

MINUTES
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #68
 MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1996
 WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

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

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Barnhardt, C.
 Barry, R.
 Boone, R.
 Cooper, B.
 Craven, J.
 Creed, J.
 Curda, L.
 Fast, P.
 Gavlak, R.
 Kelley, J.
 Lynch, D.
 Maginnis, T.
 McBeath, G.
 McFadden, T.
 McLean-Nelson, D.
 Mortensen, B.
 Nance, K.
 Nielsen, H.
 Perkins, M.
 Pippenger, M. (K. Abramowicz)
 RaLonde, R
 Reynolds, J.
 Robinson, T.
 Schweitzer, P. (J. Moessner)
 Seifert, R.
 Swazo, N.
 Walworth, J.
 Weber, J. (S. Dofing)

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Bandopadhyay, S.
 Beget, J.
 Braddock, J.
 Finney, B.
 Ruess, D.
 Schatz, M.
 Spell, D.
 Wade, C.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Barnhardt, R.
 Brown, J.
 Dexter, C.
 Ducharme, J.
 Gatterdam, R.
 Hayes, J.
 Jennings, M.
 Keating, J.
 Lando, C.
 Layral, S.
 Lister, R.
 Martin, W.
 Sampson, J.
 Tozzi, B.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pierce, R. - President, UAFSC
 Hedahl, G. - Dean, CLA
 Tremarello, A - Registrar

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

Wheeler, C. - President, ASUAF
 Alexander, V. - Dean, SFOS
 1 graduate student

B. The minutes to Meeting #67 (November 11, 1996) were approved as distributed via e-mail.

C. The agenda was approved as distributed via e-mail.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions approved:

1. Motion on when basic Core skills courses are accomplished.
2. Motion to eliminate registration signature requirement for continuing Graduate Students.
3. Motion to amend Section 3 (ARTICLE V: Committees) E., PERMANENT, 8. of the Bylaws.
4. Motion to amend Section 3 (ARTICLE V: Committees) A., of the Bylaws.

B. Motions pending: none

III Comments from Chancellor Wadlow -

Chancellor Wadlow was at a meeting of the Northwest Commission for Accreditation.

Comments from Provost, Jack Keating -

Keating spoke on the Delaware Study. The university system has been looking for a variety of ways to talk about productivity, primarily to try tapping into other models of productivity. The Systemwide Academic Council asked systemwide to gather together as many models as they could before they began using one particular model. They made an effort to do that. As we begin to look at the differences and uniqueness of this system, as opposed to other systems and this campus as opposed to other campuses, it's very hard to get a true comparison point to begin identifying faculty workload and productivity outcomes.

The most recent generation of findings is the Delaware Study. It is a reasonable sample of a cross-section of major universities in the U.S. We have not been a part of that sample until this year, and as a result we receive a printout of the statistics and do not have the capacity to manipulate the data. We will have this opportunity next year. Systemwide received this sample and applied a variety of national comparisons to the current situations at the UA system. The Systemwide Academic Council had some problems with it when they began to look at the study. The data are rolled down to the division level and some of the most recent changes in our colleges/departments are not reflected. The most volatile part of the data is when they do comparison about how many you should have in your college or unit compared to the national sample. Some of the data are negative toward UAF. This obviously gets your attention, and you ask what is the data based on. When we look at this it has a variety of problems, which we began to point out to the system. As an example, it uses a mean value as the number of faculty you should have in a department, based on this 40-50 institution sample. When we checked on the few areas where we could get standard deviations around that mean, the standard deviation may have been as high as +/- 14. That is a huge standard deviation when talking about this very volatile data. A second problem was the way they accounted for adjunct and part-time faculty. They looked at the average of part-time faculty in the classroom and said, for instance, the mathematics department should teach 80% of their courses with full-time faculty and 20% with part-time faculty. At our university we are proud to say that about 95% of our mathematics classes are taught by full-time faculty, which meant that we should therefore have 1 1/2 faculty less in mathematics than the national average would predict. So we have a lot of problems with the adjustment in numbers and what quality the numbers speak to. Nonetheless, you will be seeing this survey used as one more hallmark of how productivity should be measured.

There are some other data that are less sanguinely talked away through statistics: For instance, when we look at cost per credit hour by various units and compare the cost per credit hour in one unit at our campus at \$290 an hour against a similar type of faculty at UAA being offered at \$145 an hour. We have faculty that have been here longer and have lived through some healthy raises. That kind of comparison of the numbers makes for a very tough conversation when we talk productivity and cost per faculty member vis-a-vis student credit hours. This does not talk about quality of teaching and quality of research. Nonetheless, it is an indicator of one-third of our mission. It is what the legislature and many on the Board of Regents see as the dominant part of our mission at this campus and throughout the system. This is the most stable of the surveys trying to be used at UA as benchmarks for productivity. We do have an

issue here and the provost has talked with the deans, especially those that have some predicted overage of faculty, to make sure we can demonstrate the quality of faculty and teaching as opposed to simply the number of faculty, especially to account for the huge discrepancies we may have for cost per student credit hour. We have suggested to systemwide how not to use the survey. The provost anticipates that this issue will not go away, nor will the issue of productivity vis-a-vis cost per students. Look at your own departments and make sure we are conforming to the missions that your departments have defined. We have talked to the Board of Regents hard and long about making sure that we have unit responsibility as the benchmark of responsibility. This means that a unit delivers the teaching, research, and service mission of the university and states the way it should be doing it. Some faculty members may be terrific at one aspect of their mission and may not be as capable or prone to be as energetic in another aspect of their mission. Units should be talking about how their departments or divisions deliver the whole package.

