

MINUTES
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #89
 MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1999
 WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

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

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bandopadhyay, S.
 Barnhardt, C.
 Basham, C.
 Bruder, J.
 Butcher, B.
 Curda, L.
 Duffy, L.
 Gardner, J.
 Gatterdam, R.
 Grigg, S.
 Hartman, C.
 Illingworth, R.
 Manfredi, R.
 Mason, J.
 McBeath, J.
 Mortensen, B.
 Nance, K.
 Reynolds, J.
 Robinson, T.
 Sankaran, H.
 Shepherd, J.
 Swazo, N.
 Weber, J. (P. Merritt)
 Winker, K.
 White, D.
 Wiens, J.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Amason, A.
 Bradley-Kawagley, C.
 Garza, D.
 Luick, B.
 Mammoon, T.
 Musgrave, D.
 Norcross, B.
 Sonwalkar, V.
 Yarie, J.
 Zilberkant, E.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bantz, D.
 Ducharme, J.
 Gregory, G.
 Jennings, M.
 Johnson, J.
 Kan, J.
 Layral, S.
 Lind, M.
 Maginnis, T.
 Martin, W.
 Reichardt, P.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

ABSENT:

Banks, Stacey - President, ASUAF	Graduate Student - GSO
Downes, I. - President, UAFSC	
Collins, J. - Dean, SOM	
Leipzig, J. - Dean, CLA	
Tremarello, A - University Registrar	

B. The minutes to Meeting #88 (May 4, 1999) were approved as distributed via e-mail.

C. The agenda was approved as corrected. This is meeting #89. The motion to amend the Grade Appeals Policy is submitted by Faculty Appeals & Oversight--not Faculty & Scholarly Affairs as indicated on the attachment.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to approve the establishment of a new degree, the Bachelor of Arts and Sciences.
2. Motion on testing procedure for language credit for the Core.
3. Motion to amend the minimum requirements for the Master's degrees.

4. Motion to amend the UAF Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Policies & Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty.
 5. Motion to recommend list of administrators for evaluation.
 6. Motion on Chancellor Evaluation Process.
- B. Motions Disapproved:
1. Motion to recommend the Board of Regents change it policy 05.10.01, Section I (Tuition and Student Fees).

III A. Comment from Chancellor Marshall Lind -

Chancellor Lind indicated that it was a pleasure to meet with the Senate on a regular basis. Lind has been here for eight weeks and has spent most of his time listening to people and trying to get around and acquaint himself with the various institutes, departments, and offices. He is very happy to be a part of this university. Fairbanks is clearly the location for those students who are the best academically in the state. Lind has tried to attend the many activities on campus and in the community to better acquaint himself with those interested in UAF.

Chancellor Lind is trying to get ready for the discussions that will begin to take place with the Board of Regents later in the week. These discussions will continue as we finalize the plans for the FY2001 budget. The first part is to put together the operating budget and the second piece is the capital improvement. We are in sync with what the Board of Regents' wants us to be doing in terms of the initiatives. The budget will reflect those initiatives.

UAF is looking seriously at what new construction we will be asking for as well as how we tackle ongoing deferred maintenance. It is Lind's hope that this year and next we will be able to work cooperatively with all faculty in the challenge of the Northwest accreditation. Dana Thomas is the chair of that effort. Lind is pleased to say that we are moving forward with changes to the School of Education. Starting the first of October Roger Norris-Tull will begin as Interim Director.

Charlotte Basham asked about the denied motion. Paul Reichardt stated that it was denied because of a lack of any financial analysis.

Janice Reynolds asked when the accreditation visit would take place. Lind indicated that the team will be here in the Fall of 2001.

Harikumar Sankaran asked about the plans for a permanent dean for the College of Natural Resource Development and Management. Reichardt indicated the plan was to begin a search soon, but the problem is there is no consensus on the structure of the college dean position.

