

MINUTES  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #78  
 MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1998  
 WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

I The meeting was called to order by President Craven at 1:35 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Allen, J.  
 Barnhardt, C.  
 Basham, C.  
 Bruder, J.  
 Conti, E.  
 Cooper, B.  
 Corti, L.  
 Craven, J.  
 Curda, L.  
 Deal, S.  
 Dinstel, R.  
 Fitts, A.  
 French, J.  
 Gatterdam, R.  
 Gavlak, R.  
 Kramer, D.  
 Lando, C.  
 Lin, C.  
 Maginnis, T.  
 McBeath, G.  
 Mortensen, B.  
 Nance, K.  
 Porter, D.  
 Robinson, T.  
 Ruess, D. (S. Griggs)  
 Schatz, M.  
 Whalen, M.  
 Weber, J.  
 Wilson, B.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Bandopadhyay, S.  
 Boone, R.  
 Finney, B.  
 Johnson, T.  
 Nielsen, H.  
 Perkins, M.  
 Yarie, J.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ducharme, J.  
 Gabrielli, R.  
 Illingworth, R.  
 Keating, J.  
 Layral, S.  
 Reichardt, P.  
 Wadlow, J.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Nuss, S. - President, ASUAF  
 Long, P. - President, UAFSC  
 Tremarello, A - Registrar

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

Eichholz, M. - GSO  
 Alexander, V. - Dean, SFOS  
 Hedahl, G. - Dean, CLA

B. The minutes to Meeting #77 (February 9, 1998) were approved as distributed via e-mail.

C. The agenda was approved as distributed via e-mail with the addition of a request by John Craven for members to share their insight in dealing with the legislature concerning the budget cuts under discussion items.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions approved:

1. Motion regarding UAF Academic Calendar
2. Motion to approve the Certificate program in Microcomputer Support Specialist.
3. Motion to approve the A.A.S. in Microcomputer Support Specialist.

4. Motion to approve a policy statement on Stacked Courses.
  5. Motion to modify the date of Freshman Low Grade notification.
  6. Motion to approve the Ph.D. program in Marine Biology.
- B. Motions Pending: none

III A. Comments from Chancellor Wadlow -

First she would like to congratulate the provost on his recent appointment. This will be a lost for UAF.

The Chancellor described the some of the highlight of our current effort to increase enrollment at UAF. She highlighted some of the points made at the recent workshop. The strategy to increase enrollment is one that involves a great deal more personal contact with perspective students. This involves the entire University of Alaska Fairbanks community, all employees at one time or another. This could be personal contact or in the marketing campaign. This is an effort to mobilize all the talent we can to increase enrollment. There are two components of enrollment growth: one to get students here and the other is to retain them once their are enrolled. As part of the increased personal involvement, they are making more personal phone calls to perspective student. These calls come from faculty, staff, sometimes students from different units and departments. It also involves more high school visits. We know the phone calls have been very helpful. And also the increased contacts with high schools both with the counselors and students, by both faculty and staff. And the use of scholarship in new and different ways. The deans now have the opportunity to pre-select their scholarship winners. Once we identify prospective students we track them much more than in the past. We are also following-up to a greater degree on the growing number of students who come to different events on campus during the summer time. With the more aggressive marketing, the image of UAF has been changing in the print media and materials that we send out. There is a new brochure on the achievements of faculty. Distributed earlier was a brochure on selected students. We have drawn on alumni. Their places of employment have paid for advertisement and we have had some in-kind support for some television coverage. In many different ways we are trying to deal with the image. We continue to involve students in pretesting the material we use. We have done some additional analysis of where our students come from. It is critical to have enrollment growth right now. We should concentrate on getting more student from the areas where we already have students. We are working especially hard on the interior and the Wasilla area. In the lower 48 we are drawing more on alumni and ex-faculty members. For example, when the Arctic Chamber Coral performed in the Portland area they also met with alumni and other supporters of the university. We are drawing upon those pockets of areas where we have a core group of supporters. We are also emphasizing the importance of additional coordination and collaboration between the main campus and the branch campuses. We need some additional help. We need to be sure advisors are available when students are registering, both the perspective ones and our current students. We will need to augment the advising capacity we have during the summer months. And we need to get the catalog out sooner so that it is available to perspective students. Finally, on the retention front Gorden Hedahl heads up the on-campus group which is trying to work on different strategies to enhance our retention. Sue Wilken is working with that particular one. That ranges from additional mentoring in academic units to cutting some of the paperwork students must go through during registration and

fee payment. And on the constructive side with emphasizing the importance of maintaining student jobs on campus. Together all these strategies seem to be working. We have had an increase in the number of new students at UAF and in the number of transfer students.

