

**MINUTES**

## UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #63

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1996

WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

I The meeting was called to order by President Heyne at 1:30 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

## MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alexander, B.  
 Bandopadhyay, S.  
 Beget, J.  
 Bischak, D.  
 Biswas, N.  
 Braddock, J.  
 Carlson, R.  
 Craven, J.  
 Creed, J.  
 Curda, L.  
 Gerlach, C. (P. Fast)  
 Hallsten, D.  
 He'bert, M.  
 Heyne, E.  
 Illingworth, R.  
 Jennings, M.  
 Layer, P.  
 Lynch, D.  
 McFadden, T.  
 Morgan, J. (D. Bye)  
 Nance, K.  
 Perkins, M.  
 Pippenger, M.  
 RaLonde, R  
 Reynolds, J.  
 Schatz, M.  
 Seifert, R.  
 Summerville, S.  
 Swazo, N.  
 Thomas, D.  
 Wade, C.  
 Walworth, J

## MEMBERS ABSENT:

Juday, G.  
 Kelley, J.  
 McBeath, G.  
 McLean-Nelson, D.  
 Weingartner, T.

## OTHERS PRESENT:

Gabrielli, R.  
 Gregory, G.  
 Layral, S.

## NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

A. Wells - ASUAF  
 Pierce, R. - President-Elect, UAFSC  
 Alexander, V. - Dean, SFOS  
 Hedahl, G. - Dean, CLA  
 Tremarello, A - Director, A&R

## NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

1 graduate student

B. The minutes to Meeting #62 (March 25, 1996) were approved as distributed via e-mail.

C. The agenda was approved as amended to include New Business item, VII. F. Regents policy on role of consultation with governance.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions approved:

1. Motion to amend the UAF Governance Coordinating Procedure to delete the Library & Information Technology Users Committee.

2. Motion to suspend for one year the change in the last day of late registration.

B. Motions pending: none

### III Comments from Chancellor Wadlow and Provost Keating -

The Chancellor and Provost was not available to give a report.

### IV Governance Reports

#### A. ASUAF - A. Wells

The Elections Board of ASUAF announced the results of last week's ASUAF Presidential elections. Catherine Wheeler, current President of the ASUAF Senate, is the President-Elect for the 1996-97 school year.

ASUAF Legislative Affairs Director Health Hilyard continues to lobby for the students of UAF for passage of the Land Grant bills currently in both the Senate and House. Mr. Hilyard has offered several seminars to explain the bills and their importance to UAF students and has also enlisted the aid of ASUAF Senate members for a letter writing campaign to state legislators.

The Rules Committee of the ASUAF Senate is currently reviewing the Constitution and the By-laws of ASUAF (known as the Blue Book). Minor changes have been suggested by the committee to clarify existing rules and delete those which have become obsolete. The ASUAF Senate will vote on those revisions at their next meeting.

#### B. Staff Council - R. Pierce

Ron Pierce, President-Elect for Staff Council introduced himself. Ron is the Range Manager for Poker Flat Research Range. Eric and Marie have worked well together in the past and he felt that Don and he would continue building the communication between the two groups. Ron indicated the two areas Staff Council will be concentrating on next year are a training program for staff and a recognition program.

#### C. President's Report - E. Heyne

The President's report was attached to the agenda. Eric indicated that Meltdown/Campus clean-up will be Friday, April 26. Student Activities is looking for help and encouragement in the clean-up effort. Faculty participate in serving breakfast to the students in the Commons.

#### D. Faculty Alliance meeting - D. Lynch

A report on the Faculty Alliance meeting was attached to the agenda. Don handed out a new report which gave highlights of the Regents' meeting held in Anchorage on April 18-19.

HIGHLIGHTS OF APRIL 18, 19, 1996 REGENTS MEETING, ANCHORAGE  
DON LYNCH, PRESIDENT-ELECT, UAF FACULTY SENATE

The most significant matters affecting the University are:

MAJOR PROJECTS APPROVED BY REGENTS:

New coal-water-slurry system for UAF Power Plant  
Fund Raising for Elvey II  
Seeking funds for new Marine Science Building at Juneau

Funds from Japan appear probable for Elvey II and NOAA is very interested in the Marine Science facility at Juneau. Funding appears assured for the new coal slurry facility at UAF. In addition, the new cafeteria and dorms for Anchorage seem also probable. Each of these projects will require University matching funds both for construction and maintenance.

#### Collections II and III

The Academic Affairs committee went through these two collections very carefully. The copyright section of Collection II is not prepared as of this time. A new section was added to the beginning of Regents' policies emphasizing the need for governance review, but not in consonance with that proposed by the Faculty Alliance. Dana Thomas made a good presentation on methods for measuring Educational Effectiveness, a new policy required by Accreditation. One key element here is that COURSE SYLLABI MUST BE COMPREHENSIVE AND SPELL OUT WHAT THE EXPECTATIONS ARE. State law requires that educational materials and textbooks be free of bias towards any minority or sex unless necessary for clear educational purposes.