B. Comments from Provost Paul Reichardt -

Provost Reichardt gave an update on enrollment figures. As of September 22nd there are 5,855 students enrolled in Fairbanks. This is about 50 fewer than last year at this date. Freshman applications are even with last year, however, transfer students applications are up. This reflects the changed approach to the recruiting of undergraduate students. Graduate applications and acceptances have also gone up. Reichardt looks at this as very encouraging. The past few years we have had a large number of graduates and the incoming classes have been smaller. We have

made up that difference. We are continuing to try to focus our undergraduate recruiting efforts. The University of Alaska Scholars program has helped quite a bit. On the retention front, we continue to work on a variety of things. On areas for improvement has been food service. This year there is an EDGE program which is targeted at helping first time freshman in student housing. On the graduate front, Reichardt expects to announce a 5% increase in the stipends for TA's. This should have an impact on the moral of our graduate students and our ability to recruit and retain students.

UAF continues to work on assessment of our academic programs. Dana Thomas has agreed to head up the accreditation efforts and Jin Brown has agreed to take over the assessment effort. This year we will be concentrating on two things. One, is to make sure that each graduate program has in place an assessment plan, as do all our undergraduate programs. Another area is to follow up on the documentation of changes that have taken place as a result of our past assessment.

Beginning October 4th Hild Peters will start as an Assistant to the Provost. This is a replacement for Gina Bailey. Reichardt is still looking for someone to head up the Faculty Development efforts. Before Chancellor Wadlow left she gave Reichardt some money raised during the NorthernMomentum campaign to put into place a program called NorthernMomentum Teacher Scholars. Reichardt anticipates announcing a five year plan which will provide modest stipend to supplement sabbatical leave stipends to bring northern international scholars to UAF for a semester or so.

C. Guest Speakers: Jim Johnson, Chief of Staff & Paul Reichardt, Provost spoke on the topic of Academic & Administrative Initiatives and UAF's Response to the Initiatives

Jim Johnson spoke on President Hamilton's initiatives which include:

1. Teacher education
2. Health care
3. Vocational and technical education
4. Logistics
5. Natural resource development and management
6. Data retrieval and analysis

Johnson focused on four areas: What are the initiatives; where did they come from; where are they now; and where are they headed.

These are the academic initiatives that President Hamilton has put forward. There is also a set of administrative initiatives. One of which is being put into the category of academic initiatives is that of student outreach, recruitment, and retention. The other administrative initiatives take back seat to these academic initiatives. They include faculty and staff development, information technology, University relations and development, and research administration.

It is very clear that the University of Alaska is not loved by the people of Alaska and by the legislature. We rank 49th in the nation for general funds going to higher education. The percentage of first time freshmen going to the University of Alaska is about 40% which is the lowest in the nation. Also the percentage of high school graduate who go to college is about 40%; the national average is 67%. We are 50th in the nation. One reason that we are not loved by people is that we have not met the mandate to meet the needs of the state. We have not produced the number of people to meet the needs of the professions.

President Hamilton over the past year has met with many groups and communities around the state. He has found that in order to meet the needs of the state we need to focus primarily on these academic initiatives. These initiatives came from an assessment of the state's needs. Particularly in the area of jobs and research opportunities and where we can contribute to what industry, the state, local government, native corporations, and others need. And they also came from opportunities to serve the state.

There are different level of development for each initiatives. We have already allocated \$1.7 million toward these initiatives this year. President Hamilton, the Chancellor's and the Board of Regents decided to take the \$1.7 million and reallocate it toward these initiatives to jump start them. This year we will be able to go to the legislature and in addition to presenting the promise of leadership from the University of Alaska, we will be able to present the demonstration of leadership. That we have assessed state needs, that we have reallocated and have invested in high priority academic programs. We think this will give us the ability to make a very persuasive case to the legislature this year.

Committees have been formed across the system including administrators and faculty to take up each of these initiatives. As we build these initiatives over the next year there will be more opportunities for faculty, staff, alumni, and partners of the University to be involved in the development of these initiatives. If we alone are advocates on our behalf in Juneau, we will be modestly successful. We will be much more successful if we have faculty assistance and if we have alumni and other support. We need this support to develop the University as an economic engine for the state. The bottom line is that we need to obtain the financial means necessary to meet the state's highest priority needs.