With the decision of the provost this places us in another transition. Right now at UAF we have acting vice chancellors in two positions: Michael Rice will be retiring and Frank Williams has been asked to assume those responsibilities in addition to those he already has. Carla Kirts will assume the responsibilities of Karen Cedzo. So those two positions are taken care of and we will have a smooth transition in both of them. Now what will we do about Keating's replacement? What UAF needs most is stability, the type of stability that experienced leadership by someone who is knowledgeable about UAF can provide. Therefore the chancellor will be looking at our own talent for the appointment of a provost. She will initiate steps immediately to move toward the identification and appointment of a provost from our own ranks. The description of the job is basically the same as in 1994. There is an additional element which consists of systemwide responsibilities where the three chief academic officers comprise a council which is called the System Academic Council. The chancellor will discuss with the Board of Regents on April 16-18 in Juneau her recommendation for provost. We are moving along and will have a smooth transition. She is very confident that there will be no break in the programs that have been initiated and that we will move ahead with stability, foresight and job vigor.

Jerry McBeath asked about the replacements for the vice-chancellor positions and the possibility of eliminating these positions or merging them into some statewide position or otherwise configuring them to result in a reduction in those types of positions. The chancellor indicated that she had not been considering any merger of a position with the system. What she is considering is any recommendation that Williams or Kirts will make on two specific issues: whether we are effectively integrating our budget and planning and to look at the issue of whether we are utilizing all of our talent in public relations. The chancellor has separated from University Relations the director of development who will report directly to the Chancellor's office. She has also asked the director of financial services--budget office--Betty Hoch, to have a dotted reporting line to her.

Michael Whalen asked about recruiting. One point they are seeing in the recruitment of graduate students is the bottle neck in the Admission Office. Application are not getting to the departments. Chancellor Wadlow said that she would need specifics and that any time there is a complaint about the movement of materials we want to check it out. John Craven also commented that the process of admission for graduate students is an imperative to the successful collection of graduate students.

B. Comments from Provost, Jack Keating -

Craven extended congratulations from the Senate. Keating thanked the university community and especially the Senate for their cooperation over the past four years. The University of Wisconsin is a very good fit for him and his background experience. UAF has exceeded the potentials that he thought it had when he came here. He told the Provost Council last week that there are two antidotes that stand out that talk to the quality at UAF. The first one is that the Supercomputer needed funding and a blue ribbon committee was being sent in by the Pentagon to look at the supercomputer situation.

He met with the committee and asked why they were here in the middle of the dark, cold winter. The meetings were scheduled for three days with the last day for contract and fiscal needs for the supercomputer. We asked the campus to put on a show-and-tell. After two days they were so impressed that they immediately drafted their contract. The second antidote is when the provost's of the land grant schools had their meeting here last June. Part of the strategy is to stay away from the local university and any sell. There were close to 100 universities represented. At the beginning of the last day the President asked to suspend the agenda and wanted Keating to tell them about UAF. They had wander around campus and wanted more information. These two incidents are the epitome of his experience at UAF. The devastation that is done by the budgeting process by the legislature shows an incredible ignorance of this state and the worth and need for higher education. For a state that has needs that can only be addressed by appropriate questioning and research and to ignore that need he finds irresponsible to the extreme. At Wisconsin they have never taken money away from their higher education system.

Two weeks ago we had a meeting in Juneau with the systemwide academic officers and the registrars to find out how to address the problems with Banner. The most critical problem is our inability to get timely transcripts for students. That will be our number one priority. We have already tried to address that with manpower to get the transcripts done and at the same time systematically find out where the problems are in bring over the academic history. We asked systemwide to bring the vendor back to ask them questions and find out if the problems can be solved. The second step is already taken where we try to identify categories of a, b, or c problems. Where the "a" problems are absolute priority. We are now working with systemwide trying to address them. The "b" categories are the next to be address and the "c" categories are on the back burner. Since there has been so much investment in Banner we have to make this system work. We no longer have a parallel system. One Regent asked if we are trying to do it cheaply or doing it right.

James Allen has been asked by students where they can get information in response to Fred Pratt's recent article. Particularly the allocation. Keating indicated that the best place would be from Vice Chancellor Rice. The University has to have money up front to pay for all our grant activity. All the grant activity is billed after the research is done, including personnel. That is one source of major money. Wadlow added that Wendy Redman is preparing a written response. There isn't any reserve or slush fund, it is authority to spend money when it gets here. John Craven indicated that he had received a email message with David Creamer's response.