Don indicated that this study was discussed at the last Faculty Alliance meeting. They have received the latest copy of the study and a copy is in the Governance Office. Norm Swazo said that Faculty Affairs has discussed the study and, given the faulty ways in which the data may be interpreted, they don't see the data being used to justify the reallocations of resources between MAU's. Keating stated that his confidence level was not high that it would not happen. He also indicated that this study is purely based on student credit hours and is a teaching workload document, and it does not address the other two missions of the University.

VI Governance Reports

A. ASUAF - C. Wheeler

No report was given.

B. Staff Council - R. Pierce

Ron Pierce indicated that Staff Council has elected Paula Long as the new President-Elect. Staff Council is working on a training and development program for the staff. Part of the program is training for supervisors, which will be mandatory. The supervisors must attend the training program offered or some alternative form of supervisory training. This is an attempt to train people who have not had any supervisory training at all but are thrust into a supervisory role. This is an attempt to make a better working environment for our employees at the University. Some faculty are participating by helping to present training programs. The training program will start in the latter part of January. Staff Council is also working on a staff recognition program. It is in its final stages and should be announced in the first part of January. A committee has been put together across MAUs to look at health benefit issues at the University. Rising health costs have not been matched by increases in the University's budget from the state. Something will have to be done about the present program. This committee will meet in December to review the health care options available to the University. At the same time they will be looking at paid time off that is given to the staff for sick leave and annual leave. There is an effort to combine the sick and annual leave into one paid time off program. Rich Seifert asked if the committee would be looking at wellness programs.

C. President's Report - D. Lynch

Don's summary of the November Board of Regents meeting was included in the agenda. He had two additional items from the Faculty Alliance meeting. 1) Members of the Alliance from Anchorage are serious about trying to establish a summer academy for faculty. This will be a 2-3 week program for faculty interested in improving their instructional abilities and related to distance delivery technology. There is an idea to submit a proposal to the President's Special Projects Fund. 2) A good portion of time was spent on the Delaware Study.

D. President-Elect's Comments - J. Craven

John had two brief comments on his written report. He pointed out his correction on Senate action regarding advising. The other item is how prerequisites for courses will be programmed into Banner. Some time soon we will need to decide how we want to do that. Maynard indicated that his committee has discussed this issue informally. John noted that these issues are also related to our relationship with the other MAUs. John asked Ann Tremarello if there were significant issues that are coming up that we need to work on. Ann indicated that there were a lot of issue still up in the air. She will bring some to Curricular Affairs and others to the Statewide Academic Council. The decision on prerequisites has to be a statewide decision.

E. Coalition of Student Leaders - J. Hayes

Joe Hayes spoke for the Coalition of Student Leaders. They have been busy for the past three months. They put together a declaration of intent that was sent to all legislative candidates. Sixteen of the current members who won the election responded. The intent stated that the legislature would look at full funding of the University's budget to reflect the Board of Regents' request. The Coalition also had five issues that student leaders from the 13 campuses agreed upon and for which they would try to get legislative support for the University. The first issue was full funding for distance education; second was the capital request for technology development in the university system; third was support for the Board of Regents' Land Grant initiative; fourth, was increased money for infrastructure for technology and endowment; and fifth was full funding of the Board of Regents' operating budget. The state chamber board endorsed two of the five issues--full funding for distance education and the request for technology development in the UA system. These are a few of the things the Coalition is doing to help UA gain additional funds. Hopefully the students, faculty and staff can work as a unified group to help maintain or increase our revenues and gain more money from the legislature.

V Public Comments/Questions -

Brenton Watkins, past chair of the UAF Academic Computer Users Committee, discussed his concerns about the committee. This committee was originally part of the University Assembly and now it falls under the Governance Coordinating Committee. It is primarily academic in nature and deals with teaching and research issues related to computing, networking, and so forth. The particular concern of the committee is that this committee doesn't seem to have a great deal of influence in connection with the real issues. The chair of the Governance Coordinating Committee informally checks with the chancellor from time to time. The

committee feels it would be more productive if it answered directly to the Faculty Senate or to another administrator such as the Chancellor or Provost. Previously, until a couple of years ago, there had been some administrators on campus who the committee interacted with and they were able address a number of issues. The library has taken over much of the responsibilities and they have excellent relations with the staff. However, the committee feels that decisions are being made without their input. They have been well informed but have not been part of the planning process. It is the committee's feeling that UAF does not have any coordinated philosophy, vision, or teaching plan for academic computing and information technology. They would like to see some interstructure set up for the committee to work with. Keating indicated that he would welcome the committee reporting to him or if it wanted to report to the Senate that was fine with him.

VI New Business

A. Motion to change the name of the Alliance of Faculty Senates to the Faculty Alliance, submitted by Administrative Committee

MOTION PASSED (unanimous)
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve changing the name of the Alliance of Faculty Senates to Faculty Alliance.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: This name change is proposed by the Alliance which is a coordinating body of all three campus governing bodies because of the University of Alaska Southeast Reorganization. In this change, Southeast has replaced its Senate with a Council, and, therefore, the current name is not correct. The change to Faculty Alliance is appropriate.