#### Grievance Policy

Grievance policy remains under revision and is to be referred to Governance at a later date. Some of the problems arise from the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Family Medical Leave Act, and, although it seemed to a lesser degree, with Sexual Harassment. REGENTS POLICIES ARE NOW AVAILABLE ON INTERNET, REGENTS HOME PAGE.

#### Associate Degree in Applied Science

The Regents approved this program which adds academic courses to some 876 existing apprenticeship programs statewide to achieve an associate degree.

#### Legislative Actions

University Lands Bill may be approved, but is encountering strong opposition. The University may get the land but will be unable to use it for logging or mining. UA state appropriation is likely to be the same for this coming year as for last. According to Program Assessment, this means that the University will be short ten million dollars in order basically to fund new building operational costs and improved distance delivery. UAA housing bill has passed the House.

#### Public Comments

Mike Mayberry, Vice President, Classified Employees Association (Physical Plant), celebrated the first anniversary of their contract with the University and stressed that the Alternate Dispute Resolution Training given to union representatives has worked. This blue collar union has 250-270 members.

Ralph McGrath of former Community College Union stressed that a bill is in the legislature to recreate the Community College System. Other testimony indicated that this would be only a problem in Anchorage.

Larry Weiss testified for United Academics and urged the Regents to use the AAUP Redbook in creating new academic policies.

Cheryl Mann, President, Faculty Alliance, thanked Regents for allowing Faculty Alliance to participate in the most recent meetings of the Academic Affairs committee and hoped that there would be

more communication between Regents and Governance.

Marie Scholle of System Governance and Staff Alliance stressed that these groups will ask to meet with the Business Council particularly regarding the new Job Evaluation System.

Ron Pierce, President-Elect of UAF Staff Council, stressed that the combined efforts at lobbying of all the governance groups in Juneau this February appears to have been effective.

Don Lynch, President-Elect, UAF Faculty Senate, stressed the policy issues currently in the process of being approved by the three Senates and Alliance: new statement on Five Year Tenure Review and new statement on Locus of Tenure as well as the Alliance statement on the Meaning of Faculty Consultation. I also stressed that the formal period of governance review of Collection III, policies of most concern to faculty, which started on April 19th would not lead to significant actions as faculty are in final exam, commencement weeks and go off contract on May 20th.

Mary Hughes, UAF Board of Visitors, and Charlotte Jensen of Cooperative Extension Service, and someone else from UAF's College of Fellows described briefly the activities of their organizations.

Sean Paul, Juneau Student Organization protested in vain against having lower tuition rates at Kodiak and Prince William Sound than elsewhere in the system. Tom Walker, UAS Student Organization, stated that the culture at UAA militated against effective student governance. Apparently there are specific problems with the administration over student governance in Anchorage which do not exist in Fairbanks.

#### Reorganization

The student paper in Anchorage announced the cancellation or suspension of 85 courses for Fall 1996. UAA's reorganization is designed to eliminate several acting or interim deans. UAS's reorganization will create faculty clusters administered by a single dean.

#### Merit Pay

Juneau will use all its merit pay money for equity salary increases for those of its fifty non-bargaining unit faculty who deserve such raises. The President stated that this was within the intent of Regents Policy. UAA and UAF are both using regression analysis considering time in grade, Oklahoma study, and equity within departments to select people for equity raises. This is to be followed by qualitative judgments by deans and department heads. UAF is proceeding with merit pay. Some colleges have decided to give merit pay to only 30 to 60 percent of faculty. One college, CLA, is developing its system.

#### Enrollment

UAA School of Management has embarked on a public relations campaign using 3,000 television cassettes to be sent to high schools to increase declining enrollments. Will also offer weekend courses in business.

COMMENT: At one point, one of the Regents stated: "The Regents' goal is unity, cooperation, working together." This certainly proved to be the case among the representatives of all the governance groups from all of the campuses. The two Union representatives also were positively disposed towards governance leaders.

I asked Dana Thomas to repeat his presentation on Educational Effectiveness to the last Faculty Senate meeting of this year, May

13th, as this is a program we shall have to utilize this coming academic year.

The Regents met essentially for twelve hours straight on both Thursday and Friday without a significant break. They had a very long executive session, rumor having it that this concerned various issues surrounding contracts for deferred maintenance. The Regents did repeatedly stress the need for governance comments on policies and faculty participation in peer reviews.

I invite our Faculty Senate to give serious consideration to:

- Statement on the definition of consultation
- Statement on Five Year Tenure Review
- Statement on Locus of Tenure

Our proposed positions on these matters appear to be quite similar to those under consideration in the Anchorage and Juneau Faculty Senates.

Fairbanks once again appeared to have the strongest representation (excluding Statewide, naturally). The Chancellor, Provost, Vice-Chancellor for Administration, Dean School of Fisheries, Dean School of Engineering were present for all or part of the meetings.