Paul Reichardt spoke on how these initiatives relate to UAF. Last spring we started the budget cycle that will result in the request that will go to the legislature. We have a variety of documents that stated the priority needs of UAF. From those documents UAF put together a budget request. This became the background for the process that resulted in the initiatives. Some of these priorities have been echoed by the other MAU's. Once the initiatives were developed, we then asked what does UAF want that fits within these initiatives.

One item that is needed by all three MAU's is the need to replace positions where there are holes. If we are able to cover our basic costs then we need money for academic repair.

Jim Johnson indicated that we will be asking the legislature to cover our fixed costs and the money to pay for these initiatives. In addition to that, we are asking the legislature for the core faculty positions we didn't get last year, we are asking for information technology, and some additional student recruitment and retention money.

Linda Curda asked if there is a short paper on these initiatives that can be distributed to the faculty. Johnson indicated that there will be a package prepared for the Board of Regent's and it will then be available for others.

Larry Duffy indicated that it was nice to see the economic engine model and ask if given the same static budget situation will there be any change in functions at UAF. Reichardt indicated that if we remain under these tight budgetary controls, any new or reallocated money is going to the high priority areas. Johnson indicated that the

focus would have to be in faculty position as they generate student credit hours.

Jenifer McBeath asked if the initiative would go beyond building the human resources for the state. And would projects that show promise in their accomplishments be put forward and given greater support? Reichardt said that what they are looking for in the areas of the initiatives is to build the capacity to make contributions to solving problems. There are three pieces to that: one is to bring to the staff the proper mix of expertise necessary to do what is appropriate in these areas and to have an appropriate focus. Secondly, is to train the future workers. Third, there is the question of the rest of the stuff necessary to have a successful program.

Johnson indicated that one of the key criteria used in evaluating the proposals will be responsiveness to the state. The legislature will also demand accountability.

Janice Reynolds indicated that the process is flawed if we don't recognize that serving the needs of the people of the state can be different than the needs of the state. The people of the state move and quite often leave the state, so we have to look at the national needs as well. Johnson indicated that many of the areas that are being stressed are also being stressed nationally.

Norm Swazo asked for clarification of the \$1.7 million assigned for these initiatives.

Reichardt indicated that there was accountability for accomplishing something. In this year's FY00 allocation was \$100,000 for the teacher preparation program. He was recently asked how he was going to spend it and what was going to be accomplished. It will include increases in students enrolled in the program, a written plan for the NCATE accreditation, increased advising, and development of capstone course.

Ron Gatterdam asked faculty to think about how their programs fit into these initiatives.

IV Public Comments/Questions

Norm Swazo asked that Michael Jennings, President of United Academics, be allowed to speak during the discussion of the Faculty & Scholarly Affairs Committee.

V Governance Reports

A. ASUAF - Stacey Banks

ASUAF is conducting a post card drive asking the Governor to support the Board of Regents' budget proposal. Their goal is to get 4,000 cards. Joe Hardenbrook, ASUAF Legislative Affairs Director is coordinating this effort. This weekend ASUAF members will attend the Board of Regents meeting.

Another thing that ASUAF wants to do this year is to communicate better with other. Banks wants to get together and coordinate plans before they go to Juneau.

The finally item Banks talked about is "The Fairbanks Idea." This is an initiative that students want to start. It is based on the

Wisconsin Idea. It is a program to create partnership between UAF and the community. This would be of mutual benefit to students and the community. It would also be a way of increasing community support for the university.

Marshal Lind indicated he was enthused about the potential of the program and is delighted that it is coming from the students.

Ron Illingworth asked that the blue cards be distributed to the rural campuses.

B. Staff Council - I. Downes

Irene Downes indicated that she will be reporting only on items that will impact faculty.

Staff Council has formed an ad hoc committee on parking to look at the costs of parking. They have also formed an ad hoc committee on university advocacy. The committee on supervisory training is active. This training is available for all supervisory including faculty. She strongly encouraged faculty to attend. They will also be working with Mike Mills on student retention.

C. President's Report - R. Gatterdam

Ron Gatterdam had no comments for the Senate.