B. Motion on deletion of Health Issues Committee, submitted by Administrative Committee

MOTION PASSED (unanimous)
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to disband the Health Issues Committee of the UAF Governance Coordinating Committee and approves the following revisions to the Procedures:

(()) = Deletion

ARTICLE V Committees

Sect. 1 The conference committees of the UAF Governance Coordinating Committee shall include:

- Academic Computer Users Committee
- Intercollegiate Athletics Committee
- Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Public Safety,

Transportation and Parking
 Rural Affairs Committee
 UAF Grievance Council
 ((Health Issues))

Sect. 3 Conference Committees Charges

((F. Health Issues Committee

The charge of the Health Issues committee shall be to:

1. address health issues which affect the work environment.
2. coordinate efforts with the Health Center, Fire Department, Risk Management, and Public Safety to find solutions to health issues.))

EFFECTIVE: Upon Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and ASUAF approval, prior to Chancellor's approval

RATIONALE: A Statewide committee has been formed to address possible changes to the health benefits program. The Health Issues Committee would only duplicate efforts by this committee and would not be a productive use of staff, faculty and student time.

C. Motion to adopt procedure for petitions to the Core, submitted by Core Review

Jin Brown, Chair of the Core Review Committee, indicated that there was no current procedure for dealing with petitions based on student disabilities. The problem is that the documentation is confidential medical records. The committee has tried to craft a way for the person in Diane Preston's position and the chair of the Core Review Committee can look at the documentation and make a decision on whether the documentation is grounds for giving the student a difference in terms of the Core. In the past three years there have only been two of these petitions. The petitions were for substitutions and were signed off by the department head and dean prior to coming to the Core Review Committee. This is intended to put a policy in place where there is none and make it a policy which would not open the student's medical records to more people than would be necessary. Jerry McBeath asked if the Chair of the Core Review Committee would see the medical records and would share that information with the dean. Jin Brown and Diane Preston felt that it would be appropriate to add the dean to the review committee. Kara Nance felt that the department head would be a more appropriate person. Ron Gatterdam spoke about academic responsibility being the purview of the faculty, not administration or Regents. That was the philosophy embodied in the creation of the Senate. The main task of the Senate was to represent the faculty in academic matters. What troubles him about this motion is that it takes the authority away from the faculty and gives it to the administration. There has never been a formal motion before the Senate concerning how petitions will be handled. Ron urged the Senate to do is first, reassert that it is the faculty, through the Senate, that has the authority to set academic policy and to make exception to academic policy. Second, he would like the Senate to come up with a formal procedure for petitions. Finally, having come up with a formal procedure, then the question can be asked if this particular circumstances warrants special attention. John Craven noted that there was policy on petitions on page 19 of the current

catalog. Jerry McBeath indicated that Curricular Affairs talked about the issue briefly and because it involves a larger issue of the general petition process at the university, it would benefit from further consideration by the Curricular Affairs Committee and moved to refer it to that committee. The motion to refer this motion on a petition procedure for people with student disabilities to Curricular Affairs, with the purpose of placing it in the larger context of the overall general petition policy, passed with a vote of 20 ayes and 5 nays.

MOTION (referred to committee)

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt a procedure to be followed in petitions to the CORE based on documentation of student disability as recommended by the CORE Review Committee.

PETITION PROCEDURE

The student prepares a petition which is signed by the Coordinator for Students with Disabilities as advisor.

The petition is sent directly to the Registrar for routing.

Registrar logs the petition and sends it directly to the Chair of the CORE Review Committee.

The Chair of CORE Review and the Coordinator of Students with Disabilities jointly access the documentation of the student's disability in regard to the specifics of the petition.

The Chair of CORE Review, after viewing the documentation in regard to the specifics of the petition makes a recommendation directly to the Provost.

The Provost makes a final decision based on the recommendation and forwards the decision to Registrar.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Diane Preston, Counselor/Coordinator for Students with Disabilities, has contacted Provost John Keating in regard to petitions to the CORE requirements from students with documented disabilities. Her concern regards students who, because of documented disabilities, may be incapable of accomplishing specific CORE coursework. Her example is a student with learning disabilities who petitions to waive the Math requirement because she or he will never be able to process the material required. If such a student petitions based on her or his documented disability, there is no procedure for adjudicating the petition specifically in regard to the student's documentation. The complication is that the documentation of disability is protected student information beyond the "Buckley" guidelines (often private medical information). What makes this problematic is the matter of who is given access to the documentation.

The Provost has asked that CORE Review suggest a solution that protects the privacy of the documentation

of students with disabilities and allows good decisions to be made in regard to the academic purposes of the CORE.

In that actual instances of such cases are quite small, the above procedure is recommended for implementation.

D. Motion to approve new programs in Health Technology, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Maynard indicated that Linda Curda was involved in the development of the program and would be able to answer any questions. The motion was approved unanimously.

MOTION PASSED (unanimous)

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve a new program in Health Technology which includes an AAS in Medical Assistant and two certificates: Medical/Dental Reception and Phlebotomy & Laboratory Assisting.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

RATIONALE: See attached Executive Summary. Full program proposal #83 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers¹ Hall.