#### Program Assessment

Program Assessment is the justification for the reorganizations presently underway in Anchorage and Juneau and proposed for Fairbanks. Course cancellations in Anchorage are justified on the basis of achieving the five percent annual increase in faculty productivity mandated by Program Assessment and the College of Arts and Sciences exceeding its budget. Only seven percent of the Systemwide Program Assessment recommendations for projected funds available for fixed cost increases and other allocations of \$23,037,800 by FY1998 have been met as of Spring 1996.

Of this amount, UAF has reached fifteen percent of its goal of \$11,854,500 for reallocation and eleven percent of its total goal of \$15,934,300 in reductions and reallocations. Reallocations are to include \$4,079,800 for annual maintenance, operation of new facilities, and improving the technology of distance delivery. The total to be reallocated to distance delivery is \$1,390,000. The total reduction to academic programs is to be \$2,634,400. Of this total, \$758,400 or twenty-nine percent has actually been realized.

UAA and UAS have reached ten percent of their reduction goals; UAF has reached eleven percent of its goal. Statewide has increased its expenditures by five percent and thus is not meeting any part of its goal. The Regents agenda document is useful reading for Senators and is available in the Governance Office. Collection Three as revised should soon be available. It will be approved by the Regents at the June 13th meeting in Fairbanks. The revised document should be available shortly through System Governance. UAF's Faculty Senate will have its last opportunity to comment on Monday, May 13th, the day after Commencement. Comments may be sent directly to Pat Ivey.

V Public Comments/Questions - none

VI Old Business

A. Motion to recommend changes to proposed Regents' Policy on locus of tenure, submitted by Faculty Affairs

Eric indicated that this issue was addressed at the last meeting and this was the version to come out of Faculty Affairs. Norman Swazo spoke in favor of the motion in light of UAF's reorganization for the academic year 1996-97. Don indicated that the Board of Regents is asking as a goal for the entire university that faculty all work together regardless of where they are located. The Board is serious about distance delivery of education. Instructional faculty on this campus may also have a role to play all over the state. The motion passed with 1 vote against.

MOTION PASSED (1 nay)

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the proposed language in Regents' Policy on locus of tenure (OX-01.05.2c) be amended as follows:

CAPS = Additions  
[[ ]] = Deletions

Faculty will be tenured [[within an academic unit of a community college, extended college or campus, or school or college of an MAU within the University of Alaska]] AT THE LEVEL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS, THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE, OR THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SOUTHEAST. Faculty may transfer with tenure to another academic unit (E.G., DEPARTMENT, PROGRAM) in the same or another [[MAU]] UNIVERSITY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA SYSTEM only upon the approval of the faculty and the Chancellor of the receiving academic unit.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Having been presented to the UAF Faculty Senate for formal review and recommendation, the most recent revisions to Regents' Policy ("Collection III: Faculty Policies," 04.04.04-07 and 10.09.01, 4th Draft) are found unsatisfactory in locating tenure "within an academic unit of a community college, extended college or campus, or school or college of an MAU within the University of Alaska." Revised language in OX-01.05.2c, specifically the words "academic unit" and MAU," remain ambiguous and subject to interpretation which may undermine the award of tenure as a continuous appointment. "Academic unit" is, for the most part, an artificial administrative entity, all too readily subject to the contingencies of changing educational objectives and mission and corresponding reorganization of the academy. The UAF Faculty Senate's amendment to the proposed language, "at the level of the University of Alaska Fairbanks, The University of Alaska Anchorage, or the University of Alaska Southeast," seeks to assure that there will be no termination of an appointment with continuous tenure except as a bona fide formal discontinuance of a program or department of instruction, which discontinuance must "be based essentially upon educational considerations, as determined primarily by the faculty as a whole or an appropriate committee thereof" (cf. AAUP Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure).

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Motion to recommend changes to proposed Regents' Policy on Post-Tenure Evaluation, submitted by Faculty Affairs

Eric indicated that this motion has changed quite extensively from the last version. Barbara Alexander indicated that one change has been the five year review. Another major change includes adding administrators who are holding tenured rank. Eric clarified that this would be a peer faculty and administration evaluation. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION PASSED (unanimous)

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the proposed language in Regents' Policy on Post-Tenure Evaluation (P OX-01.06) be amended as follows:

