05.10.01, Section I (Tuition and Student Fees).	
1:40	III	A. Remarks by Chancellor M. Lind	10 Min.
	B.	Remarks by Provost P. Reichardt	10 Min.
	C.	Guest Speakers:	
		Jim Johnson & Paul Reichardt	30 Min.
		Topic: Academic & Administrative Initiatives	
		UAF Response to the Initiatives	
		Senate Open Discussion and Questions	30 Min.
3:00		***BREAK***	10 Min
3:10	IV	Public Comments/Questions	10 Min.
3:20	V	Governance Reports	10 Min.
	A.	ASUAF - Stacey Banks	
	B.	Staff Council - I. Downes	
	C.	President's Report - R. Gatterdam	
	D.	President-Elect's Comments - L. Duffy	
3:30	VI	New Business	
	A.	Motion to amend the Grade Appeals Policy (Attachment 89/1), submitted by Faculty Appeals & Oversight	5 Min.
	B.	Motion to amend the GRE/GMAT requirement	5 Min.

for graduate admission (Attachment 89/2),  
submitted by Graduate School Advisory Committee

- 3:35 VII Committee Reports 20 Min.
  - A. Curricular Affairs - C. Basham (Attachment 89/3)
  - B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - N. Swazo (Attachment 89/4)
  - C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - J. Gardner (Attachment 89/5)
  - D. Core Review - J. Brown (Attachment 89/6)
  - E. Curriculum Review - S. Bandopadyhay
  - F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber
  - G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - T. Maginnis
  - H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - D. White (Attachment 89/7)
  - I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - L. Duffy (Attachment 89/8)
  - J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - K. Nance
- 3:55 VIII Discussion Items 5 Min.
  - A. Committee charge of Faculty & Scholarly Affairs
- 4:00 IX Members' Comments/Questions 5 Min.
- 4:05 X Adjournment

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 89/1  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #89  
SEPTEMBER 27, 1999  
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY & SCHOLARLY AFFAIRS

MOTION:  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Grade Appeals Policy as indicated below.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: These proposed changes to the UAF Grade Appeals Policy are intended to bring Senate policy in compliance with the new Board of Regent's policy and University Regulations.

\*\*\*\*\*

[[ ]] = Deletion  
CAPS = Additions

UAF GRADE APPEALS POLICY

I. Introduction

The University of Alaska is committed to the ideal of academic freedom and so recognizes that the assignment of grades is a faculty responsibility. Therefore, the University administration shall not influence or affect an assigned grade or the review of an assigned grade.

The following procedures are designed to provide a means for students to seek review of final course grades alleged to be

arbitrary and capricious. Before taking formal action, a student must attempt to resolve the issue informally with the instructor of the course. A student who files a written request for review under the following procedures shall be expected to abide by the final disposition of the review, as provided below, and may not seek further review of the matter under any other procedure within the university.

## II. Definitions

A. A "grade" refers to final letter grades A, B, C, D, F, [[NB ]] and Pass. The I (incomplete) designates a temporary grade, FOR ONE YEAR not a final grade, so it is not subject to appeal UNTIL IT BECOMES FINAL.

B. For the purpose of this procedure, "arbitrary and capricious" grading means:

1. the assignment of a course grade to a student on some basis other than performance in the course, or
2. the assignment of a course grade to a student by resorting to standards different from those which were applied to other students in that course, or
3. the assignment of a course grade by a substantial, unreasonable and unannounced departure from the instructor's previously articulated standards.

C. "Grading errors" denotes errors in the calculation of grades rather than errors in judgment.

D. [[All references to duration in "days" refers to university working days, which exclude weekends, holidays and days in which the university is officially closed.]] 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. "Department head" for the purposes of this policy denotes the administrative head of the academic unit offering the course (e.g., head, chair or coordinator of an academic department, or the campus director if the faculty member is in the College of Rural Alaska).

F. THE "DEAN/DIRECTOR" IS THE ADMINISTRATIVE HEAD OF THE COLLEGE OR SCHOOL OFFERING THE COURSE OR PROGRAM FROM WHICH THE ACADEMIC DECISION OR ACTION ARISES. FOR STUDENTS AT EXTENDED CAMPUSES THE DIRECTOR OF THE CAMPUS MAY SUBSTITUTE FOR THE DEAN/DIRECTOR OF THE UNIT OFFERING THE COURSE OR PROGRAM.