Executive Summary of Medical Assistant Certificate and Degree Program Request, Division of Health Technology, College of Rural Alaska

Request prepared by:

- Betsy Tozzi, Assistant Professor, Health Technology, CRA/TVC
- Linda Curda, Assistant Professor, Division Head, Health Technology, CRA/KUC
- Ruth Lister, Director, Tanana Valley Campus, College of Rural Alaska

The Medical Assistant Certificate and A.A.S. Programs prepare students for careers as health care paraprofessionals. Employers have indicated needs for workers that crossed functional borders within their organizations (i.e. identified the need for skilled, cross-trained individuals), and most frequently cited a need for administrative staff (receptionists and billing/reimbursement specialists) and out-patient care paraprofessionals (phlebotomists, procedure assistants, instrument care specialists). The specialty certificates in Medical/Dental Reception and Phlebotomy and Lab Assisting as well as the Medical Assistant A.A.S. degree have been designed to be responsive to these local employers' needs.

Welfare reform has reduced education and training benefits to eligible recipients; eligible individuals may receive financial support for a maximum of 12 months. To address these welfare reform changes and the needs of many students to enter the work force as soon as possible, the Medical/Dental Reception Certificate and Phlebotomy and Lab Assisting Certificate programs document proficiency in specialized skill areas and provide employment options when students have completed approximately 1/2 the necessary credits required for the Medical Assistant A.A.S. degree.

After graduating with a certificate, a student may elect to complete the Medical Assistant A.A.S. degree requirements in order to enhance employability. As a direct result of their course work within the program, three students have been hired as phlebotomists in Fairbanks, and one of these three individuals has already sat for the ASCP national examination and received a passing score, thereby achieving national certification as a Phlebotomy Technician (PBT, ASCP).

These proposed programs have been developed to align with the UAF 2000 strategic plan. As accreditation of health care programs will be required for students to be eligible to sit for national certification examinations, curricula have been constructed to meet all necessary accreditation standards. Inasmuch as all required program components have been developed and are in place, no complications are foreseen in implementation of certificate and A.A.S. degree programs upon approval. Resources and equipment needs will not require allocation of any additional funds to Tanana Valley Campus or College of Rural Alaska. No new funding is required or requested to support the programs. Disposable medical supplies for classes are paid for with student material fees; donations of equipment and supplies from numerous sources have helped offset start-up costs and ongoing expenditures.

In conclusion, due to current and future needs for skilled health care workers and cost containment mandates in health care, the Medical Assistant Certificate and A.A.S. Degree programs in the College of Rural Alaska are well positioned to provide vocational-technical training for interested students. The implementation of these programs will benefit the university by generating increased student credit hours and improved ties with the community, employers, and government agencies. The Medical / Dental Reception Certificate, Phlebotomy and Lab Assisting Certificate, and the Medical Assistant A.A.S. degree programs will generate a cadre of well-qualified cross-trained health care paraprofessionals and allow employers to recruit from their local communities rather than hiring new staff from outside of Alaska.

October 28, 1996

E. Motion to approve new Certificate in Applied Business, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Tom Robinson expressed his concern that certificate and associate programs prepare students for entry into a four year degree program. Ruth Lister indicated that certificate and associate degrees are meant to be terminal degree to prepare people for work. There is some good articulation in some areas. However, in the applied business area there is not because the BBA has requirements that does not allow many of the certificate and associate level course to be recognized. What they try to do is find out what direction the student is going and funnel any students wanting a four year degree to the BBA program. This certificate is more for people in the community who are trying to get courses that will prepare them for management and middle management jobs within the business community. The motion was approved unanimously.

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Certificate in Applied

Business.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents¹ Approval

RATIONALE: See attached Executive Summary. Full program proposal #48 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers¹ Hall.

CERTIFICATE OF APPLIED BUSINESS
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
COLLEGE OF RURAL ALASKA
TANANA VALLEY CAMPUS

Regents Executive Summary

The UAF College of Rural Alaska proposes an innovative vocational, technical education certificate in Applied Business. This certificate is intended to serve Alaskan businesses and organizations by providing a pool of graduates who have received comprehensive training (30 credits) in critical aspects of business management. The certificate will further act as a stepping stone for the Associates Degree in Applied Business and various Bachelor Degrees.

Currently, there are over 60 declared majors in the Applied Business program and credit hour production increased 30% in the fall of 1996 compared to fall of 1995. While subscription to the applied business courses are strong, the credit hours do not currently produce a corresponding number of graduates. Low numbers of graduates are a result of program demographics. Nearly all students are non-traditional and part-time (i.e. more mature, experienced, and working full or part-time, taking 6 credits). As a result of work and family demands completing all the academic requirements for an A.A.S. may take more than 5 years. This intermediate vocational education certificate is therefore vital to continued student motivation.

Many small to medium size business, non-profits, and agencies in Fairbanks promote employees into management positions without benefit of formal supervisory training. There is a strong need for a structured and credible management training certificate program in Fairbanks. The Northwest, Kuskokwim, and Tanana Valley Campuses already provide that management training through existing applied business courses as part of the A.A.S. degree. An intent of this certificate is to "bundle" those courses already offered in other programs into a meaningful management curriculum which will fulfill a current training need in both Rural Alaska and Fairbanks and provide a path for business people who have no college experience to earn degrees.

Faculty who teach the courses required in this certificate have significant credibility within their respective local business sectors. Once the certificate program is approved, the College of Rural Alaska Applied Business department will implement an image campaign to stimulate additional demand by business for employees awarded this certificate.

Implementation of the Certificate in Applied Business will support the University of Alaska's commitment to business development within the State of Alaska and the vocational education component of the university's mission. Credits from the certificate are readily transferred and accepted within the A.A.S. business degrees of UAA

and UAF. Implementation of the certificate will significantly benefit students who transfer between universities prior to award of their A.A.S. degree.