C. Guest Speakers: Paul Reichardt & Ralph Gabrielli -  
Overview of President Komisar's Committees on  
Resource Allocation & the Extended Sites

John Craven asked members of two committees to inform the Senate of the progress of those committees. These committees were formed by President Komisar to answer the question of administrative expenses and overall financing of the enterprise. One of the committees is to address the question of the extended campuses. The charge to that committee is the need to review in depth the role and finances of the universities extended campuses. The diversity of their mission and the range of their costs are not fully appreciated. It is also a misguided public perception that ever since restructuring the extended campuses have withdrawn from their role as community colleges. Some of the universities extended campus are efficient and well run, other carry exceedingly high

costs because of their small size and organizational structure. Chancellor Lind is the chair of that committee. There are two elements to the charge: first to detail the financial resource necessary to operate the extended sites, and second, to analyze alternative ways to delivering high quality and cost effective academic programs. That report has been written. Dean Gabrielli is a member of that committee and will address the report. The second committee is called the resource allocation committee, chaired by Chancellor Gorsuch. The main points are to develop a resource allocation model to be used for the urban centers to assure an effective and equitable distribution of the universities resources. Such an allocation model must take into consideration variation in enrollment, difference in cost by discipline and level of instruction, infrastructure needs, and area differentials. Dean Reichardt and John Craven are members of that committee. Dean Reichardt will address the Senate on the main points of that committee.

Ralph Gabrielli indicated that the role of the extended sites committee was to identify financial resources needed to operate the sites and to also analyze alternative way to delivery education to remote locations while maintaining high quality and to be cost effective. What this meant was to find way to reduce \$4 million over the next three years. With a small reduction of \$0.25 million stated for the next year; \$1.75 million for the next; and finally \$2 million in fiscal year 2001. There are 12 extended campuses in the UA system. For an analysis we grouped the campuses based on size, demography, and some economic variables. The first type was the largest included Kenai, Mat-Su, and Tanana Valley. Type two, the middle four, included Kodiak, Prince William Sound, Ketchikan, and Sitka. Finally, the third type includes five rural campuses of UAF, Bristol Bay, Chukchi, Interior-Aleutians, Kuskokwim, and Northwest.

The criteria used for analysis were taken from the Regents' paper on principles, purposes and priorities of public higher education in Alaska--the so called White Paper or working paper. It included access for all appropriate allocation of resources, the use of delivery technology, and appropriate consideration of operational characteristics. What the committee did was to identified six cost savings options to analyze them in terms of pluses and minuses and to estimate what savings could be achieved. The six options included more distance delivery, campus reorganization, more university collaboration systemwide, increased collaboration with K-12 throughout the state, decreased institutional support, and increasing the non-general funds. They also identified three savings levels--low, medium and high. The low savings was a level estimated to save less than \$500,000 by the third year of implementation; the medium level was between \$0.5 million and \$1.5 million; the high level was a savings of over \$1.5 million. For each of those options we looked at pluses and minus.

Option one, more distance education. The benefits identified include more response to changes in enrollment, broaden array of course offerings, academic resources could be reallocated without physically moving faculty. Some of the minuses included quality, retention and graduation rates, and the cost of upgrading and maintaining technology. A low level of savings was estimated for this option. Option two, campus reorganization. The committee looked at possible reorganizations or regrouping of campuses by types, or by shared educational challenges or closeness of missions. Benefits included reduced administrative costs, closer coordination, etc. Minuses were lost of autonomy and the idea that centralization of administration could hamper local collaboration and regional programs. A low level of savings was estimated.

Option three, increased university collaboration. This assumed

access to a statewide pool of faculty. Benefits include improved quality and accessibility of courses. There is a need for technology.

Option four, increased collaboration with K-12 partnerships. There is an anticipation of improved graduations and retention rates and opportunities for increased partnerships. There are space sharing problems and possible contractual problems with faculty. The estimate of fiscal impact was initially low but achieving mid-level after three years.

Option five, reduced institutional support. This is the centralized service center ideal. It should prevent some consolidations and centralization and reduce duplication but it will also reduce the direct access students have to support services. It was thought what would happen is instead of reducing duplicate efforts it would result in a shifting of work from one area to another.

Option six, increased non-general support. This option was analyzed, whereby portions of the existing state support would be replaced by tuition, fees, grants, contracts, local support and in-kind contributions. The pluses include strengthen admission, increased responsiveness to local needs, increases in collaborations and partnerships. This requires additional central support and as always, soft money is an unstable base for strong, continuing programs. It was estimated that mid-level savings could be achieved by the third year. The status of report is that it has been presented to the President in preliminary form and will go to the planning committee of the Board in April.

Jerry McBeath asked what is the central recommendation of the task force? Ralph indicated that they identified areas to be investigated. In respect to the administration, they all relate and one that comes closest is the one that talks about the reorganization of the campuses. No specific recommendations were made but an estimate is made of the savings that are possible. John Craven asked if the \$4 million in savings is possible? Ralph said that most of the rural site campuses do business in areas where the cost of doing business is very high. In the past 10 years there have been significant reductions. In order to save \$4 million it would require a significant reengineering of the entire system. Without that, \$4 million on top of the other costs would result in a significant reduction of programs that exist in rural Alaska. John French is concerned that they are looking at cost saving and cost saving models without looking at the administrative model. The latter would be required in terms of defining the effectiveness. David Porter asked about the possibility of looking at the report. Ralph believes that it will be distributed in April.