G. "FINAL GRADE" FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS POLICY IS THE GRADE ASSIGNED FOR A COURSE UPON ITS COMPLETION.

H. A "GRADING ERROR" IS A MATHEMATICAL MISCALCULATION OF A FINAL GRADE OR AN INACCURATE RECORDING OF THE FINAL GRADE.

I. 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.

### III. Procedures

A. Errors by an instructor in determining and recording a grade or by the university staff in transcribing the grade are sources of error that can be readily corrected through the student's prompt attention following the normal change of grade procedure.

1. It is a student's obligation to notify the instructor of any possible error immediately by the most direct means available. If this is through an oral conversation and/or the issue is not immediately resolved, it is the student's responsibility to provide the instructor with a signed, written request for review of the grade, with a copy to the unit department head and the dean of the college or school in which the course was offered.

2. Notification must be received by the instructor and/or department head within [[20]] 15 days from the first day of instruction of the next regular semester (i.e., fall semester for grade issued at the end of the previous spring semester or summer session; spring semester for grade issued at the end of the previous fall semester).

3. The instructor is responsible for notifying the student in writing of his or her final judgment concerning the grade in question within [[10]] 5 days of receipt of the request, and for promptly submitting the appropriate change of grade form to the Director of Admissions and Records if an error occurred.

4. If the student does not receive a response from the instructor or the unit department head by the required deadline, the student must seek the assistance of the dean of the college or school in which the course was offered.

5. If the instructor is no longer an employee of the university or is otherwise unavailable, the student must bring the matter to the attention of the unit department head who will make every effort to contact the instructor BY THE 15TH CLASS DAY OF THE NEXT REGULAR SEMESTER..

a. If the instructor can not be contacted but course records are available, the department head WILL EFFECT RESOLUTION WITHIN 5 CLASS DAYS OF NOTIFICATION BY THE STUDENT. THE DEPARTMENT HEAD may correct a grading error through the regular change of grade process on behalf of the instructor.

b. If the instructor can not be contacted and course records are either unavailable or indecisive, the student may request a review following the procedure outlined below.

c. If the instructor can be contacted and elects to participate, then a constructive participation

is to be welcomed by the review committee. The procedures of Paragraph III.A.5.a. or Paragraph III.A.5.b. will be instituted if the instructor withdraws from participation.

6. There may be extenuating circumstances when the deadlines cannot be met due to illness, mail disruption, or other situations over which the student may have no control. In such a case, upon request from the student, the dean of students, after review of supporting documentation provided by the student, may recommend to the grade appeals committee that the deadlines be adjusted accordingly. An extension of the deadline will be limited to one semester but every effort should be made to complete the appeal process within the current semester.

B. If no such error occurred, the remaining option is by review for alleged arbitrary and capricious grading, or for instances where the course instructor is unavailable and satisfaction is not forthcoming from the appropriate department head.

1. This review is initiated by the student through a signed, written request to the department head with a copy to the dean of the college or school in which the course was offered.

a. The student's request for review may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and available at the Admissions and Records Office.

b. By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the review of the grade, and that the university's administration can not influence or affect the outcome of the review.

c. The request for a review must be received no later than [[45]] 20 days after the first day of instruction in the next regular semester (i.e., fall semester for grade issued at the end of the previous spring semester or summer session; spring semester for grade issued at the end of the previous fall semester). OR WITHIN 5 DAYS OF RECEIPT OF NOTIFICATION OF THE PROCESS BY THE DEAN/DIRECTOR OF THE COLLEGE OR SCHOOL IN WHICH THE COURSE WAS OFFERED.

d. The request must detail the basis for the allegation that a grade was improper and the result of arbitrary and capricious grading and must present the relevant evidence.

2. It is the responsibility of the department head to formally notify both the instructor who issued the grade and the dean of the unit's college or school that a request for a review of grade has been received.

3. If the instructor of the course is also the department head, the Dean of the College will designate another department head within the college to act as the department's representative for all proceedings. If the

instructor of the course is also the Dean of the College, the Provost will designate another Dean within the University to act as the college's monitor of all proceedings.