Finally, there is no additional cost to UAF or the University of Alaska System for this certificate. All faculty required to teach the certificate courses are currently employed and all courses required are currently offered through other degree programs.

9/30/96

F. Resolution on Union-Governance Relations, submitted by Ad Hoc Committee on Union-Governance Relations

Norm Swazo indicated that United Academics will begin its ground rules negotiation meeting with the administration on December 20th. The idea is to pay attention to the fourth and sixth whereas's of the resolution. The Faculty Affairs Committee has the policy responsibility of recommending and commenting on this. The idea is to preserve the Senate's role in speaking to these issues. United Academics has constituted itself to sustain and enhance faculty governance and thus the request to this arrangement with the Faculty Senate. Jerry McBeath asked whether this was a recommendation. Another problem he saw was it creates a rather large negotiating team. John Craven indicated that this resolution requires the Senate to assign a member of United Academic to the standing committee on Faculty Affairs, but the Faculty Senate's constitution and bylaws are silent on such an issue. It requires that the Administrative Committee know who in the Senate are members of UA in order to assure that at least one member of UA is assigned to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Then, there is no guarantee that the UA member would want to serve on the UA negotiation team. He recommended an amendment to motion on paragraph # (3) & #(4) to read: "To include a member of the UAF Faculty Senate's standing committee on faculty Affairs... and insert (if such a willing member exists on that committee),..." Don Lynch spoke on the resolution and indicated that he would like to see the Senate pass the resolution as originally written. He is concerned with the here and now and best representing this campus. The amendment failed with only three ayes. The resolution then passed with a vote of 19 ayes and 4 nays.

RESOLUTION PASSED

=====

WHEREAS the UAF Faculty Senate is the duly elected assembly of faculty representatives, serving as the legislative body of the university faculty, having authority to recommend on formulation and implementation of policy pertinent to faculty governance at UAF; and

WHEREAS the UAF Faculty Senate carries out the tasks of faculty governance through a number of Standing and Permanent Committees; and

WHEREAS the charge of the UAF Faculty Senate's various Standing and Permanent Committees includes evaluation and recommendation on policy initiatives affecting faculty governance; and

WHEREAS the UAF Faculty Senate's Standing Committee on Faculty

Affairs and the UAF Faculty Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Union-Governance Relations have specific charge to evaluate and recommend on policy directly and substantially pertinent to mandatory items of collective bargaining; and

WHEREAS United Academics/AAUP-AFT is a duly recognized collective bargaining agent negotiating with the University of Alaska Administration on behalf of faculty concerns; and

WHEREAS United Academics/AAUP-AFT, notwithstanding its legally independent incorporation, is constituted inter alia explicitly to sustain and enhance faculty governance at the University of Alaska;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That the UAF Faculty Senate hereby requests the Executive Board of United Academics/AAUP-AFT:

(1) to reaffirm, by way of written communication to the President of the UAF Faculty Senate and to the President of the Faculty Alliance, UA/AAUP-AFT's commitment to sustain and enhance faculty governance at the University of Alaska;

(2) to make provision, by way of exchange of written and oral communications, for the UAF Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Union-Governance Relations to review and recommend on the substance of UA/AAUP-AFT contract negotiations with the University of Alaska Administration;

(3) to include a member of the UAF Faculty Senate's Standing Committee on Faculty Affairs, who is also a member of United Academics, in UA/AAUP-AFT Executive Board deliberations on contract negotiations; and,

(4) to appoint, as representative of the UAF Faculty Senate, a member of the UAF Faculty Senate's Standing Committee on Faculty Affairs, who is also a member of United Academics, to the UA/AAUP-AFT Contract Negotiating Team, with all rights and privileges of participation thereto pertaining.

G. Motion on changes to the policies on "W", "I", and "NB", submitted by Curricular Affairs

Maynard introduced the motion and indicated that under the incomplete grade the word temporary should be deleted. The Curricular Affairs Committee took the assignment to come up with a negotiated agreement; no side is entirely satisfied. He also indicated that changes in the policies and the grades were a package deal and no parts would be considered separately. John Creed indicated they would like to keep the NB grade but that it can work for them. Linda Curda indicated that faculty in her area was split on the NB grade. Maynard stated that the motion has been sent to the student, however they have not responded to the committee. Ann said all parts are interwoven, and as long as it was passed as a package she felt it would work. It is a compromise in that moving the withdrawal date back to the ninth week will please the students and that is the way it is done in the rural campuses. Expanding the incomplete to cover the functions of the old NB grade will mean a greater burden on the faculty, because there is a requirement for a form to be filled out to tell the student what they need to finish the course. It seems to satisfy almost all the concerns. Linda Curda

asked about faculty initiated withdrawal and notification of students. Maynard said that it would be very incumbent upon faculty to look at how they award grades and delineate it so they know how they are doing it, as well as so their students know. Ruth Lister said that her original comments still hold on her concern that the NB grade be eliminated because for some of the kinds of courses and populations they work with it is a very appropriate grade to use. Ruth was also concern that they may be left trying to track down part-time instructors. Kara Nance asked if the form could include a statement of what the grade will revert to if the student takes no other action. Ann indicated that the forms could include such a statement and they do send a copy of the form to the students. They can also work in some kind of notification that the faculty member fills outs when withdrawing a student that is turned into the office and then the student gets a copy of it. John Craven asked for clarification that the incomplete grade could stay as a permanent grade if no other action was taken. The motion passed with a vote of 21 ayes and 5 nays.