Paul Reichardt said that the resource allocation committee has been at work since November on developing an allocation model for the system. There are more than 30 existing models which start out with inputs that consist of some set of the following: modeled instructional budget, a research budget, a public service budget, and a physical plant budget. In some states those are all set by formula and in some others are set by policy. Some combination of those four drive the budgets and the other pieces of the model which are academic support, student services, and institutional support or administration. They have been looking at the range of models available and their applicability to UAF. The agenda for UAF is to make sure that any allocation decisions be based on the entire spectrum of our activities. The agenda at UAA is to maximize the size of any coefficient in front of student credit hours. And the agenda for UAS is to ensure that a budget have a base plus increment for numbers of students or levels of activity. Those are the practical constraints of the committee. It became clear to

committee that developing allocation models is tricky because it is difficult to draw the line between model development and policy decision. As a result of that it has become clear to the committee that probably the best service they can play is to present to the Regents some set of allocation models that highlight the policy decisions. At the one extreme we could follow an allocation model such as the Con Bunde model. We can contrast that with a model that propagates the budget based upon inclusion of some reasonable input for research or one that has an incentive associated with it. That presents regents with a clarification of the policy they have developed in the past. That is the approach that the committee is taking. Our timetable was to make an initial report to the Regents at the April meeting and follow it up with a final report somewhere down the line. That timetable has slipped. They may have some alternatives for an instructional model for the April meeting.

Any consideration of cost differentials based upon discipline and level of instruction treats UAF fairly. In terms of activity measured by student credit hours we are larger than UAA at the graduate level; we are about equal size at the upper division undergraduate level; and they swamps us at the lower division and developmental levels. It is imperative for us to have discipline and level and some consideration that we are the only unit which provides Ph.D. education. John French asked about the focus on the use of instructional models. This might encourage the Legislature to focus only on that aspect of the university and forget that they also have a research and service role. Reichardt indicated that there has to be a piece that includes instruction in any model. Right now the only model that is out in the political world is the Bunde proposal. It is the absolute worst model for UAF. The political decision is whether we are better off being able to explain how we allocate our budget in terms of some model and some willingness to make some adjustment if some small ones are needed versus not having anything at all. There is a lack of support by the university for Bunde's model. Outside of UA there may be support. The committee has looked at how other institutions budgets are allocated.

#### IV Governance Reports

##### A. ASUAF - S. Nuss

There are many things going on at the Student Senate. Two members of the senate will go to Juneau over spring break to speak with legislators. They are still in the planning process for the graduation party held in conjunction with the Alumni Association. It will be on May 2nd. Look for a good turnout. Two weeks ago the Senate held an election. They are now at full capability with 28 senators. ASUAF will hold presidential elections after spring break. There are two key items from the Senate. One is calling on the math department to come up with a consistent policy on the use of calculators. They might also want to look at expanding it to include the general chemistry courses. This request came from the fact that some math classes allow the use of calculators. The second item is ASUAF is asking for the resignation of the student regent.

ASUAF is looking at services for next year. They are seriously thinking of turning over the computer lab to DCC. This will reduce their need for staffing. They are looking at next year's budget. ASUAF currently funds \$10,000 for students to attend various conferences. Next year the budget may be increased to \$15,000. This will allow more student to attend conferences, not just to present papers but for any academic purpose.

Kara asked about the funding of labs. Steve indicated that the Presidential special funds are being used to fund the staffing needs of the labs. Cliff Lando indicated that he, as math department chair, has not been contacted about the issue of calculators.

B. Staff Council - P. Long

Paul Long recently joined other faculty, staff, and students in Juneau to meet with legislators and to attend the Board of Regents' meeting. Staff have been meetings with Jim Johnson and union representative about a collective bargaining union.

Supervisory training is going well. A guest speaker at the May 5th supervisory training session is William Carmack. Phil Younker is providing the funding support to bring him to Fairbanks. Suggestions for future training sessions are welcome.

Nomination for the 2nd annual Chancellor's award are due on May 1. The Chancellor has given a gold decal parking spot for the recipient. Information and a nomination form are on the governance web site.

Upcoming is the Staff Council raffle to support the Carolyn Sampson scholarship. Every year the Staff Council holds a raffle that is awarded at the staff picnic. Tickets will be on sale soon. Paula encouraged everyone to buy tickets. The staff picnic will be on May 29th.