D. President-Elect's Comments - L. Duffy

Larry Duffy indicated that the public comments will be on the agenda at about 3:00 for the rest of the year. This is the time for the faculty to talk to the Senate about issue on the agenda. We might want to stimulate faculty interest in coming to the Senate meetings and participating in the discussion.

VI New Business

A. Motion to amend the Grade Appeals Policy, submitted by Faculty Appeals & Oversight

Norm Swazo informed the Senate of the need to bring the UAF policy into line with the new Board of Regents Policy. They took into consideration comments by the Curricular Affairs Committee. The proposed change bring us into compliance. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION:
=====

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

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

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

[[]] = Deletion
CAPS = Additions

UAF GRADE APPEALS POLICY

I. Introduction

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

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

II. Definitions

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

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

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

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

D. [[All references to duration in "days" refers to university working days, which exclude weekends, holidays and days in which the university is officially closed.]] AS USED IN THE SCHEDULE FOR REVIEW OF ACADEMIC DECISIONS, A CLASS DAY IS ANY DAY OF SCHEDULED INSTRUCTION, EXCLUDING SATURDAY AND SUNDAY, INCLUDED ON THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR IN EFFECT AT THE TIME OF A REVIEW. FINAL EXAMINATION PERIODS ARE COUNTED AS CLASS DAYS.

E. "Department head" for the purposes of this policy denotes the administrative head of the academic unit offering the course (e.g., head, chair or coordinator of an academic department, or the campus director if the faculty member is in the College of Rural Alaska).

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

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

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

I. THE NEXT REGULAR SEMESTER IS THE FALL OR SPRING SEMESTER FOLLOWING THAT IN WHICH THE DISPUTED ACADEMIC DECISION WAS MADE. FOR EXAMPLE, IT WOULD BE THE FALL SEMESTER FOR A FINAL GRADE ISSUED FOR A COURSE COMPLETED DURING THE PREVIOUS SPRING SEMESTER OR SUMMER SESSION. THE SPRING SEMESTER IS THE NEXT REGULAR SEMESTER FOR AN ACADEMIC DECISION MADE DURING THE PREVIOUS FALL SEMESTER.

III. Procedures

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

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

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

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

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

5. If the instructor is no longer an employee of the university or is otherwise unavailable, the student must bring the matter to the attention of the unit department

head who will make every effort to contact the instructor BY THE 15TH CLASS DAY OF THE NEXT REGULAR SEMESTER.

- a. If the instructor can not be contacted but course records are available, the department head WILL EFFECT RESOLUTION WITHIN 5 CLASS DAYS OF NOTIFICATION BY THE STUDENT. THE DEPARTMENT HEAD may correct a grading error through the regular change of grade process on behalf of the instructor.
- b. If the instructor can not be contacted and course records are either unavailable or indecisive, the student may request a review following the procedure outlined below.
- c. If the instructor can be contacted and elects to participate, then a constructive participation is to be welcomed by the review committee. The procedures of Paragraph III.A.5.a. or Paragraph III.A.5.b. will be instituted if the instructor withdraws from participation.

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

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

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

- a. The student's request for review may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and available at the Admissions and Records Office.
- b. By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the review of the grade, and that the university's administration can not influence or affect the outcome of the review.
- c. The request for a review must be received no later than [[45]] 20 days after the first day of instruction in the next regular semester (i.e., fall semester for grade issued at the end of the previous spring semester or summer session; spring semester for grade issued at the end of

the previous fall semester). OR WITHIN 5 DAYS OF RECEIPT OF NOTIFICATION OF THE PROCESS BY THE DEAN/DIRECTOR OF THE COLLEGE OR SCHOOL IN WHICH THE COURSE WAS OFFERED.

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

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

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

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

a. One tenure-track faculty member from the academic unit in which the course was offered (other than the instructor of the course).

b. Two tenure-track faculty members from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the course was offered. If available, one of these two members will be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

c. One tenure track faculty member from outside the college or school in which the course was offered. If available, this member is to be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

d. [[At the option of the student whose grade is being reviewed, t]] The fifth member to be appointed by the dean will be a NON-VOTING student REPRESENTATIVE. [[or another tenure track faculty member outside the college or school in which the course was offered. If the fifth member is a faculty member, this member will be selected from the members of the UAF Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee if one is available.]]

e. The campus judicial officer or his/her designee shall serve as a nonvoting facilitator for grade appeals hearings. This individual shall serve in an advisory role to help preserve consistent hearing protocol and records.