CAPS = Additions

[[ ]] = Deletions

Tenured faculty members, INCLUDING ADMINISTRATORS HOLDING TENURED FACULTY STATUS, will be evaluated intensively [[at least]] every five years by peer faculty and administrators HAVING LINE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF SUPERVISION (E.G., DEPARTMENT HEAD/CHAIR, SCHOOL/CAMPUS DIRECTOR, COLLEGE DEAN) OF THE TENURED FACULTY MEMBER. INASMUCH AS DETERMINATION OF FACULTY STATUS IS PRIMARILY A FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY, ADMINISTRATORS PARTICIPATING IN THE POST-TENURE EVALUATION PROCESS SHOULD CONCUR WITH THE PEER FACULTY JUDGMENT EXCEPT IN RARE INSTANCES AND THEN ONLY BY PROVIDING COMPELLING REASONS IN WRITING AND IN DETAIL. These evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the criteria and process for evaluation in Regents' Policy, University Regulation, and MAU rules and procedures on evaluation of faculty. NEITHER THE CRITERIA NOR THE PROCESS OF POST-TENURE EVALUATION WILL BE CONSTRUED AS EQUIVALENT TO THE PROBATIONARY EVALUATION OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, THE AWARD OF TENURE ITSELF SERVING AS PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF A FACULTY MEMBER'S DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE AS TEACHER, SCHOLAR, AND CITIZEN OF THE ACADEMY AT LARGE. THEREFORE, POST-TENURE EVALUATION MUST BE ESPECIALLY CAREFUL TO BE COMPLIANT WITH STANDARDS OF DUE PROCESS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM, I.E., TEACHING, RESEARCH, PUBLIC SERVICE, AND EXTRAMURAL ACTIVITIES FREE OF CAPRICIOUS INSTITUTIONAL CENSORSHIP OR DISCIPLINE. MAU rules and procedures will include a process for remediation to address situations in which the competence and/or performance of a faculty member is deemed to be unsatisfactory. At any time prior to the scheduled evaluation, the TENURED faculty member's Dean or Director may, as a result of [[other]] PEER FACULTY evaluations, initiate processes to improve faculty performance [[which could include the post-tenure review process]].

Once a TENURED faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation as a result of the intensive post-tenure review process, annual evaluations will take place until the TENURED faculty member receives a satisfactory POST-TENURE evaluation. THE YEAR IN WHICH A SATISFACTORY EVALUATION IS GIVEN WILL BE THE BASE YEAR FOR THE NEXT SCHEDULED INTENSIVE POST-TENURE REVIEW. Unsatisfactory evaluations REFLECTING [[AN]] THE TENURED FACULTY MEMBER'S unwillingness or inability to fulfill [[the]] A REASONABLE performance assignment for three consecutive years constitute grounds for termination for cause. 'CAUSE' SHALL BE UNDERSTOOD TO BE A DECLARATION OF INCOMPETENCE DIRECTLY AND SUBSTANTIALLY (1) IN THE FACULTY MEMBER'S RESPONSIBILITIES IN TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE, AND/OR (2) FOR MORAL TURPITUDE.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Regents' Policy revisions have been presented to the UAF Faculty Senate for formal review and recommendation on content. The section on Post-Tenure Evaluation is an entirely new addition to Regents' Policy concerning faculty status. The proposed amendment to policy seeks to highlight the UAF faculty perspective on the issue of post-tenure evaluation, and to do so in such a way as to safeguard the enduring attitude and standards endorsed by the American Association of University Professors and associated institutions of higher education.

\*\*\*\*\*

VII New Business

A. Election for the 1996-97 UAF Faculty Senate President-Elect

Ballots were passed out to voting Senate members and were tallied during the break.

B. Resolution to ratify election of 1996-97 UAF Faculty Senate President-Elect, submitted by Administrative Committee

Eric announced the results of the election. There was no opposition to ratifying the election and the resolution passed.

RESOLUTION PASSED

=====

BE IT RESOLVED, That the UAF Faculty Senate ratifies the election of President-Elect on the basis of the following ballot.

BALLOT

PRESIDENT-ELECT

Please vote for ONE individual to serve as the President-Elect of the UAF Faculty Senate for 1996-97.

\*\*\* John Craven, Professor  
Physics/GI

Michael Jennings, Assistant Professor  
School of Education

\*\*\*President-Elect

\*\*\*\*\*

C. Evaluating Educational Effectiveness - D. Thomas

Dana offered a motion to adopt a policy for UAF. This is in response from the work done on accreditation last year. UAF is behind in student outcomes assessment which is a requirement of accreditation. Ron questioned the use of persistence as a measurement. There is a significant difference between the full-time on-campus student and the part-time rural based student. The definition of persistence that is applicable to the on-campus student does not effectively work or accurately represent what is



happening to the rural student. Dana indicated that faculty are key to this process. Dana went on to give an example of how one part of the assessment might take place. This will involve extensive faculty work. UAS is ahead of UAF in their assessment program. Dana also indicated that there is no financial commitment from the administration at this time. However, he believes that some would have to be forthcoming for the process to work. Dana urged everyone to keep the process as simple as possible. The motion passed without opposition.

MOTION PASSED

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend the adoption of a policy on evaluating educational effectiveness as described below.