C. President's Comments - J. Craven

John indicated that his comments on the MA & MS are included in his written statement. The Chancellor will host a round table discussion tomorrow on the recent meetings in Juneau. Audioconference meetings are set for the Legislative Information Office tomorrow and other time. The Chancellor has a request out for comments on the proposed increases to parking fees. The 1999-2000 catalog will be coming out in January 1999. The Senate needs to look at the course review cycle. John appointed an hoc committee to meet and present recommendations at next Administrative Committee meeting. Committee members need to review the draft timetable.

John indicated that he had learned from the Chancellors Workshop that there are a number of good things that have happened on campus. Several examples--the UAF fire department was named Fire Prevention Program of the year for their outreach programs. The Chamber of Commerce should make note that the university continues to be part of the community. The Bristol Bay campus received a new grant for \$113,000. There are strong community feelings toward the rural campuses within those communities. By fall 1998 student housing will be refurbished. One can see changes on campus. The new student enrollment is up. When John goes to Anchorage for meetings, they are looking at a 3% decrease in enrollment. UAF is working at increases in its enrollment.

D. President-Elect's Comments - M. Schatz

The following was distributed as a handout at the meeting.

Dear colleagues,

I have been trying to find the "perfect" words for over a week, and now I find myself on the eve of the meeting without having written



down ANY of my thoughts. The university is being eaten up by the vultures in the state capitol who have decided that keeping their promise of cutting \$50 million from our state expenditures is more important than reasonable thinking.

Our state is not poor. We have \$942 million in earnings from our Permanent Fund AFTER the checks are written and AFTER the fund is inflation proofed for next year. The existence of these earnings were seen by our earlier legislators as a guarantee against huge cuts to state programs during "hard times." I think the hard times are here, folks.

I sat down, the other day to write a letter to Provost Keating to BEG for the replacement of the RIP position in my own department. I penned the usual, very valid, reasons for the importance of the replacement of this faculty member: 1) The loss of this position would put our entire program in jeopardy of loss of accreditation, 2) The loss of this position would compromise the reputation of the finest music program in the state of Alaska, 3) The loss of this position would affect the Fairbanks public in ways from which they would have a hard time recovering, and so on.....

As I was formulating my thoughts I had an awful realization. In PREVIOUS years the loss of faculty to the RIP weakened programs but did not mean the loss of programs in EVERY area of the university. The Alaska Legislature has been in the business of cutting general fund money to the UA system for a long time. The Board of Regents and the administration on all campuses have been forced to cut back in all areas of university operations. If we do not receive a raise this year the effect will be felt VERY STRONGLY in the only place left to cut --- academic programs.

My face-to-face talks with legislators in Juneau last month did much to increase my pessimism regarding funding for the university. These legislators either: 1) Don't want to vote for the Governor's suggested increase to the university because he is a democrat and they are republicans and they "can't side with the democrats in an election year," 2) Are still misled by the ridiculous notion that there is a great deal of "fat" to be trimmed from administration (and believe that "administration" means just the salaries of administrators rather than every no-classroom or research related activity at the university), 3) See us as "just one more agency with our hand out for money," or 4) Believe that the people of this state don't want their money to go towards higher education.

Well folks, I'M MAD AS HELL AND I'M NOT GOING TO TAKE IT ANYMORE! We, as the Faculty Senate, the representatives of the academic programs here at UAF must come up with a plan. We must do our damndest to shake some sense into this Legislature. If we don't we will be party to the destruction of the University of Alaska and, ultimately , the State of Alaska.

I need your help. I ask for thoughtful discussion, today, as to what we can do to change this tide. We are not helpless.

V Public Comments/Questions - none

VI New Business

A. Motion prohibiting faculty from receiving a Ph.D. degree from UAF, submitted by Faculty & Scholarly Affairs

Ray Gavlak withdrew the motion and indicated that the committee

would like to work on it some more.

\*\*\*\*\*

B. Motion to amend the probation policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Jerry McBeath introduced the motion. Ann Tremarello asked for an amendment to change the word special to non-degree. McBeath asked how students are currently notified of their academic standing. Ann indicated that the notifications come from the deans' offices. When Banner issues are taken care of they will get that information from last semester. There were no objections and the motion passed as amended.

MOTION PASSED AS AMENDED

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the following new policy on academic probation which replaces the existing policy passed by the Fairbanks Academic Council on October 14, 1987.

\*\*\*\*\*

PROBATION

An undergraduate degree status or full-time NON-DEGREE [[special]] student whose semester or cumulative GPA is less than 2.0 will be on probation until that situation changes. Probation reviews are done after both fall and spring semesters.

EFFECTIVE: May 10, 1998

RATIONALE: Current policy and practice provide for three levels of review for probation: for students on good standing whose semester or cumulative GPAs are less than 2.0; for students placed on probation at admission whose semester or cumulative GPA are less than 2.0; and for readmitted students continued on probation whose semester or cumulative GPAs are less than 2.0. This proposal simplifies the probation action, reducing three distinctions to one.