4. The dean will appoint a 5 member review committee composed of the following:

- a. One tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the course was offered (other than the instructor of the course).
- b. Two tenure-track faculty members from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the course was offered. If available, one of these two members will be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.
- c. One tenure track faculty member from outside the college or school in which the course was offered. If available, this member is to be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.
- d. [[At the option of the student whose grade is being reviewed, t]] The fifth member to be appointed by the dean will be a NON-VOTING student REPRESENTATIVE. [[or another tenure track faculty member outside the college or school in which the course was offered. If the fifth member is a faculty member, this member will be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee if one is available.]]
- e. The campus judicial officer or his/her designee shall serve as a nonvoting facilitator for grade appeals hearings. This individual shall serve in an advisory role to help preserve consistent hearing protocol and records.

5. The committee must schedule a mutually agreeable date, time and location for the appeal hearing within 10 working days of receipt of the student's request.

- a. During this and subsequent meetings, all parties involved shall protect the confidentiality of the matter according to the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and any other applicable federal, state or university policies.
- b. Throughout the proceedings, the committee will encourage a mutually agreeable resolution.
- c. The mandatory first item of business at this meeting is for the committee to rule on the validity of the student's request. Grounds for dismissal of the request for review are:
  - 1) This is not the first properly prepared request for appeal of the particular grade.

- 2) The actions of the instructor do not constitute arbitrary and capricious grading, as defined herein.
- 3) The request was not made within the policy deadlines.
- 4) The student has not taken prior action to resolve the grade conflict with the instructor, as described under section III, A.

d. In the event that the committee votes to dismiss the request, a written notice of dismissal must be forwarded to the student, instructor, department head and dean within five days of the decision, and will state clearly the reasoning for the dismissal of the request.

6. Acceptance for consideration of the student's request will result in the following:

- a. A request for and receipt of a formal response from the instructor to the student's allegation.
- b. A second meeting scheduled to meet within 10 days of the decision to review the request.
  - 1) The student and instructor will be invited to attend the meeting.
  - 2) The meeting will be closed to outside participation, and neither the student nor instructor may be accompanied by an advocate or representative. Other matters of format will be announced in advance.
  - 3) The proceedings will be tape recorded and the tapes will be stored with the campus Judicial Officer.
  - 4) The meeting must be informal, non-confrontational and fact-finding, where both the student and instructor may provide additional relevant and useful information and can provide clarification of facts for materials previously submitted.

7. The final decision of the committee will be made in private by a majority vote.

[[a. The committee is not authorized to award a grade (letter or pass/fail) or take any action with regard to the instructor.]]

[[b.]] a. Actions which the committee can take if it accepts the student's allegation of arbitrary and capricious grading must be directed towards a fair and just resolution, and may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 1) direct the instructor to grade again the student's work under the supervision of the department head,

- 2) direct the instructor to administer a new final examination and/or paper in the course,
- 3) direct a change of the student's registration status (i.e., withdrawn, audit, dropped) in the course.

B. THE ACADEMIC DECISION REVIEW COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS WILL RESULT IN THE PREPARATION OF WRITTEN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. CONCLUSIONS WILL RESULT IN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

- 1) THE REQUEST FOR A GRADE CHANGE IS DENIED.
- 2) 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.
- 3) 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 DIRECTS THE DEAN/DIRECTOR TO INITIATE THE PROCESS SPECIFIED BY MAU RULES AND PROCEDURES TO CHANGE THE GRADE TO THAT SPECIFIED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE.

c. A formal, written report of the decision must be forwarded to the student, instructor, department head, dean and Director of Admissions and Records within five days of the meeting.

d. The decision of the committee is final.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 89/2  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #89  
 SEPTEMBER 27, 1999  
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOTION:  
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Graduate Student Admission requirements as follows:

[[ ]] = Deletions  
 CAPS = Additions

Graduate Admission Requirements:

You may be admitted to graduate status if you have a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution with at least a 3.0 ("B") cumulative grade point average in your undergraduate studies, and a 3.0 ("B") average in



your major, and the major is deemed suitable for continuation of studies in the field of choice. SOME PROGRAMS REQUIRE THE GRE AND OTHER SPECIAL CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION OF STUDENT'S TO THEIR PROGRAM.