EFFECTIVE:           Immediately  
                                          Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE:           In order to maintain our institutional accreditation, UAF must develop and implement a process of educational evaluation. In addition, the UA Board of Regents has a draft policy requiring such a process which they will consider at their June meeting. Copies of the accreditation standards and proposed BOR policy are available at the Faculty Development Office. The provost has named the following team to coordinate UAF's effort in this regard; Dana Thomas (Chair), Paul Reichardt, Joan Worley, Jin Brown, Meriam Karlsson, Ralph Gabrielli, and Ron Johnson. This team offers the proposed UAF policy below to begin our development and implementation of an educational effectiveness evaluation process. Evaluating educational effectiveness methods may include, but are not limited to, interviews, transcript analyses including persistence, performance, and course taking patterns, student self-evaluations, standardized tests, portfolio samples, capstone courses, course grades, exit surveys, and graduate employee or employer surveys. The Office of Faculty Development will arrange a workshop this fall for training faculty in this area.

\*\*\*\*\*

UAF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION POLICY

In accordance with its mission, the University of Alaska Fairbanks has a continuing responsibility to review and improve performance of students, faculty, and programs. UAF therefore establishes the Educational Effectiveness Evaluation to describe the effects of curriculum, instruction, and other institutional programs. The process will be useful for curricular and institutional reform and will be consistent with UA Board of Regents Policy and institutional and specialized accreditation standards.

The university shall ensure the academic freedom of the academic community in the development and maintenance of this process.

Evaluations shall be conducted with regard to the following:

- 1) Student Information - Students will be assessed upon entry to the university for purposes of course advising and placement, especially in mathematics and English, and for describing the gender, age, ethnicity, and previous education of students recruited, retained, and graduated over time.

- 2) Evaluation of the CORE Curriculum - Evaluation of the CORE curriculum will include assessment embedded within CORE courses as well as the assessment of students within upper division courses, especially oral and writing intensive courses.
- 3) Programmatic Evaluation - Each degree and certificate program will establish and maintain a student outcomes assessment process useful for curricular reform and consistent with institutional and specialized accreditation standards.
- 4) Evaluation of Out of Class Learning - An important element of a student's overall education is learning that occurs outside of classes. Therefore, an evaluation of those activities and student support services impacting a student's education shall be conducted.

\*\*\*\*\*

D. Motion to amend the minimum high school gpa for admission to the concurrent enrollment (AHEAD) program, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Dana recalled the brief discussion about allowing high school students to enter a degree program in their final high school year provided they met certain criteria. There was some discussion at that time about the policy's grade point average requirement of 2.5. When the Senate motion went to the Chancellor, she approved it and wrote that she would like the Senate to consider a higher gpa. It came back to Curricular Affairs and they passed it at a 3.0 gpa. It is back before the Senate for consideration. Rich Seifert spoke against the higher gpa. Ann Tremarello spoke about the program and how students would be admitted to the program. Norman Swazo proposed an amendment to the motion to admit student as a degree candidate with a 3.0 gpa and conditionally admit students with a 2.5 gpa. Sukumar spoke against the motion. Madeline Schatz and Dana Thomas spoke against the amendment. The amendment failed. Don Lynch and Ron Illingworth spoke about the need for good advising and do not support increasing the gpa. The motion failed with a vote of 7 yes, 16 nays, and 1 abstention.

\*\*\*\*\*

E. Motion to recommend changes to proposed Regents' Policy on Failure to Receive Tenure, submitted by Faculty Affairs

Michael Pippenger remarked that he did not agree with the changes to Regents' policy as proposed but that this motion was to change some of the wording of the proposed policy. There was discussion about how the current policy and the proposed policy differ in allowing faculty to go through the review process more than once. Michele He'bert spoke in favor of the current policy. The motion changing language from (MAY CONTINUE TO SERVE to WILL CONTINUE TO SERVE ..., BUT MAY NOT STAND...) passed unanimously.

MOTION PASSED (unanimous)

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the proposed language in Regents' Policy on Tenure (0X.01.05) be amended as follows:

CAPS = Additions  
 [[ ]] = Deletions

Proposed Regent's Policy 0X.01.05  
 F.5. Failure to Receive Tenure.  
 {Rearranged}

[[A faculty member may stand]] A CANDIDATE STANDING for tenure prior to the mandatory year of review [[In so doing, the candidate]] MUST PROCEED THROUGH ALL STEPS [[may withdraw at any step]] in the process. [[prior to review by the Chancellor.]] If the decision of the Chancellor is to deny tenure, the faculty member [[shall be offered a terminal appointment]] WILL CONTINUE TO SERVE AS TENURE TRACK FACULTY SUBJECT TO REGENTS' POLICY 0X.01.07 (Termination of Faculty Appointment), BUT MAY NOT STAND AGAIN FOR TENURE PRIOR TO THE MANDATORY YEAR OF REVIEW. THE DECISION OF THE CHANCELLOR IN THIS INSTANCE IS FINAL.

A faculty member must stand for tenure BY OR in the mandatory review year. [[as defined in section 4.b.(1-4) above.]] If tenure is not awarded IN THE MANDATORY YEAR, the faculty member [[shall]] WILL be offered a terminal appointment for one additional year of service.