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to change the policies on "Withdrawing from a Class" and "Faculty Initiated Withdrawal" and the grading policies of "I" Incomplete and "NB" No Basis, as follows:

(()) = deletions

CAPS = ADDITIONS

Withdrawing from a Class --

If you withdraw from a class after the third Friday after the first day of instruction, a grade of "W" will appear on your academic record. The "W" grade does not affect your GPA. The last day you can withdraw from a class is the ((fourth)) NINTH Friday after the first day of instruction. ((unless you are a freshman or a non-degree students. Freshman and non-degree students may withdraw from classes until the sixth Friday after the first day of instruction.))

Faculty Initiated Withdrawal/DROP--

((If you do not meet the prerequisites for a course in which you have enrolled the faculty member teaching that course has the right to drop you from the class prior to the fourth Friday after the first day of instruction.))

IF YOU DO NOT MEET THE PREREQUISITES FOR A COURSE IN WHICH YOU HAVE ENROLLED, OR IF YOU HAVE NOT PARTICIPATED SUBSTANTIALLY IN THE COURSE, THE FACULTY MEMBER TEACHING THAT COURSE HAS THE RIGHT TO WITHDRAW YOU FROM THE CLASS BY THE NINTH FRIDAY AFTER THE FIRST DAY OF INSTRUCTION. IF YOU ARE WITHDRAWN FROM A CLASS AFTER THE THIRD FRIDAY AFTER THE FIRST DAY OF INSTRUCTION, A GRADE OF "W" WILL APPEAR ON YOUR ACADEMIC RECORD. FACULTY INITIATED WITHDRAWALS PREVIOUS TO THE THIRD FRIDAY AFTER THE FIRST DAY OF INSTRUCTION WILL BE TREATED AS A DROPPED CLASS.

"I" Incomplete--

A grade used to indicate that ((you've satisfactorily completed

(C or better) the majority of the work in a course, but for personal reasons beyond your control,)) YOU haven't been able to complete the course during the scheduled course time.

When the "I" grade is given, the instructor includes a statement of the work required of you to complete the course AND THE TIME LIMITS YOU HAVE TO COMPLETE THE WORK. THE MAXIMUM TIME TO BE ALLOWED IS ONE YEAR. AT THE END OF THE DEFINED TIME LIMITS THE INSTRUCTOR MAY ISSUE A GRADE BASED ON THE WORK TURNED IN. IF THE INSTRUCTOR DOES NOT CHANGE THE "I" GRADE IT BECOMES PERMANENT AT THE END OF ONE YEAR.

((You must make up an incomplete within one year or it will automatically be changed to an "F" grade.)) The "I" grade is not computed in your GPA. ((until it has been changed to a regular letter grade by the instructor or until one year has elapsed, at which time it will be computed as an "F")) Seniors cannot graduate with an "I" grade in either a UAF or major course requirement. ((To determine a senior's GPA at graduation , an "I" grade will be computed as a failing grade))

(("NB" No Basis--

Instructors may award a No Basis (NB) grade if there is insufficient student progress and/or attendance for evaluation to occur. No credit is given, nor is "NB" calculated in the GPA. This is a permanent grade and may not be used to substitute for the Incomplete (I). It can't be removed by later completing outstanding work.))

EFFECTIVE: Fall 1997

RATIONALE: With the change in the cap on tuition student credit shopping does not seem to be a problem, which was one of the main reasons for the double tiering of the original policy. This change makes the withdrawal policy uniform for all students. This policy does not effect the CRA policy which states that students have nine weeks for their withdrawal period.

The faculty initiated withdrawal policy change gives the instructor the ability to remove from the class students who have a very high probability of failing the class if they were to attempt to start participation at a later date. It also provides a bit of a grade safety net for students who for what ever reason sign up for a class and then never turn in any work, but also never withdraw, from accumulating a series of "F" grades.

Students who are Faculty dropped during the first three weeks, because they do not meet the course prerequisites, will not have the course appear on their transcript and they will receive a full tuition refund. Students who are Faculty Withdrawn after the fourth Friday will receive a "W" on their transcript and will not receive any tuition refund.

This may place students who are receiving financial aid in jeopardy of loosing that aid but in most cases this policy will be no more onerous than if the student received a grade other than an A, B, C, or D.

This change in the "I" grade gives the instructor the

option to control the time limits and to issue a grade based on the work turned in. The permanent "I" more correctly reflects what the student did not accomplish, as compared to the transformation of the "I" to an "F". A student who receives a permanent "I" grade would have to retake the course to earn credit. The criteria by which the instructor will issue the "I" can be delineated at the beginning of the course, just as they do for all other grades. As per the catalog instructors are expected to state their grading policies in writing at the beginning of each course.

Changes in the "I", and "W" grading policies address the purposes for having the "NB" grade. Therefore the "NB" grade is no longer needed.

VII Guest Speaker - Jim Sampson, Mayor, FNSB

Don Lynch indicated that the borough mayor was invited to comment on the University and to give the senators an opportunity to question him. Don told Mayor Sampson that the Senate was made up of faculty representatives from all over the state, as well as from departments on campus. The Senate ex-officio membership includes the Registrar, Dean Hedahl, and the Provost.