\*\*\*\*\*

C. Motion to amend the academic disqualification policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Jerry McBeath introduced the motion and indicated that currently disqualification is done twice a year. This motion will reduce academic disqualification actions from twice during the academic year to once at the conclusion of the spring semester. This will bring the policy into agreement with terminations on athletic eligibility and student loans. There were no objections and the motion passed.

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approved the following new policy on Academic Disqualification which replaces the existing policy passed by the Fairbanks Academic Council on November 20, 1978.

\*\*\*\*\*

ACADEMIC DISQUALIFICATION

Undergraduate students on probation whose semester and cumulative GPAs are less than 2.0 at the end of the spring semester may be disqualified from degree status. Disqualified students may continue their enrollment at UAF only as non-degree students, limited to enrolling in nine credits per semester, until reinstated into an academic program.

EFFECTIVE: May 10, 1998

RATIONALE: Current UAF practice is to review students for academic disqualification at the end of both fall and spring semesters. Disqualifying students after the fall semester imposes undue hardships on those who have already returned to campus in the expectation that they will be able to continue in their degree programs. Moreover, because eligibility determinations for financial aid and athletic participation are made only at the end of the academic year, some students may be academically disqualified while remaining eligible for financial aid and athletic participation. The new policy language will make the academic disqualification time line consistent with that used for determining financial aid and athletic participation eligibility.

\*\*\*\*\*

D. Motion to adopt an interim promotion and tenure process for ACCFT faculty, submitted by Faculty & Scholarly Affairs

Ray Gavlak indicated that they were approached by ACCFT faculty who have recently negotiated a contract. In that contract the language in the rationale indicated that the MAU would be more responsible for promotion and tenure. Previously ACCFT faculty associated with the Fairbanks campus have have their promotion and tenure process that was regional in nature and used the UAA committee. We were asked develop an interim process by which these ACCFT faculty could be incorporated into the promotion and tenure process at UAF. There is one candidate from ACCFT this year. John French said that it should clarify what interim means. It is intended for this academic year and 1997-98 should be added.

Jerry McBeath indicated that we are well into the promotion and tenure process and there would have to be a different timetable for the ACCFT review. Ray indicated there has to be some policy in place no matter how many candidates will be reviewed and that is not in place right now. Ron Illingworth has worked with the promotion and tenure committee and there is a willingness to meet and deliberate over this application. This is the first year that ACCFT faculty have been able to have a review by a UAF faculty committee. Keating indicated that all policies will be review relative to the new contract with United Academics. The motion was amended to include IN ACADEMIC YEAR 1997-98. There were no objections to the amendment. The amended motion passed.

MOTION PASSED AS AMENDED  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to adopt an interim promotion and

tenure process IN ACADEMIC YEAR 1997-98 for ACCFT faculty associated with the UAF MAU. The specific steps (mirroring existing UAF policy & regulations) shall be:

1. Submission of materials by the faculty member.
2. Review of material by the campus director.
3. Review by a peer review committee.
4. Review by the CRA Executive Dean.
5. Review by the University-wide Promotion & Tenure Committee.
6. Review by the Chancellor's Office.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: For the last several years ACCFT faculty at UAF have utilized a Regional Review Process for promotion and tenure decisions which was modeled on the system in place at UAA. This process involved forwarding P&T packages to UAA for review by their University-wide P&T committee. This committee was augmented by representatives from UAF (ACCFT members). This UAA committee made recommendations for or against P&T and sent their recommendations to the UAF Chancellor.

The most recent ACCFT collective bargaining agreement states in item 5.4.B. that "The University and the Union agree that evaluation policies in which decisions are made within MAUs are desirable. New policies which reflect this goal will be generated through the normal governance structure and will be patterned on the current Regional Review Process (RRP). These policies will become effective when approved by the University and the Union. No changes will be made in UAA policy."

ACCFT faculty at UAF established an ad hoc P&T policy and procedures development committee. This committee developed Standards and Indices (Unit Criteria) which have been approved by CRA faculty and forwarded to the CRA Executive Dean, approved, and forwarded to the UAF Provost office in accordance with UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty.

Changes in the procedures from RRP to local review include establishment of a peer review committee within CRA, inclusion of the CRA Dean within the review process, and inclusion of the UAF University-wide P&T committee in the review process.

However, given the establishment of a new bargaining unit at UAF (United Academics), and given that UAF ACCFT faculty have existed under UAA policy for faculty appointment and evaluation for several years, we recommend that an interim process be approved to accommodate those UAF ACCFT faculty who wish to stand this year. Subsequently, the entire UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty will require revision to include UAF ACCFT faculty as well as the new United Academics contract language. This is a longer process but one which should be initiated soon.