EFFECTIVE:           Immediately

RATIONALE:           The previous wording of this policy stated that a faculty member denied tenure prior to the mandatory year MAY continue as a tenure track faculty, implying the Chancellor could, outside of Regent's Policy 0X.01.07 (Termination of Faculty Appointment), issue a terminal contract upon the denial of early tenure. Provost Keating stated in a previous UAF Faculty Senate meeting that was not the intent of the proposed policy. Hence, this change in wording better reflects the intention on the proposed policy.

-----  
 Dana proposed another motion to keep the current policy on tenure as it relates to candidates withdrawing at any step. After more discussion on the issue the motion passed.

Eric, Don, and Michael will recommend to the Faculty Alliance that the policy remain the same. The second position will be the motion previously passed with the changes in wording.

MOTION PASSED (unanimous)  
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that Regents' Policy on Tenure (0X.01.05, F.5. Failure to Receive Tenure.) as currently approved remain the same.

\*\*\*\*\*

F.           Regents' Policy on Role of Consultation with Governance,  
               Recommended amendments to draft policy 01.03, Definitions,  
               forwarded to the Senate from Faculty Alliance

Don Lynch indicated that this motion originally came out of UAA to the Faculty Alliance. The original wording came from a policy from Mississippi State. In the most recent revision of Regents' policy a section was added on consultation with governance. This motion adds the definition of consultation.

MOTION PASSED (3 nays)  
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that Regents' Policy (01.03 Definitions) include the following sections on governance and consultation.

CAPS = Additions  
[[ ]] = Deletions

J. FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENT GOVERNANCE

FACULTY, STAFF AND STUDENT GOVERNANCE IS DEFINED IN REGENTS' POLICY 03.01.01.

[[J.]K. Regents' Policy

[[K]]L. University Regulation

[[L]]M. MAU Rules and Procedures

N. CONSULTATION

TO FACILITATE OPEN COMMUNICATION AND EFFECTIVE UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE, THE PRESIDENT AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS OF THE UNIVERSITY WILL PROACTIVELY EXERCISE DILIGENCE IN CONSULTING WITH THE FACULTY, APT AND CLASSIFIED STAFF, STUDENTS, AND EXTERNAL CONSTITUENTS ON ISSUES AFFECTING THEM. CONSULTATION IS CHARACTERIZED BY EARLY DISCUSSIONS WITH THE AFFECTED CONSTITUENCIES, JOINTLY FORMULATED PROCEDURES FOR CONSULTATION, REASONABLE DEADLINES WITHIN THE CONSTRAINTS OF THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR, ACCESS TO APPROPRIATE INFORMATION, ADEQUATE FEEDBACK, AND TIMELY COMMUNICATION OF DECISIONS TO THE AFFECTED CONSTITUENCIES.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The role of everyone else involved in developing policy and/or regulation in 01.02 is defined in 01.03 except governance. Governance is defined in 03.01.01, "Faculty, Staff, and Student Governance," so a cross-reference would take care of that.

Those who develop, pass, and implement Regents' policy, University Regulation, and MAU rules and procedures, and what those documents are, are already defined. Placement of how they would do it (consultation) seems to clarify and complete the picture.

\*\*\*\*\*

VIII Discussion Items

A. Report on Collection 2 & 3 - D. Lynch

Don had no new report on Collection 2 & 3.

B. Discussion of minimum class size policy - E. Heyne

A version of this list was passed out at the Provost Council as a draft list having been generated by the Chancellor for ways to fill faculty time when their classes are canceled for under enrollment. Our policy on minimum class size is very old and is being enforced differently in each college. If the administration is going to start

enforcing minimum class sizes and canceling more classes we need to discuss this in the Senate. The Senate needs to take the lead on this issue. Eric opened discussion to talk about the issue and to take a course of action.

Dean Hedahl reported that in the response to program assessment under enrolled classes is one of the items the Chancellor is responding to. The deans have been looking at the efficient use of resources and looking at under enrolled classes. There is a subgroup of the Provost Council that is meeting to examine this policy.

Don indicated that historically the idea behind the policy was that there should be minimum class sizes subject to: a) is the course required for the major; b) is the course required for graduation that year; and c) will the Dean approve a deviation from that rule. Michele He'bert suggested that since there already is a Provost's committee, someone attend the meetings and report back to Faculty Senate. Dana Thomas said that we need to send a message back to the Chancellor concerning the list. One of the things missing from the list is a reassignment of work load. And where is research? Norman Swazo indicated that workload is an issue undertaken by the Faculty Affairs Committee and suggested that it be referred to that committee for follow-up. Paul Layer, speaking as a department head within CNS, indicated they were trying to come up with a policy within their college. He felt that each college might come up with different criteria. Also, in talking about distribution of load they were talking about faculty development, reassignment of research and service, and also reassignment of tasks within the unit, so that there would be more development in the educational programs.