Mayor Jim Sampson thinks what is needed is for the community and the university to come together more often. Even the borough and community do not recognize that the University is the largest single state employer in the borough. Mayor Sampson gave his thoughts as they relate to the community and the university and what he sees happening in the funding area. When he looks at the University's operating budget and capital budget, there are some real disturbing things. He sees a shift toward the railbelt and the southcentral region of the state. But he sees it everywhere, not just with the University. If it's not a major shift to the southcentral, you are seeing major reductions. The operating budgets are being driven down in municipalities and universities, and they have to compete with an operating and capital budget that has less and less money. It's hard to compete when you are viewed as a state agency or a government. The borough is competing for revenue just like everyone else is. Municipalities get very little money from the state.

Related to this, some of the elected senators and representatives really don't have a tie to the university. The interior delegation is fragmented; it isn't a strong delegation for those issue that are important to us. It is aligned strictly by party. There are some things that you need to cross party lines for, even in the legislature. There will be less dollars for municipal governments, less dollars for K-12, and less dollars for the university. Mayor Sampson is certainly willing to try to find ways to become stronger. He is open to suggestion from the Faculty Senate about what we as a community can do to support the university. We are going to continue to have pressure on the operating budget. State agencies, the university, and municipalities are going to get hit hardest. We are all in the same boat. There have to be some things happen with the interior delegation. We have got to keep pressure on them because too often we are viewed as a special interest.

Janice Reynolds asked about joint lobbying efforts for the mutual support of the university and borough. This would provide unified support. Mayor Sampson indicated that if the university was

interested in putting some time into a unified effort, they would be willing to support that, especially as it refers to deferred maintenance. There needs to be an outreach from the university to get supporters that live in the outlying districts. When you have single member districts, you can't forget that and need to have people that live in those districts say the university is important to them. Alaska has a governor that has a long range financial plan and the mayor doesn't see where the needs of the university and municipalities are being met. The Senate and the House have different views on long range financial plans for the state whereby the university's and municipality's needs are not being met. When you have both sides putting together long range financial plans that don't take in the needs of our university and the municipalities, we have a problem.

John Creed doesn't understand why this state can almost get away with not supporting education at the K-12 and university level when Alaska has such a young population and there is a massive national trend in favor of education. Sampson indicated that while all the legislators say they support education, when the borough went to the legislature there was no support from the House. It has become a funding issue and who really supports the funding is the local property taxpayer. There is a major shift in property tax from the big spenders to the little people. The biggest part of that increase, at least locally, is in education. The borough has continued to support education while at the same time the legislature has not. It doesn't matter which party the administration and leadership is from, their plan is to shift whatever they can from the state to local government. That way they can come home with a reduced budget. As long as you are viewed as a state agency or public institution or university or municipality or school district, you are going to have a tough time.

VIII Committee Reports

A. Curricular Affairs - Maynard Perkins

The following report was submitted as a handout at the Senate meeting.

Curricular Affairs Meeting

Draft of Minutes of Curricular Affairs Meeting, December 6, 1996

Meeting Chaired by Maynard Perkins

Minutes by Carol Barnhardt

Submitted by Maynard Perkins, Chair of Curricular Affairs

Quorum Established: Carol Barnhardt, Joan Braddock, John Creed, Gayle Gregory, Jerry McBeath, Terry McFadden, Wanda Martin, Maynard Perkins, Ann Tremarello, Jane Weber

AGENDA ITEMS

1. REVIEW OF MOTIONS FROM CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE:
HEALTH TECHNOLOGY AND CERTIFICATE IN APPLIED BUSINESS. (See Attachments 68/6 AND 68/7 for UAF Faculty Senate #68 Meeting of Dec. 6, 1996.)

DISCUSSION: The Curricular Affairs Committee needs to simply certify that the appropriate steps have been followed in sending this motion on to the floor of the Senate.

ACTION: The Committee reviewed the motions and agreed that they should go forward to the Senate floor as stated.

2. REVIEW OF THE OFFICIAL POSITION OF THE CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE

DISCUSSION: The Curriculum Review Committee has existed for several years as a review body for curriculum changes (see page 7 of the current Course & Degree Procedures Manual). When the Senate was formed it was never included in the bylaws as a subcommittee of Curricular Affairs. While the bylaws do permit subcommittees, there is some feeling that this committee should be included in the bylaws. The pertinent question for discussion is whether or not it should be a Permanent Committee or remain as a Subcommittee and should it be included in the bylaws in any form. Under current policy, motions from Curriculum Review go directly to the Faculty Senate.

Jerry McBeath, chair of the Curriculum Review Committee, described the role of this subcommittee and that of the Core Review Committee (the two subcommittees of Curricular Affairs). The group discussed some of the possible areas of ambiguity and redundancy in the work of the three committees. There appeared to be general consensus that the amount of curricular work justified more than one committee and that Curricular Affairs needed to be involved in the subcommittees work primarily when there were changes that affected policy.

ACTION: The Curriculum Review Committee will discuss this issue again, and will then provide additional information to Curricular Affairs.

3. GRADING CHANGES (NO BASIS, INCOMPLETE GRADES, WITHDRAWAL AND DROP OPTIONS)

DISCUSSION: After considering all input submitted to the Committee, minor changes were made to the grading motion that was passed at the November 22nd meeting.

MOTION: See attachment 68/10 for UAF Faculty Senate #68 Meeting of Dec. 6, 1996.