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

- a. During this and subsequent meetings, all parties involved shall protect the confidentiality of the matter according to the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and any other applicable federal, state or university policies.
 - b. Throughout the proceedings, the committee will encourage a mutually agreeable resolution.
 - c. The mandatory first item of business at this meeting is for the committee to rule on the validity of the student's request. Grounds for dismissal of the request for review are:
 - 1) This is not the first properly prepared request for appeal of the particular grade.
 - 2) The actions of the instructor do not constitute arbitrary and capricious grading, as defined herein.
 - 3) The request was not made within the policy deadlines.
 - 4) The student has not taken prior action to resolve the grade conflict with the instructor, as described under section III, A.
 - d. In the event that the committee votes to dismiss the request, a written notice of dismissal must be forwarded to the student, instructor, department head and dean within five days of the decision, and will state clearly the reasoning for the dismissal of the request.
6. Acceptance for consideration of the student's request will result in the following:
- a. A request for and receipt of a formal response from the instructor to the student's allegation.
 - b. A second meeting scheduled to meet within 10 days of the decision to review the request.
 - 1) The student and instructor will be invited to attend the meeting.
 - 2) The meeting will be closed to outside participation, and neither the student nor instructor may be accompanied by an advocate or representative. Other matters of format will be announced in advance.
 - 3) The proceedings will be tape recorded and the tapes will be stored with the campus Judicial Officer.
 - 4) The meeting must be informal, non-confrontational and fact-finding, where both the student and instructor may provide additional relevant and useful

information and can provide clarification of facts for materials previously submitted.

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

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

it

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

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

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

- 1) THE REQUEST FOR A GRADE CHANGE IS DENIED.
- 2) THE REQUEST FOR A GRADE CHANGE IS UPHELD; THE REVIEW COMMITTEE REQUESTS THE COURSE INSTRUCTOR TO CHANGE THE GRADE; AND THE COURSE INSTRUCTOR CHANGES THE GRADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH MAU RULES AND PROCEDURES.
- 3) THE REQUEST FOR A GRADE CHANGE IS UPHELD; THE COURSE INSTRUCTOR IS EITHER UNAVAILABLE TO CHANGE THE GRADE OR REFUSES TO, AND THE REVIEW COMMITTEE DIRECTS THE DEAN/DIRECTOR TO INITIATE THE PROCESS SPECIFIED BY MAU RULES AND PROCEDURES TO CHANGE THE GRADE TO THAT SPECIFIED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE.

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

d. The decision of the committee is final.

B. Motion to amend the GRE/GMAT requirement for graduate admission, submitted by Graduate School Advisory Committee

Larry Duffy indicated that there are difficulties administering the GRE and the GMAT and also wanted to include the GMAT in the exception. This motion was discussed last year by both graduate committees. Joe Kan asked that the gpa in paragraph two be clarified to say undergraduate gpa. Duffy indicated that programs can have higher admission standards and that these were the minimum. The motion as amended passed unanimously.

MOTION:

=====

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

[[]] = Deletions
CAPS = Additions

Graduate Admission Requirements:

You may be admitted to graduate status if you have a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution with at least a 3.0 ("B") cumulative grade point average in your undergraduate studies, and a 3.0 ("B") average in your major, and the major is deemed suitable for continuation of studies in the field of choice. SOME PROGRAMS REQUIRE THE GRE OR GMAT AND OTHER SPECIAL CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION OF STUDENT'S TO THEIR PROGRAM.

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

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2000

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

VII Committee Reports

A. Curricular Affairs - C. Basham

A report was attached to the agenda. Paul Reichardt spoke on the addition of computer classrooms. This summer they added Gruening 211 and 301 Rasmusen Library as hands-on computer classrooms. These classrooms can be scheduled through Scott Keifer. Ron Gatterdam also indicated that the Math computer lab in Chapman can also be scheduled for classroom use.