Ron spoke about the reorganization of UAF in 1988 which joined the community colleges with UAF and became a new entity. Policies which had been developed for the previously existing UAF with a campus here may not have any relationship to the new entity created after that. Certainly this needs to be reviewed. Don reminded the Senate that under program assessment over a three year period faculty productivity is expected to increase by 15 percent.

Eric asked that Dana Thomas from Curricular Affairs and Paul Layer from Scholarly Activities meet with Faculty Affairs. He also asked that the Faculty Affairs Committee send a representative to the Provost's subcommittee on under enrolled classes.

Dana asked for feedback from the faculty on what direction the committee should take on this. If criteria are established, whether at the college level or whatever, there also needs to be a set of priorities to administrators if a class is under enrolled.

Michael Jennings recommended that the decision be made at the lowest possible unit level because of the diversity within the system. Paul Layer agreed but thought we do need to make sure there are some guidelines to make sure there is some communication or equity among units. Madeline hoped that any rules made would contain a cause that allows exceptions. It was moved and seconded to refer the issue of minimum class size to Faculty Affairs. There was no opposition.

Eric asked how the Senate wanted to respond to the list. Michael said it's an administratively developed list for the benefit of administration without consultation of faculty. Send it back as inappropriate. If they would like our input on developing alternative ways of contributing to the institution we will be happy to discuss that. Eric indicated that he would send a letter expressing those thoughts. Michele He'bert said she liked a more positive approach and suggested saying that this is a big concern for us, we feel that

the units' participation in the process is critical to enriching our university as a whole and making each different unit grow, and we would like a little more participation in the list. We appreciate the list but we would like to go forward in making it more unit specific. Eric indicated that he didn't want to say anything about unit based or to take a position on how it should be, only that it should have faculty input, but he would try to be tactful and positive

C. Report of the Program Assessment Task Force - D.

Thomas

Last fall six faculty members were asked to review previous budget review documents, program review, program assessment, and other documents to see if there were any good ideas for budget reducing mechanisms and to offer some alternatives to the Chancellor should we face another budget shortfall. The six met a number of times, read through the documents, and sent to the Chancellor a list of suggestions for a new way of looking at possible ways of cutting. The report and the Chancellor's response were passed to the Provost Council and are now filtering through the departments. Dana urged faculty and departments to look at the report because they used both statewide and UAF data. Dana has no knowledge of what the Chancellor is going to use from the report other than what was included in the agenda. The full report is available in the Governance Office and in each Dean's office.

D. Status of college/school merit increase procedures

This item was included so that faculty can get a sense of how things are going in the other units. Rich Seifert indicated that ACE was not happy with the way it was working out. A group of faculty in ACE were assigned to a committee to try to determine how the merit distribution should go. A memo was sent out April 15 which asked faculty members to vote as to who they think has merit and to what degree. So far, 11 out of 31 have responded. Two months ago the faculty in ACE overwhelmingly expressed the desire to do what UAS did.

Madeline was not available to give the CLA report so it was given by Dean Hedahl. CLA has a committee which polled the college for what procedure should be utilized. Merit pay will be awarded college wide. They have developed a score card which faculty members have the option of submitting. There was a college-wide vote and 53% voted not to participate. A two-thirds majority was required to deny participation. The majority voted for college awards rather than division awards and to use a score card system. Norman Swazo indicated that he had received some objection to the implementation and had been asked to state on the floor of the Senate that the vote in CLA should be declared invalid because there were some faculty members who did not vote because their ballot included the name of the faculty member.

James Beget reported that CNS took a poll about a month ago. There was such a poor result they have moved on to the score card type of accounting. They are in the process of developing a score card. Paul Layer indicated that the CNS model is based on productivity.

James Walworth reported on SALRM. They have not addressed the issue of whether to participate. They have a committee that has been developing a score card. There are a lot of questions on how to verify information.

Ray RaLonde indicated that SFOS is made up of four different units.

IMS is looking at a score card; SFOS Education, particularly in Juneau is having a very difficult time and is very torn on this issue. FITC is research and public service. They don't fit well in the score card procedure and have not developed a policy yet. MAP is primarily service. They are looking at a system to evaluate the effectiveness of service activities.

SOE has three units and 2 units have voted. All three units have different criteria for the voting. In general, Terry McFadden has heard no positive comments and a multitude of negative comments. He has not seen anything divide the faculty as much as this. As it is worked out now, each department will vote and then the department heads will get together with the Dean and review all the vote and make the final assignment.

In SOM each of the three departments will be looking at the past three years of activities reports and evaluations and rank their department members. It will then go the faculty development and planning committee for review. They will send the rankings on to the dean. They will ask that each department gets a proportionate amount of the salary increase.

Sukumar was not available to give a report on SME and CRA is not going through this process.