Results of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE)--Results of the GRE are required from all applicants IF THEIR GPA IS BELOW 3.0 AND THEY ARE SEEKING SPECIAL ADMISSION except those applying for the MBA program. If you are applying to the MBA program, you are required to submit scores from the GMAT. Refer to the admission requirements of the specific degree program for which you are applying to determine what other tests might be required.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2000

RATIONALE: The GRE has become more difficult to administer in Alaska resulting in an increasing number of waivers.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 89/3  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #89  
 SEPTEMBER 27, 1999  
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

The Curricular Affairs Committee Report met on September 9, 1999. Present were Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Carol Barnhardt, Chris Hartman, Ron Illingworth, Janice Reynolds, Judy Shepherd, Ann Tremarello, Gayle Gregory, Wanda Martin, Ed Murphy, Katrina Klassen, and Charlotte Basham. The following items were discussed:

1. Representative from Curricular Affairs to the Instructional Working Group. Since Wanda, Ann, and Ed attend those meetings as well as our meeting it was suggested that the committee is well represented. However, it was pointed out that we still should have a faculty representative. Depending on when the meetings will be held, Charley may be able to attend.
2. We were asked to review the Faculty Senate Grade Appeals Policy and resolve discrepancies between it and the Board of Regents Policy on Student Dispute Resolution (R09.03). A group will be meeting on Friday to consider the policy. We would like to ask them especially to reconsider the discrepancy in the number of days allowed for a student to file a formal request. Some general points were mentioned in the meeting; Charley agreed to specify the discrepancies, which are attached.
3. Ron Illingworth is willing to serve on the Provost's committee for distance delivery.
4. Diane Marshall, on behalf of David Bantz, Library Director, requested faculty participation to attend a seminar on mobile computing. Chris Hartman and Janice Reynolds said they would be willing to consider this.
5. On the topic of computers, Janice raised a concern about the lack of computerized teaching facilities, that is, enough computers to conduct a class that uses them. We're not sure where to direct this concern.
6. We considered the problem of another discrepancy between Faculty Senate and administrative policies. In implementing a spring course review cycle, the Senate intended that all courses reviewed in an academic year become effective in the next academic year. However, last spring Provost Reichardt denied all such requests and stated that all courses approved in the spring cycle would become effective the

following spring. This was due to problems pointed out by the Registrar in having courses advertised in the pre-registration schedule that would then be changed. For the next meeting we will look at what our policy actually says and discuss whether we need to change it or ask the Provost to reconsider.

Items for future meetings:

--Ann T. said that her office is working on a computerized degree audit. She will bring a proposal to the next meeting. She will also bring a request to adjust deadlines for withdrawing from courses taken for credit/no credit.

--At our next meeting, or whenever we receive a more specific request for action, we will consider the issue of dual enrollment (offering both H.S. and college credits for UAF courses).

--a discrepancy between the language requirements for the Associate and Baccalaureate degrees (Wanda Martin).

--transfer policy for AA degree

--look at policy for the number of correspondence courses that can be used for credit toward a degree (Ron Illingworth).

Charlotte Basham, Chair

-----  
Discrepancies found between the Board of Regents Policy on Student Dispute Resolution (R09.03) and Faculty Senate Grade Appeals Policy. (submitted by Charlotte Basham on behalf of Curricular Affairs)

a) There is a discrepancy in the number of days which the instructor and/or department head has to respond to a notification of appeal (BOR says 5 days; Senate 10). We support the Senate policy on this issue. )

b) There is a discrepancy in the number of days into the next semester by which a student must notify the instructor and/or department head (BOR says 15th day; Senate 20th). Again, we support the Senate policy.

c) There is a discrepancy in the number of days allowed for a student to file a written request for a formal review. The BOR states that it must be filed by the 20th class day of the next regular semester or within 5 class days of receipt of notification of the process. The Senate policy states that the request must be received no later than 45 days after the first day of instruction in the next regular semester. This is perhaps the most important one, as it disadvantages students who take courses via distance delivery. It essentially allows for no time between the receipt of a response by the instructor and the date required for filing a formal request.)