\*\*\*\*\*

## E. Nominations for President-Elect

Kara Nance nominated Ron Gatterdam. There were no other nominations presented. Nominations will remain open until the next Senate meeting. Ron will submit a personal statement for the next Senate agenda.

## VII Committee Reports

## A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath

A report was attached to the agenda. They will be looking at the petition process at their next meeting following spring break on March 23 at 3:00 in the Wood Center Conference Room B.

## B. Faculty &amp; Scholarly Affairs - R. Gavlak

A report was attached to the agenda.

## C. Graduate &amp; Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen

A report was attached to the agenda. A motion was passed by the committee and will be forwarded to the Senate at the next meeting. The major item of business is masters degree requirements and possibly initiating a masters degree within a Ph.D. program. They would like wider input from the university community on this issue and they will have a meeting the week after spring break on March 26 at 1:30 in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

## D. Core Review - J. Brown

A report was attached to the agenda.

## E. Curriculum Review - J. French

No report.

## F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber

A report was attached to the agenda.

## G. Faculty Appeals &amp; Oversight - J. Kelley

A report was attached to the agenda.

H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -  
D. Porter

A Handout was distributed at the meeting. There are three items the committee is working on: 1) a motion to the Senate to create a committee to handle a faculty seminar series. 2) a questionnaire to be distributed to the faculty asking for information on what they perceive to be their needs in terms of successful career development. They will prepare a report based on information gathered in an effort to provide guidance on what resources are

available and what would be most useful to them. 3) the final item is to get an update on what the Faculty Alliance is doing on faculty development.

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1997-98 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT,  
ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE  
Submitted by David O. Porter, Chair

The Committee met six times Fall Semester and twice so far Spring Semester. It meets Thursday at 11 a.m. every other week. The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for March 5.

Our Committee began 1997-98 with an item of business forwarded to the committee from the 1996-97 Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee. The 1996-97 Committee investigated at length the feasibility and desirability of the Faculty Senate sponsoring a Faculty Seminar Series. Presentations would be made by UAF faculty recently completing sabbatical leaves, serving as principal investigators for major research projects and grants, and distinguished visiting academics. The Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost co-sponsored two Faculty Seminars in 1996-97 and the Provost committed his office to continued support of this series. The Committee considered at length whether the Faculty Seminar Series should be sponsored under the auspices of the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee or a new permanent Senate committee. In its final meetings of the 1996-97 Committee approved a motion to recommend to the Faculty Senate that it create a permanent committee of three members to oversee, schedule and host the Faculty Seminar Series. The duties of the Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement are central to many core interests of Senate members. A successful annual Faculty Seminar Series will require early scheduling, effective promotion and arrangements for hosting speakers and attendees. Timely and careful performance of duties of this magnitude was believed to be too much to add to the duties of an existing committee.

At our first meeting in October 1997, the 1997-98 Committee reviewed the Committee's proceedings of the previous year and approved a motion to prepare a RESOLUTION for the approval of the Faculty Senate. A RESOLUTION was drafted for review by the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee by Rich Seifert, last year's Committee Chair, and David Porter, 1997-98 Committee Chair. At the February 27, 1998, meeting of the Administrative Committee Mr. Porter was advised that the Committee should draft a MOTION proposing an amendment to Faculty Senate By-laws to create a new permanent Committee on Faculty Seminars. Mr. Porter and Mr. Seifert will present a draft MOTION to the Administrative Committee for the April Senate meeting.

President John Craven asked the 1997-98 Committee to investigate the present state of faculty development policy at UAF. At its first meetings the Committee reviewed current documents and efforts to create a comprehensive policy document. Committee member Channon Price gave a detailed report on the assignment he had in 1993 to compile and rationalize a comprehensive document on faculty development policy. After deliberation, the Committee decided it was premature to attempt a comprehensive document on faculty development until after completion of negotiations between management and United Academics on a new labor contract. A precursor to the development of such a policy, however, is reliable and current information on what Senate members perceive as the resources needed and available to successfully develop their careers at UAF.

A questionnaire to collect information from faculty was drafted and reviewed over the next three meetings. A final draft approved at meeting of February 3, 1998, reviewed by the Administrative Committee February 27, 1998, and forwarded to Senate offices for distribution to all members of the UAF faculty. A report summarizing responses is planned for the April meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Statewide Faculty Alliance is undertaking an initiative in the area of faculty development. The Committee will contact the UAF representatives on the Alliance and offer to assistance. A modest amount of money has been allotted to a Faculty Alliance committee to carry out their initiative.

I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - S. Henrichs

A report was attached to the agenda.

J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal

A report was attached to the agenda. Scott indicated that legislative reports will be send out as needed.