ACTION: Passed unanimously

4. RESIDENCY CREDITS AS EFFECTED BY DISTANCE DELIVERY COURSES

DISCUSSION: Ann Tremarello provided information on some of the major questions and issues that need to be addressed in any motion that is prepared in regard to residency credits for distance delivered courses. The primary concerns relate to UALC courses (e.g. will UALC courses be identified as such on students records in BANNER?, will a UALC course from Sitka count as a UAF residency credit?, will individual departments review UALC courses?)

ACTION: Maynard Perkins will prepare a memo to send to all deans and departments about residency credits and distance delivered courses as a means of getting feedback to allow Curricular Affairs to develop an appropriate motion.

5. NECESSITY OF STATING COURSE PRE-REQUISITES IN CATALOG

DISCUSSION: The question has come up in various committees about whether or not the catalog must specifically state or by permission of the instructor, or if this is implicitly understood. Should there be

a blanket statement added to the first page of the course descriptions? The committee did not see major problems, but did acknowledge that some clarification and consistency in the catalog would be useful.

ACTION: Ann Tremarello was asked to draft a motion to address this issue by drafting a motion for the committee to consider at its January meeting.

6. TRANSFER OF CREDIT WITHIN THE UA SYSTEM AS APPLIED TO GRADE OF D.

DISCUSSION: At the current time a grade of D does not transfer to UAF even though Board of Regents Policy P10.04.06 A.3 indicates that UAF must accept all other UA units courses. The faculty at UAF has reaffirmed its desire to not accept D grades from anywhere including other UA units. It is fairly standard policy throughout the U.S. to accept only grades of C or better. The BOR's intent is to make the three MAUs as similar as possible and at the present time, UAF is out of compliance with Regents policy.

ACTION: Maynard Perkins will develop a motion to bring us into compliance with Regents Policy and we will review it at the January meeting.

7. NEW MOTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED IN FUTURE FROM ANN TREMARELLO, UNIVERSITY REGISTRAR:

A. Any transfer or former UAF student who has completed a bachelors degree from an accredited institution will be considered to have completed the equivalent of the baccalaureate core when officially accepted to another undergraduate degree program at UAF.

B. Any transfer student who has completed the transfer Associate in Arts and Sciences or Associate of Arts degree from one of the Washington community colleges listed on the attached pages, will be considered to have completed the lower division requirements (100-200 level courses) of the baccalaureate core.

DISCUSSION: These motions are included as part of a package that provides additional information and explanations. This packet will be widely distributed within the UA system.

8. CURRICULAR AFFAIRS MEMBERS WILL MEET DURING THE BREAK OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING ON DECEMBER 9TH TO IDENTIFY A MEETING TIME FOR THE SPRING SEMESTER.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00.

B. Faculty Affairs - Norm Swazo

A report was submitted with the agenda.

C. Graduate Curricular Affairs - Mark Tumeo

A report was submitted with the agenda.

D. Scholarly Activities - Bruce Finney

No report was submitted.

E. CNCSHDR - Rudy Krejci

No report was submitted.

F. Developmental Studies - Ron Illingworth

A report was submitted with the agenda.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - Diane Bischak

The following report was submitted as a handout at the Senate meeting.

Report of the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Committee, November 14, 1996

The meeting was called to order at 11:38 AM. There were not enough members for a quorum, but the committee members present met anyway.

Members present: Bischak, Alexander, Ogunsola, Karlsson, Lee, Wilson, Stolzberg, Walsh. Nonmembers present: Donald Lynch, Steve Finner.

Please note: Barbara Wilson is currently unable to answer her email, although she can receive it. Her phone in Kotzebue is 442-2379, fax 442-2322.

Steve Finner, Director of Chapter and State Services, AAUP, discussed the relationship between governance and collective bargaining, grievance procedures, and tenure.

Old business:

1. The committee's motion for a bylaws change on the charge of the committee was passed by the Faculty Senate. A subcommittee on nonretention appeals will be formed when and if necessary.

2. The subcommittee on faculty ethics developed the following statement on faculty ethics:

We recommend that the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) establishes a general faculty ethics policy with the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics as a suggested basis for development. Should the FAC eventually adopt such a policy, we request FAC works with the Faculty Appeals & Oversight Subcommittee on Faculty Ethics regarding enforcement issues.

3. Oversight of administrator evaluations. The subcommittee has developed a draft form for interviewing heads of evaluation committees and a draft memo to the provost concerning the process. These forms have now been sent to the chairs of last year's evaluation committees. The chair will send the draft memo to the provost requesting that the dates of this year's evaluation be moved up substantially and that the schedule for the cycle of evaluations for all academic administrators be made public.

New business.

1. Input to collective bargaining agreement: the chair will be co-chairing (with Steve Aufrecht, UAA) the committee that will write the grievance procedure for the collective bargaining agreement negotiations. Anyone interested in serving on this committee should contact her. You must be a union member (or join) to serve.

Other committees being formed include salary and compensation, faculty status (appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure), reduction in force and financial exigency, workload, distance learning and technology, and intellectual property. Contact John French at ffjsf@aurora, 474-1875 (O), 455-8530 (H), to serve on any of these committees.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -
Rich Seifert

No report was submitted.

I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - Peggy Schumaker

No report was submitted.

J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - Michael Jennings

No report was submitted.

K. Service Committee - Kara Nance

No report was submitted.

L. University-Wide Promotion/Tenure - John Keller

No report was submitted.

IX Discussion Items - none

X Members' Comments/Questions - none

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 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.