Paul Reichardt will be working with the Curricular Affairs Committee to look at the spring course changes. We need to fix the cycle of course approvals that meets the needs of the students.

B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - N. Swazo

A report was attached to the agenda.

C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - J. Gardner

A report was attached to the agenda.

D. Core Review - J. Brown

A report was attached to the agenda.

E. Curriculum Review - S. Bandopadhyay

No report was available.

F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber

No report was available.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - T. Maginnis

No report was available.

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

A report was attached to the agenda.

I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - L. Duffy

A report was attached to the agenda.

J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - K. Nance

No report was available.

VIII Discussion Items

A. Committee charge of Faculty & Scholarly Affairs

Norm Swazo indicated that the item for discussion was prompted from comments made by Ron Gatterdam on the role of the Faculty Senate. He sees the role of the Senate as dealing primarily with curricular affairs and that the mandatory items of collective bargaining are better left to the respective unions. This raises the question of the charge of the Faculty & Scholarly Affairs Committee. The issues then becomes whether we want to retain that charge or change it.

The constitutional/bylaw charge of the committee is as follows:

Bylaws

E. STANDING:

2. The Faculty and Scholarly Affairs Committee will deal with policies related to workload, appointment, termination, promotion, tenure, sabbatical leave, academic freedom, research and creative activity.

Norm gave some background on the formation of the union and how it relates to the Senate and this committee. He also felt that we should retain the charge and should establish a formal liaison with the respective unions. He thinks that the Faculty Senate can show solidarity with the unions as they negotiate on our behalf.

Ron Illingworth commented on the composition of the Senate committee and indicated that it would need to include members from all groups.

Sukumar Bandopadhyay said he is on the union and has been on the Senate for the past 10 year and has seen both sides of the issues. When it comes to promotion, tenure, salary, etc. they seek the guidance from everyone. He agreed with Norm that the committee can be advisory to the union.

Ron Gatterdam felt that it was appropriate for members of the union to sit as ex-officio members to the committee. He also hopes that the unions would ask committee members to sit as ex-officio members on some of their working groups. Ron felt that the unions have done a poor job of establishing communications to the rank and file on the campus and does not want the Senate to become the place for debate about union issues. The union needs to do that external to the Senate. He would not like to see motions come to the Senate asking the unions to do such and such. It would be an inappropriate role for the Senate. That kind of role deflate some of the moral standing we have with the administration. And it would dilute the efforts we have in academic matters. Coordination would be appropriate but this should not be the spokesplace for the union or to the union, especially because we have not control over the union.

Norm found this a difficult position to accept because we do have the constitutional prerogative allowed to us in so far as we are able to address mandatory items of collective bargain. We recognized that the unions have been established as the sole bargaining agent, but that does not exclude us from engaging these issues in a spirit of solidarity. The whole idea is that we can and do demonstrate faculty solidarity on these issue and the Senate should be a place where we can indeed speak of these in union with the particular committees of the respective unions. He see no reason why Faculty Affairs could not provide the liaison consultation as they engage in the positions they would be putting forward.

Larry Duffy had difficulty with the definition of liaison. He has no problem offering his opinion to a union representative or to a committee if it is for informational purposes. He sees the position of the Faculty Senate and its mission as looking at the UAF institution, especially on curriculum matters. He felt that an liaison to assist communication was good.

Jenifer McBeath stated that we could develop a relationship between the Senate and unions to each other's benefit. Many of the faculty are member in the Senate and the union. The union is a vehicle developed to achieve our goal. We need to form a cooperative relationship between the union and the Senate to add more voice to our opinion. The purpose is to solve the problems and to facilitate

the faculty wishes and voice.

Jim Gardner indicated that the Senate represents the entire faculty and no one union does that.

Norm Swazo suggested that additional conversation take place at the committee level and then bring forward some recommendation to the Senate. Ron Gatterdam said that he would welcome something coming out of the committee about ex-officio membership to coordinate so that we can talk to each other. He urged the union to find a different medium for communicating to the faculty than through the Senate.

IX Members' Comments/Questions

Tom Robinson indicated that the School of Management is in the current issue of Fortune magazine. There is a feature about the investment class in the magazine.

X Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.