K. Service Committee - K. Nance

No report was available.

VIII Discussion Items

A. Board of Regents/Legislative meeting

John Craven started the discussion by talking about the RIP 2 replacement policy. This is based on favorable treatment by the Legislature. Keating indicated that the two premises that the RIP strategy were based on were the governor's budget, or the restoration of last years cuts, plus new moneys for faculty negotiated raises with the new contract. If there is no new money for faculty raises it will be equivalent to the \$1.7 million cut taken last year. If the \$1.7 million from this campus or the \$3.4 million systemwide is not restored, then UAF is looking at another \$1.7 million cut deficit for next year. What the Chancellor is looking for is to get the collective voices and ears of people who have been to Juneau to see if there is any indication of what will happen. On March 13 there will be an attempt to announce the first restorations from the RIP positions. We intent to offer these back to the units in increments starting at 25% and move to 50%.

Madeline Schatz referred to her written comments. We are at a time were the non replacement of any RIP position means the end of a program. We are deciding which programs are being cut by the retirements. We have been blaming the administration, but the blame is on our legislators who have decided not to support the university budget. There is a misconception there is so much fat in our administration that they can cut us by several million dollars and that we can still function. They don't realized that administration means more than just salaries. We are not just another agency. They don't understand the importance of higher education to the state of Alaska. They believe they are doing what their constituents want. We have a real problem. We need to discuss ideas of what we can do. The Legislature is not listening.

They want to cut the state budget by \$50 million. There is \$942 million in the earnings of the Permanent Fund. The earnings are meant to help the state along in hard times. We have to get them to do something.

Jerry McBeath indicated that the legislature will not touch any of the reserve. It was not for the purpose of bailing out any government agency. Jerry thought the discussion would be about RIP savings. What he hears is pretty much the same as everyone else and that the RIP savings may not exist next year. The Legislature will eat them up in the future. Jerry will be spending time in Juneau with legislators at the end of the month. That personal contact is what will change minds. He is not sure they are willing to change. The Republican majority is strongly committed to reducing \$50 million.

John Craven agreed with Jerry and indicated that you have to sway more than one person before the caucus makes up its mind collectively. David Porter said that we are early in the session when you get the most clear statements. We are coming into an election. At last week's Rotary meeting Governor Wally Hickel introduced the community dividend program. He made this proposal based on revisiting the idea that we are going to building our communities again and Alaska. It is his sense that as we move closer to the end of this session we will see some movement. We need to continue to build credibility for our programs.

Keating agreed with McBeath and asks how you can pull \$50 million from the economy and then put \$707 million money back into the Dividend fund. The caucus is insistent that we do that. The Board of Regents had a confrontational breakfast with the legislators and put their case on the table. They had a strong debate at the end of the meeting and passed a proposition that asked them to take from the savings and give modest moneys to the University. This is a very vibrant debate going on in the Legislature right now on using the dividend money. Last year we were bailed out with one time only maintenance money. This was used to restore the lecturers. That money will not be around next year. The RIP savings also have to cover lecturers. If we get fixed by the dividend fund in one year, it would have to be a yearly fix, otherwise you will never get on solid ground. It is essential that the majority caucus change its mentality of what is taken out of the operating budgets in order to satisfy their constituents. We need to change their own local constituents to say that the university is a priority for them. When they did a poll 66% of the people said the university needs more money. We need to get them to talk with the legislators. We are one of the two states known to pull money out of higher education last year. It will be a hard sell to attract new students.

Elena Conti asked how the legislators respond to the poll and the data. Keating said they believe that the \$50 million cut is the magic wand to maintaining their super majority.

Scott Deal indicated that the legislators are not receiving information that their constituents are worried about the university. We need to take action and not coddle up to the legislature. We need to spend more money on ad campaigns. We need to get people riled up. The legislators will make their decision based on how many letters and phone calls they receive. We need to go after the voters.

David Porter said that one thing that continues to be a concern is how well we can track what we are doing. If we don't know and can not report in a systematic way what is going on we will not increase levels of confidence. There also need to be some policy so we know what direction we are heading. We also have to have quality. The



lack of policy and the lack of tying that to some kind of consistent reporting system is a long term problem.

John Craven said the Board of Regents has demonstrated that they have been remiss. Their new found attention to presentations about research and their new found willingness to have meetings with legislators. Those have been every beneficial. It should have been a standard operating procedure. It needs to be nurtured. They need to discover that they too have to lobby.

Ron Gatterdam said that the issues of budget have been around for a long time. We have to change the attitude that we are only important to the local economy. There is no appreciation of the importance of the university as an institution of higher learning and not just its economic impact around the state. We need to go to the legislature through companies which hire our students. We need to look to those companies to lend support for the university with the legislature.

IX Members' Comments/Questions

none

X Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 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.