Linda Curda said that faculty were all worried when this was introduced that it would be divisive, difficult, impossible, would divide faculty and reduce productivity. From the comments around the table, it has been shown that it has done all of the above and worse. She felt that UAS had the correct direction. Can we reverse what is happening at UAF and as a faculty, step forward and say that we would like to go to something different? Michael Jennings reminded the Senate that they had taken a position on this issue some time ago. Vera Alexander reported that SFOS has an advisory council and at their recent meeting came out with a resolution opposing this process which they sent to the Chancellor. Although they applaud the idea of faculty involvement in setting up the criteria, they absolutely were against the idea that faculty were put into a position of evaluating each other and were concerned about the effect on morale.

Michael Pippenger observed that at the beginning of the academic year, when the Senate started to discuss the annual salary increase, the question was raised about dividing the 2.6% equally or doing what we want with it. At that time Provost Keating said we can't do that because Regent's policy said so much goes for discretionary and so much for annual salary increases. Don Lynch indicated that there is a very serious equity salary problem in Southeast. No one that he knows is arguing against the equity program. There is general agreement that we have inequities in our salaries and those should be corrected. What UAS is saying is that is our top and only priority this year. UAF is being told they will do both--merit and equity. Norman Swazo moved to reaffirm the November 18th resolution on policy on compensation. Michele He'bert asked that we go forward to the administration and request they follow the example of UAS and UAA and use all the 2.6% of this year's salary raise for equity. Michael Pippenger spoke against the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 15 yes and 8 nays.

MOTION PASSED  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the UAF Administration follow the example of Chancellor Lind of UAS and

spend all 2.6% of this year's salary raise money for equity.

\*\*\*\*\*

IX Committee Reports

A. CURRICULAR AFFAIRS - Dana Thomas

A report was attached to the agenda.

B. FACULTY AFFAIRS - Barbara Alexander

A report was attached to the agenda.

C. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES - Paul Layer

No report was available.

D. DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES - Ron Illingworth

The following report was distributed as a handout at the meeting.

The Faculty Senate Developmental Studies Committee has entered into a dialogue regarding the climate for learning at all of the UAF campuses. The underlying presumption is that we, as faculty, can have a positive effect on this climate and that there are things which we, as faculty, can do to affect it. Improving the learning climate, we believe, will also increase retention. We have several initiatives in progress at this time.

\* Discussions involving improving the campus climate for learning at UAF's Fairbanks and rural campuses. These include what areas can or should be changed, who is responsible for those areas, and what can be done to affect change.

\* Enhancing the opportunity for student educational success.

\* Better identification of student starting points

\* Improving student placement into specific courses

\* Renorming of the American College Testing ASSET test for UAF's Fairbanks and rural campuses in order to ensure its applicability to our student population.

\* Evaluation of the American College Testing Compass program as a possible replacement for or alternative to the ASSET. The Compass testing programs could be delivered via networked delivery systems on the Fairbanks campus, Tanana Valley Campus, Northwest Campus, Bristol Bay Campus, Chukchi Campus, Kuskokwim Campus, and the Interior-Aleutians Campus. Compass includes both diagnostic and placement capabilities.

\* Evaluation of the Supplemental Instruction system for possible implementation in a video supplemental instruction (VSI) mode with selected courses for UAF's Fairbanks and rural campuses. VSI is a successful industry initiative which has been adapted for post-secondary use.

\* Discussions involving the relationship between student financial aid, grading policies, and developmental classes.



\* Development of institutional research data regarding students involved in developmental classes at UAF.

E. FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT - Diane Bischak

The Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee has been working in two areas. One is the general area of selection of grievance council faculty members. They have an 8 member subcommittee to serve as a pool of faculty members for hearing panels. Diane will also be nominating a member of the committee to be one of the faculty representatives to the grievance council.

The other areas is the evaluation of academic administrators. The Provost is proceeding with the evaluation of four administrators this spring--Hall, Akasofu, Alexander, and Trent. A subcommittee on Administrator Evaluation will oversee the process of administrator evaluation following the 1990 Senate guidelines. The subcommittee includes DeAnne Hallsten, Nag Rao, and Mark Tumeo. They will be reviewing the work of the four administrator evaluation committees.

F. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ASSESSMENT & IMPROVEMENT -  
Rich Seifert

No report was available.

G. LEGISLATIVE & FISCAL AFFAIRS - Michael Jennings

Michael reminded everyone to get the word out by May 6th. The Legislature will be doing close out. There are a number of bills that concern UA. The land grant bill is one that is of interest to the administration. The information is on the Internet and Wendy Redman updates the list weekly.

X Members' Comments/Questions

Eric received a letter from Gary Copus, department of Justice, asking the Senate to address the question of selective admission requirements. Curricular Affairs had approved it for Justice and Provost Keating disapproved it and said this issue needs to be discussed university-wide. Eric referred the issue to Curricular Affairs.

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Tapes of this Faculty Senate meeting are in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall if anyone wishes to listen to the complete tapes.

Submitted by Sheri Layral, Faculty Senate Secretary.