d) There is a difference in specifying who serves on an appeals committee. In the BOR faculty membership is not specified, whereas in the Senate policy it is spelled out, including that there be a tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the course was offered. The BOR policy states that there will be a non-voting student representative, whereas the Senate policy states that the appealing student may choose to have a student as the fifth member (and presumably voting member) of the committee. We felt that with the exception of the position of a student member, there is not a problem with leaving the UAF policy as it is in regard to committee membership, as it does not conflict with BOR policy; it is more specific.)

e) There is a serious discrepancy in the instructor's role in the process. The BOR policy states that if the committee upholds the student's appeal, 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. The Senate policy states that the committee may direct the instructor to grade again the student's work under the supervision of the department head or administer a new final examination and/or paper in the course.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 89/4  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #89  
 SEPTEMBER 27, 1999  
 SUBMITTED BY FACULTY & SCHOLARLY AFFAIRS

The Faculty & Scholarly Affairs Committee was convened at 11:30AM Tuesday, September 14th by John Yarie. Present were: John Yarie, Barry Mortenson, Susan Grigg, and Norm Swazo. The Committee elected Norm Swazo as committee chair.

No other business was conducted and the meeting adjourned accordingly.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 89/5  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #89  
 SEPTEMBER 27, 1999  
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

The Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs Committee met on Monday, September 13. Harikumar Sankaran "volunteered" to serve on any forthcoming committee on Distance Delivery. Joe Kan presented possible changes to the graduate student portion of the Mission Statement/Strategic Plan.

James Gardner, Chair

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 89/6  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #89  
 SEPTEMBER 27, 1999  
 SUBMITTED BY CORE REVIEW

Report from CORE Review:

The Committee met for first time on Monday, 13 September, 1999. The Chair introduced new members, Jordan Titus and Suzanne Bordelon. All members present save for Natural Sciences member who was given faulty information about meeting date. The Committee still has no member from Engineering/Management.

Our expectations for the coming year include the following matters:

- \* The second round of Assessment for the Communications, Library Science, and Perspectives on the Human Condition areas of the CORE Curriculum (to include courses not yet assessed and courses out of rotation) as well as assessment of CORE "O" and "W" requirement.

- \* To assure that assessment this time includes CRA locations and other areas of CORE course presentation. (CORE Review was unprepared to include CRA and other areas in the first round of

assessment)

- \* Consideration of how assessment reports so far can be used to improve the CORE Curriculum for our students.
- \* Production and implementation of a plan to better reach students about the purpose and value of the CORE Curriculum.
- \* Continue tracking petitions and using that information to address student problems in the system.

and to address

- \* Other matters concerning the CORE Curriculum which may come our way.

Jin Brown, Chair  
CORE Review Committee

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 89/7  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #89  
SEPTEMBER 27, 1999  
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT

#### Report of the Faculty Development Committee

The Faculty Development committee met on September 9, 1999. Roughly half the committee was in attendance. The committee discussed the faculty needs survey that was conducted several years ago by this committee. We decided that before addressing the survey and how we can make use of the data we needed to address our charge to prepare a faculty handbook. All were in agreement that UAF needs a [new] faculty handbook. Many on the committee felt that while we could provide constructive input into the contents of the report, we were unclear on the extent to which the Administrative Committee sought our help. We hope this will be resolved at the administrative committee meeting on September 17.

Dan White, Chair

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 89/8  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #89  
SEPTEMBER 27, 1999  
SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE SCHOOL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### Graduate School Advisory Committee Report

The Graduate School Advisory Committee met on August 24, 1999 and September 7, 1999. Dr. Duffy agreed to serve as acting chair until the committee elected a permanent chair. The concept of a graduate faculty designation at UAF was discussed and Dr. Kan presented recent data comparing UAF's program to other universities. Dr. Kan also discussed some new initiatives in the graduate program which are under consideration.

The committee discussed the need to have graduate education in any new strategic plan or mission statement. Some of the past activities of

the committee in supporting affordable housing for graduate students and improving GRE availability were also discussed. The committee also wanted its policy modification on admission requirements, which was sent forward last year, moved to Senate Agenda for approval.

Submitted by Larry Duffy